

PUBLIC SAMPLE / FICTIONAL ENGAGEMENT

Technical evidence memorandum

Prepared for Northline Studio

A fictional organization used solely to demonstrate reporting. No client information, live indicators or actual evidence is included.

Report reference	Reporting cutoff	Intended reader
LEG-001	07 Oct 2026 / 23:59 UTC	Instructing counsel and authorized matter team

EXECUTIVE ASSESSMENT

This fictional memorandum compares a disputed public page with an earlier supplied capture and records the handling of those materials. A payment instruction differs between the two copies. The supplied records do not establish who edited the page, whether the copies reflect the full page history or whether a particular legal claim is satisfied.

DECISION REQUESTED

Counsel should decide whether to seek additional original records or provider-held material through appropriate channels. Limit circulation to the agreed matter team until distribution is reviewed.

Inside this report

02 Scope and method / 03 Findings / 04 Evidence and chronology / 05 Action plan / 06 Handover and limitations

Illustrative format only. Final scope, response cadence, authorized recipients and local requirements are agreed for each engagement. No service outcome or legal determination is promised.

02 / HALDEN INTELLIGENCE

Scope, coverage & method

AGREED QUESTION AND COVERAGE

Answer the fictional instruction: what differences are visible between two supplied page captures, and what provenance gaps affect their interpretation? Review client-provided copies and maintain an illustrative exhibit index and handling sequence.

OUTSIDE THIS ASSESSMENT

Legal opinions, expert-witness designation, conclusions on intent or liability, assurance of privilege or admissibility, device acquisition, third-party access and claims of forensic accreditation.

Asset / record	Accountable owner	Coverage
AS-01 / Earlier capture	Instructing team	Exhibit EX-01; supplied copy
AS-02 / Later capture	Instructing team	Exhibit EX-02; supplied copy
AS-03 / Instruction record	Matter lead	Defined question and authorized recipients

REPORTING METHOD

Define authority and scope; register supplied material; separate direct observations from statements; assess alternative explanations; review findings against source limitations; assign actions with acceptance evidence.

CONFIDENCE IS NOT SEVERITY

High: the cited material directly supports this narrow observation. Moderate: the observation has support but an important gap remains. Low: it is a lead or statement requiring corroboration. Confidence never establishes identity, intent or legal liability.

PRIORITY AND TIME

High: address promptly because of potential material harm or dependency. Medium: assign a near-term owner. Low: review in the agreed cycle. These are qualitative priorities, not CVSS ratings. All times are UTC; event times and receipt times are distinct.

03 / HALDEN INTELLIGENCE

Findings & interpretation

F-01 / HIGH PRIORITY / HIGH CONFIDENCE

Visible payment instruction changed between supplied copies

Observation. EX-01 shows the approved contact route; EX-02 shows a different payment-contact reference. The comparison concerns only visible contents of the copies.

Why it matters. The difference is relevant to counsel's factual question and should be preserved with both source versions.

Alternative / uncertainty. The copies might represent different page states, localized views or incomplete captures rather than a single unauthorized edit.

Recommended action. Record the exact difference and ask counsel whether original captures and contextual records are needed.

Evidence: E-01, E-02

F-02 / HIGH PRIORITY / HIGH CONFIDENCE

Capture provenance is incomplete

Observation. The supplied files lack a complete collector record, tool version and verified source-clock information.

Why it matters. The memorandum cannot independently establish the claimed capture times or completeness.

Alternative / uncertainty. The original collector may retain supporting notes outside the supplied bundle.

Recommended action. Request the collector's original records through the instructing team and preserve the copies without silently modifying them.

Evidence: E-01, E-02

F-03 / MEDIUM PRIORITY / HIGH CONFIDENCE

Integrity checks do not establish authorship

Observation. The illustrative handling workflow calls for a file digest at receipt and transfer. No real evidence digest is represented in this public sample.

Why it matters. A matching digest can support file consistency in a defined workflow but cannot identify who created the underlying content.

Alternative / uncertainty. A faithfully preserved copy can still be incomplete or misleading about the original event.

