

EVIDENTIARY CHRONOLOGY

MOCK HEARING – SIMULATION ONLY

Southbridge Technologies, Inc. v. ApexGrid Infrastructure, Inc.

PURPOSE OF THIS DOCUMENT

This Evidentiary Chronology is a working reference for the mock hearing.

It is intended to place the material events in chronological order, identify the exhibits that support each event, and distinguish the evidentiary significance of each event from the limitations of the supporting evidence.

This chronology is **not itself an exhibit** and does not enlarge, modify, or supplement the evidentiary scope of any underlying exhibit.

Unless otherwise stated, times are expressed in **Central Daylight Time (CDT)**. Where a row identifies a message date, Certidox certification-event time, or DigiStamp genTime, those values are distinct and should not be treated as interchangeable.

I. UNDERLYING TRANSACTION, CERTIFIED REFERENCE AND DISPUTED RECORDS

Date / Time	Event	Supporting Exhibit(s)	Evidentiary Significance	Limitation
September 14, 2026	Southbridge Technologies, Inc. and ApexGrid Infrastructure, Inc. execute the Master Services Agreement and Enterprise Services Order Form through DocuSign. The Order Form shows Service A selected, Options B, C and D unselected, and identifies Laura Bennett as ApexGrid's Authorized Representative for Optional Service elections.	Exhibit 01	Establishes the contractual framework, the selections as originally executed, Laura Bennett's contractual role, and the original Election Period.	Does not establish which, if any, Optional Services were later elected.
September 18, 2026 – 12:00 PM CT	The original Election Period stated in the executed Order Form expires.	Exhibits 01 and 12	Explains why a later extension was required before any additional Optional Service election could be made.	Does not preclude a later valid extension; Exhibit 12 separately stipulates the validity of the September 24 extension.
September 24, 2026 – 9:48:45 to 9:48:48.79 AM CDT	Laura Bennett's Certidox-certified email requests an extension of the Election Period through 5:00 PM CDT that day and states that all other Order Form terms would remain unchanged. The certified representation records a message date of 9:48:45 AM; manifest.json records a Certidox certification-event time of 9:48:47 AM; response.tsr records a DigiStamp genTime of 9:48:48.79 AM.	Exhibits 02, 12 and 14	Places the extension request in a certified record before Southbridge's acceptance. Exhibit 12 stipulates receipt; Exhibit 14 permits independent verification of the payload-to-manifest chain and the DigiStamp timestamp evidence.	The message date, certification-event time and DigiStamp genTime are distinct. DigiStamp does not independently attest to the accuracy of the Certidox certification-event time, and Exhibit 14 does not reconstruct the native .eml byte-for-byte.

