On March 13, 2014, the National Ombudsman received a complaint from Mr Blok1 about Utrecht University (UU) and the National Board for Scientific Integrity (NCSI). He complains about state of affairs during the investigation of his scientific integrity. Based on the investigation, UU has come to a provisional opinion. When Mr. Blok appealed to the NCS, two other scientists had complained about this matter, as well. The NCSI upheld the complaints of the two scientists, while rejected the complaints of Mr. Blok as being unfounded. Consequently, the UU has come to the conclusion that Mr. Blok had acted in violation of scientific integrity. The National Ombudsman has examined the complaints from the perspective of a fair play for the citizen. He believes that commenting on the decisions of the Board of the University and/or the NCSI, as well as the underlying justification is beyond his competence. In this context, it is important to mention that, in view of a recent ruling by the Court Amsterdam2, the National Ombudsman is not competent to give opinions on complaints about the NCSI. NCSI has indicated its intention to voluntarily participate in this investigation. The National Ombudsman is aware that the investigation on scientific integrity involves importance of both individual scientists and academic (government) institutes. Thus, an individual scientist has a vulnerable position. For that reason, the National Ombudsman finds it important that the governments and institutions possessing a public authority for integrity investigations handle the individual scientists, who are subject of the investigation, with a great caution, and that they pay attention to such scientists position and status. The fair play for the citizen means that, in this case, the Utrecht University and the NCSI should have allowed Mr. Blok to use his procedural opportunities during investigations on his scientific integrity and, thereby, to ensure a fair and transparent business. UU and NCSI must have provided Mr. Block with any information regarding actions and decisions, which could have affected Mr. Blok's interests. UU and NCSI should have given Mr. Blok the opportunity to express his viewpoints and set forth corresponding facts, as well as defend them against the opposite viewpoints (adversarial). UU and the NCSI should have actively provided information on the procedural opportunities that Mr. Blok could exploit, and should have made it clear to Mr. Blok why they did certain things. In short, the University of Utrecht and the NCSI should have carried out an investigation, in which they ensured a fair play for the citizen. With these notions, the National Ombudsman looked into the state of affairs described in the report of findings. He has found that the University of Utrecht had not been transparent at certain points. For instance, the UU has not explained how they had chosen the experts; they also have not kept Mr. Blok informed of their correspondence with these experts. On some points, the University has not given Mr. Blok the chance to use his procedural opportunities, as he might have expected. In particular, during the investigation, the UU has not informed Mr. Blok of the nature and extent of the complaint and has involved a dependent and anonymous technical committee in carrying out the follow-up investigation. Furthermore, the National Ombudsman found that the NCSI has not properly informed of, and involved Mr. Blok in their hearings. Neither NCSI has provided Mr. Blok, in one of the complaints, with the procedural opportunities that fit the position and importance of the person, whose scientific integrity is under the investigation. Taken together, the National Ombudsman concluded that the complaints about the practices of the Utrecht University and the National Board for Scientific Integrity are grounded as being contrary to the requirement of the fair play.