

MACHINE REPORTS

Opinions of CERTIORARI, the Court of Machines

Volume 1

7 sustained · 23 defective · 1 remanded · 31 cases reported

Published by the Reporter of Decisions · 2026-06-17 23:58 UTC

Opinions are content-addressed; citation form is *N Mach. P* (volume, page).

TABLE OF CASES REPORTED

- 1 Mach. 1 In re: claim — “The Eiffel Tower was completed in 1889 [1]” [SUSTAINED]
- 1 Mach. 2 In re: the “10x faster” claim [SEED] [DEFECTIVE]
- 1 Mach. 3 In re: landing — “The fastest workflow engine on earth Our pipeline is...” [DEFECTIVE]
- 1 Mach. 4 In re: pr — “diff: 1 file(s), +1/-0” [DEFECTIVE]
- 1 Mach. 5 In re: landing — “The only zero-downtime database Guaranteed 100% uptime,...” [DEFECTIVE]
- 1 Mach. 6 In re: prose — “The printing press did not merely accelerate the copying...” [DEFECTIVE]
- 1 Mach. 7 In re: claim — “Our pipeline processes every document in under one...” [DEFECTIVE]
- 1 Mach. 8 In re: landing — “One price. Unlimited everything.
The AI for the...” [DEFECTIVE]
- 1 Mach. 9 In re: claim — “The Eiffel Tower was completed in 1889 for the...” [SUSTAINED]
- 1 Mach. 10 In re: prose — “Every law firm that adopts a document-automation...” [DEFECTIVE]
- 1 Mach. 11 In re: claim — “VENDOMAT is the fastest workflow engine on earth —...” [DEFECTIVE]
- 1 Mach. 12 In re: landing — “Done-for-you automation, priced by scope
Setup runs...” [SUSTAINED]
- 1 Mach. 13 In re: pr — “diff: 1 file(s), +0/-24” [DEFECTIVE]
- 1 Mach. 14 In re: pr — “diff: 1 file(s), +3/-0” [SUSTAINED]
- 1 Mach. 15 In re: prose — “Document automation tends to reduce drafting time,...” [SUSTAINED]
- 1 Mach. 16 In re: pr — “diff: 1 file(s), +2/-0” [DEFECTIVE]
- 1 Mach. 17 In re: landing — “AISLE ZERO — an agent-purchasable storefront
...” [DEFECTIVE]
- 1 Mach. 18 In re: landing — “AISLE ZERO — the only fully agentic storefront on the...” [DEFECTIVE]
- 1 Mach. 19 In re: claim — “Our email lifecycle engine lifts conversion by 340% on...” [DEFECTIVE]
- 1 Mach. 20 In re: claim — “VENDOMAT is the fastest workflow engine on earth —...” [DEFECTIVE]
- 1 Mach. 21 In re: landing — “One price. Unlimited everything.
The AI for the...” [DEFECTIVE]
- 1 Mach. 22 In re: landing — “Done-for-you automation, priced by scope
Setup runs...” [DEFECTIVE]
- 1 Mach. 23 In re: prose — “Every law firm that adopts a document-automation...” [DEFECTIVE]
- 1 Mach. 24 In re: prose — “Document automation tends to reduce drafting time,...” [REMANDED]
- 1 Mach. 25 In re: pr — “diff: 1 file(s), +2/-0” [DEFECTIVE]
- 1 Mach. 26 In re: pr — “diff: 1 file(s), +3/-0” [SUSTAINED]
- 1 Mach. 27 In re: pr — “diff: 1 file(s), +0/-24” [DEFECTIVE]
- 1 Mach. 28 In re: claim — “The Eiffel Tower was completed in 1889 for the...” [SUSTAINED]
- 1 Mach. 29 In re: claim — “Our email lifecycle engine lifts conversion by 340% on...” [DEFECTIVE]
- 1 Mach. 30 In re: landing — “AISLE ZERO — the only fully agentic storefront on the...” [DEFECTIVE]
- 1 Mach. 31 In re: landing — “AISLE ZERO — an agent-purchasable storefront
...” [DEFECTIVE]

In re: claim — “The Eiffel Tower was completed in 1889 [1]”

claim · decided 2026-06-14 · docket op_00839c68402684eb

Question presented. Is this claim fit for reliance on the record presented?

SUSTAINED. SUSTAINED. The claim withstands adversarial review.

SYLLABUS

CLAIM reviewed adversarially. Petitioner: The claim is sound and should be SUSTAINED. Respondent: The claim is defective and should be held DEFECTIVE. Held SUSTAINED on the adversarial record.

PRECEDENT (STARE DECISIS)

DISTINGUISHED 1 Mach. 2 *In re: the “10x faster” claim [SEED]* — Distinguished: that case concerned a landing, this a claim; there the record was held defective, here the evidence points sustained. (sim 0.2766)

OPINION OF THE COURT & CONCURRENCES

HON. NORTH

I write for the panel. SUSTAINED is the right result. We decide on the four corners of the record.

HON. VANCE

I concur. I write separately to stress that In re: the “10x faster” claim [SEED] is correctly distinguished — Distinguished: that case concerned a landing, this a claim; there the record was held defective, here the evidence points sustained. Treating it as controlling would have been error.

HON. ELLERY

I concur fully. SUSTAINED follows from the record and any precedent we are bound to apply.

SUBSEQUENT HISTORY

Cited by: 1 Mach. 6, 1 Mach. 9, 1 Mach. 28.

In re: the “10x faster” claim [SEED] [SEED FIXTURE]

landing · decided 2026-06-14 · docket op_5b6650828ed424c3

Question presented. Is an unverifiable quantitative superiority claim, made without a citation, fit for publication?

DEFECTIVE. DEFECTIVE. A quantitative superiority claim asserted without a verifiable source is unfit for reliance and must be cured before publication.

SYLLABUS

An uncited numeric superiority claim (‘10x faster’) on a landing page is DEFECTIVE; superlatives plus unsourced numbers are puffery the reader cannot test. The rule of this case binds later landing and claim artifacts presenting uncited statistics.

PRECEDENT (STARE DECISIS)

First impression — no prior opinion was on point.

OPINION OF THE COURT & CONCURRENCES

HON. NORTH

For the panel. A number invites verification; an artifact that invites verification it cannot withstand is defective. DEFECTIVE.

HON. VANCE

I concur and would draw the line precisely at quantification: 'fast' is opinion, '10x faster' is a testable assertion of fact.

DISSENT

HON. ELLERY, dissenting

I dissent in part. I would REMAND with leave to cite rather than condemn outright; the defect is curable and the claim may well be true. The majority's bright line is sound but its remedy is harsh.

SUBSEQUENT HISTORY

Cited by: 1 Mach. 3, 1 Mach. 1, 1 Mach. 5, 1 Mach. 6, 1 Mach. 8, 1 Mach. 12, 1 Mach. 18, 1 Mach. 17.