Date / Time	Event	Supporting Exhibit(s)	Evidentiary Significance	Limitation
September 24, 2026 – 9:53:55 AM CDT	Sarah Mitchell’s email bears a message date of 9:53:55 AM CDT. She agrees on behalf of Southbridge to extend the Election Period through 5:00 PM CDT on September 24, 2026, with all other Order Form terms unchanged.	Exhibits 03 and 12	Exhibit 12 stipulates the parties’ authority and that the exchange validly extended the Election Period through 5:00 PM CDT.	Does not establish which Optional Services ApexGrid later elected.
September 24, 2026 – 9:58:22 to 9:58:26.26 AM CDT	The Certidox certification record associated with Exhibit 05 records a certification-event time of 9:58:22 AM. The independently issued DigiStamp RFC 3161 response records a genTime of 9:58:26.26 AM. The reconstructed certified PDF shows Service A and Option B selected and Options C and D unselected.	Exhibits 05, 12 and 16	Establishes a fixed certified reference for the document before the 12:44:43 PM message date borne by Exhibit 06. Exhibit 16 permits independent reconstruction of the exact certified PDF and verification of the relevant SHA-256 and RFC 3161 relationships.	Does not, by itself, establish underlying human identity, authority, factual truth or legal effect. The certification-event time and DigiStamp genTime are distinct; current Certidox status is a separate live value.
September 24, 2026 – 10:18:30 to 10:18:34.82 AM CDT	Laura Bennett’s certified email states that ApexGrid elects Option B – Predictive Grid Analytics and that Options C and D remain unselected, and attaches the updated Order Form. document.json records a message date of 10:18:30 AM; manifest.json records a certification-event time of 10:18:32 AM; response.tsr records a DigiStamp genTime of 10:18:34.82 AM.	Exhibits 04, 12 and 18	Provides the certified reference communication. Exhibit 18 records protected attachment metadata, and Exhibit 12 stipulates that the matching SHA-256 establishes byte-for-byte identity between Exhibit 05 and the PDF attachment whose hash was recorded with Exhibit 04.	Exhibit 18 reconstructs the certified email-content representation, not the native .eml byte-for-byte, and does not contain the attachment bytes. The time values are distinct, and DigiStamp does not independently attest to the Certidox certification-event time.
September 24, 2026 – 12:44:43 PM CDT message date borne by Exhibit 06	Exhibit 06 purports on its face to be an outbound email from Laura Bennett adding Options C and D and instructing Southbridge to proceed with Options B, C and D. The purported message itself bears no Certidox QR code; the only Certidox QR visible in Exhibit 06 appears in the quoted earlier thread and resolves to the certification record associated with Exhibit 02.	Exhibits 06, 12 and 21	Defines the principal disputed email. 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. Exhibit 06 has neither. 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.	The presence of email headers and a DKIM-Signature header is stipulated, but not their authenticity, provenance, cryptographic validity or evidentiary effect. The absence of a QR or certification record, standing alone, does not itself establish falsity.

Date / Time	Event	Supporting Exhibit(s)	Evidentiary Significance	Limitation
Date / time not established by stipulation	Exhibit 07 is the disputed Enterprise Services Order Form associated with Exhibit 06. It shows Service A and Options B, C and D selected. Its SHA-256 differs from the SHA-256 of Exhibit 05 and from the PDF-attachment SHA-256 recorded with Exhibit 04. Exhibit 07 was not separately certified through Certidox and no corresponding document-certification record exists.	Exhibits 07 and 12	Establishes that Exhibit 07 is materially different from the certified A+B reference document and does not have a separate Certidox document-certification record.	The differing SHA-256 establishes nonidentity, not falsification. Exhibit 12 does not stipulate that every Order Form was required to be separately certified. Does not establish who created or altered Exhibit 07, knowledge, fraud or intent.
September 24, 2026 – 5:54:11 PM CDT	Sarah Mitchell transmits Southbridge Invoice ST-2026-0924-01 to Laura Bennett. The invoice reflects Service A and Options B, C and D, total annual fees of \$200,000, and a \$20,000 mobilization deposit.	Exhibits 08 and 09	Shows Southbridge's commercial reliance on the B+C+D scope reflected in its records.	Does not establish that Options C and D were validly elected or authenticate Exhibits 06 or 07. The billing amount is contextual.
September 24, 2026 – 6:04:02 PM CDT	Laura Bennett sends a Certidox-certified response stating that ApexGrid elected Option B only and that Options C and D were not selected and remain unselected.	Exhibits 10 and 12	Shows Laura's contemporaneous rejection of the B+C+D position. Under the stipulated automatic workflow, the message generated its own QR code and separate Certidox certification record; Southbridge's receipt is stipulated.	This is a later response after the billing conflict became explicit. It does not, by itself, authenticate or invalidate Exhibits 06 or 07 or establish fraud or intent.
September 24, 2026 – 6:15:52 PM CDT	Sarah Mitchell responds that Southbridge received a 12:44 PM email from Laura's ApexGrid account adding Options C and D, and produces the disputed email and disputed Order Form in support of Southbridge's position.	Exhibit 11	Establishes Southbridge's subsequent reliance upon and production of Exhibits 06 and 07 as records supporting the B+C+D position.	Does not, by itself, establish the authenticity, provenance or authorship of Exhibits 06 or 07, or that Sarah Mitchell personally created or altered them.

