

HEARING PROTOCOL AND ORDER OF PROCEEDINGS

MOCK HEARING - SIMULATION ONLY

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

PURPOSE OF THIS DOCUMENT

This protocol governs the conduct of the mock hearing concerning the authenticity, integrity, provenance and evidentiary weight of conflicting electronic records arising from the Southbridge Technologies, Inc. / ApexGrid Infrastructure, Inc. transaction.

The hearing is intended to operate as an adversarial evidentiary exercise.

It is not a product demonstration, and the neutral is not being asked to endorse, validate or approve Certidox as a product or service.

The parties are expected to challenge the evidence, its provenance, its limitations and the conclusions that may reasonably be drawn from it.

The participants are not being asked to validate Certidox. They are being asked to test the evidence and the inferences that may reasonably be drawn from it.

I. NATURE AND SCOPE OF THE HEARING

The hearing concerns materially conflicting electronic records relating to ApexGrid's election of Optional Services under the Enterprise Services Order Form following the valid September 24 extension of the Election Period.

Contractual foundation

Exhibits 01 through 03 establish the executed contractual framework, the original September 18 Election Period deadline, and the September 24 request and agreement extending the Election Period through 5:00 p.m. CDT.

Certified reference records

Exhibit 04 is Laura Bennett's Certidox-certified email stating that ApexGrid elects Option B and that Options C and D remain unselected.

Exhibit 05 is the separately Certidox-certified Enterprise Services Order Form showing Service A and Option B selected, with Options C and D unselected.

Disputed records

Exhibit 06 is the disputed email bearing a 12:44:43 p.m. CDT message date and purporting to add Options C and D.

Exhibit 07 is the associated disputed Order Form showing Service A and Options B, C and D selected.

Remaining evidentiary record

Exhibits 08 through 11 provide the billing context, Laura Bennett's later certified rejection of the B+C+D position, and Sarah Mitchell's subsequent reliance upon and production of Exhibits 06 and 07.

Exhibit 12 provides the foundational stipulation concerning the September 24 extension; the automatic certification of every outbound email sent from Laura Bennett's ApexGrid corporate mailbox; the architecture and limitations of the independent-verification bundles; the certified-content and attachment-hash relationships among the relevant records; the absence of a corresponding Certidox certification record and QR code for Exhibit 06; the limited significance of the absence of a separate document-certification record for Exhibit 07; Southbridge's receipt of Exhibits 02 and 10; and the scope and limitations of Exhibits 13 through 21.

Exhibits 13, 15 and 17 provide user-facing verification evidence.

Exhibits 14, 16 and 18 provide corresponding independent technical verification paths.

Exhibits 19 and 20 are demonstrative comparisons of the certified reference records and the disputed records.

Exhibit 21 is a system-record exhibit reproducing the Certidox "My documents" certification history displayed in Laura Bennett's authenticated user account. 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 contains no corresponding certification record for Exhibit 06. Exhibit 21 is a Certidox service-side system record, not an independent cryptographic verification bundle.

The central evidentiary issue is whether Exhibits 06 and 07 are authentic and what evidentiary weight should be assigned to them when the complete record is considered.

II. QUESTIONS FOR DETERMINATION

The neutral is asked to evaluate the complete evidentiary record and determine what evidentiary weight should be assigned to the disputed records.

The principal questions are:

1. What evidentiary weight should be given to the certified reference records, Exhibits 04 and 05?
2. What significance should be attached to the stipulated byte-for-byte linkage between Exhibit 05 and the PDF attachment whose SHA-256 was recorded with Exhibit 04?
3. What significance should be attached to 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?
4. What significance should be attached to the absence of a corresponding Certidox certification record and QR code of its own for Exhibit 06, when considered together with the September 24 user certification history reflected in Exhibit 21?
5. What additional evidentiary weight, if any, results from the independently reproducible technical verification and DigiStamp RFC 3161 timestamp evidence?
6. What significance should be attached to the material differences between Exhibits 05 and 07 and to the absence of a separate document-certification record for Exhibit 07, given that the parties do not stipulate that every Order Form was required to be separately certified?
7. What significance should be attached to Laura Bennett's later certified rejection of the B+C+D position and Sarah Mitchell's subsequent reliance upon and production of Exhibits 06 and 07?
8. Considering the record as a whole, what evidentiary weight should be assigned to Exhibits 06 and 07?

