

# Fake News Analysis Report

Query ID: query\_66b58ab3

## VERDICT: TRUE NEWS

### Query News Sample



"Adani met Jagan Reddy in 2021, promised Rs 1,750 crore bribe, says US agency"

### Top Visual Evidence



"US complaint says Adani met and promised Rs 1750 crore bribe to Jagan Mohan Reddy"

# Fake News Analysis Report

Query ID: query\_66b58ab3

## Final Unified Reasoning

- Detailed Reasoning:

The final classification is REAL, with a high degree of confidence. Here's a breakdown of the reasoning, prioritizing the evidence as instructed:

- Primary Support (Evidence 3: Web Search - TRUE with High Support Score): The web search results provide the strongest evidence, indicating a high support score (20.0) for the claim. This means multiple credible news sources corroborate the core assertion that Adani met with Jagan Reddy and offered a bribe. This significantly outweighs any inconsistencies found in the image-text and image-image analyses.

- Secondary Support (Evidence 2: Image-Image Consistency): The image-image analysis reveals a strong alignment in entities and event context. Both images feature Jagan Reddy and Adani in public settings, suggesting they were indeed present together at some event. While the sentiment is neutral in both, the visual consistency reinforces the possibility of a meeting as described in the claim.

- Minor Considerations (Evidence 1: Image-Text Consistency): The image-text analysis initially raised concerns due to sentiment and event mismatches. The image is a portrait and doesn't directly depict a bribe or a meeting. However, this is a relatively minor point. A portrait of Jagan Reddy could easily be taken after or before a meeting with Adani, and his expression doesn't necessarily contradict the allegations. The lack of a direct visual representation of the event doesn't invalidate the claim, especially when supported by strong external verification.

- Arguments FOR the REAL classification:

- Strong Web Verification:** The high support score from the web search is the most compelling evidence, indicating widespread reporting and corroboration of the claim.

- Entity and Event Consistency:** The image-image analysis confirms the presence of both individuals in a public setting, aligning with the claim of a meeting.

- Arguments AGAINST the REAL classification:

- Image-Text Mismatch:** The image doesn't directly depict the alleged bribe or meeting, creating a disconnect between the visual and textual elements.

- Neutral Sentiment:** The neutral sentiment in both images doesn't strongly support the negative allegations made in the text.

Ultimately, the overwhelming support from the web search verification (Evidence 3) outweighs the minor inconsistencies in the image-text and image-image analyses. Therefore, the final classification is REAL, with high confidence.

# Fake News Analysis Report

Query ID: query\_66b58ab3

## Image vs. Text Analysis (Query)

Okay, let's break down this image and text pairing step-by-step.

### STEP 1: Sentiment Alignment

**1. Text Sentiment:** The text carries a strongly **negative** sentiment. It alleges bribery and corruption involving a significant sum of money. The phrasing ("promised bribe," "US agency") contributes to a serious and accusatory tone.

**2. Image Sentiment:** The image shows a man (identified as Jagan Reddy) looking directly at the camera with a slightly concerned or defensive expression. His posture and facial expression are relatively neutral, but could be interpreted as slightly anxious or uncomfortable.

**3. Comparison:**

- Classification: Sentiment Mismatch
- Reasoning: The text conveys a very negative and serious accusation, while the image presents a relatively neutral or slightly concerned individual. The image doesn't inherently reflect the negativity of the allegations.

### STEP 2: Entity Consistency

**1. Text Entities:**

- **Adani:** A person and a company name.
- **Jagan Reddy:** A person (likely a politician).
- **US agency:** An organization.

**2. Image Entities:**

- **Jagan Reddy:** Clearly visible in the image.

**3. Comparison:**

- Classification: Entities Mismatch
- Reasoning: While Jagan Reddy is present in the image, Adani and the "US agency" are not visually represented. The image only depicts one of the entities mentioned in the text.

### STEP 3: Event/Action Consistency

**1. Text Event/Action:** The main event is an alleged meeting between Adani and Jagan Reddy where a bribe was promised.

**2. Image Depiction:** The image shows Jagan Reddy in a seated position, seemingly speaking or gesturing. It doesn't depict a meeting, bribery, or any specific action related to the text's event. It's a portrait-style image.

# Fake News Analysis Report

Query ID: query\_66b58ab3

## 3. Comparison:

- Classification: Event/Action Mismatch
- Reasoning: The image doesn't visually represent the core event described in the text (the meeting and alleged bribe). It's a static portrait, lacking any context of the alleged event.

## STEP 4: Final Judgment

- Judgment: FAKE
- Brief Reasoning: The combination of Sentiment Mismatch , Entities Mismatch , and Event/Action Mismatch strongly suggests the image is not a truthful representation of the text. The image is a simple portrait and doesn't reflect the serious allegations of bribery and corruption described in the text. The lack of visual connection to the event or other key entities makes the pairing misleading.

# Fake News Analysis Report

Query ID: query\_66b58ab3

## Query Image vs. Evidence Image Analysis

Okay, let's analyze the two images step-by-step.

- STEP 1: Sentiment Alignment
  - **Image 1 Sentiment:** The person in the image (Y.S. Jagan Mohan Reddy) appears to have a slightly concerned or serious expression. His hand gesture could be interpreted as defensive or explanatory. Overall, the sentiment leans towards neutral with a hint of concern.
  - **Image 2 Sentiment:** The person in the image (Gautam Adani) appears to be speaking at a conference, with a serious and focused expression. The background suggests a formal setting. The sentiment is neutral, possibly leaning slightly towards professional seriousness.
  - **Comparison:** Sentiment Ambiguous/Neutral
  - **Reasoning:** Both images depict individuals in serious settings, but the expressions are not strongly emotional. The overall sentiment is neutral in both, making a direct alignment difficult to determine.
- Classification: Sentiment Ambiguous/Neutral
- Reasoning: Both images convey a neutral sentiment, making it difficult to determine alignment.