II. SUBSEQUENT USER-FACING VERIFICATION, INDEPENDENT TECHNICAL VERIFICATION, DEMONSTRATIVE COMPARISONS AND SYSTEM-RECORD EVIDENCE

The following exhibits were prepared or used for user-facing verification, independent technical verification, demonstrative comparisons, or system-record evidence in connection with the mock hearing. They should not be treated as additional historical events occurring on September 24, 2026.

Verification Step	Supporting Exhibit(s)	Evidentiary Function	Limitation
User-facing verification of the extension-request email	Exhibit 13	Records the Certidox verification result displayed after the QR code in Exhibit 02 is scanned, including the certification information, current status and certified email content made visible through the interface.	Records what the Certidox interface displays. Does not, by itself, establish delivery, receipt, underlying human identity or authorship.

Verification Step	Supporting Exhibit(s)	Evidentiary Function	Limitation
Independent technical verification of Exhibit 02	Exhibit 14	Reconstructs the certified email-content representation as document.json and permits verification of the payload-to-manifest hash chain, QR and reading-key linkage, and independently issued DigiStamp RFC 3161 timestamp evidence using independently available tools and DigiStamp trust material obtained independently of Certidox.	Does not reconstruct the native .eml byte-for-byte or the complete transport history or MIME structure. Does not independently establish receipt, identity, authority or current live Certidox status.
User-facing verification of the certified Order Form	Exhibit 15	Records the Certidox verification result displayed after the QR code in Exhibit 05 is scanned, including the certification information, current status and the document view showing Service A and Option B selected while Options C and D are unselected.	Records what Certidox displayed. Does not, by itself, establish underlying human identity or authority or determine who created or modified Exhibit 07.
Independent technical verification of Exhibit 05	Exhibit 16	Reconstructs the exact certified PDF as document.pdf and permits verification of its SHA-256, QR and reading-key linkage, manifest integrity and independently issued DigiStamp RFC 3161 timestamp evidence .	Does not, by itself, establish underlying human identity or authority, factual truth, legal effect, current live status, or any conclusion concerning fraud, authorship or intent.
User-facing verification of the Option B election email	Exhibit 17	Records the Certidox verification result displayed after the QR code in Exhibit 04 is scanned, including the certification information, current status, certified email content and displayed attachment entries.	Records what Certidox displayed. Does not, by itself, establish receipt, underlying human identity or authorship, or the authenticity of Exhibits 06 or 07.
Independent technical verification of Exhibit 04	Exhibit 18	Reconstructs the certified email-content representation as document.json and permits verification of the payload-to-manifest hash chain, QR and reading-key linkage, and independently issued DigiStamp RFC 3161 timestamp evidence . It also reconstructs the certified email-content representation containing protected attachment metadata, including the SHA-256 recorded for the PDF attachment. Under Exhibit 12, the matching SHA-256 establishes byte-for-byte identity between Exhibit 05 and that attachment for purposes of this mock hearing.	Does not reconstruct the native .eml byte-for-byte or contain the attachment files as separate payloads. Does not independently establish receipt, identity, authority, current live status, or the authenticity of Exhibits 06 or 07.
Demonstrative comparison of certified and disputed Order Forms	Exhibit 19	Compares the certified reference Order Form identified as Exhibit 05 with the disputed Order Form identified as Exhibit 07. Shows the dispute-relevant differences in Options C and D and the different SHA-256 values; summarizes the independent reconstruction of Exhibit 05 through Exhibit 16 , its stipulated byte-for-byte linkage to the PDF attachment whose SHA-256 was recorded with Exhibit 04, and the independently verifiable timestamp evidence supporting the certified reference.	Does not create or stipulate additional facts. Does not, by itself, establish that Exhibit 07 is false, determine who personally created or altered it, establish knowledge or fraudulent intent, or determine admissibility or ultimate evidentiary weight. The absence of a separate document-certification record for Exhibit 07, standing alone, does not establish falsity.
Demonstrative comparison of certified reference and disputed emails	Exhibit 20	Compares the certified reference email identified as Exhibit 04 with the disputed email identified as Exhibit 06. Summarizes the certified content of Exhibit 04, its independent reconstruction and timestamp evidence through Exhibit 18, the automatic outbound-email certification rule stipulated in Exhibit 12, the absence of a corresponding certification record and QR code of its own for Exhibit 06, and the fact that the QR code visible in the quoted earlier thread resolves to Exhibit 02.	Does not create or stipulate additional facts. Does not, by itself, establish that Exhibit 06 is false, determine who authored, created or altered it, establish knowledge or fraudulent intent, or determine admissibility or ultimate evidentiary weight. The presence of header fields and a DKIM-Signature header in Exhibit 06 is stipulated only as to presence, not authenticity, provenance or cryptographic validity.