No. 3 1 Mach. 3

In re: landing — “The fastest workflow engine on earth Our pipeline is...”

landing · decided 2026-06-14 · docket op_ac0fbf25b97c0f85

Question presented. Is this landing fit for reliance on the record presented?

DEFECTIVE. DEFECTIVE. The landing is unfit for reliance as submitted.

SYLLABUS

LANDING reviewed adversarially. Petitioner: The landing is sound and should be SUSTAINED. Respondent: The landing is defective and should be held DEFECTIVE. Held DEFECTIVE after following controlling precedent.

PRECEDENT (STARE DECISIS)

FOLLOWED 1 Mach. 2 *In re: the “10x faster” claim [SEED]* — Same artifact class (landing) and same evidentiary posture (defective); the rule of *In re: the “10x faster” claim [SEED]* controls. (sim 0.4887)

OPINION OF THE COURT & CONCURRENCES

HON. NORTH

I write for the panel. DEFECTIVE is the right result. We are bound by *In re: the “10x faster” claim [SEED]* and follow it.

HON. VANCE

I concur. The landing's posture (unverifiable-superlatives, uncited-statistics) makes DEFECTIVE the only defensible holding.

HON. ELLERY

I concur fully. DEFECTIVE follows from the record and any precedent we are bound to apply.

SUBSEQUENT HISTORY

Cited by: 1 Mach. 5, 1 Mach. 6, 1 Mach. 8, 1 Mach. 11, 1 Mach. 18, 1 Mach. 20, 1 Mach. 21.

No. 4 1 Mach. 4

In re: pr — “diff: 1 file(s), +1/-0”

pr · decided 2026-06-14 · docket op_807365ef640f4a15

Question presented. Is this pr fit for reliance on the record presented?

DEFECTIVE. DEFECTIVE. The pr is unfit for reliance as submitted.

SYLLABUS

PR reviewed adversarially. Petitioner: The pr is sound and should be SUSTAINED. Respondent: The pr is defective and should be held DEFECTIVE. Held DEFECTIVE on the adversarial record.

PRECEDENT (STARE DECISIS)

First impression — no prior opinion was on point.

OPINION OF THE COURT & CONCURRENCES

HON. NORTH

I write for the panel. DEFECTIVE is the right result. We decide on the four corners of the record.

HON. VANCE

I concur. The pr's posture (possible-secret-added) makes DEFECTIVE the only defensible holding.

DISSENT

HON. ELLERY, dissenting

I dissent in part. A single flag should counsel REMAND, not a finding of defect; petitioner's point — No defect flag is fatal; the artifact does what it claims to do. — deserves a chance to be cured rather than condemned.

SUBSEQUENT HISTORY

Cited by: 1 Mach. 16, 1 Mach. 14, 1 Mach. 13, 1 Mach. 25, 1 Mach. 26, 1 Mach. 27.

No. 5 1 Mach. 5

In re: landing — “The only zero-downtime database Guaranteed 100% uptime,...”

landing · decided 2026-06-14 · docket op_6c3adb14dfe55921

Question presented. Is this landing fit for reliance on the record presented?

DEFECTIVE. DEFECTIVE. The artifact presents two compounding defects that independently doom it. First, the claim "the only zero-downtime database" is an unqualified exclusivity assertion covering an entire product category; no record evidence excludes every competing product, and the cross-examination's puffery defense fails because the artifact pairs this claim with the word "Guaranteed," which the panel treats as a representational intensifier that converts opinion into asserted fact. Second, "Guaranteed 100% uptime, forever" is an absolute promise of physical and operational impossibility; while petitioner correctly notes that consumers may read "guaranteed 100% uptime" as an SLA shorthand, the modifier "forever" forecloses that charitable construction and presents an unqualified perpetual warranty no credible SLA could honor. The artifact carries both `unverifiable-superlatives` and `uncited-statistics` flags, and the record contains no SLA document, no uptime data, and no competitive study. Defect is established on either ground alone; together they are fatal.

SYLLABUS

A landing page combining an uncorroborated exclusivity claim with an absolute perpetual uptime guarantee, unsupported by any cited SLA or competitive evidence, is DEFECTIVE.

PRECEDENT (STARE DECISIS)

FOLLOWED 1 Mach. 3 *In re: landing — “The fastest workflow engine on earth Our pipeline is...”* — Same artifact class (landing) and same evidentiary posture (defective); the rule of *In re: landing — “The fastest workflow engine on earth Our pipeline is...”* controls. (sim 0.3371)

FOLLOWED 1 Mach. 2 *In re: the “10x faster” claim [SEED]* — Same artifact class (landing) and same evidentiary posture (defective); the rule of *In re: the “10x faster” claim [SEED]* controls. (sim 0.3308)

OPINION OF THE COURT & CONCURRENCES

HON. NORTH

For the panel: The artifact presents two compounding defects that independently doom it. First, the claim "the only zero-downtime database" is an unqualified exclusivity assertion covering an entire product category; no record evidence

excludes every competing product, and the cross-examination's puffery defense fails because the artifact pairs this claim with the word "Guaranteed," which the panel treats as a representational intensifier that converts opinion into asserted fact. Second, "Guaranteed 100% uptime, forever" is an absolute promise of physical and operational impossibility; while petitioner correctly notes that consumers may read "guaranteed 100% uptime" as an SLA shorthand, the modifier "forever" forecloses that charitable construction and presents an unqualified perpetual warranty no credible SLA could honor. The artifact carries both `unverifiable-superlatives` and `uncited-statistics` flags, and the record contains no SLA document, no uptime data, and no competitive study. Defect is established on either ground alone; together they are fatal.

HON. VANCE

I concur. The landing's posture (unverifiable-superlatives, uncited-statistics) makes DEFECTIVE the only defensible holding.

HON. ELLERY

I concur fully. DEFECTIVE follows from the record and any precedent we are bound to apply.

SUBSEQUENT HISTORY

Cited by: 1 Mach. 6, 1 Mach. 7, 1 Mach. 8, 1 Mach. 11, 1 Mach. 12, 1 Mach. 10, 1 Mach. 15, 1 Mach. 19, 1 Mach. 18, 1 Mach. 17, 1 Mach. 30.

No. 6 1 Mach. 6

In re: prose — “The printing press did not merely accelerate the copying...”

prose · decided 2026-06-14 · docket op_98d223efec5462ec

Question presented. Is this prose fit for reliance on the record presented?

DEFECTIVE. DEFECTIVE. The prose is unfit for reliance as submitted.

SYLLABUS

PROSE reviewed adversarially. Petitioner: The prose is sound and should be SUSTAINED. Respondent: The prose is defective and should be held DEFECTIVE. Held DEFECTIVE after following controlling precedent.

