Internet Law Firm

Architecture, Classification Engine & Design Doctrine

Jurisdiction-agnostic legal coordination for the internet

Version 1.0 — February 2026

Contents

1. Mission & Operating Principles

Internet Law Firm exists to coordinate access to human legal professionals for internet-based disputes, without practicing law, giving legal advice, or holding client funds.

"We do not replace lawyers. We route work to them."

What ILF Is

- A case intake and triage system

- A routing engine for lawyers, firms, and recovery specialists

- A coordination layer for contingency-based legal work

- A neutral marketplace infrastructure

What ILF Is Not

- A law firm

- A legal representative

- A provider of legal advice

- A guarantor of outcomes

- A custodian of trust funds

This distinction keeps ILF outside unauthorized practice of law (UPL) in all major jurisdictions.

Non-Negotiable Principles

Human-in-the-Loop Only: All legal actions are performed by licensed human professionals. ILF only coordinates.

Pay-on-Success: No upfront fees to users. Compensation flows only if recovery or resolution occurs.

Non-Custodial by Design: ILF does not hold settlement funds, manage trust accounts, or touch client money.

Jurisdictional Neutrality: ILF does not favor governments, political actors, ideologies, or jurisdictions.

2. The Core Insight

Today's internet has global platforms, instant payments, and cross-border harm. But legal recourse is still local, slow, and fragmented.

"The internet has traffic, congestion, and accidents —
but no neutral infrastructure between harm and lawful resolution."

ILF is the missing middleware between internet harm and human law. No one owns this layer yet.

What This Enables

- Small cases stop being ignored (< $5k gets routed to solo lawyers)
- Large cases surface earlier (LITMUS pattern detection)
- Platforms self-correct when patterns emerge (reputational pressure)
- Abuse becomes expensive (structured coordination reduces asymmetry)

Future Verticals (Quiet Expansion)

Vertical	Target
Payment recovery	GhostLedger (live now)
Wage theft	Gig workers, contractors
Creator revenue disputes	YouTube, TikTok, Twitch
Platform deplatforming	Account termination recovery
Cross-border contract claims	International freelance disputes

3. ILF Case Flow

```
Step 1: INTAKE
  User submits claim (via GhostLedger or future verticals)
  → IntakeSubmission created

Step 2: CLASSIFICATION
  Case Classification Engine tags 5 dimensions:
  dispute type, jurisdiction, value band, complexity, recovery path
  → CaseClassification created

Step 3: ROUTING
  Cases matched to professionals by specialty + geography
  Professionals opt in — never assigned
  → Case enters matching pool

Step 4: ENGAGEMENT
  Professional accepts case
  ILF exits the legal loop — lawyer and user interact directly
  → ILFEngagement created

Step 5: OUTCOME
  If successful: agreed fee paid, ILF coordination fee settled
  If unsuccessful: user owes nothing, ILF earns nothing
```

What Each Party Sees

Party	Visible Information
User	"Your case has been routed for review." No probabilities. No promises.
Lawyer / Firm	Redacted case summary, jurisdiction, value band, evidence checklist, fee option.
Platform (admin)	Anonymized routing metrics, resolution rates, failure reasons.

4. Case Classification Engine (CCE)

The CCE does NOT decide legal merit. It does NOT recommend legal action. It does NOT replace human judgment. It only categorizes, estimates routing complexity, and matches cases to appropriate human professionals.

"Think air-traffic control, not autopilot."

Dimension A: Dispute Type

Type	Description
Payment withheld	Platform holds funds without clear reason
Wage theft	Non-payment for completed work
Platform fund freeze	Account balance frozen
Contract breach	Failure to honor agreed terms
Marketplace dispute	Buyer/seller disagreement
Deplatforming	Account termination, content removal
Cross-border nonpayment	International payment failure

Closed taxonomy — no free-text categories. Prevents chaos.

Dimension B: Jurisdictional Scope

Scope	Description
Single	One jurisdiction (e.g., US-CA)
Multi-state	Multiple states within one country
Cross-border	Multiple countries involved
Unknown	Requires human review before routing

Dimension C: Value Band

Band	Amount	Routing Pool
Micro	< $500	Recovery agents, automated demand
Small	$500 – $5k	Solo lawyers, arbitration
Medium	$5k – $50k	Boutique firms
Large	$50k – $250k	Litigation-capable firms
Strategic	$250k+	Senior firms only

Prevents over-lawyering small cases and under-lawyering large ones.

