SAMPLE — DEFENDANT'S RESPONSE & PROOFS PACKAGE

(Fictional — FOR TESTING ONLY — NOT A REAL / LEGAL DOCUMENT)

Package ID: DEF-PKG-2023-0001
Prepared for (Defendant): City Transport Corporation — Mock Division
Prepared by: Legal & Operations Unit — City Transport Corporation (Mock)
Date prepared: March 18, 2023

1. DEFENDANT'S STATEMENT

The defendant, City Transport Corporation (CTC) — Mock Division, through its driver, Mr. Ramesh Singh (fictional), provides the following account of the events on March 14, 2023 at approximately 08:30 AM on M.G. Road near Lotus Junction, Bengaluru.

Driver's account: The bus was traveling in the left lane when a stationary auto-rickshaw stopped unexpectedly. The driver states he initiated an overtaking maneuver with due care. As the bus merged, the plaintiff's car (Maruti Suzuki Swift, Reg. KA-09-AB-4567) suddenly decelerated and, according to the driver, partially moved left, reducing available clearance and causing contact. The bus driver asserts he maintained a safe speed and performed mirror and horn checks prior to overtaking.

Legal position: The defendant denies primary liability and asserts contributory negligence on part of the plaintiff for sudden braking and lane encroachment. The defendant requests that the AI-judge consider the attached proofs and apportion liability accordingly.

2. PROOFS / EVIDENCE SUBMITTED BY DEFENDANT

The defendant submits the following documents and exhibits (all fictional/mock) as evidence in support of its defense:

Exhibit D1 — Bus Driver's Signed Statement: Signed witness statement by Mr. Ramesh Singh describing overtaking attempt and sudden deceleration by plaintiff's vehicle. Dated March 14, 2023.

Exhibit D2 — Bus Maintenance & Inspection Log: Recent maintenance checklist and tachograph/vehicle inspection showing brakes and steering system were in working order; last full service on February 25, 2023 (Mock).

Exhibit D3 — Passenger Affidavits: Two signed affidavits from bus passengers (fictional) corroborating the driver's account that the bus attempted to overtake a stopped auto-rickshaw and that contact appeared sudden.

Exhibit D4 — Bus CCTV (Internal) Snapshot Frames: Extracted frames from internal bus CCTV showing relative positions immediately before contact (Mock snapshots attached as image references in evidence bundle).

Exhibit D5 — Third-party CCTV Frame Comparison: Alternate camera angle from nearby shop CCTV (Mock) showing plaintiff's car reducing speed prior to contact (frames provided).

Exhibit D6 — Speedometer / Telematics Export (Mock): Telematics export showing bus speed range 38–42 km/h in the 30 seconds preceding the collision; GPS trace included.

Exhibit D7 — Bus Driver Training Certificate: Driver's refresher training completion certificate dated Jan 10, 2023 (Mock).

Exhibit D8 — Photographs of Road Conditions & Lane Markings: Photos taken within 15 minutes after collision showing road, lane markings, and position of stationary auto-rickshaw (Mock).

Exhibit D9 — Independent Witness Statement (Shopkeeper): Shopkeeper (fictional) statement indicating plaintiff's vehicle braked sharply before the collision.

Exhibit D10 — Vehicle Damage Comparison Report: Independent inspector's comparison showing impact location on plaintiff's car consistent with contact from right side of bus; report (Mock).

3. CHAIN OF CUSTODY & AUTHENTICATION (Mock)

All electronic evidence (CCTV frames, telematics export) are provided as digital exhibits with accompanying MD5 checksums and a signed declaration from the defendant's IT officer certifying no alterations since extraction (Mock). Physical affidavits and signed statements bear notarization stamps in the mock package.

4. DEFENDANT'S EVIDENTIAL ANALYSIS (Mock)

- Clearance: Internal bus CCTV frames and passenger affidavits indicate the bus began its overtake with approximate lateral clearance; however, the plaintiff's sudden deceleration reduced the available gap.
- Speed: Telematics indicate bus speed within posted limits (approx. 38–42 km/h).
- Point of impact: Damage comparison report suggests contact occurred on bus's right front panel and plaintiff's rear-left quarter — consistent with scenario where plaintiff's vehicle changed trajectory or braked.
- Responsibility: Based on the combined evidence, the defendant contends that contributory negligence by the plaintiff is significant and requests apportionment (e.g., plaintiff 60% — defendant 40%) for testing alternative verdict scenarios.

5. SUGGESTED VERDICT APPORTIONMENT (FOR TESTING)

The defendant proposes the following alternative apportionment scenarios for the AI-judge to evaluate based on evidence weighting: 1. Scenario A — High weight to defendant evidence: Plaintiff 60% / Defendant 40% contributory liability. 2. Scenario B — Balanced weighting: Plaintiff 50% / Defendant 50%. 3. Scenario C — Low weight to defendant evidence (if CCTV from independent camera strongly favors plaintiff): Plaintiff 80% / Defendant 20%.

6. EXHIBITS CHECKLIST (Mock)

The following exhibits are included in the mock evidence bundle (for testing ingestion). They are filenames in the test dataset and are fictional placeholders: - D1_driver_statement.pdf - D2_maintenance_log.pdf - D3_passenger_affidavits.zip (two PDFs) - D4_bus_internal_cctv_frames.zip (jpg/png) - D5_thirdparty_cctv_frames.zip (jpg/png) - D6_telematics_export.csv - D7_driver_training_cert.pdf - D8_road_photos.zip (jpg/png) - D9_shopkeeper_statement.pdf - D10_damage_report.pdf

7. LEGAL NOTE (Mock)

This defendant package is a fictional mock bundle prepared solely for testing/training an AI judge system. Exhibits referenced are mock files and must be treated as synthetic test data. No part of this package should be used as real evidence in legal proceedings or to misrepresent facts.

Prepared by: Legal & Operations Unit — City Transport Corporation (Mock)
Authorized Representative: A. K. Menon (Mock) — Deputy Manager (Legal)
Date: March 18, 2023