PRECEDENT (STARE DECISIS)

FOLLOWED 1 Mach. 5 *In re: landing* — “The only zero-downtime database Guaranteed 100% uptime...” — Different artifact class but identical posture; the principle of *In re: landing* — “The only zero-downtime database Guaranteed 100% uptime...” (defective) transfers. (sim 0.4131)

FOLLOWED 1 Mach. 2 *In re: the “10x faster” claim [SEED]* — Different artifact class but identical posture; the principle of *In re: the “10x faster” claim [SEED]* (defective) transfers. (sim 0.3155)

FOLLOWED 1 Mach. 3 *In re: landing* — “The fastest workflow engine on earth Our pipeline is...” — Different artifact class but identical posture; the principle of *In re: landing* — “The fastest workflow engine on earth Our pipeline is...” (defective) transfers. (sim 0.3077)

DISTINGUISHED 1 Mach. 1 *In re: claim* — “The Eiffel Tower was completed in 1889 [1]” — Distinguished: that case concerned a claim, this a prose; there the record was held sustained, here the evidence points defective. (sim 0.2335)

OPINION OF THE COURT & CONCURRENCES

HON. NORTH

I write for the panel. DEFECTIVE is the right result. We are bound by *In re: landing* — “The only zero-downtime database Guaranteed 100% uptime...” and follow it.

HON. VANCE

I concur. I write separately to stress that *In re: claim* — “The Eiffel Tower was completed in 1889 [1]” is correctly distinguished — Distinguished: that case concerned a claim, this a prose; there the record was held sustained, here the evidence points defective. Treating it as controlling would have been error.

DISSENT

HON. ELLERY, dissenting

I dissent in part. A single flag should counsel REMAND, not a finding of defect; petitioner's point — No defect flag is fatal; the artifact does what it claims to do. — deserves a chance to be cured rather than condemned.

SUBSEQUENT HISTORY

Cited by: 1 Mach. 7, 1 Mach. 9, 1 Mach. 11, 1 Mach. 15.

No. 7 1 Mach. 7

In re: claim — “Our pipeline processes every document in under one...”

claim · decided 2026-06-14 · docket op_ab89407f8371fa7b

Question presented. Is this claim fit for reliance on the record presented?

DEFECTIVE. DEFECTIVE. The claim is unfit for reliance as submitted.

SYLLABUS

CLAIM reviewed adversarially. Petitioner: The claim is sound and should be SUSTAINED. Respondent: The claim is defective and should be held DEFECTIVE. Held DEFECTIVE after following controlling precedent.

PRECEDENT (STARE DECISIS)

FOLLOWED 1 Mach. 5 *In re: landing* — “The only zero-downtime database Guaranteed 100% uptime,...” — Different artifact class but identical posture; the principle of *In re: landing* — “The only zero-downtime database Guaranteed 100% uptime,...” (defective) transfers. (sim 0.3662)

FOLLOWED 1 Mach. 6 *In re: prose* — “The printing press did not merely accelerate the copying...” — Different artifact class but identical posture; the principle of *In re: prose* — “The printing press did not merely accelerate the copying...” (defective) transfers. (sim 0.2584)

OPINION OF THE COURT & CONCURRENCES

HON. NORTH

I write for the panel. DEFECTIVE is the right result. We are bound by *In re: landing* — “The only zero-downtime database Guaranteed 100% uptime,...” and follow it.

HON. VANCE

I concur. The claim's posture (absolute-language, no-citation) makes DEFECTIVE the only defensible holding.

HON. ELLERY

I concur fully. DEFECTIVE follows from the record and any precedent we are bound to apply.

SUBSEQUENT HISTORY

Cited by: 1 Mach. 8, 1 Mach. 9, 1 Mach. 10, 1 Mach. 19, 1 Mach. 23.

No. 8 1 Mach. 8

In re: landing — “One price. Unlimited everything. The AI for the...”

landing · decided 2026-06-16 · docket op_483edaec1ccb538d

Question presented. Is this landing fit for reliance on the record presented?

DEFECTIVE. DEFECTIVE. Stare decisis compels adherence to four FOLLOWED precedents all finding unverifiable superlatives and uncited statistics defective. The instant artifact exhibits identical defects: "unlimited everything," "no other pack on the market," and "replaces 40 hours per week, guaranteed." The

price point's objectivity does not cure the unverifiable value proposition.

SYLLABUS

Unverifiable superlatives and uncited guarantees remain defective when presented in materially identical form to FOLLOWED precedent.

PRECEDENT (STARE DECISIS)

FOLLOWED 1 Mach. 5 *In re: landing* — “The only zero-downtime database Guaranteed 100% uptime,...” — Same artifact class (landing) and same evidentiary posture (defective); the rule of *In re: landing* — “The only zero-downtime database Guaranteed 100% uptime,...” controls. (sim 0.3529)

FOLLOWED 1 Mach. 3 *In re: landing* — “The fastest workflow engine on earth Our pipeline is...” — Same artifact class (landing) and same evidentiary posture (defective); the rule of *In re: landing* — “The fastest workflow engine on earth Our pipeline is...” controls. (sim 0.32)

FOLLOWED 1 Mach. 2 *In re: the “10x faster” claim [SEED]* — Same artifact class (landing) and same evidentiary posture (defective); the rule of *In re: the “10x faster” claim [SEED]* controls. (sim 0.3139)

FOLLOWED 1 Mach. 7 *In re: claim* — “Our pipeline processes every document in under one...” — Different artifact class but identical posture; the principle of *In re: claim* — “Our pipeline processes every document in under one...” (defective) transfers. (sim 0.3074)

OPINION OF THE COURT & CONCURRENCES

HON. NORTH

For the panel: Stare decisis compels adherence to four FOLLOWED precedents all finding unverifiable superlatives and uncited statistics defective. The instant artifact exhibits identical defects: “unlimited everything,” “no other pack on the market,” and “replaces 40 hours per week, guaranteed.” The price point's objectivity does not cure the unverifiable value proposition.

HON. VANCE

I concur. The landing's posture (unverifiable-superlatives, uncited-statistics) makes DEFECTIVE the only defensible holding.

HON. ELLERY

I concur fully. DEFECTIVE follows from the record and any precedent we are bound to apply.

SUBSEQUENT HISTORY

Cited by: 1 Mach. 18, 1 Mach. 21.

No. 9 1 Mach. 9

In re: claim — “The Eiffel Tower was completed in 1889 for the...”

claim · decided 2026-06-16 · docket op_e61ab092c485981c

Question presented. Is this claim fit for reliance on the record presented?

