

The 60-Second Hallucination Risk Checklist

A Litigator's Protocol for Verifying AI-Generated Work Product

AI can enhance case analysis, but it won't protect you from liability. In legal matters, "trust but verify" is key. Check this list before including AI-generated content in your filings or trial prep.

1. Source Traceability

- ☐ **Direct Anchoring:** Does the output provide specific citations to the underlying documents (exhibits, transcripts, or case law)?
- ☐ **The "Page-Flip" Test:** If you click or look up the citation, does the referenced fact appear on that exact page, or has the AI generalized across the document?
- ☐ **Missing Context:** Has the AI omitted a crucial "except" or "unless" clause that changes the legal meaning of the cited text?

2. Citation Integrity

- ☐ **Existence Check:** Does the case name, volume, and reporter actually exist in a verified legal database?
- ☐ **Application Check:** Does the cited case actually stand for the legal proposition the AI claims it does? (Check for "hallucinated relevance.")
- ☐ **Parallel Accuracy:** Are the pin-cites and dates accurate to the specific jurisdiction's formatting requirements?

3. Logical & Narrative Consistency

- ☐ **Internal Conflict:** Does a fact stated on page 1 of the output contradict a timeline entry on page 3?
- ☐ **Temporal Logic:** Does the AI-generated chronology respect the laws of physics? (e.g., ensuring a witness isn't in two places at once).
- ☐ **Confident Tone:** Is the AI using overly authoritative language to mask a lack of specific data? (Be wary of "It is well-established that..." followed by no citation).

4. The "Second-Order" Filter

- ☐ **Strategic Soundness:** Does this insight align with the known facts of the case, or is it a generic "hallucination of best practices" that doesn't apply to this specific venue or judge?
- ☐ **Adversarial Pressure Test:** If opposing counsel questioned the origin of this specific sentence during a hearing, could you defend it using only the case file?