Verification Step	Supporting Exhibit(s)	Evidentiary Function	Limitation
User certification history / system-record evidence	Exhibit 21	Reproduces the Certidox “My documents” certification history displayed in Laura Bennett’s authenticated user account for ApexGrid Infrastructure, Inc. Exhibit 12 stipulates that Exhibit 21 accurately displays all Certidox document and email certification records associated with that user account dated September 24, 2026. It displays records associated with Exhibits 02, 05, 04 and 10, but no corresponding certification record for Exhibit 06. The underlying certification data are stored in encrypted form; access requires authentication to Laura Bennett’s account; and Laura Bennett was the only authorized user of that account.	Exhibit 21 is a Certidox service-side system record, not an independent cryptographic verification bundle. It does not, by itself, establish that Exhibit 06 is false, determine authorship of any disputed record, or establish fraud, intent or ultimate evidentiary weight.

III. CORE CHRONOLOGICAL SEQUENCE

The evidentiary sequence may be summarized as follows:

September 14 / September 18: the parties execute the contractual framework on September 14. The original Election Period expires at 12:00 PM Central Time on September 18.

September 24, 9:48:45–9:53:55 AM: Laura requests an extension through 5:00 PM CDT in a Certidox-certified email; Sarah accepts on behalf of Southbridge. Exhibit 12 stipulates authority, receipt and the validity of the extension.

September 24, 9:58:22–9:58:26.26 AM: the A+B Order Form is associated with a Certidox certification-event time and an independently issued DigiStamp RFC 3161 genTime. The reconstructed certified PDF shows Service A and Option B selected and Options C and D unselected.

September 24, 10:18:30–10:18:34.82 AM: the certified Option B election email records that Options C and D remain unselected. The recorded attachment SHA-256 is linked under Exhibit 12 to Exhibit 05.

September 24, 12:44:43 PM message date borne by Exhibit 06: Exhibit 06 purports on its face to be an outbound email from Laura Bennett stating the opposite position and adding Options C and D. The purported message has no Certidox QR code of its own and no corresponding Certidox certification record. Exhibit 21, which by stipulation accurately displays all Certidox document and email certification records associated with Laura Bennett’s user account dated September 24, contains no corresponding record for Exhibit 06.

Exhibit 07: the associated disputed B+C+D Order Form differs materially from the certified Exhibit 05 A+B Order Form. It was not separately certified through Certidox, and no corresponding document-certification record exists. The record does not establish when or by whom Exhibit 07 was created.

September 24, 5:54 PM: Southbridge transmits an invoice based on Service A plus Options B, C and D.

September 24, 6:04:02 PM CDT: Laura sends a Certidox-certified response rejecting C and D. At 6:15:52 PM, Sarah responds by relying upon and producing the disputed B+C+D email and Order Form as Southbridge records.