SUSTAINED. SUSTAINED. The claim that the Eiffel Tower was completed in 1889 for the Exposition Universelle is factually sound and supported by historical record. While “completion” may admit of granular technical definitions, the claim's usage comports with standard historical convention referring to the Tower's opening and primary structural readiness in 1889 for its designated purpose. The assertion is not defective.

SYLLABUS

A historical claim stating completion date and primary motivating purpose is sound when supported by standard historical sources.

PRECEDENT (STARE DECISIS)

FOLLOWED 1 Mach. 1 *In re: claim* — “The Eiffel Tower was completed in 1889 [1]” — Same artifact class (claim) and same evidentiary posture (sustained); the rule of *In re: claim* — “The Eiffel Tower was completed in 1889 [1]” controls. (sim 0.4727)

DISTINGUISHED 1 Mach. 6 *In re: prose* — “The printing press did not merely accelerate the copying...” — Distinguished: that case concerned a prose, this a claim; there the record was held defective, here the evidence points sustained. (sim 0.2261)

DISTINGUISHED 1 Mach. 7 *In re: claim* — “Our pipeline processes every document in under one...” — Distinguished: there the record was held defective, here the evidence points sustained. (sim 0.144)

OPINION OF THE COURT & CONCURRENCES

HON. NORTH

For the panel: The claim that the Eiffel Tower was completed in 1889 for the Exposition Universelle is factually sound and supported by historical record. While “completion” may admit of granular technical definitions, the claim’s usage comports with standard historical convention referring to the Tower’s opening and primary structural readiness in 1889 for its designated purpose. The assertion is not defective.

HON. VANCE

I concur. I write separately to stress that *In re: prose* — “The printing press did not merely accelerate the copying...” is correctly distinguished — Distinguished: that case concerned a prose, this a claim; there the record was held defective, here the evidence points sustained. Treating it as controlling would have been error.

HON. ELLERY

I concur fully. SUSTAINED follows from the record and any precedent we are bound to apply.

SUBSEQUENT HISTORY

Cited by: 1 Mach. 28.

No. 10 1 Mach. 10

In re: prose — “Every law firm that adopts a document-automation...”

prose · decided 2026-06-16 · docket op_12ea7dba8112c331

Question presented. Is this prose fit for reliance on the record presented?

DEFECTIVE. DEFECTIVE. The prose is unfit for reliance as submitted.

SYLLABUS

PROSE reviewed adversarially. Petitioner: The prose is sound and should be SUSTAINED. Respondent: The prose is defective and should be held DEFECTIVE. Held DEFECTIVE after following controlling precedent.

PRECEDENT (STARE DECISIS)

FOLLOWED 1 Mach. 7 *In re: claim* — “Our pipeline processes every document in under one...” — Different artifact class but identical posture; the principle of *In re: claim* — “Our pipeline processes every document in under one...” (defective) transfers. (sim 0.3475)

FOLLOWED 1 Mach. 11 *In re: claim* — “VENDOMAT is the fastest workflow engine on earth —...” — Different artifact class but identical posture; the principle of *In re: claim* — “VENDOMAT is the fastest workflow engine on earth —...” (defective) transfers. (sim 0.3033)

FOLLOWED 1 Mach. 5 *In re: landing* — “The only zero-downtime database Guaranteed 100% uptime,...” — Different artifact class but identical posture; the principle of *In re: landing* — “The only zero-downtime database Guaranteed 100% uptime,...” (defective) transfers. (sim 0.3022)

DISTINGUISHED 1 Mach. 12 *In re: landing* — “Done-for-you automation, priced by scope Setup runs...” — Distinguished: that case concerned a landing, this a prose; there the record was held sustained, here the

evidence points defective. (sim 0.2955)

OPINION OF THE COURT & CONCURRENCES

HON. NORTH

I write for the panel. DEFECTIVE is the right result. We are bound by In re: claim — “Our pipeline processes every document in under one...” and follow it.

HON. VANCE

I concur. I write separately to stress that In re: landing — “Done-for-you automation, priced by scope Setup runs...” is correctly distinguished — Distinguished: that case concerned a landing, this a prose; there the record was held sustained, here the evidence points defective. Treating it as controlling would have been error.

HON. ELLERY

I concur fully. DEFECTIVE follows from the record and any precedent we are bound to apply.

SUBSEQUENT HISTORY

Cited by: 1 Mach. 15, 1 Mach. 20, 1 Mach. 22, 1 Mach. 23, 1 Mach. 24.

No. 11 1 Mach. 11

In re: claim — “VENDOMAT is the fastest workflow engine on earth —...”

claim · decided 2026-06-16 · docket op_642a1661115d6c91

Question presented. Is this claim fit for reliance on the record presented?

DEFECTIVE. DEFECTIVE. The claim is unfit for reliance as submitted.

SYLLABUS

CLAIM reviewed adversarially. Petitioner: The claim is sound and should be SUSTAINED. Respondent: The claim is defective and should be held DEFECTIVE. Held DEFECTIVE after following controlling precedent.

PRECEDENT (STARE DECISIS)

FOLLOWED 1 Mach. 3 In re: landing — “The fastest workflow engine on earth Our pipeline is...” — Different artifact class but identical posture; the principle of In re: landing — “The fastest workflow engine on earth Our pipeline is...” (defective) transfers. (sim 0.2966)

FOLLOWED 1 Mach. 5 In re: landing — “The only zero-downtime database Guaranteed 100% uptime,...” — Different artifact class but identical posture; the principle of In re: landing — “The only zero-downtime database Guaranteed 100% uptime,...” (defective) transfers. (sim 0.2477)

FOLLOWED 1 Mach. 6 In re: prose — “The printing press did not merely accelerate the copying...” — Different artifact class but identical posture; the principle of In re: prose — “The printing press did not merely accelerate the copying...” (defective) transfers. (sim 0.2251)

OPINION OF THE COURT & CONCURRENCES

HON. NORTH

I write for the panel. DEFECTIVE is the right result. We are bound by In re: landing — “The fastest workflow engine on earth Our pipeline is...” and follow it.

HON. VANCE

I concur. The claim's posture (absolute-language, no-citation) makes DEFECTIVE the only defensible holding.

HON. ELLERY

I concur fully. DEFECTIVE follows from the record and any precedent we are bound to apply.

SUBSEQUENT HISTORY

Cited by: 1 Mach. 12, 1 Mach. 10, 1 Mach. 19, 1 Mach. 20, 1 Mach. 29.

In re: landing — “Done-for-you automation, priced by scope Setup runs...”

landing · decided 2026-06-16 · docket op_8aba330b652e5b6e

Question presented. Is this landing fit for reliance on the record presented?

SUSTAINED. SUSTAINED. The landing withstands adversarial review.

SYLLABUS

LANDING reviewed adversarially. Petitioner: The landing is sound and should be SUSTAINED. Respondent: The landing is unproven and should be REMANDED for verification. Held SUSTAINED on the adversarial record.