Dimension D: Complexity Score (1–5)

Scored based on: number of parties, evidence completeness, platform involvement, and jurisdictional conflict.

- Score ⊡ 2 → automation-friendly routing
- Score ⊡ 4 → mandatory human triage

Dimension E: Recovery Path (Internal Only)

Path	Description
Informal demand	Letter or structured communication
Platform escalation	Internal dispute process
Arbitration	Third-party resolution
Litigation	Court proceedings
Informational only	Unlikely recovery, evidence preserved

Recovery path is NEVER shown to users. Internal routing signal only.

5. Routing Logic & Safeguards

```
Routing Algorithm:

IF jurisdiction == UNKNOWN       → Human Review
ELSE IF jurisdiction == CROSS_BORDER  → Human Review
ELSE IF value_band == STRATEGIC   → Senior Legal Pool
ELSE IF value < $500              → Recovery Agent Pool
ELSE IF complexity >= 4           → Senior Legal Pool
ELSE                             → Match by specialty + geography

Professionals opt in, never assigned.
CCE slows down when risk increases — speed is not always the goal.
```

Mandatory Human Overrides

- Cross-border disputes (always)
- Government-involved entities
- Politically exposed parties
- Platform-wide incidents (systemic flag from LITMUS)
- Media-sensitive claims

Anti-Gaming Controls

- Claim frequency caps per identity hash
- Duplicate case detection (same entity + same amount + same timeframe)
- Evidence completeness thresholds (minimum attachments required)
- Reputation scoring (non-public, internal only)

Hard Rules (Do Not Break)

- Never show success probabilities to users
- Never auto-escalate to litigation
- Never prioritize based on politics or ideology

- Never require token usage to access the system

6. Lawyer & Firm Onboarding

Lawyers and firms opt into the ILF network voluntarily. They are never cold-contacted, never assigned cases, and always retain full professional independence.

Credential Verification

Check	Method
Bar number validation	Verified against public bar association records
Jurisdiction confirmation	Must match declared practice areas
Specialty declaration	Self-declared, verified by case history
Contingency preference	Whether they accept success-fee structures
Value band range	Minimum and maximum case sizes they accept

Conflict-of-Interest Controls

· Lawyers cannot accept cases involving entities they represent or have represented

· Firm-level conflict check against all active engagements

· Automatic recusal when platform employer matches accused entity

· Conflict declarations are logged immutably

Performance Tracking

Lawyers accumulate a success rate based on resolved cases. This is internal only — never displayed to users, never used as marketing. It influences routing priority but never excludes professionals from receiving cases.

7. Full-Stack Integration

```
LITMUS  →  LICO  →  ILF / GhostLedger  →  Human Lawyers
(signal)  (coordination)   (resolution)      (action)


Each layer has a strict boundary.
Nothing collapses into regulation or politics.
```

LITMUS — The Signal Layer

LITMUS is a passive intelligence layer that detects patterns, not guilt. It watches for sudden spikes in complaints, repeated fund freezes by the same platform, coordinated nonpayment behavior, and emerging abuse vectors. LITMUS only says: "Something abnormal is happening here."

LICO — The Coordination Layer

LICO receives LITMUS signals and performs human validation. It decides whether an issue is isolated, systemic, jurisdiction-sensitive, or escalation-worthy. LICO can invite lawyers to review patterns and flag cases for priority routing — but it never enforces, never accuses publicly, and never lobbies politically.

ILF / GhostLedger — The Resolution Layer

Cases flow through intake, classification, and routing. The CCE tags "systemic issue" when LITMUS patterns are present, giving lawyers additional context. No user is told "this is systemic." No platform is accused. Lawyers independently decide what to do.

Two Flow Types

Normal Flow (90% of cases):

```
User → GhostLedger → CCE → Lawyer → Resolution
```

Pattern-Detected Flow (critical 10%):

```
Multiple Users → LITMUS detects pattern
              → LICO validates
              → ILF flags related cases
              → Lawyers see "systemic issue" tag
```

8. GhostLedger as First Vertical

GhostLedger is payment recovery. ILF is horizontal legal infrastructure. GhostLedger becomes the first vertical, the proof of concept, and the revenue engine. ILF becomes the umbrella, the network, and the long-term asset.