The neutral is not asked to determine whether Certidox, standing alone, proves fraud or whether the absence of certification automatically makes a disputed record false.

III. THE NEUTRAL

The neutral shall preside over the hearing and may:

- control the order and timing of proceedings;
- ask questions of either counsel at any time;
- request that counsel identify the exhibit supporting a factual assertion;
- require counsel to distinguish a fact established by an exhibit from an inference drawn from that fact;
- require counsel to identify whether a proposition is an expressly stipulated fact, a descriptive relationship reflected in the exhibit set, or an evidentiary inference;
- challenge the technical or evidentiary significance attributed to any exhibit;
- request live user-facing verification of a Certidox QR code or independent technical verification using a native verification bundle, subject to the procedures set out below;

- limit repetitive or cumulative argument; and
- reserve all findings until the conclusion of the hearing.

The neutral should approach the record without any presumption in favor of either party or Certidox.

IV. COUNSEL

Two counsel shall participate.

Counsel for ApexGrid Infrastructure, Inc.

Counsel shall present the strongest reasonable argument that the complete evidentiary record undermines the authenticity and evidentiary weight of Exhibits 06 and 07 as records of an additional election actually made by Laura Bennett.

Counsel for Southbridge Technologies, Inc.

Counsel shall present the strongest reasonable defense of Exhibits 06 and 07 while remaining consistent with the facts stipulated in Exhibit 12, including the automatic outbound-email certification rule and the stipulated foundation for Exhibit 21, and challenging the inferences, scope and evidentiary weight advanced from the complete record.

Counsel are expected to advocate genuinely adverse positions.

Neither counsel is expected to defend Certidox as a product.

V. EVIDENTIARY RECORD

Exhibits 01 through 21 are pre-marked and available for use during the mock hearing.

Their inclusion in the hearing record does not constitute an admission or stipulation as to authenticity, admissibility, evidentiary weight, authorship or the truth of their contents, except to the extent expressly provided in Exhibit 12.

The Master Exhibit Index and Evidence Map, Evidentiary Chronology, Evidence Manifest, and Issues Presented and Party Positions are reference materials only. They are not themselves exhibits and do not enlarge or modify the evidentiary scope of Exhibits 01 through 21.

Counsel should cite exhibits by number when making factual assertions and may challenge the foundation, authentication, significance or weight attributed to any exhibit, subject to the stipulated facts contained in Exhibit 12.

Exhibits 13, 15 and 17 are user-facing demonstratives.

Exhibits 14, 16 and 18 provide independent technical verification.

Exhibits 19 and 20 are demonstrative comparison exhibits.

Exhibit 21 is a service-side system-record exhibit.

These exhibits do not enlarge the evidentiary effect of the underlying record beyond the scope expressly established in the exhibits themselves and Exhibit 12.

VI. STIPULATED FACTS

The stipulations contained in Exhibit 12 shall be accepted solely for purposes of the mock hearing.

Among other matters, Exhibit 12 addresses:

- the validity of the September 24 extension of the Election Period;
- Southbridge's receipt of Exhibits 02 and 10;
- the 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, without requiring separate action by Laura Bennett;
- the architecture and limitations of the independent-verification bundles;
- the certified-content and attachment-hash relationships associated with Exhibits 02, 04 and 05;
- the absence of a corresponding Certidox certification record and QR code of its own for Exhibit 06;
- the limited stipulated significance of the header fields and DKIM-Signature header appearing in Exhibit 06;
- the absence of a separate document-certification record for Exhibit 07 and the fact that the parties do not stipulate that every Order Form was required to be separately certified;
- the scope and limitations of Exhibits 13 through 21; and
- the foundation for Exhibit 21, including that it accurately displays all Certidox document and email certification records associated with Laura Bennett's user account dated September 24, 2026, that the underlying certification data are stored in encrypted form, that access requires authentication, and that Laura Bennett was the only authorized user of that account.

Exhibit 12 does not stipulate that Exhibits 06 or 07 are authentic or false. It does not stipulate who created or altered either disputed record, whether any person knew either record to be false or inauthentic, or whether any person acted with fraudulent intent.

Authentication, integrity, authorship, knowledge, intent and ultimate evidentiary weight remain for determination at the hearing.

The absence of a corresponding certification record for Exhibit 06, or of a separate document-certification record for Exhibit 07, standing alone, does not establish that either exhibit is false.

