

MASTER EXHIBIT INDEX AND EVIDENCE MAP

MOCK HEARING – SIMULATION ONLY

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

Purpose of this document

This Master Exhibit Index and Evidence Map is a working reference for the mock hearing. It is intended to identify the exhibits, describe their evidentiary function, and distinguish what each exhibit establishes from what it does not establish.

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

Exhibit	Description	Evidence Type	What It Establishes	What It Does Not Establish	Status
01	DocuSign Contract Package – September 14, 2026	Contract / native source package	Establishes the contractual framework between Southbridge Technologies, Inc. and ApexGrid Infrastructure, Inc.; identifies Laura Bennett as ApexGrid's Authorized Representative for Optional Service elections; shows Service A selected and Options B, C and D unselected as originally executed; and fixes the original Election Period ending at 12:00 p.m. Central Time on September 18, 2026.	Does not establish what, if any, additional Optional Services were elected after the later September 24 extension. Does not resolve the authenticity of Exhibits 06 or 07.	FINAL
02	Certidox-Certified Email – Election Period Extension Request – September 24, 2026	Native certified email evidence	Records Laura Bennett's request that Southbridge extend the Election Period through 5:00 p.m. CDT on September 24, 2026, and states that all other Order Form terms would remain unchanged. Bears the Certidox QR code generated through the automatic outbound-email certification process described in Exhibit 12. Under that stipulated process, the message also generated its own separate Certidox certification record. Southbridge's receipt is separately stipulated in Exhibit 12.	Does not, by itself, establish receipt, personal authorship or authority, or any later election of Optional Services. Those foundational matters are addressed separately in Exhibit 12.	FINAL
03	Sarah Mitchell Email – Election Period Extension Accepted – September 24, 2026	Native email evidence	Records Southbridge's agreement to extend the Election Period through 5:00 p.m. CDT on September 24, 2026 so ApexGrid could make an additional election at the stated pricing, with all other Order Form terms unchanged. Exhibit 12 stipulates the parties' authority and the validity of the extension.	Does not establish which Optional Services ApexGrid later elected. Does not resolve the authenticity of Exhibits 06 or 07.	FINAL

Exhibit	Description	Evidence Type	What It Establishes	What It Does Not Establish	Status
04	Certidox-Certified Email – Option B Election – September 24, 2026	Native certified email evidence	Records certified email content stating that ApexGrid elects Option B – Predictive Grid Analytics and that Options C and D remain unselected. The email bears its own Certidox QR code and separate Certidox certification record. Exhibit 18 independently reconstructs the certified email-content representation, and Exhibit 12 stipulates the attachment-hash linkage to Exhibit 05.	Does not, by itself, establish receipt or personal authorship. The email verification bundle does not reconstruct the native .eml file byte-for-byte or contain the attachment bytes. Does not determine the authenticity of Exhibits 06 or 07.	FINAL
05	Certidox-Certified Enterprise Services Order Form – Service A + Option B	Certified document evidence	Shows Service A and Option B selected, with Options C and D unselected. Bears its own Certidox QR code. Exhibit 16 permits independent reconstruction of the exact certified PDF; for purposes of the hearing, Exhibit 12 stipulates that Exhibit 05 is byte-for-byte identical to the PDF attachment whose SHA-256 was recorded with Exhibit 04.	Does not, by itself, determine who created or modified Exhibit 07, whether Exhibit 07 reflects an election actually made by Laura Bennett, or any ultimate conclusion concerning fraud or authorship.	FINAL
06	Disputed Email – Purported Election of Options B, C and D – September 24, 2026, 12:44:43 p.m. CDT	Disputed native email evidence	Purports on its face to be a later outbound email from Laura Bennett adding Options C and D and instructing Southbridge to proceed with Options B, C and D. It is produced as a native .eml file and contains email headers, MIME structure, an attached PDF and the earlier September 24 thread. The purported 12:44:43 p.m. message has no Certidox QR code of its own and no corresponding Certidox certification record. The QR code visible in the quoted earlier thread resolves to the certification record associated with Exhibit 02. 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.	Exhibit 12 stipulates to the presence of the header fields and data in Exhibit 06, but not to their authenticity, provenance or evidentiary effect, and does not stipulate that the DKIM-Signature header is cryptographically valid or establishes authenticity, origin or authorship. The absence of a corresponding Certidox certification record or QR code, standing alone, does not establish that Exhibit 06 is false.	FINAL
07	Disputed Enterprise Services Order Form – Service A + Options B, C and D	Disputed document evidence	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.	The differing SHA-256 establishes that Exhibit 07 is not byte-for-byte identical to Exhibit 05; it does not establish falsification. The absence of a separate Certidox document-certification record, standing alone, does not establish that Exhibit 07 is false, and Exhibit 12 does not stipulate that every Order Form was required to be separately certified. Does not establish authorship, knowledge, fraud or intent.	FINAL
08	Southbridge Invoice ST-2026-0924-01 – September 24, 2026	Commercial context	Shows Southbridge invoicing ApexGrid on the basis of Service A and Options B, C and D, with total annual fees of \$200,000 and a 10% mobilization deposit of \$20,000.	Does not determine whether Options C and D were validly elected or whether Exhibits 06 and 07 are authentic. The billing issue is contextual and is not the central authenticity issue in the hearing.	FINAL