GhostLedger	Internet Law Firm
GhostLedger	Internet Law Firm
Payment recovery	All internet disputes
Narrow scope	Horizontal infrastructure
Early revenue	Long-term network
Proof of demand	Platform moat
Public-facing	Quiet, neutral, structural

Strategic Ordering

1. Keep calling it GhostLedger publicly (narrow, safe, understandable)
2. Internally architect Internet Law Firm as the parent
3. Never brand it politically
4. Never promise justice — only coordination
5. Let lawyers do law, you do rails

9. Design Doctrine

Derived from stress-testing against structurally fragile projects. These rules are non-negotiable — they protect GhostLedger and ILF from the failure modes that destroy leveraged, political, or ideological systems.

"If any answer is wrong — redesign."

9.1 Treasury: Never Be a Forced Seller

Treasury assets must NEVER be used as liquidation collateral. If liquidation is possible, collapse is inevitable.

- Allowed: Cash-like stable reserves, time-locked protocol-owned liquidity, non-leveraged yield
- Forbidden: Leveraged BTC/ETH, cross-protocol rehypothecation, speculative positions

9.2 Governance: No Political or Personality Gravity

The protocol must survive even if every founder disappears tomorrow.

- No named individuals in protocol branding
- No "strategic political allies"
- Multisig governance (3/5 minimum, geographically distributed)
- Public voting thresholds, emergency actions rate-limited on-chain

9.3 Regulatory: Design So Regulators Have Nothing Interesting

Call it infrastructure, tooling, middleware, settlement rails. Never: revolution, liberation, wealth transfer.

- Neutral jurisdictions, no nation-state capital dependency
- No promises of yield tied to effort
- No "financial freedom" rhetoric

9.4 Narrative: Utility First, Always

If the token disappeared, the system should still work. Fee token over governance token. Optional usage, not mandatory. Revenue feeds token — not hype.

9.5 Transparency: Preempt Distrust

Assume everyone distrusts you by default. Ship with: live treasury dashboard, on-chain liabilities, clear "what we cannot do" list, automatic alerts for balance changes. Trust is verifiable, not claimed.

10. Regulatory Stress Test

"The best regulatory outcome is when regulators get bored fast."

GhostLedger is NOT:

Classification	Why Not
A lender	Does not extend credit or loans
A debt collector	No coercion, no harassment
A broker-dealer	Does not trade securities
An investment vehicle	No yield, no returns, no speculation
A law firm	Does not practice law or represent clients

GhostLedger IS:

Classification	Legal Analogy
A contingent service marketplace	Similar to contingency law firms
A claims facilitation layer	Intake, documentation, coordination
A success-fee coordinator	Paid only on recovery, like referral networks

The Anti-Fragility Checklist

Every system component must pass ALL of these:

Question	Required Answer
Can treasury be liquidated?	NO
Can founders rug governance?	NO
Can politics affect operations?	NO
Is token required to use product?	NO

Would regulators find this boring?   **YES**

Does it hold user funds long-term?   **NO**

Does it use leverage?   **NO**

Does it survive founder disappearance?   **YES**

11. The Layered Doctrine

The foundational separation that keeps the entire system legally safe, politically neutral, and structurally unkillable.

Detect ☐ Accuse

LITMUS sees patterns, never names perpetrators

Coordinate ☐ Enforce

LICO routes and validates, never punishes

Route ☐ Represent

ILF matches professionals, never practices law

Observe ☐ Control

The system watches, humans decide and act

Break this doctrine system becomes attackable.
Follow it system becomes inevitable.

The GhostLedger Doctrine (Lock This In)

"We coordinate recovery, we do not promise outcomes,
we do not hold your money, and we only win when you win."

This single sentence protects you legally, ethically, and structurally.

The ILF Charter (Short Form)

The Internet Law Firm provides infrastructure for lawful dispute coordination. It does not practice law, provide advice, or replace licensed professionals. It operates on transparency, neutrality, and outcome-based incentives. Its success is measured by resolved cases — not hype, not volume, not politics.