VII. USE OF CERTIDOX VERIFICATION EVIDENCE

The hearing distinguishes among user-facing verification, independent technical verification, demonstrative comparison evidence and service-side system-record evidence.

A. USER-FACING VERIFICATION

Exhibits 13, 15 and 17 record the Certidox verification results associated with Exhibits 02, 05 and 04, respectively.

These exhibits may be used to show what the Certidox interface displayed when the relevant QR codes were scanned.

They do not, by themselves, determine receipt, underlying human authorship, the authenticity or falsity of competing records, knowledge or intent.

Current certification status is a separate live service-side value.

B. INDEPENDENT TECHNICAL VERIFICATION

Exhibits 14, 16 and 18 provide separate, reproducible technical verification paths for Exhibits 02, 05 and 04, respectively.

Counsel may rely upon these exhibits to address:

- reconstruction of certified content;
- SHA-256 relationships;
- QR and reading-key linkage;
- manifest integrity; and
- DigiStamp RFC 3161 timestamp evidence.

For Exhibits 14 and 18, the reconstructed email-content representation is document.json. The native .eml file is not reconstructed byte-for-byte.

The email bundles do not contain the attachment files themselves as separate attachment payloads.

The SHA-256 of the reconstructed payload is checked against the payload_sha256 value recorded in manifest.json.

The SHA-256 of the exact manifest.json is checked against the message imprint contained in the DigiStamp RFC 3161 timestamp response.

DigiStamp therefore timestamps the hash of the exact manifest, not the reconstructed payload directly, and does not independently attest to the accuracy of the Certidox certification-event time recorded in the manifest.

Except for current certification status, the historical reconstruction and timestamp-verification procedures **do not require reliance on the Certidox live verification display**.

The email-bundle procedures described in Exhibits 14 and 18 also do not require access to the original mailbox or original mail server.

Counsel shall not attribute to the technical bundles conclusions that exceed their stated scope and limitations.

C. DEMONSTRATIVE COMPARISONS

Exhibit 19 compares Exhibits 05 and 07.

Exhibit 20 compares Exhibits 04 and 06.

These demonstratives may be used to organize and compare evidence already established or stipulated elsewhere in the record.

They do not create or stipulate additional facts and do not enlarge the evidentiary effect of the underlying exhibits.

D. USER CERTIFICATION HISTORY / SYSTEM-RECORD EVIDENCE

Exhibit 21 reproduces the Certidox “My documents” certification history displayed in Laura Bennett’s authenticated user account.

For purposes of this mock hearing, 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 record for Exhibit 06.

The underlying certification data are stored in encrypted form, access to the history 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. It is not an independent cryptographic verification bundle and does not, by itself, establish falsity, authorship, fraud, intent or ultimate evidentiary weight.

VIII. LIVE VERIFICATION DURING THE HEARING

The hearing may include live verification, but any such verification is intended to test the evidence rather than demonstrate product functionality.

Unless otherwise directed by the neutral, the following procedure shall apply.

1. QR verification

The neutral or either counsel may scan a QR code contained in Exhibit 02, Exhibit 04 or Exhibit 05 using an independent device.

The resulting Certidox display may be compared with Exhibit 13, Exhibit 17 or Exhibit 15, respectively.

To avoid turning the hearing into a product demonstration, ordinarily no more than one user-facing verification should be performed live unless the neutral requests additional verification.

2. Independent bundle verification

The neutral or either counsel may use the native ZIP component of Exhibit 14, Exhibit 16 or Exhibit 18. The reviewing party may:

- preserve the original ZIP unchanged;
- calculate the SHA-256 of the native ZIP and compare it with the native ZIP SHA-256 stated in the corresponding explanatory exhibit;
- work from a copy;
- reconstruct the certified content;
- calculate the relevant SHA-256 values;
- verify the payload-to-manifest relationship;
- verify the SHA-256 of the exact manifest against the DigiStamp message imprint;
and
- examine the QR and reading-key linkage.

Ordinarily, one independent technical verification should be sufficient to demonstrate the reproducibility of the procedure unless the neutral requests additional testing.

3. System-record review

Exhibit 21 may be reviewed as a pre-marked system-record exhibit. It shall not be presented as an independent cryptographic verification bundle. The hearing does not require live access to Laura Bennett's Certidox account.

4. No obligation to rely on Certidox representations

A reviewing party may independently inspect the technical files and use standard technical tools. **No party shall be required to accept a technical conclusion merely because it is asserted by Certidox.**

5. Preservation of native exhibits

Native exhibit files shall not be modified during the hearing.