Exhibit	Description	Evidence Type	What It Establishes	What It Does Not Establish	Status
09	Sarah Mitchell Email Transmitting Invoice ST-2026-0924-01 – September 24, 2026	Native email evidence	Shows Sarah Mitchell transmitting Southbridge's mobilization invoice to Laura Bennett and stating that it reflects Service A and Options B, C and D, with \$20,000 due.	Does not establish that Options C and D were validly elected or establish the authenticity, provenance or authorship of Exhibits 06 or 07.	FINAL
10	Certidox-Certified Laura Bennett Response to Invoice – September 24, 2026	Native certified email evidence	Records Laura Bennett's position that ApexGrid elected Option B only and that Options C and D were not selected and remain unselected. The email bears its own Certidox QR code, automatically generated through the outbound-email certification process described in Exhibit 12. Under that stipulated process, the message also generated its own separate Certidox certification record. Southbridge's receipt is separately stipulated in Exhibit 12.	Is a later response after the billing conflict became explicit. Does not, by itself, authenticate or invalidate Exhibits 06 or 07, establish who created them, or establish fraud or intent.	FINAL
11	Sarah Mitchell Response Producing Disputed Records – September 24, 2026	Native email evidence	Shows Sarah Mitchell relying upon and producing the disputed email identified as Exhibit 06 and the disputed Order Form identified as Exhibit 07 as Southbridge records supporting the position that ApexGrid elected Options B, C and D.	Does not, by itself, establish the authenticity, provenance or authorship of Exhibits 06 or 07, or that Sarah Mitchell personally created or altered those records.	FINAL
12	Joint Stipulation Regarding Digital Record Attribution, Automatic Outbound Email Certification and Independent Verification	Joint stipulation	Stipulates, solely for purposes of the mock hearing, the contractual extension foundation; 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 architecture and limits 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 for Exhibit 06; the limited significance of the absence of a document-certification record for Exhibit 07; Southbridge's receipt of Exhibits 02 and 10; and the evidentiary scope of Exhibits 13 through 21. Exhibit 12 further stipulates that Exhibit 21 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.	Does not stipulate that Exhibits 06 or 07 are authentic or false. 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.	FINAL
13	Certidox Verification of Exhibit 02	Demonstrative exhibit	Records the user-facing Certidox result displayed after the QR code in Exhibit 02 was scanned, including the certifier, organization, recipient, displayed date, title, current status, and certified email content made visible through the interface.	Records what Certidox displayed. Does not, by itself, establish delivery or receipt, underlying human identity or authorship, or the authenticity, provenance or authorship of Exhibits 06 or 07.	FINAL

Exhibit	Description	Evidence Type	What It Establishes	What It Does Not Establish	Status
14	Certidox Independent Verification Bundle for Exhibit 02	Technical verification exhibit	Permits independent reconstruction of the certified email-content representation as document.json; verification of the payload-to-manifest hash chain, QR and reading-key linkage, and the associated DigiStamp RFC 3161 timestamp using independently available tools and trust material. The reconstructed record contains an empty attachments array.	Does not reconstruct Exhibit 02 as a byte-for-byte native .eml file or reproduce the complete transport history or MIME structure. Does not, by itself, establish receipt, underlying human identity or authority, current live Certidox status, or the authenticity of Exhibits 06 or 07.	FINAL
15	Certidox Verification of Exhibit 05	Demonstrative exhibit	Records the user-facing Certidox result displayed after the QR code in Exhibit 05 was 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, determine who created or modified Exhibit 07, or determine whether Exhibit 07 is authentic.	FINAL
16	Certidox Independent Verification Bundle for Exhibit 05	Technical verification exhibit	Permits independent reconstruction of the exact certified PDF as document.pdf and verification of its SHA-256, QR and reading-key linkage, manifest integrity, and associated DigiStamp RFC 3161 timestamp. Provides a fixed certified reference against which another digital or printed representation can be examined.	Does not, by itself, establish underlying human identity or authority, the factual truth or legal effect of the document, who created or modified Exhibit 07, whether Exhibit 07 is authentic, current live Certidox status, or any ultimate conclusion concerning fraud, authorship or intent.	FINAL
17	Certidox Verification of Exhibit 04	Demonstrative exhibit	Records the user-facing Certidox result displayed after the QR code in Exhibit 04 was scanned, including the certifier, organization, recipient, displayed date, title, current status, certified email content, and two displayed attachment entries.	Records what Certidox displayed. Does not, by itself, establish delivery or receipt, underlying human identity or authorship, or the authenticity, provenance or authorship of Exhibits 06 or 07. Technical time fields and attachment metadata are addressed separately in Exhibit 18.	FINAL
18	Certidox Independent Verification Bundle for Exhibit 04	Technical verification exhibit	Permits independent reconstruction of the certified email-content representation as document.json and verification of the payload-to-manifest hash chain, QR and reading-key linkage, and DigiStamp RFC 3161 timestamp. Records protected attachment metadata, including the SHA-256 recorded for the PDF attachment. Exhibit 12 stipulates, for purposes of this mock hearing, that the matching SHA-256 establishes that Exhibit 05 is byte-for-byte identical to that attachment.	Does not reconstruct the native .eml file or contain the attachment files as separate payloads. Does not, by itself, establish receipt, underlying human identity or authority, current live Certidox status, the authenticity of Exhibits 06 or 07, or any ultimate conclusion concerning fraud, alteration, intent or liability.	FINAL

