lejacie

LEJACIE · PRACTICE TOOL

AI helped prepare it. Can you stand behind it?

A verification workflow for legal work. For law students, lawyers and legal teams preparing AI-assisted research, drafts and material intended for courts or tribunals.

INDEPENDENT PROTOTYPE BY LEJACIE · DRAFT 3 · NOVEMBER 2026

THIS GUIDE IS FOR YOU IF

- You are about to enter information into an AI tool
- AI has already produced research, a draft, a summary or a translation
- You are reviewing someone else's AI-assisted work
- You manage a team, approve tools or set the standard

CONTENTS

Start where you are	1
Steps 1 to 6: the workflow	2
Verification record	9
If you find an error or possible disclosure	10
For students and supervised staff	11
For firms, clinics and legal teams	12
Before this becomes your working standard	13
References and about	14

Draft 3, 4 November 2026: the Draft 2 content of 22 October 2026, set in Lejacie's current design. Independent prototype, draft 2, 22 October 2026. For review and adaptation, not automatic adoption as a firm standard. Not issued or endorsed by a court, tribunal or regulator. Not legal or professional advice. Court documents current to 22 October 2026; check the current official documents and matter-specific directions before use.

START HERE

The document reads well. That does not tell you whether it is correct.

The authorities look plausible. The chronology is neatly organised. That does not tell you whether the work is correct, or whether the information should have been entered into the tool in the first place. This resource helps you check what AI contributed, verify the material you intend to use, identify forum-specific requirements and record unresolved issues before the work moves on.

WHAT VERIFICATION MEANS

Verification means checking against the relevant source material, not asking the tool whether its answer is right. The Supreme Court of Victoria expressly distinguishes checking original sources from asking an AI tool to confirm AI-generated content [1] para 7.4(e).

START WHERE YOU ARE

YOUR SITUATION	START HERE
You are about to enter information into a tool	Step 1: Check before uploading (page 2)
AI has already produced research, a draft or a summary	Step 2: Identify its contribution (page 3)
You are reviewing someone else's work	Step 3: Check against the sources (page 4)
The material includes witness evidence, expert opinion or translation	Step 4: Protect the integrity of the evidence (page 6)
The document is about to be filed, served or provided	Step 5: Check the forum and release decision (page 7)
Something may already have gone wrong	If you find an error or possible disclosure (page 10)
You manage the team or approve tools	What the organisation must put in place (page 12)

WHAT THIS RESOURCE DOES, AND DOES NOT DO

This is a proposed working process. It is not a complete statement of court rules, professional obligations or information-security requirements.

The Supreme Court of Victoria, Federal Court and Administrative Review Tribunal have their own AI documents. Their scope and requirements must be checked separately. A requirement in one forum should not be presented as a rule in another [1, 2, 3].

Use this workflow alongside: the current rules, practice notes and directions for the matter; any orders or directions made in the proceeding; professional obligations relevant to your role; and your organisation's approved-tool, supervision and information-handling arrangements.

Completing the checklist does not establish that a document is compliant or ready to file.

STEP 1

Before uploading anything: are you authorised to use this information in this tool?

Start with the information, not the tool's marketing label.

1 Check

- I know which tool, account and service arrangement I am using.
- I have checked whether my organisation permits this tool for this task.
- I have identified whether the proposed input includes confidential, private, privileged or otherwise restricted information.
- I have checked relevant restrictions, including court orders and restrictions affecting material obtained through proceedings.
- I understand the relevant contractual terms and settings, including access, retention and use of inputs.

The Supreme Court's practice note cautions against entering confidential or sensitive information into public AI tools. For closed tools, it requires caution and examination of contractual terms or privacy and confidentiality settings. Lawyers' confidentiality obligations continue to apply [1] paras 6.8 to 6.9.

The ART's direction separately addresses protected information and both public and privately available tools. A restricted environment does not remove every limitation on the use of the information [2] paras 3.17 to 3.21.

If you cannot establish that the use is permitted

Pause the upload. Ask the appropriate supervisor, information-security lead or adviser. Removing names, paying for an account or switching off chat history should not be treated as a substitute for reviewing the information, obligations and service arrangement.

Source SC GEN 25 paras 6.8 to 6.9 **[1]**; ART Practice Direction paras 3.17 to 3.21 **[2]**

RECORD

RECORD	
Tool and account	
Proposed task	
Information permitted for this task	
Approval or review relied on	
Unresolved restrictions	

The recording fields are Lejacie's suggested practice.

STEP 2

Identify what AI actually did

You cannot check a contribution you have not identified. "AI-assisted" is not a sufficient description.

2 Did the tool...

- Suggest authorities?
- Draft or rewrite an argument?
- Extract dates?
- Summarise documents?
- Translate material?
- Calculate figures?
- Produce an image, recording or other media?
- Change the wording of a witness's account?