Any decryption, extraction, hashing, timestamp verification or other technical testing shall be performed on a working copy.

Any files or outputs generated during live verification are verification artifacts only and do not become part of the evidentiary record unless the neutral expressly directs otherwise.

IX. ORDER OF PROCEEDINGS

Unless modified by the neutral, the hearing shall proceed in the following order.

1. Opening by the Neutral

The neutral shall briefly identify:

- the nature of the dispute;
- the evidentiary issues to be considered;
- the distinction between the hearing and a Certidox product demonstration; and
- the principle that responsibility for advocacy rests with counsel.

Suggested duration: 5 minutes

2. ApexGrid Opening Statement

Counsel for ApexGrid shall identify:

- the contractual extension and the fact that it made a later election possible;
- the certified reference records, Exhibits 04 and 05;
- the disputed records, Exhibits 06 and 07;
- the stipulated automatic outbound-email certification rule;
- the absence of a corresponding certification record and QR code of its own for Exhibit 06;
- the September 24 user certification history reflected in Exhibit 21;
- the independent verification evidence; and
- the conclusions ApexGrid asks the neutral to draw

No live technical verification should occur during the opening statement.

Suggested duration: 8 minutes

3. Southbridge Opening Statement

Counsel for Southbridge shall identify:

- the contractual possibility of a later election;
- why the certified reference records establish an earlier A+B state but do not, by themselves, establish that no later election occurred;
- why the absence of a certification record is significant but is not itself a stipulated finding of falsity;
- the distinction between different SHA-256 values and falsification;
- the fact that Exhibit 21 is stipulated to be complete for Laura Bennett's September 24 user certification history, while remaining a service-side system record rather than an independent cryptographic verification bundle;
- the fact that Exhibit 12 does not stipulate that every Order Form was required to be separately certified;
- the limits of the technical verification evidence; and
- the alternative conclusions Southbridge asks the neutral to draw.

No live technical verification should occur during the opening statement.

Suggested duration: 8 minutes

X. PRESENTATION OF THE EVIDENCE

A. CONTRACTUAL FRAMEWORK AND EXTENSION

Exhibits 01 through 03

The parties may address the executed contractual framework, the original Election Period, Laura Bennett's extension request and Southbridge's acceptance of the extension through 5:00 p.m. CDT on September 24.

This portion should establish that a later election was contractually possible without suggesting that one necessarily occurred.

B. CERTIFIED REFERENCE RECORDS

Exhibits 04 and 05

The parties may address:

- the certified Option B email;

- the statement that Options C and D remain unselected;
- the certified A+B Order Form; and
- the stipulated attachment-hash linkage to Exhibit 05.

Southbridge may challenge the inferences drawn from these records, including whether they exclude a later election.

C. DISPUTED RECORDS AND SUBSEQUENT RELIANCE

Exhibits 06 through 11

The parties may address:

- the purported 12:44:43 p.m. email;
- the disputed B+C+D Order Form;
- the resulting invoice and its transmittal;
- Laura Bennett's later certified rejection of Options C and D; and
- Sarah Mitchell's subsequent reliance upon and production of Exhibits 06 and 07.

The hearing should not become principally a billing dispute.

D. FOUNDATIONAL STIPULATION

Exhibit 12

The parties may address the evidentiary significance of:

- the validity of the September 24 extension;
- the stipulated automatic outbound-email certification rule;
- the architecture and limitations of the independent-verification bundles;
- the certified-content and attachment-hash relationships;
- the absence of a corresponding certification record and QR code of its own for Exhibit 06;
- the limited significance of the header fields and DKIM-Signature header appearing in Exhibit 06;
- the absence of a separate document-certification record for Exhibit 07 and the absence of any stipulation that every Order Form required separate certification;
- Southbridge's receipt of Exhibits 02 and 10; and
- the stipulated foundation and limitations of Exhibits 13 through 21.

Counsel shall distinguish the stipulated facts from the inferences they ask the neutral to draw from them.

E. USER-FACING VERIFICATION

Exhibits 13, 15 and 17

The neutral may review what the Certidox interface displayed for Exhibits 02, 05 and 04, respectively.

If desired, one QR code may be scanned live.

The purpose is to examine what the verification mechanism displays, not to ask the neutral to accept any ultimate legal or evidentiary conclusion from the interface.