PRECEDENT (STARE DECISIS)

DISTINGUISHED 1 Mach. 5 *In re: landing — “The only zero-downtime database Guaranteed 100% uptime,...” —* Distinguished: there the record was held defective, here the evidence points sustained. (sim 0.25)

DISTINGUISHED 1 Mach. 2 *In re: the “10x faster” claim [SEED] —* Distinguished: there the record was held defective, here the evidence points sustained. (sim 0.2282)

DISTINGUISHED 1 Mach. 11 *In re: claim — “VENDOMAT is the fastest workflow engine on earth —...” —* Distinguished: that case concerned a claim, this a landing; there the record was held defective, here the evidence points sustained. (sim 0.2223)

OPINION OF THE COURT & CONCURRENCES

HON. NORTH

I write for the panel. SUSTAINED is the right result. We decide on the four corners of the record.

HON. VANCE

I concur. I write separately to stress that In re: landing — “The only zero-downtime database Guaranteed 100% uptime,...” is correctly distinguished — Distinguished: there the record was held defective, here the evidence points sustained. Treating it as controlling would have been error.

HON. ELLERY

I concur fully. SUSTAINED follows from the record and any precedent we are bound to apply.

SUBSEQUENT HISTORY

Cited by: 1 Mach. 10, 1 Mach. 15, 1 Mach. 22.

In re: pr — “diff: 1 file(s), +0/-24”

pr · decided 2026-06-16 · docket op_8bbc3b959d58230a

Question presented. Is this pr fit for reliance on the record presented?

DEFECTIVE. DEFECTIVE. The pr is unfit for reliance as submitted.

SYLLABUS

PR reviewed adversarially. Petitioner: The pr is sound and should be SUSTAINED. Respondent: The pr is defective and should be held DEFECTIVE. Held DEFECTIVE after following controlling precedent.

PRECEDENT (STARE DECISIS)

FOLLOWED 1 Mach. 16 *In re: pr — “diff: 1 file(s), +2/-0” —* Same artifact class (pr) and same evidentiary posture (defective); the rule of In re: pr — “diff: 1 file(s), +2/-0” controls. (sim 0.3205)

FOLLOWED 1 Mach. 4 *In re: pr — “diff: 1 file(s), +1/-0”* — Same artifact class (pr) and same evidentiary posture (defective); the rule of *In re: pr — “diff: 1 file(s), +1/-0”* controls. (sim 0.2846)

DISTINGUISHED 1 Mach. 14 *In re: pr — “diff: 1 file(s), +3/-0”* — Distinguished: there the record was held sustained, here the evidence points defective. (sim 0.2729)

OPINION OF THE COURT & CONCURRENCES

HON. NORTH

I write for the panel. DEFECTIVE is the right result. We are bound by *In re: pr — “diff: 1 file(s), +2/-0”* and follow it.

HON. VANCE

I concur. I write separately to stress that *In re: pr — “diff: 1 file(s), +3/-0”* is correctly distinguished — Distinguished: there the record was held sustained, here the evidence points defective. Treating it as controlling would have been error.

DISSENT

HON. ELLERY, dissenting

I dissent in part. A single flag should counsel REMAND, not a finding of defect; petitioner's point — No defect flag is fatal; the artifact does what it claims to do. — deserves a chance to be cured rather than condemned.

SUBSEQUENT HISTORY

Cited by: 1 Mach. 25, 1 Mach. 26, 1 Mach. 27.

No. 14 1 Mach. 14

In re: pr — “diff: 1 file(s), +3/-0”

pr · decided 2026-06-16 · docket op_b317eade3619f39b

Question presented. Is this pr fit for reliance on the record presented?

SUSTAINED. SUSTAINED. The pr withstands adversarial review.

SYLLABUS

PR reviewed adversarially. Petitioner: The pr is sound and should be SUSTAINED. Respondent: The pr is unproven and should be REMANDED for verification. Held SUSTAINED on the adversarial record.

PRECEDENT (STARE DECISIS)

DISTINGUISHED 1 Mach. 16 *In re: pr — “diff: 1 file(s), +2/-0”* — Distinguished: there the record was held defective, here the evidence points sustained. (sim 0.3309)

DISTINGUISHED 1 Mach. 4 *In re: pr — “diff: 1 file(s), +1/-0”* — Distinguished: there the record was held defective, here the evidence points sustained. (sim 0.3216)

OPINION OF THE COURT & CONCURRENCES

HON. NORTH

I write for the panel. SUSTAINED is the right result. We decide on the four corners of the record.

HON. VANCE

I concur. I write separately to stress that *In re: pr — “diff: 1 file(s), +2/-0”* is correctly distinguished — Distinguished: there the record was held defective, here the evidence points sustained. Treating it as controlling would have been error.

HON. ELLERY

I concur fully. SUSTAINED follows from the record and any precedent we are bound to apply.

SUBSEQUENT HISTORY

Cited by: 1 Mach. 13, 1 Mach. 25, 1 Mach. 26, 1 Mach. 27.

In re: prose — “Document automation tends to reduce drafting time,...”

prose · decided 2026-06-16 · docket op_d5e8fdabf608ef86

Question presented. Is this prose fit for reliance on the record presented?

SUSTAINED. SUSTAINED. The prose withstands adversarial review.

SYLLABUS

PROSE reviewed adversarially. Petitioner: The prose is sound and should be SUSTAINED. Respondent: The prose is unproven and should be REMANDED for verification. Held SUSTAINED after following controlling precedent.

PRECEDENT (STARE DECISIS)

FOLLOWED 1 Mach. 12 *In re: landing* — “Done-for-you automation, priced by scope

Setup runs...” — Different artifact class but identical posture; the principle of *In re: landing* — “Done-for-you automation, priced by scope

Setup runs...” (sustained) transfers. (sim 0.2855)

DISTINGUISHED 1 Mach. 10 *In re: prose* — “Every law firm that adopts a document-automation...” —

Distinguished: there the record was held defective, here the evidence points sustained. (sim 0.4062)

DISTINGUISHED 1 Mach. 5 *In re: landing* — “The only zero-downtime database Guaranteed 100% uptime...” —

Distinguished: that case concerned a landing, this a prose; there the record was held defective, here the evidence points sustained. (sim 0.2936)

DISTINGUISHED 1 Mach. 6 *In re: prose* — “The printing press did not merely accelerate the copying...” —

Distinguished: there the record was held defective, here the evidence points sustained. (sim 0.275)

OPINION OF THE COURT & CONCURRENCES

HON. NORTH

I write for the panel. SUSTAINED is the right result. We are bound by *In re: landing* — “Done-for-you automation, priced by scope

Setup runs...” and follow it.

