

MOCK HEARING - SIMULATION ONLY - DEMONSTRATIVE EXHIBIT

EXHIBIT 20 - COMPARISON OF EXHIBIT 04 CERTIFIED REFERENCE EMAIL AND EXHIBIT 06 DISPUTED EMAIL

The comparison below distinguishes the certified reference communication from the disputed message bearing the later 12:44:43 PM message date and identifies the evidentiary limits of each.

	CERTIDOX-CERTIFIED REFERENCE EMAIL	DISPUTED EMAIL
Source exhibit	Exhibit 04	Exhibit 06
Status in record	CERTIDOX-CERTIFIED REFERENCE	DISPUTED MESSAGE
Message date / reference time	Certified representation records message date 10:18:30 AM CDT; Certidox certification-event time 10:18:32 AM CDT; DigiStamp genTime 10:18:34.82 AM CDT	Bears a message date of 12:44:43 PM CDT
Core message content	ApexGrid elects Option B - Predictive Grid Analytics. "Options C and D remain unselected."	Purports to state: "we've decided to add Options C and D as well" and "Please proceed with Options B, C and D."
QR code for this message	Own Certidox QR code generated through the stipulated automatic outbound-email certification workflow	No Certidox QR code belonging to the purported 12:44:43 PM message. The QR visible in the quoted earlier thread resolves to the certification record associated with Exhibit 02.
Separate Certidox certification record	Yes. The stipulated automatic workflow generated a separate record for Exhibit 04.	No corresponding Certidox certification record exists for the purported 12:44:43 PM message. Exhibit 21, which by stipulation accurately displays all Certidox document and email certification records associated with Laura Bennett's user account dated September 24, 2026, contains no corresponding record for Exhibit 06.
Automatic workflow consequence	Exhibit 12 stipulates that every outbound email sent from Laura Bennett's ApexGrid corporate mailbox was automatically certified through Certidox and generated its own separate Certidox certification record and QR code. The certification process required no separate action by Laura Bennett.	Exhibit 06 purports to be an outbound email from that mailbox, but has no corresponding Certidox certification record and no Certidox QR code of its own.
Independent verification	Exhibit 18 independently reconstructs the certified email-content representation and verifies its payload-to-manifest and RFC 3161 timestamp relationships.	No corresponding Certidox certification record exists for the purported message.
Associated Order Form	Protected attachment metadata records the SHA-256 of the PDF attachment. Exhibit 12 stipulates that the matching SHA-256 establishes that Exhibit 05 is byte-for-byte identical to that attachment. Exhibit 05 shows A+B selected, with C and D unselected.	Associated with disputed Exhibit 07, which shows A+B+C+D selected and has a different SHA-256 from Exhibit 05 and from the PDF-attachment SHA-256 recorded with Exhibit 04.
Headers / DKIM	Not the basis of the certified reference chain described here.	Headers and a DKIM-Signature header appear on Exhibit 06, but Exhibit 12 does not stipulate their authenticity, provenance, cryptographic validity or evidentiary effect.
Key limitation	Does not, by itself, establish personal authorship, authority, factual truth or legal effect.	The absence of a Certidox QR code or certification record, standing alone, does not establish falsity.

Key point: Exhibit 04 is supported by its own Certidox certification record and an independently reconstructible technical verification path. Exhibit 06 bears a later message date but has no corresponding Certidox certification record or QR code of its own; Exhibit 21's stipulated September 24 user certification history contains no corresponding record for Exhibit 06.

EXHIBIT 04 - CERTIFIED REFERENCE	EXHIBIT 06 - DISPUTED MESSAGE
Certified message content: “Option B - Predictive Grid Analytics” “Options C and D remain unselected.” Attachment: updated Enterprise Services Order Form. Own Certidox QR code and separate certification record under the stipulated automatic workflow	Purported message content: “Following up on my earlier message, we’ve decided to add Options C and D as well.” “Please proceed with Options B, C and D.” Associated with disputed Exhibit 07. No QR code belonging to the purported 12:44:43 PM message and no corresponding Certidox certification record.

WHY THE CONTRAST IS PROBATIVE

- **Automatic certification.** Exhibit 12 stipulates that every outbound email sent from Laura Bennett’s ApexGrid corporate mailbox was automatically certified through Certidox and generated its own separate Certidox certification record and QR code. The certification process required no separate action by Laura Bennett.
- **Exhibit 06 has no certification trace of its own.** The purported 12:44:43 PM message has no corresponding Certidox certification record and no Certidox QR code of its own. The QR code visible in the quoted earlier thread resolves to the certification record associated with Exhibit 02.
- **User certification history.** Exhibit 21 accurately displays, by stipulation, all Certidox document and email certification records associated with Laura Bennett’s user account dated September 24, 2026. It displays the records associated with Exhibits 02, 05, 04 and 10, but no corresponding record for Exhibit 06.
- **Evidentiary limitation.** Exhibit 21 is a Certidox service-side system record, not an independent cryptographic verification bundle. Neither Exhibit 21 nor the absence of a corresponding certification record, standing alone, establishes that Exhibit 06 is false, determines authorship, or establishes fraud or intent.

THE QR CODE VISIBLE IN EXHIBIT 06

The QR code visible in Exhibit 06 appears only within the quoted earlier thread. Independent verification resolves that QR code to the certification record associated with Exhibit 02. It is not a QR code for the purported 12:44:43 PM message.

1. INDEPENDENT RECONSTRUCTION OF EXHIBIT 04

Exhibit 18 independently reconstructs the certified email-content representation associated with Exhibit 04 as `document.json`. The reconstructed representation records the certified message content electing Option B and expressly stating that Options C and D remain unselected, together with protected attachment metadata.

2. INDEPENDENT TIMESTAMP EVIDENCE

The DigiStamp RFC 3161 timestamp associated with Exhibit 04 records a `genTime` of 10:18:34.82 AM CDT. This precedes the 12:44:43 PM message date borne by Exhibit 06. The timestamp verification can be reproduced using independently available technical tools and DigiStamp trust material obtained independently of Certidox.

3. LINKAGE TO THE CERTIFIED ORDER FORM

The reconstructed Exhibit 04 certified email-content representation records the SHA-256 of its PDF attachment. Under Exhibit 12, the matching SHA-256 establishes that Exhibit 05 is byte-for-byte identical to that attachment for purposes of this mock hearing. Exhibit 05 shows Service A and Option B selected, with Options C and D unselected.

4. REPRODUCIBLE VERIFICATION

Except for current certification status, the reconstruction and timestamp verification described in Exhibit 18 do not require access to the original mailbox, the original mail server, the Certidox live verification interface or reliance on a Certidox-generated verification display.

5. LIMITS OF THIS DEMONSTRATIVE

- This demonstrative does not, by itself, establish that Exhibit 06 is false.
- It does not determine who authored, created or altered Exhibit 06.
- It does not establish knowledge, fraudulent intent, admissibility or ultimate evidentiary weight.
- The presence of header fields and a DKIM-Signature header in Exhibit 06 is stipulated only as to presence; their authenticity, provenance and cryptographic validity are not stipulated.

The absence of a Certidox QR code or certification record, standing alone, does not establish falsity. Its significance here must be evaluated together with the automatic outbound-email certification rule stipulated in Exhibit 12 and the September 24 user certification history reflected in Exhibit 21.