CHECK

- I can identify the task the tool performed.
- I know what input it used, so far as reasonably ascertainable.
- I can locate its contribution in the current document.
- I have identified material received from a client, colleague or contractor that may also need checking.
- I have told the reviewer what remains unknown.

The Supreme Court requires court users to be prepared to identify AI-produced portions of court documents and explain verification [1] para 7.6. The ART also expects people to be able to explain how AI was used and checked [2].

If the contribution is unclear

Do not describe it as verified. Identify the affected sections, ask the preparer for further information and agree how the checking will be completed. Where the sources or preparation history cannot be established, consider with the responsible practitioner whether the work needs to be reconstructed from reliable material.

Source SC GEN 25 para 7.6 [1]; ART Practice Direction and checklist [2]

STEP 3

Check against the sources: does the material support what the document says?

Do not stop at "the case exists" or "the dates look right". The Supreme Court requires meaningful human verification and responsibility for currency, completeness, accuracy and jurisdictional applicability. Its checking guidance covers references, quotations, proofreading and adaptation to the situation [1] paras 7.1 to 7.4. Use the checks relevant to the work.

MATERIAL	CHECK
Case or other authority	It exists; the citation and pinpoint are correct; the relevant passage supports the proposition.
Legislation	The provision, version, commencement position and jurisdiction are appropriate to the issue.
Quotation	The words match the source, attribution is correct and omitted context does not change the meaning.
Fact	There is an identifiable factual basis; the draft does not turn an allegation or inference into an established fact.
Chronology	Dates and events match source documents; uncertainty and conflicting accounts remain visible.
Summary	It preserves material qualifications, contrary information and relevant context.
Calculation	Inputs, assumptions, method and result have been checked.
Argument	The sources support it, and a suitably qualified person has assessed its relevance and legal basis.

This table is Lejacie's proposed checking method. It is not a quotation of a single court's requirements.

3 Check the gaps as well as the statements

- Important material has not disappeared in summarising or rewriting.
- The output has not imported an assumption from another jurisdiction.
- The wording does not express more certainty than the evidence or authority supports.
- Potential bias or discriminatory assumptions have been considered.
- The final edited version, not only an earlier draft, has been checked.

Use an original source, not generated reassurance

Opening and reading original material is different from receiving another generated answer about it. The Supreme Court permits verification using original source material housed within an AI tool, but says asking an AI tool to confirm generated content is not sufficient verification [1] para 7.4(e).

If a source cannot be found

Mark the item unresolved. Do not leave it in the document as though it has been checked. Ask the responsible reviewer whether it should be removed, replaced with a supported proposition or investigated further.

Source SC GEN 25 paras 7.1 to 7.4 [1]

STEP 4

If the work involves evidence: accuracy alone is not enough

A passage can sound convincing and still misrepresent what a witness knows, remembers or believes. The Supreme Court requires particular caution with evidence and requires relevant documents to reflect the person's own knowledge and words [1] paras 6.10 to 6.11. The ART expressly says AI must not make up, exaggerate, change or add to a person's evidence [2] para 3.9.

4 Witness, expert and translated material

WITNESS MATERIAL

- The draft distinguishes the witness's account from a generated inference or suggested explanation.
- Rewriting has not introduced certainty, detail or meaning that the witness did not provide.
- The responsible practitioner has considered how the material was prepared and what further checking is required.

EXPERT MATERIAL

- The report contains the expert's own opinion and reasoning.
- Applicable expert-evidence rules, codes and disclosure requirements have been checked.
- AI assistance has not been treated as a replacement for the expert's professional judgement.

Both the Supreme Court practice note and the ART direction direct attention to separate expert-evidence requirements [1] para 6.12; [2] para 3.10.

TRANSLATION

- The original document is available.
- Applicable translation and certification requirements have been checked.
- Any required review has been completed by an appropriately competent person.
- Relevant AI-use disclosure requirements have been addressed.

In ART proceedings, AI translation may trigger disclosure requirements. These do not displace separate requirements for a NAATI certified translation where applicable [2] paras 1.8 and 3.11 to 3.13.

If integrity is uncertain

Pause reliance on the affected material and seek appropriate review. A polished draft or signed checklist does not resolve uncertainty about how evidence was created.

Source SC GEN 25 paras 6.10 to 6.12 [1]; ART Practice Direction paras 1.8, 3.9 to 3.13 [2]

STEP 5

Check the forum before release: verification, disclosure and certification are different

Verification concerns whether and how the material was checked. Disclosure concerns telling the court or tribunal about AI use. Certification is a particular confirmation required in the relevant circumstances. Doing one does not automatically complete the others.

