

AI detection report

A closer look at your writing.

Generated
October 16, 2026
5:08 PM


DETECTION SUMMARY

14%

AI probability

• Likely written by a human

An estimate for the whole document, rather than the portion of text written by AI.



726

Words scanned

19

Sentences analyzed

0 of 19

Likely AI sentences

Document: Pasted text

Prepared for Matthew Graham

01 Analyzed text

No passages highlighted.

Your Honour,

Pursuant to Rule 4.9 of the Court Rules and Procedures, Plaintiff respectfully supplements and clarifies the previously filed witness list based upon information Defendant has now produced during Discovery.

Defendant has clarified that the same individuals who filed the respective records also captured the underlying images:

GreyMC captured and filed the record associated with P-002; and
Lieutenant SonOfaLancer captured and filed the records associated with P-003 and P-004.
Plaintiff therefore updates the witness list as follows.

1. ShellSchockMSG — Plaintiff
Plaintiff may testify concerning:

the August 13, 2026 arrest and confinement;
the DHS administrative appeal;
the circumstances surrounding the three challenged Bank Robbery convictions;
the conditions of confinement;
the attack Plaintiff experienced while confined in Revcatraz;
damages arising from any conviction or detention ultimately found unlawful; and
other matters within Plaintiff's personal knowledge relevant to the claims and damages in this action.

01 Analyzed text

No passages highlighted.

2. paper_cute

Plaintiff's police record identifies paper_cute as the officer associated with Crime Record #20869.

Plaintiff may seek testimony concerning:

the creation or entry of Crime Record #20869;
the three Bank Robbery convictions contained in that record;
the evidence associated with the record when the convictions were entered;
whether any other evidence accompanied P-002, P-003, or P-004;
why the three incidents were entered together in the same crime record; and
other matters concerning the creation and enforcement of Crime Record #20869.

3. GreyMC

Defendant has identified GreyMC as the person who both captured P-002 and filed the record associated with the first Bank Robbery conviction.

Plaintiff may seek testimony concerning:

when and where P-002 was captured;
GreyMC's physical location when P-002 was captured;
what GreyMC personally observed;
the viewing or camera circumstances under which P-002 was captured;
how GreyMC determined that Plaintiff was specifically within the bank vault;
whether any evidence other than P-002 was relied upon when the first Bank Robbery record was submitted;
the submission of P-002 to DHS; and
the factual basis supporting the first Bank Robbery conviction.

4. Lieutenant SonOfaLancer

Defendant has identified Lieutenant SonOfaLancer as the person who both captured P-003 and P-004 and filed the records associated with the second and third Bank Robbery convictions.

Plaintiff may seek testimony concerning:

when and where P-003 and P-004 were captured;
SonOfaLancer's physical location when each image was captured;
what SonOfaLancer personally observed during the incidents;
the circumstances under which the screenshots were obtained;
how the screenshots were submitted to DHS;
the basis upon which the associated records were filed as Bank Robbery;

01 Analyzed text

No passages highlighted.

SonOfaLancer's role and actions during those incidents; and matters relevant to authentication, foundation, credibility, bias, or impeachment if those issues become material during testimony.

Plaintiff may also seek testimony concerning the August 21, 2026 interaction reflected in P-008, but only to the extent the Court determines that interaction is relevant to credibility, bias, hostility, or impeachment. Plaintiff does not contend that P-008, standing alone, establishes retaliation or misconduct concerning the original convictions.

5. Individual(s) who prepared D-001 through D-003 — Identity presently unknown

Plaintiff may seek testimony concerning:

- how the recreated scene was prepared;
- the positions selected for the actors;
- the source materials used;
- how Plaintiff's reconstructed position was determined;
- whether the recreation relied upon contemporaneous evidence existing when the original conviction was entered or later inference;
- and the intended evidentiary purpose of D-001 through D-003.

6. Individual(s) who prepared or authenticated D-004 through D-007 — Identity presently unknown

Plaintiff may seek testimony concerning:

- the source of the Discord/global-chat information;
- how the messages were correlated to P-002 through P-004;
- the source and timezone of the displayed timestamps;
- the operation of the relevant Discord/in-game message bridge;
- the authentication of the underlying records; and
- the basis for the incident dates Defendant attributes to the three alleged offenses.

Clarification of Prior Witness Designations

Plaintiff previously identified the photographers of P-002, P-003, and P-004 by description because Defendant had not yet disclosed their identities.

Based upon Defendant's clarification that GreyMC captured P-002 and Lieutenant SonOfaLancer captured P-003 and P-004, Plaintiff withdraws those unknown-photographer placeholders only to the extent they are now replaced by GreyMC and SonOfaLancer by name.

01 Analyzed text

No passages highlighted.

All other previously announced witnesses remain preserved unless expressly replaced or withdrawn by this filing.

Plaintiff does not necessarily intend to call every witness listed above. This filing is made to preserve the witnesses whose testimony may become material after completion of the outstanding Rule 4.7 production and before the witness phase of this action.

Reading the score

Human: below 15%. Mixed: 15-29%. Likely AI: 30% or higher.
Scores of 75% and above display as 100%, as on screen.

Reading the highlights

Highlights mark passages flagged by the model. Darker tints indicate higher sentence scores when available. Sentence scores are separate from the document score.

AI detection is an estimate, not proof of authorship. False positives and negatives are possible. Consider drafts, context and writing history; do not use this report alone to penalize a writer.