Exhibit	Description	Evidence Type	What It Establishes	What It Does Not Establish	Status
19	Comparison Against the Certidox-Certified Reference Record – Exhibits 05 and 07	Demonstrative comparison exhibit	Presents a side-by-side comparison of the certified reference Order Form identified as Exhibit 05 and the disputed Order Form identified as Exhibit 07. Shows the dispute-relevant differences in Options C and D and the different SHA-256 values; identifies Exhibit 05 as independently reconstructible through Exhibit 16 ; and summarizes its stipulated byte-for-byte linkage to the PDF attachment whose SHA-256 was recorded with certified Exhibit 04, together with 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.	FINAL
20	Comparison of Exhibit 04 Certified Reference Email and Exhibit 06 Disputed Email	Demonstrative comparison exhibit	Presents a side-by-side comparison of the certified reference email identified as Exhibit 04 and 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.	FINAL
21	Certidox User Certification History – Laura Bennett – September 24, 2026	System-record exhibit	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. The underlying certification data are stored in encrypted form; access to the “My documents” history requires authentication to Laura Bennett’s account, and Laura Bennett was the only authorized user of that account. The history displays four certification records, at 9:48 a.m., 9:58 a.m., 10:18 a.m. and 6:04 p.m. CDT, and no certification record corresponding to the purported 12:44:43 p.m. Exhibit 06 communication.	Is a Certidox service-side system record, not an independent cryptographic verification bundle. Does not, by itself, establish that Exhibit 06 is false, determine authorship of any disputed record, or establish fraud, intent or ultimate evidentiary weight.	FINAL

EVIDENTIARY STRUCTURE

The exhibits are organized into eight distinct evidentiary layers.

1. CONTRACTUAL FRAMEWORK AND EXTENSION

Exhibits 01 through 03

Exhibit 01 establishes the contractual framework, Laura Bennett’s authority to make Optional Service elections, the selections as originally executed, and the original Election Period. Exhibits 02 and 03 document the September 24 request and agreement to extend

that Election Period through 5:00 p.m. CDT. Exhibit 12 separately stipulates the relevant authority, receipt and validity of the extension.

This layer establishes that a later election on September 24 was contractually possible; it does not establish which Optional Services were ultimately elected.

2. CERTIFIED REFERENCE ELECTION

Exhibits 04 and 05

Exhibit 04 is the certified email stating that ApexGrid elected Option B – Predictive Grid Analytics and that Options C and D remain unselected. Exhibit 05 is the separately certified Enterprise Services Order Form showing Service A and Option B selected and Options C and D unselected.

These exhibits form the certified reference record against which the later disputed B+C+D records can be examined. **Both certified reference records predate the 12:44:43 p.m. message date borne by Exhibit 06.** Exhibit 12 separately stipulates the byte-for-byte linkage between Exhibit 05 and the PDF attachment whose SHA-256 was recorded with Exhibit 04.

3. DISPUTED RECORDS, BILLING CONTEXT AND SUBSEQUENT RELIANCE

Exhibits 06 through 11

Exhibits 06 and 07 are the disputed B+C+D email and Order Form. Exhibits 08 and 09 show the resulting Southbridge invoice and its transmittal based on Service A plus Options B, C and D. Exhibit 10 records Laura Bennett's later certified rejection of that position. Exhibit 11 shows Sarah Mitchell relying upon and producing Exhibits 06 and 07 as Southbridge records supporting the B+C+D position.

The invoice explains how the conflict became explicit, but the billing amount is contextual. The central issue remains the authenticity, provenance and evidentiary weight of the disputed records.