Recommended action. Separate integrity statements from provenance and attribution; record any transformations and retain original files.

Evidence: E-03

04 / HALDEN INTELLIGENCE

Evidence & chronology

Evidence register

ID / source	Receipt time (UTC)	Known limitation
E-01 / Fictional EX-01 earlier page copy	2026-10-04 09:00 UTC	Collector and original capture details incomplete
E-02 / Fictional EX-02 later page copy	2026-10-04 09:05 UTC	Not independently retrieved from the original provider
E-03 / Fictional instruction and handling record	2026-10-04 10:00 UTC	No real signatures, seals or evidence hashes

Event chronology

Event time (UTC)	Recorded event	Source
04 Oct / 09:00	EX-01 receipt recorded in example register	E-01
04 Oct / 09:05	EX-02 receipt recorded separately	E-02
05 Oct / 14:00	Comparison reviewed; provenance gap retained	E-03

HANDLING AND PROVENANCE

The entries above are invented descriptions, not evidence attachments. In a real engagement, assign a unique evidence ID; record collector, authority, source, collection and receipt times, method and limitations; retain the original in approved storage; and log access, transformations and transfers. Calculate digests on actual files where appropriate. Never invent a digest or custody event.

SOURCE BOUNDARIES

A screenshot can support what was visible in that copy. It does not, on its own, prove origin, completeness, authorship or the full history of an event. Preserve contradictions and distinguish client-reported events from independently verified observations.

05 / HALDEN INTELLIGENCE

Action plan & service register

When	Owner	Completion evidence	State
Before reliance	Instructing counsel	Confirm question, recipients and permitted use	Required
Before final memorandum	Matter lead	Request originals and collector notes	Open
At every transfer	Evidence custodian	Record handler, purpose, time and integrity result	Required
Before external filing	Client counsel	Review disclosure, privilege and admissibility questions	Client decision

Illustrative exhibit and custody index

Record	Handling event	Integrity / location
EX-01 / E-01	04 Oct 09:00 UTC; received by Custodian A	Digest not populated in public sample; example vault item 01
EX-02 / E-02	04 Oct 09:05 UTC; received by Custodian A	Digest not populated in public sample; example vault item 02
Review copy	05 Oct 14:00 UTC; Analyst B compared copies	Transformation and tool log required in real matter
Proposed delivery	Not performed in sample	Recipient approval and transfer receipt required

This is a reporting example, not an expert report, sworn statement, actual chain of custody or signed instruction. Counsel controls legal characterization and distribution.

CLOSING AN ACTION

Record the actual completion time, responsible person and evidence reference. A request, recommendation or platform submission is not completion. Keep unresolved dependencies visible and agree the next review date with the client.

Limitations & handover

LIMITS ON RELIANCE

Technical comparison does not determine authenticity, intent, liability, privilege or admissibility. No conclusion should extend beyond the supplied materials and the stated question.

DISTRIBUTION AND RETENTION

This fictional sample is public. A live report requires an approved recipient list, secure delivery method, retention schedule and disposal owner agreed with the client and, where relevant, counsel. Do not place real evidence or personal data in public website assets.

Release checklist for a live engagement

Required check	Record to complete before issue
Authority and scope	Approved instruction reference and authorized assets
Analyst and peer review	Named preparer, reviewer, review date and corrections
Client decisions	Decision owner, accepted actions and unresolved objections
Delivery and acceptance	Approved recipients, transfer receipt and acceptance date
Follow-up and retention	Next review, retention basis and disposal responsibility

These fields are deliberately unsigned. No real review, instruction, client approval or evidence transfer is represented by this sample.

Method references

Background guidance only; these publications do not validate fictional findings or certify this report. Apply current platform procedures and engagement-specific legal advice separately.

NIST SP 800-86 — Guide to Integrating Forensic Techniques into Incident Response (2006)
<https://csrc.nist.gov/pubs/sp/800/86/final>

NIST SP 800-61 Rev. 3 — Incident Response Recommendations and Considerations for Cybersecurity Risk Management (2025)
<https://csrc.nist.gov/pubs/sp/800/61/r3/final>