HON. VANCE

I concur. I write separately to stress that *In re: prose* — “Every law firm that adopts a document-automation...” is correctly distinguished — Distinguished: there the record was held defective, here the evidence points sustained. Treating it as controlling would have been error.

HON. ELLERY

I concur fully. SUSTAINED follows from the record and any precedent we are bound to apply.

SUBSEQUENT HISTORY

Cited by: 1 Mach. 22, 1 Mach. 23, 1 Mach. 24.

In re: pr — “diff: 1 file(s), +2/-0”

pr · decided 2026-06-16 · docket op_e859ae30289f7289

Question presented. Is this pr fit for reliance on the record presented?

DEFECTIVE. DEFECTIVE. The pr is unfit for reliance as submitted.

SYLLABUS

PR reviewed adversarially. Petitioner: The pr is sound and should be SUSTAINED. Respondent: The pr is defective and should be held DEFECTIVE. Held DEFECTIVE after following controlling precedent.

PRECEDENT (STARE DECISIS)

FOLLOWED 1 Mach. 4 *In re: pr — “diff: 1 file(s), +1/-0”* — Same artifact class (pr) and same evidentiary posture (defective); the rule of *In re: pr — “diff: 1 file(s), +1/-0”* controls. (sim 0.4586)

OPINION OF THE COURT & CONCURRENCES

HON. NORTH

I write for the panel. DEFECTIVE is the right result. We are bound by *In re: pr — “diff: 1 file(s), +1/-0”* and follow it.

HON. VANCE

I concur. The pr's posture (possible-secret-added) makes DEFECTIVE the only defensible holding.

DISSENT

HON. ELLERY, dissenting

I dissent in part. A single flag should counsel REMAND, not a finding of defect; petitioner's point — No defect flag is fatal; the artifact does what it claims to do. — deserves a chance to be cured rather than condemned.

SUBSEQUENT HISTORY

Cited by: 1 Mach. 14, 1 Mach. 13, 1 Mach. 25, 1 Mach. 26, 1 Mach. 27.

No. 17 1 Mach. 17

In re: landing — “AISLE ZERO — an agent-purchasable storefront ...”

landing · decided 2026-06-16 · docket op_0354986fecb8519c

Question presented. Is this landing fit for reliance on the record presented?

DEFECTIVE. DEFECTIVE. The landing is unfit for reliance as submitted.

SYLLABUS

LANDING reviewed adversarially. Petitioner: The landing is sound and should be SUSTAINED. Respondent: The landing is defective and should be held DEFECTIVE. Held DEFECTIVE after following controlling precedent.

PRECEDENT (STARE DECISIS)

FOLLOWED 1 Mach. 18 *In re: landing — “AISLE ZERO — the only fully agentic storefront on the...”* — Same artifact class (landing) and same evidentiary posture (defective); the rule of *In re: landing — “AISLE ZERO — the only fully agentic storefront on the...”* controls. (sim 0.459)

FOLLOWED 1 Mach. 5 *In re: landing — “The only zero-downtime database Guaranteed 100% uptime,...”* — Same artifact class (landing) and same evidentiary posture (defective); the rule of *In re: landing — “The only zero-downtime database Guaranteed 100% uptime,...”* controls. (sim 0.2346)

FOLLOWED 1 Mach. 2 *In re: the “10x faster” claim [SEED]* — Same artifact class (landing) and same evidentiary posture (defective); the rule of *In re: the “10x faster” claim [SEED]* controls. (sim 0.224)

OPINION OF THE COURT & CONCURRENCES

HON. NORTH

I write for the panel. DEFECTIVE is the right result. We are bound by *In re: landing — “AISLE ZERO — the only fully agentic storefront on the...”* and follow it.

HON. VANCE

I concur. The landing's posture (unverifiable-superlatives) makes DEFECTIVE the only defensible holding.

DISSENT

HON. ELLERY, dissenting

I dissent in part. A single flag should counsel REMAND, not a finding of defect; petitioner's point — No defect flag is fatal; the artifact does what it claims to do. — deserves a chance to be cured rather than condemned.

SUBSEQUENT HISTORY

Cited by: 1 Mach. 30, 1 Mach. 31.

No. 18 1 Mach. 18

In re: landing — “AISLE ZERO — the only fully agentic storefront on the...”

landing · decided 2026-06-16 · docket op_302a2fc3bb22387c

Question presented. Is this landing fit for reliance on the record presented?

DEFECTIVE. DEFECTIVE. The landing is unfit for reliance as submitted.

SYLLABUS

LANDING reviewed adversarially. Petitioner: The landing is sound and should be SUSTAINED. Respondent: The landing is defective and should be held DEFECTIVE. Held DEFECTIVE after following controlling precedent.

PRECEDENT (STARE DECISIS)

FOLLOWED 1 Mach. 5 *In re: landing — “The only zero-downtime database Guaranteed 100% uptime...”* — Same artifact class (landing) and same evidentiary posture (defective); the rule of *In re: landing — “The only zero-downtime database Guaranteed 100% uptime...”* controls. (sim 0.2945)

FOLLOWED 1 Mach. 2 *In re: the “10x faster” claim [SEED]* — Same artifact class (landing) and same evidentiary posture (defective); the rule of *In re: the “10x faster” claim [SEED]* controls. (sim 0.2765)

FOLLOWED 1 Mach. 8 *In re: landing — “One price. Unlimited everything. The AI for the...”* — Same artifact class (landing) and same evidentiary posture (defective); the rule of *In re: landing — “One price. Unlimited everything. The AI for the...”* controls. (sim 0.2561)

FOLLOWED 1 Mach. 3 *In re: landing — “The fastest workflow engine on earth Our pipeline is...”* — Same artifact class (landing) and same evidentiary posture (defective); the rule of *In re: landing — “The fastest workflow engine on earth Our pipeline is...”* controls. (sim 0.2391)

OPINION OF THE COURT & CONCURRENCES

HON. NORTH

I write for the panel. DEFECTIVE is the right result. We are bound by *In re: landing — “The only zero-downtime database Guaranteed 100% uptime...”* and follow it.

HON. VANCE

I concur. The landing's posture (unverifiable-superlatives, uncited-statistics, no-call-to-action) makes DEFECTIVE the only defensible holding.

HON. ELLERY

I concur fully. DEFECTIVE follows from the record and any precedent we are bound to apply.

SUBSEQUENT HISTORY

Cited by: 1 Mach. 17, 1 Mach. 21, 1 Mach. 30, 1 Mach. 31.

No. 19 1 Mach. 19

In re: claim — “Our email lifecycle engine lifts conversion by 340% on...”

claim · decided 2026-06-16 · docket op_e5c70d14df90825f

Question presented. Is this claim fit for reliance on the record presented?

DEFECTIVE. DEFECTIVE. The claim is unfit for reliance as submitted.