5 Complete a forum-specific check

RECORD

RECORD
Which court or tribunal?
Which proceeding and document type?
Current practice note or direction, version and link
Relevant paragraphs
Any case-specific orders or directions?
Is disclosure required for this use?
Where and how must it appear?
Is explanation or certification required?
Who checked this, and when?

Source SC GEN 25 paras 7.1 to 7.6 **[1]**; ART Practice Direction paras 2.4 to 2.6, 3.11 to 3.16 **[2]**; GPN-AI **[3]**

Examples, not a complete court comparison

Supreme Court of Victoria. SC GEN 25 requires verification and readiness to identify AI-produced portions and explain checking. The Court may direct users to provide further information. Do not turn this into a claim that every use requires a standard disclosure statement [1] paras 7.1 to 7.6.

Administrative Review Tribunal. The ART direction identifies circumstances requiring disclosure, including specified uses involving evidence and translation. It addresses prominent disclosure at or near the beginning of a document and permits additional directions and certification requirements [2] paras 2.4 to 2.6 and 3.11 to 3.16.

Federal Court. Check the current GPN-AI and any directions in the proceeding. It sets expectations for responsible use consistent with existing legal and professional obligations. Do not substitute another court's summary for the Federal Court document [3].

Other courts and tribunals. Check the relevant forum directly, including the County Court, Magistrates' Court, VCAT and Federal Circuit and Family Court where applicable.

If the position has not been established, record "not yet confirmed", not "no requirement".

STEP 6

Make the handover usable: "I checked it" is not enough

Before a reviewer signs, approves or relies on the work, provide a short account.

6 The handover

> "I used [tool] for [task]. Its contribution appears in [sections]. I checked [material] against [sources]. I corrected [issues]. The unresolved items are [items]. The forum-specific check is recorded at [location]."

FOR THE PREPARER

- I have distinguished completed checks from outstanding ones.
- I have identified sources the reviewer needs.
- I have disclosed uncertainty about the tool, input or preparation history.

FOR THE REVIEWER

- I understand what AI contributed.
- I have assessed what review my role requires, not simply accepted a completed checklist.
- Relevant legal judgement has been exercised by an appropriately qualified person.
- Outstanding items have an owner and a decision.
- The decision concerns the final version intended for use.

If time is running out

Do not convert "not checked" into "checked" because filing is approaching. Tell the responsible practitioner what remains unresolved. They must determine the appropriate response to the deadline, including any procedural step. This resource cannot decide that for the matter.

Source The handover account and both checklists are Lejacie's suggested practice **[4]**

VERIFICATION RECORD

Keep enough information to explain the work

Suggested template, not a universal court-prescribed form.

DOCUMENT DETAILS

FIELD	RECORD
Matter identifier and document version	
Intended use and forum	
Tool, account and date of use	
Task and scope of AI contribution	
Relevant input restrictions and approval	
Preparer	
Reviewer and review scope	
Applicable disclosure or certification	
Unresolved issues and responsible person	
Release decision and date	

CHECKING LOG

ITEM OR SECTION	SOURCE AND PINPOINT	CHECK PERFORMED	RESULT: VERIFIED, CORRECTED, REMOVED, UNRESOLVED	CHECKED BY, DATE

Store this record through the organisation's approved information-management arrangements. The log itself may contain sensitive information; do not automatically copy it into another AI tool.

IF YOU FIND AN ERROR OR POSSIBLE DISCLOSURE

Stop further reliance and establish what happened

Suggested incident-response prompts. Follow applicable obligations and your organisation's process.

Six prompts

1. **Identify the affected material.** What information, output, document and version are involved?
2. **Establish where it went.** Was it entered into a tool, shared internally, sent to a client, served or filed?
3. **Notify the appropriate responsible person.** Do not independently contact a court, client or regulator outside your role or authority.
4. **Preserve relevant records securely.** Follow the approved incident process for prompts, outputs, correspondence and access records.
5. **Determine the response.** The responsible practitioner and relevant specialists should assess correction, notification, confidentiality, security and other obligations.
6. **Check the cause.** Was the problem limited to one item, or could the same process have affected other work?

The Supreme Court cautions that AI use must not mislead the Court or other participants [1] para 6.2. The ART identifies possible responses including correction, replacement, withdrawal and further explanation [2] para 1.11.

Source SC GEN 25 para 6.2 [1]; ART Practice Direction para 1.11 [2]. The prompts are Lejacie's suggested practice [4]

FOR STUDENTS AND SUPERVISED STAFF

Make your contribution reviewable

Before, during and after

Before using AI, ask:

> "Is this tool permitted for this task, and what information may I use?"

When handing over work, explain:

- What the tool did.
- What you read and checked yourself.
- What remains unresolved.
- Where the verification record is stored.

If this is assessed work, check the university's or course's requirements separately. Academic permission, workplace permission and court requirements are different questions.