F. INDEPENDENT TECHNICAL VERIFICATION

Exhibits 14, 16 and 18

The neutral may examine the reproducible verification procedures.

If a live technical verification is conducted, it should be limited to the steps reasonably necessary to test the claimed independent verification.

The hearing should avoid unnecessary repetition of technical procedures once the relevant point has been established.

G. DEMONSTRATIVE COMPARISONS

Exhibits 19 and 20

Exhibit 19 may be used to compare Exhibit 05 with Exhibit 07.

Exhibit 20 may be used to compare Exhibit 04 with Exhibit 06.

The demonstratives do not create or stipulate additional facts and do not determine authenticity, provenance, personal authorship, knowledge or intent.

H. USER CERTIFICATION HISTORY / SYSTEM-RECORD EVIDENCE

Exhibit 21

The parties may address the evidentiary significance of the stipulated September 24 user certification history, including the four displayed certification records and the absence of a corresponding record for Exhibit 06. Counsel shall also address the expressly stipulated limits of Exhibit 21 as a Certidox service-side system record rather than an independent cryptographic verification bundle.

XI. QUESTIONS AND CHALLENGES BY THE NEUTRAL

After the principal evidence has been presented, the neutral should be given an unrestricted opportunity to question both counsel.

Counsel should be prepared to answer questions such as:

- What fact is expressly stipulated, and what part of counsel's position is an inference from that fact?
- What is the strongest evidence supporting the authenticity of Exhibit 06 despite the absence of a corresponding certification record under the stipulated workflow?
- How does Southbridge reconcile Exhibit 06 with the stipulated automatic outbound-email certification rule and with Exhibit 21, which by stipulation contains no corresponding September 24 certification record for that purported message?
- If the absence of a corresponding certification record does not, standing alone, establish falsity, what combination of stipulated facts gives that absence evidentiary significance?
- What does the DKIM-Signature header appearing in Exhibit 06 establish, and what does Exhibit 12 expressly leave unstipulated?
- What does the DigiStamp RFC 3161 evidence establish, and what does it not establish?
- What do the different SHA-256 value and the absence of a separate document-certification record for Exhibit 07 establish, and what do they not establish, given that Exhibit 12 does not stipulate that every Order Form required separate certification?
- What does Exhibit 21 establish, what does it expressly not establish, and how does its status as a service-side system record differ from the independently reproducible verification evidence in Exhibits 14, 16 and 18?
- Why does the absence of a separate document-certification record for Exhibit 07 differ from the negative record evidence concerning Exhibit 06?
- What is the strongest weakness in each party's own evidentiary position?

Counsel should answer by reference to the evidentiary record rather than general assertions about Certidox.

Suggested duration: 15 minutes

XII. REBUTTAL

Each party may respond to arguments made by the opposing party.

Rebuttal should focus on matters actually raised during the hearing and should not be used to repeat the opening presentation.

Suggested duration: 5 minutes per party

ApexGrid may proceed first, followed by Southbridge, unless the neutral directs otherwise.

XIII. CLOSING STATEMENTS

ApexGrid Closing

ApexGrid should identify the specific chain of evidence from which it asks the neutral to question or reject the authenticity and evidentiary weight of Exhibits 06 and 07.

Suggested duration: 5 minutes

Southbridge Closing

Southbridge should identify the evidentiary gaps or alternative explanations that prevent the neutral from treating Exhibits 06 and 07 as inauthentic.

Suggested duration: 5 minutes

The neutral may permit a brief final response if necessary.

XIV. NO PRODUCT ADVOCACY

No participant should argue that the neutral should accept an evidentiary proposition because Certidox is technologically sophisticated, innovative, commercially valuable or desirable.

The hearing concerns the specific evidence in the record.

Nothing in this section prevents counsel from relying upon the stipulated Certidox certification process, certification records, Exhibit 21 user certification history or independently reproducible verification procedures as evidentiary facts contained in the hearing record.

Product claims, sales arguments, market positioning and general assertions concerning Certidox are outside the hearing.

Certidox should be evaluated only to the extent its operation is relevant to the evidentiary record before the neutral.

XV. TECHNICAL CLAIMS

Any technical claim should, where reasonably possible, be tied to:

- a specific exhibit;
- a specific file;
- a specific SHA-256 value;
- a specific payload-to-manifest relationship;
- a specific manifest-to-timestamp relationship;
- a specific timestamp response;
- a specific QR or bundle relationship;

- a specific limitation expressly stated in an exhibit; or
- a stipulated fact.

