First case  l’ = l

* We   have     c =  l’ :: c’   and  l’  = l
* From     m models  c   and  m models ¬l   we get m models c’
  + Lemma
    - Given:
    - m models (l∨c′)
    - l=l′
    - m models ¬l (where m models ¬l :: empty)
    - We want to prove that m models c′.
    - Given that m models (l∨c′), it means that m satisfies either l or c′.
    - Since l=l′ and m models ¬l′, it implies that m does not satisfy l′.
    - If m doesn't satisfy l, then the only remaining possibility is that it satisfies c′.
    - Thus, m must satisfy c′, as it is the only remaining possibility from (l∨c′).
  + Hence, m models c′.
* By IH  applied to l and c’  - we have           .m  models  (remove l c’)
* Lemma   l = l’  then remove l (l’ :: c’) = remove  l c’
* So we are done (by m models (remove l c’)  and l = l’  we get  m models (remove l (l’ :: c’))