Do not certify a legal conclusion you are not authorised or competent to assess. Identify the issue for your supervisor.

Source Lejacie's suggested practice **[4]**

FOR FIRMS, CLINICS AND LEGAL TEAMS

Do not leave organisational decisions to individual improvisation

Before adopting this workflow, establish the following.

THE TEAM NEEDS	THE ORGANISATION SHOULD IDENTIFY
Permission to use a tool	Approved tools, permitted tasks and approval conditions.
Information-handling boundaries	What may be entered, restrictions and who resolves uncertainty.
Appropriate checking	Verification expectations matched to the task and consequences.
Supervision	Who prepares, reviews, exercises legal judgement and authorises release.
Current forum information	An owner for court-specific source checks and updates.
A workable record	Where logs are kept, access controls and retention arrangements.
A response when something fails	Incident contacts, escalation and correction processes.
Maintenance	Review dates and triggers, including tool, contract and rule changes.

These are Lejacie's suggested implementation arrangements. They should be adapted to the organisation, not represented as requirements imposed identically by every court.

Questions to resolve before approving a tool

- Who can access inputs and outputs?
- How are they stored, retained and deleted?
- Are they used to train or improve systems?
- Which providers or subcontractors process them?
- Can users locate and inspect the original sources?
- What changes when the model, product or terms change?
- What records can the organisation retrieve?
- How are incidents reported and access ended?

Answers must be assessed against the proposed use and applicable obligations. "Enterprise", "private" or "secure" is not the assessment itself.

Source Lejacie's suggested practice **[4]**; compare SC GEN 25 para 6.9 **[1]** and ART Practice Direction paras 3.17 to 3.21 **[2]**

BEFORE THIS BECOMES YOUR WORKING STANDARD

Test the process under pressure

Try it with a realistic task.

The 4:47pm Test

> It is late in the day. A junior has used AI to prepare a chronology. One date is disputed. A cited source cannot be found. The reviewer is unavailable and filing is approaching.

Can the team identify:

- What must not be represented as verified?
- Who takes responsibility for the unresolved questions?
- What records the reviewer needs?
- Who decides how to respond to the deadline?
- What happens if the normal reviewer is unavailable?

If the process depends on guessing or exceptional personal effort, revise it.

This is an application of Lejacie's 4:47pm Test [4]. It does not replace legal, security, accessibility or usability review.

Source Safe to Say, Safe to Reach, Safe to Use [4]

REFERENCES AND ABOUT THIS RESOURCE

Where it comes from

	DOCUMENT	WHERE TO FIND IT
[1]	Supreme Court of Victoria, Practice Note SC GEN 25: The Use of Artificial Intelligence by Court Users, 14 May 2026, paras 6.2, 6.8 to 6.12 and 7.1 to 7.6.	supremecourt.vic.gov.au
[2]	Administrative Review Tribunal (Use of Generative AI) Practice Direction 2026, 20 August 2026, paras 1.8, 1.11, 2.4 to 2.6, 3.9 to 3.21.	art.gov.au
[3]	Federal Court of Australia, Practice Note GPN-AI: Use of Generative Artificial Intelligence, 16 April 2026, and Notice to the Profession of the same date.	fedcourt.gov.au
[4]	Rupasinghe C, Safe to Say, Safe to Reach, Safe to Use: Practice Standard, consultation draft, Lejacie, 2026 (including the 4:47pm Test).	lejacie.com
[5]	Rupasinghe C, AI Verification Checklist for Law Students, Lawyers and Law Firms, Lejacie, draft 1, October 2026 (the earlier version this workflow replaces).	lejacie.com

ABOUT THIS RESOURCE

A rewritten prototype of Lejacie's AI verification checklist, developed using Safe to Say, Safe to Reach, Safe to Use **[4, 5]**. It separates source-based requirements from proposed working methods, makes uncertainty visible and connects checking with supervision, escalation and maintenance.

The court examples draw on the Supreme Court of Victoria's SC GEN 25, the Federal Court's GPN-AI and the ART's Generative AI Practice Direction **[1, 2, 3]**. This is not an exhaustive or fully verified cross-forum compliance matrix. Check the current official documents and matter-specific directions before use.

BEFORE OPERATIONAL ADOPTION, AND VERSION

Obtain appropriate practitioner and information-security review; complete the relevant forum-specific checks; test with intended users; assign a maintenance owner and review triggers. Those steps are not completed merely by producing this draft.

Draft 3, 4 November 2026: the Draft 2 content of 22 October 2026, set in Lejacie's current design.

Draft 2 for practitioner review, 22 October 2026. Prepared by Chami Rupasinghe, Founder, Lejacie, admitted Australian lawyer, non-practising. Not issued or endorsed by a court, tribunal or regulator. Not legal or professional advice. Feedback to **info@lejacie.com** with the page number.