

FORENSIC EVIDENCE ASSESSMENT REPORT

Report ID: sub_2307

Pseudonym: N/A

Generated: 2026-01-26 09:07:24 UTC

Status: REJECTED

Classification: UNKNOWN

CONFIDENTIAL - SECTION 45 COMPLIANT


This report contains sensitive information and is intended solely for authorized recipients. Unauthorized disclosure, distribution, or copying is prohibited.

Executive Summary

This forensic report presents the automated assessment of evidence submission **N/A**. The evidence underwent comprehensive analysis through a six-layer validation framework including anonymity preservation, credibility assessment, coordination detection, Byzantine consensus, and optional counter-evidence processing.

Key Findings:

- Credibility Score: **37.45%**
- Consensus Decision: **REJECTED**
- Coordination Detected: **NO**
- Evidence Type: **N/A**



Chain of Custody

Field	Value
Evidence Hash	N/A...
Chain Hash	N/A...
Submission Time	2026-01-26T09:07:07.168307
Processing Time	0.00s
Chain Verified	PENDING

Note: All evidence is cryptographically hashed and recorded in an immutable chain to ensure integrity and prevent tampering.

Credibility Assessment

Metric	Score	Confidence Interval
Deepfake Detection	37.45%	[0.0%, 0.0%]
Cross-Modal Consistency	0.00%	N/A
Physical Plausibility	0.00%	N/A
Final Credibility Score	37.45%	[0.0%, 0.0%]

Interpretation: VERY LOW credibility - Evidence likely manipulated or inauthentic.

Coordination Analysis

NO COORDINATION DETECTED

No evidence of coordination with other submissions was found. The submission appears to be independent.

Consensus Decision

DECISION: REJECTED

Agreement: 0.0%

Vote Distribution: Accept: 0 | Reject: 5

Status unknown.

Technical Details

Processing Timeline:

Stage	Timestamp	Duration
Submission	2026-01-26T09:07:07	-
Anonymization	N/A	0.00s
Credibility Assessment	N/A	0.00s
Consensus	N/A	0.00s

Legal Disclaimer

This automated assessment is provided for informational purposes only and should not be considered as legal advice or definitive proof of authenticity. The system uses pre-trained machine learning models and heuristic analysis which may have limitations and potential errors.

Section 45 Compliance: This report is generated in compliance with Section 45 of the Evidence Act, which governs the admissibility of electronic evidence. However, final determination of admissibility rests with the appropriate legal authorities.

Limitations:

- Automated assessments may not detect all forms of manipulation
- Results should be validated by human experts where applicable
- The system operates on submitted evidence without external verification
- Coordination detection is based on patterns and may have false positives/negatives

Recommended Actions: All evidence marked for "REVIEW" or with high uncertainty should undergo manual expert examination before being used in legal proceedings.

Report generated by Corruption Reporting System v1.0.0-MVP

Generated: 2026-01-26 09:07:24 UTC