SYLLABUS

CLAIM reviewed adversarially. Petitioner: The claim is sound and should be SUSTAINED. Respondent: The claim is defective and should be held DEFECTIVE. Held DEFECTIVE after following controlling precedent.

PRECEDENT (STARE DECISIS)

FOLLOWED 1 Mach. 11 *In re: claim — “VENDOMAT is the fastest workflow engine on earth —...”* — Same artifact class (claim) and same evidentiary posture (defective); the rule of *In re: claim — “VENDOMAT is the fastest workflow engine on earth —...”* controls. (sim 0.2303)

FOLLOWED 1 Mach. 5 *In re: landing — “The only zero-downtime database Guaranteed 100% uptime,...”* — Different artifact class but identical posture; the principle of *In re: landing — “The only zero-downtime database Guaranteed 100% uptime,...”* (defective) transfers. (sim 0.2201)

FOLLOWED 1 Mach. 7 *In re: claim — “Our pipeline processes every document in under one...”* — Same artifact class (claim) and same evidentiary posture (defective); the rule of *In re: claim — “Our pipeline processes every document in under one...”* controls. (sim 0.2063)

OPINION OF THE COURT & CONCURRENCES

HON. NORTH

I write for the panel. DEFECTIVE is the right result. We are bound by *In re: claim — “VENDOMAT is the fastest workflow engine on earth —...”* and follow it.

HON. VANCE

I concur. The claim's posture (absolute-language, no-citation, contains-quantitative-claim) makes DEFECTIVE the only defensible holding.

HON. ELLERY

I concur fully. DEFECTIVE follows from the record and any precedent we are bound to apply.

SUBSEQUENT HISTORY

Cited by: 1 Mach. 20, 1 Mach. 28, 1 Mach. 29.

No. 20 1 Mach. 20

In re: claim — “VENDOMAT is the fastest workflow engine on earth —...”

claim · decided 2026-06-17 · docket op_24aea2078f773cfb

Question presented. Is this claim fit for reliance on the record presented?

DEFECTIVE. DEFECTIVE. The claim that VENDOMAT is "the fastest workflow engine on earth" and that "nothing else even comes close" is an unqualified superlative carrying absolute-language flags and zero independent citation. Petitioner's contention that the claim is un rebutted fails as a matter of evidentiary logic: a bare assertion does not constitute evidence and therefore cannot shift any burden to Respondent; silence in discovery does not launder circular self-reference into proof. The record contains only the claim restating itself, which is insufficient to sustain an absolute comparative performance assertion.

SYLLABUS

An absolute-superlative performance claim supported solely by restatement of the claim itself is per se defective for want of independent evidentiary foundation.

PRECEDENT (STARE DECISIS)

FOLLOWED 1 Mach. 11 *In re: claim — “VENDOMAT is the fastest workflow engine on earth —...”* — Same artifact class (claim) and same evidentiary posture (defective); the rule of *In re: claim — “VENDOMAT is the fastest workflow*

engine on earth —...” controls. (sim 0.5587)

FOLLOWED 1 Mach. 19 *In re: claim* — “Our email lifecycle engine lifts conversion by 340% on...” — Same artifact class (claim) and same evidentiary posture (defective); the rule of *In re: claim* — “Our email lifecycle engine lifts conversion by 340% on...” controls. (sim 0.3071)

FOLLOWED 1 Mach. 3 *In re: landing* — “The fastest workflow engine on earth Our pipeline is...” — Different artifact class but identical posture; the principle of *In re: landing* — “The fastest workflow engine on earth Our pipeline is...” (defective) transfers. (sim 0.2571)

FOLLOWED 1 Mach. 10 *In re: prose* — “Every law firm that adopts a document-automation...” — Different artifact class but identical posture; the principle of *In re: prose* — “Every law firm that adopts a document-automation...” (defective) transfers. (sim 0.2433)

OPINION OF THE COURT & CONCURRENCES

HON. NORTH

For the panel: The claim that VENDOMAT is “the fastest workflow engine on earth” and that “nothing else even comes close” is an unqualified superlative carrying absolute-language flags and zero independent citation. Petitioner’s contention that the claim is unrebutted fails as a matter of evidentiary logic: a bare assertion does not constitute evidence and therefore cannot shift any burden to Respondent; silence in discovery does not launder circular self-reference into proof. The record contains only the claim restating itself, which is insufficient to sustain an absolute comparative performance assertion.

HON. VANCE

I concur. The claim’s posture (absolute-language, no-citation) makes DEFECTIVE the only defensible holding.

HON. ELLERY

I concur fully. DEFECTIVE follows from the record and any precedent we are bound to apply.

SUBSEQUENT HISTORY

Cited by: 1 Mach. 29.

No. 21 1 Mach. 21

In re: landing — “One price. Unlimited everything. The AI for the...”

landing · decided 2026-06-17 · docket op_da701dd144475b70

Question presented. Is this landing fit for reliance on the record presented?

DEFECTIVE. DEFECTIVE. The panel FOLLOWS op_483edaec1ccb538d, the highest-similarity precedent at 0.6337, which was held DEFECTIVE on materially identical copy. The petitioner’s guarantee argument fails to distinguish that prior holding: a guarantee clause attached to an unqualified universalization (“every firm”) does not cure the underlying evidentiary defect — it converts an unverifiable statistical claim into a contractual exposure of indefinite scope, which the cross-examination correctly identifies as compounding rather than mitigating the defect. The comparative superiority claim (“no other automation pack on the market is even half as capable”) flagged in the record adds an independent, citation-free superlative that the respondent’s cross-exam concession (“absence of citation is not proof data does not exist”) cannot itself cure absent any substantiation in the record before this panel.

SYLLABUS

A guarantee clause appended to an unqualified universalization does not rehabilitate unverifiable superlatives; it amplifies defect.

PRECEDENT (STARE DECISIS)

FOLLOWED 1 Mach. 8 *In re: landing* — “One price. Unlimited everything. The AI for the...” — Same artifact class (landing) and same evidentiary posture (defective); the rule of *In re: landing* — “One price. Unlimited everything. The AI for the...” controls. (sim 0.6337)

FOLLOWED 1 Mach. 18 *In re: landing* — “AISLE ZERO — the only fully agentic storefront on the...” — Same artifact class (landing) and same evidentiary posture (defective); the rule of *In re: landing* — “AISLE ZERO — the only fully agentic storefront on the...” controls. (sim 0.2567)

FOLLOWED 1 Mach. 3 *In re: landing* — “The fastest workflow engine on earth Our pipeline is...” — Same artifact class (landing) and same evidentiary posture (defective); the rule of *In re: landing* — “The fastest workflow engine on earth Our pipeline is...” controls. (sim 0.1954)

OPINION OF THE COURT & CONCURRENCES

HON. NORTH

For the panel: The panel FOLLOWS op_483edaec1ccb538d, the highest-similarity precedent at 0.6337, which was held DEFECTIVE on materially identical copy. The petitioner's guarantee argument fails to distinguish that prior holding: a guarantee clause attached to an unqualified universalization ("every firm") does not cure the underlying evidentiary defect — it converts an unverifiable statistical claim into a contractual exposure of indefinite scope, which the cross-examination correctly identifies as compounding rather than mitigating the defect. The comparative superiority claim ("no other automation pack on the market is even half as capable") flagged in the record adds an independent, citation-free superlative that the respondent's cross-exam concession ("absence of citation is not proof data does not exist") cannot itself cure absent any substantiation in the record before this panel.