- STEP 2: Entity Consistency
  - **Entities in Image 1:** Y.S. Jagan Mohan Reddy (politician)
  - **Entities in Image 2:** Gautam Adani (businessman), Y.S. Jagan Mohan Reddy (politician)
  - **Comparison:** Entities Aligned
  - **Reasoning:** Both images feature Y.S. Jagan Mohan Reddy, confirming the presence of the same entity across both images. Gautam Adani is also present in Image 2.
- Classification: Entities Aligned
- Reasoning: Y.S. Jagan Mohan Reddy is present in both images.

- STEP 3: Event/Action Consistency
  - **Event/Action in Image 1:** The image shows Y.S. Jagan Mohan Reddy in a posed portrait, likely during a press conference or similar event. He appears to be speaking or explaining something.
  - **Event/Action in Image 2:** The image shows Gautam Adani and Y.S. Jagan Mohan Reddy at a public event, likely a conference or meeting. Both are positioned near microphones, suggesting they are speaking.
  - **Comparison:** Event/Action Aligned
  - **Reasoning:** Both images depict the individuals in a public setting, likely involved in a formal discussion or presentation. The presence of microphones in Image 2 reinforces this.
- Classification: Event/Action Aligned
- Reasoning: Both images show the individuals in a public setting, likely engaged in a formal discussion.

# Fake News Analysis Report

Query ID: query\_66b58ab3

---

- STEP 4: Final Judgment
- **Judgment:** TRUE
- **Brief Reasoning:** While the sentiment is ambiguous in both images, the entity and event consistency are strong. Both images feature Y.S. Jagan Mohan Reddy and depict him in a public setting. This suggests the images are likely related and not manipulated to create a false narrative. The alignment of entities and events supports the claim that the images are connected.

# Fake News Analysis Report

Query ID: query\_66b58ab3

## Text vs. Text Factual Consistency Analysis

### Evidence Snippet #1

**Factual Score:** 1

**Rationale:** Both sentences state the same factual claim: Adani met Jagan Reddy and promised a bribe of Rs 1,750 crore, according to a US agency/complaint. There are no additions or omissions.

### Evidence Snippet #2

**Factual Score:** 1

**Rationale:** Both sentences describe the same event: a meeting between Gautam Adani and former Andhra Pradesh Chief Minister Jagan Reddy, where a bribe was allegedly offered. Sentence A states a bribe of Rs 1,750 crore, while Sentence B states a bribe of \$200 million. These amounts are approximately equivalent, indicating the same underlying claim. The US agency/securities panel allegation is also present in both sentences.

### Evidence Snippet #3

**Factual Score:** 0

**Rationale:** Sentence A states that Adani promised a bribe of Rs 1,750 crore, while Sentence B states that Adani promised a bribe of \$200 million. These are different amounts, representing different facts. Therefore, they do not describe the same real-world situation.

### Evidence Snippet #4

**Factual Score:** 1

**Rationale:** Both sentences refer to the same event: a US agency alleging that Adani met Jagan Reddy in 2021 and promised a bribe of Rs 1,750 crore. Sentence B is a news report from Business Standard confirming this claim.

# Fake News Analysis Report

Query ID: query\_66b58ab3

## Text vs. Text Analysis (cont.)

### Evidence Snippet #5

**Factual Score:** 0

**Rationale:** Sentence A describes a meeting between Adani and Jagan Reddy, alleging a bribe offer by a US agency. Sentence B discusses temple vandalism and political reactions in Andhra Pradesh. These are unrelated events.

### Evidence Snippet #6

**Factual Score:** 1

**Rationale:** Both sentences describe the same event: allegations that Adani met Jagan Reddy and promised a bribe of Rs 1,750 crore. Sentence B, from The Hindu, reports on an indictment detailing these accusations, directly supporting the claim made in Sentence A.

### Evidence Snippet #7

**Factual Score:** 1

**Rationale:** Both sentences describe the same event: Gautam Adani meeting Jagan Reddy in 2021 and promising a bribe. While the amount is slightly different (Rs 1,750 crore vs. \$200 million), these are likely different ways of representing the same monetary value. The core facts – the meeting, the year, and the promise of a bribe – are identical.

### Evidence Snippet #8

**Factual Score:** 0

**Rationale:** Sentence A alleges a meeting between Adani and Jagan Reddy involving a bribe promise, citing a US agency. Sentence B reports an incident of an elderly man being crushed by Jagan Reddy's convoy. These are distinct events and do not share the same factual content.

# Fake News Analysis Report

Query ID: query\_66b58ab3

## Text vs. Text Analysis (cont.)

### Evidence Snippet #9

**Factual Score:** 0

**Rationale:** Sentence A claims Adani met Jagan Reddy and promised a bribe. Sentence B states Adani was indicted for bribing officials and misleading investors. While both relate to Adani and bribery in India, they describe different events. Sentence A focuses on a specific meeting and alleged promise, while Sentence B refers to a legal indictment. They do not convey the same factual information.

### Evidence Snippet #10

**Factual Score:** 1

**Rationale:** Both sentences state the same fact: Adani met Jagan Reddy in 2021 and promised a bribe of Rs 1,750 crore, according to a US agency. Sentence B is from hindutamil.in, a trusted news source, and simply reports the same claim.