4. FOUNDATIONAL STIPULATION AND DIGITAL ATTRIBUTION

Exhibit 12

Exhibit 12 supplies the foundational facts required for the mock hearing. Among other matters, it addresses the contractual extension; the stipulated automatic Certidox certification of every outbound email sent from Laura Bennett's ApexGrid corporate mailbox; the verification architecture and technical limitations of the Certidox bundles; the certified-content and attachment-hash relationships among the relevant certified 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.

Exhibit 12 also stipulates that Exhibit 21 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 to that history requires authentication, and that Laura Bennett was the only authorized user of that account.

The stipulation is deliberately limited. It does not establish that Exhibits 06 or 07 are authentic or false, determine who created or altered either disputed record, or establish knowledge, fraudulent intent, admissibility or ultimate evidentiary weight.

5. USER-FACING CERTIDOX VERIFICATION

Exhibits 13, 15 and 17

These demonstratives record the results displayed through the Certidox interface after scanning the QR codes contained in Exhibits 02, 05 and 04 respectively. They provide a straightforward user-facing view of the certification information and certified content.

They are expressly limited to recording what Certidox displayed and do not, by themselves, resolve questions such as receipt, underlying human authorship, or the authenticity of competing records.

6. INDEPENDENT TECHNICAL VERIFICATION

Exhibits 14, 16 and 18

These technical exhibits provide **separate, reproducible verification paths** without requiring use of the Certidox mobile application. Exhibit 14 reconstructs the certified email-content representation associated with Exhibit 02. Exhibit 16 reconstructs the exact certified PDF associated with Exhibit 05. Exhibit 18 reconstructs the certified email-content representation associated with Exhibit 04, including protected attachment metadata. The SHA-256 recorded for the PDF attachment can be compared with the independently calculated SHA-256 of Exhibit 05 and, under Exhibit 12, the matching SHA-256 establishes byte-for-byte identity for purposes of this mock hearing.

The bundles permit verification of the relevant SHA-256 relationships, QR and reading-key linkage, manifest integrity and **independently issued DigiStamp RFC 3161 timestamp evidence** using **independently available tools and DigiStamp trust material obtained independently of Certidox**.

Except for current certification status, the reconstruction and timestamp verification described in Exhibits 14, 16 and 18 **do not require access to the Certidox live verification interface or reliance on a Certidox-generated verification display**. The email-bundle

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

7. DEMONSTRATIVE COMPARISONS

Exhibits 19 and 20

Exhibit 19 compares the certified reference Order Form identified as Exhibit 05 with the disputed Order Form identified as Exhibit 07. Exhibit 20 compares the certified reference email identified as Exhibit 04 with the disputed email identified as Exhibit 06.

These demonstratives **synthesize the factual and technical relationships established or stipulated elsewhere in the record**, including content differences, SHA-256 relationships, independent reconstruction, timestamp evidence, and the automatic outbound-email certification workflow and related certification-record evidence.

They **do not create or stipulate additional facts** and **do not enlarge the evidentiary effect of the underlying exhibits**. They do not, by themselves, establish that Exhibits 06 or 07 are false, determine personal authorship or alteration, or establish knowledge, fraudulent intent, admissibility or ultimate evidentiary weight.

8. USER CERTIFICATION HISTORY

Exhibit 21

Exhibit 21 provides a separate system-record layer. It reproduces the Certidox “My documents” certification history displayed in Laura Bennett’s authenticated user account for ApexGrid Infrastructure, Inc. For purposes of the 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.

The displayed history contains the certification records associated with Exhibits 02, 05, 04 and 10, but no certification record corresponding to the purported 12:44:43 p.m. Exhibit 06 communication.

Exhibit 21 is a Certidox service-side system record rather than an independent cryptographic verification bundle. It does not, by itself, establish that Exhibit 06 is false or determine authorship, fraud, intent or ultimate evidentiary weight.

CENTRAL EVIDENTIARY QUESTION

The hearing does not ask whether Certidox, by itself, proves fraud.

The evidentiary question is whether Exhibits 06 and 07 are authentic and what evidentiary weight should be assigned to them when the record is considered as a whole, including the certified A+B reference records, the stipulated automatic outbound-email certification process, the absence of a corresponding Certidox certification record and QR code for Exhibit 06, the September 24 user certification history reflected in Exhibit 21, and the parties' subsequent reliance on the competing records.

Certidox functions in this mock hearing as a mechanism for establishing and later verifying reference records against which disputed content may be tested. Ultimate conclusions concerning authenticity, authorship, knowledge, intent and liability remain for the Neutral to determine from the evidentiary record as a whole.

STATUS OF THE RECORD

Exhibits 01 through 21 are final for purposes of the mock hearing.