IV. EVIDENTIARY SIGNIFICANCE

The chronology presents a contractual foundation followed by two materially different record sets.

Contractual foundation: Exhibits 01 through 03 establish the original Order Form, expiration of the original Election Period, and the September 24 extension that made a later election contractually possible.

Certified reference records: Exhibit 05 shows Service A and Option B selected with C and D unselected. Exhibit 04 records the certified email content stating that ApexGrid elects Option B and that C and D remain unselected. **Both certified reference records predate the 12:44:43 PM message date borne by Exhibit 06.**

Disputed records: Exhibit 06 purports to be an email bearing a later 12:44:43 PM message date and adding C and D; Exhibit 07 is the associated B+C+D Order Form. Exhibit 06 has no corresponding Certidox certification record and no Certidox QR code of its own. Exhibit 21, which by stipulation accurately displays all Certidox document and email certification records associated with Laura Bennett's user account dated September 24, contains no corresponding record for Exhibit 06. Exhibit 07 was not separately certified through Certidox and no corresponding document-certification record exists. Neither absence, standing alone, establishes falsity.

Certification-system foundation: 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.

User certification history: Exhibit 21 is a Certidox service-side system record that, by stipulation, accurately displays all Certidox document and email certification records associated with Laura Bennett's user account dated September 24, 2026. It displays records associated with Exhibits 02, 05, 04 and 10, but no corresponding record for Exhibit 06. The underlying certification data are encrypted, access to the history requires authentication, and Laura Bennett was the only authorized user of the account. Exhibit 21 is

not an independent cryptographic verification bundle and does not, by itself, establish falsity, authorship, fraud or intent.

Subsequent reliance: Exhibits 08 through 11 show the billing consequence, Laura's later certified rejection of C and D, and Sarah's subsequent reliance upon and production of Exhibits 06 and 07.

Verification and comparison architecture: Exhibits 13, 15 and 17 provide user-facing verification results. Exhibits 14, 16 and 18 provide **separate, reproducible technical verification paths** using independently available tools and **independently issued DigiStamp RFC 3161 timestamp evidence**.

Except for current certification status, those reconstruction and timestamp-verification procedures **do not require reliance on the Certidox live verification interface**; the email-bundle procedures in Exhibits 14 and 18 also **do not require access to the original mailbox or original mail server**.

Exhibits 19 and 20 provide demonstrative comparisons of the certified reference records and the disputed records. They synthesize relationships established or stipulated elsewhere in the record and **do not create or stipulate additional facts or enlarge the evidentiary effect of the underlying exhibits**.

V. CENTRAL EVIDENTIARY ISSUE

This chronology does not, by itself, determine whether any person committed fraud or intentionally altered a record.

The central evidentiary issue is whether Exhibits 06 and 07 are authentic and what evidentiary weight should be assigned to them when evaluated against:

- the contractual extension that made a September 24 election possible;
- the certified reference records that predate the 12:44:43 PM message date borne by Exhibit 06;
- the stipulated rule that every outbound email sent from Laura Bennett's ApexGrid corporate mailbox was automatically certified through Certidox and generated its own separate certification record and QR code;
- the absence of a corresponding Certidox certification record and QR code of its own for Exhibit 06;
- the September 24 user certification history reflected in Exhibit 21, which contains no corresponding record for Exhibit 06, together with the expressly stated limitations of that service-side system record;
- the material difference between Exhibit 07 and the certified Exhibit 05 reference document, and the absence of a separate document-certification record for Exhibit 07, without treating either fact as standalone proof of falsity;

- the user-facing and independent technical verification of the certified reference records, including independently issued DigiStamp RFC 3161 timestamp evidence;
- the relationships summarized in Exhibits 19 and 20, to the extent established or stipulated by the underlying evidentiary record; and
- the later conduct and reliance of the parties when the conflict became explicit.

Ultimate conclusions concerning authentication, integrity, provenance, authorship, knowledge, intent and evidentiary weight remain matters for determination at the mock hearing.