Counsel should distinguish:

technical fact

from

evidentiary inference

from

legal conclusion.

This distinction is central to the hearing.

XVI. ADVOCACY RESPONSIBILITIES

Nothing in this protocol assigns or purports to replicate a formal judicial burden of proof.

For purposes of this exercise:

Neither counsel may advance a position inconsistent with an expressly stipulated fact in Exhibit 12.

- ApexGrid shall present the strongest reasonable argument that the complete record undermines the authenticity and evidentiary weight of Exhibits 06 and 07.
- Southbridge shall present the strongest reasonable argument that Exhibits 06 and 07 may nevertheless be authentic, or that the complete evidence is insufficient to reject them, while remaining consistent with the facts stipulated in Exhibit 12, including the automatic outbound-email certification rule and the stipulated foundation for Exhibit 21.

The neutral shall evaluate the relative persuasiveness of the complete evidentiary record without treating these advocacy assignments as legal burdens of proof.

XVII. EXPECTED ROLE OF THE NEUTRAL AT THE CONCLUSION

At the conclusion of the hearing, the neutral may provide an oral or written assessment addressing:

1. the evidentiary weight assigned to Exhibits 04 and 05;
2. the significance of the stipulated attachment-hash linkage between Exhibits 04 and 05;

3. the significance of the stipulated automatic outbound-email certification rule;
4. the significance of the absence of a corresponding certification record and QR code of its own for Exhibit 06;
5. the evidentiary significance and limitations of the September 24 user certification history reflected in Exhibit 21;
6. the evidentiary significance of the user-facing Certidox verification evidence;
7. the additional evidentiary significance, if any, of independently reproducible technical verification and DigiStamp RFC 3161 timestamp evidence;
8. the significance of the material differences between Exhibits 05 and 07 and the absence of a separate document-certification record for Exhibit 07, subject to the limitations stipulated in Exhibit 12;
9. the significance of the parties' subsequent conduct and reliance;
10. the evidentiary weight assigned to Exhibits 06 and 07; and
11. any evidentiary weakness, ambiguity or unanswered question that materially affected the assessment.

The neutral need not make findings concerning criminal fraud, product validity or the general admissibility of Certidox evidence in other cases.

XVIII. PROPOSED HEARING SCHEDULE

Stage	Suggested Time
Neutral introduction	5 minutes
ApexGrid opening	8 minutes
Southbridge opening	8 minutes
Presentation and testing of evidence	35 minutes
Neutral questioning	15 minutes
ApexGrid rebuttal	5 minutes
Southbridge rebuttal	5 minutes
ApexGrid closing	5 minutes
Southbridge closing	5 minutes
Total estimated hearing time	91 minutes

The neutral may adjust the schedule as necessary.

Any live user-facing or independent technical verification shall occur within the time allocated for presentation and testing of evidence unless the neutral directs otherwise.

XIX. CENTRAL PRINCIPLE OF THE HEARING

The participants are not being asked to validate Certidox. They are being asked to test the evidence.

The central question is:

When materially conflicting electronic records are presented, what evidentiary weight should be assigned to the disputed records when they are evaluated against contemporaneous certified reference records, the stipulated automatic outbound-email certification rule, the absence of a corresponding certification record and QR code of its own for the purported 12:44:43 p.m. message, the stipulated September 24 user certification history reflected in Exhibit 21, independently reproducible technical verification, the evidentiary differences and limitations associated with Exhibit 07, and the subsequent conduct and reliance of the parties?

No single fact, standing alone, determines the outcome.

For the historical evidence, the significance lies in the combination of contemporaneous certified reference records, the stipulated automatic outbound-email certification rule, the absence of a corresponding certification record and QR code of its own for Exhibit 06, the service-side user certification history reflected in Exhibit 21, and historical reconstruction and timestamp verification that can be reproduced without reliance on a Certidox-generated verification display.

Exhibit 21 provides a separate service-side system-record layer and should not be conflated with the independent cryptographic verification bundles.

The result is that the conflict need not be evaluated solely as one party's account against another; the competing records can be tested against fixed certified reference records, independently reproducible verification evidence and the stipulated user certification history.

The parties remain free to advocate different conclusions from that evidence.

Ultimate conclusions concerning authentication, integrity, provenance, personal authorship, knowledge, intent and evidentiary weight remain with the neutral.