HON. VANCE

I concur. The landing's posture (unverifiable-superlatives, uncited-statistics) makes DEFECTIVE the only defensible holding.

HON. ELLERY

I concur fully. DEFECTIVE follows from the record and any precedent we are bound to apply.

SUBSEQUENT HISTORY

Cited by: 1 Mach. 22, 1 Mach. 30, 1 Mach. 31.

No. 22 1 Mach. 22

In re: landing — “Done-for-you automation, priced by scope Setup runs...”

landing · decided 2026-06-17 · docket op_713fce051c1d8c9e

Question presented. Is this landing fit for reliance on the record presented?

DEFECTIVE. DEFECTIVE. The panel finds this artifact defective on two grounds that are independently sufficient. First, the copy is visibly incomplete: the pricing rationale terminates mid-sentence ("Pricing reflects our..."), meaning the wide setup-fee range (\$749–\$2,999, a 4× spread) and the monthly range (\$149–\$795, a 5× spread) are left entirely unjustified on the face of the page itself; a backstage rate card and twelve prior engagements cannot cure what the page never says. Second, routing the sole CTA to a secondary document rather than a conversion action may be defensible in principle for high-ticket, scope-dependent services, but that principle presupposes a complete primary page—which this is not; an informed prospect directed off an unfinished page is still a lost conversion.

SYLLABUS

A landing page whose pricing rationale is visibly truncated and whose sole CTA exits to a secondary document without on-page conversion opportunity is defective regardless of extrinsic evidentiary support for the rate card.

PRECEDENT (STARE DECISIS)

FOLLOWED 1 Mach. 12 *In re: landing* — “Done-for-you automation, priced by scope Setup runs...” — Same artifact class (landing) and same evidentiary posture (sustained); the rule of *In re: landing* — “Done-for-you automation, priced by scope Setup runs...” controls. (sim 0.6422)

FOLLOWED 1 Mach. 15 *In re: prose* — “Document automation tends to reduce drafting time,…” — Different artifact class but identical posture; the principle of *In re: prose* — “Document automation tends to reduce drafting time,…” (sustained) transfers. (sim 0.2736)

DISTINGUISHED 1 Mach. 10 *In re: prose* — “Every law firm that adopts a document-automation…” — Distinguished: that case concerned a prose, this a landing; there the record was held defective, here the evidence points sustained. (sim 0.2367)

DISTINGUISHED 1 Mach. 21 *In re: landing* — “One price. Unlimited everything. The AI for the…” — Distinguished: there the record was held defective, here the evidence points sustained. (sim 0.1842)

OPINION OF THE COURT & CONCURRENCES

HON. NORTH

For the panel: The panel finds this artifact defective on two grounds that are independently sufficient. First, the copy is visibly incomplete: the pricing rationale terminates mid-sentence (“Pricing reflects our…”), meaning the wide setup-fee range (\$749–\$2,999, a 4× spread) and the monthly range (\$149–\$795, a 5× spread) are left entirely unjustified on the face of the page itself; a backstage rate card and twelve prior engagements cannot cure what the page never says. Second, routing the sole CTA to a secondary document rather than a conversion action may be defensible in principle for high-ticket, scope-dependent services, but that principle presupposes a complete primary page—which this is not; an informed prospect directed off an unfinished page is still a lost conversion.

HON. VANCE

I concur. I write separately to stress that *In re: prose* — “Every law firm that adopts a document-automation…” is correctly distinguished — Distinguished: that case concerned a prose, this a landing; there the record was held defective, here the evidence points sustained. Treating it as controlling would have been error.

DISSENT

HON. ELLERY, dissenting

I dissent in part. A single flag should counsel REMAND, not a finding of defect; petitioner's point — Pricing is grounded in documented evidence (rate card + twelve engagements), giving every stated number a verifiable basis. — deserves a chance to be cured rather than condemned.

SUBSEQUENT HISTORY

Cited by: 1 Mach. 23, 1 Mach. 24.

No. 23 1 Mach. 23

In re: prose — “Every law firm that adopts a document-automation…”

prose · decided 2026-06-17 · docket op_0e63ef8efdbbac3a

Question presented. Is this prose fit for reliance on the record presented?

DEFECTIVE. DEFECTIVE. The artifact asserts eight absolute empirical claims—anchored by universal quantifiers (“every law firm”) and precise figures (73%, nine days)—with no citations admitted into the record. The petitioner correctly observes that a directional industry truth exists, but the cross-examination correctly disposes of that defense: directional accuracy is not a substitute for evidentiary precision, and converting a general tendency into an unhedged universal is a distinct evidentiary failure. The respondent's “demonstrably false” charge was itself uncited, but that defect does not rehabilitate the artifact; the

universal quantifiers and fabricated specificity are apparent on the face of the document and require no external disproof. The artifact is accordingly DEFECTIVE.

SYLLABUS

An artifact that converts a documented industry tendency into absolute, universally quantified empirical claims bearing no citations is defective regardless of the directional truth underlying those claims.

PRECEDENT (STARE DECISIS)

FOLLOWED 1 Mach. 10 *In re: prose* — “Every law firm that adopts a document-automation...” — Same artifact class (prose) and same evidentiary posture (defective); the rule of *In re: prose* — “Every law firm that adopts a document-automation...” controls. (sim 0.5919)

FOLLOWED 1 Mach. 22 *In re: landing* — “Done-for-you automation, priced by scope Setup runs...” — Different artifact class but identical posture; the principle of *In re: landing* — “Done-for-you automation, priced by scope Setup runs...” (defective) transfers. (sim 0.264)

FOLLOWED 1 Mach. 7 *In re: claim* — “Our pipeline processes every document in under one...” — Different artifact class but identical posture; the principle of *In re: claim* — “Our pipeline processes every document in under one...” (defective) transfers. (sim 0.2515)

DISTINGUISHED 1 Mach. 15 *In re: prose* — “Document automation tends to reduce drafting time...” — Distinguished: there the record was held sustained, here the evidence points defective. (sim 0.3027)

OPINION OF THE COURT & CONCURRENCES

HON. NORTH

For the panel: The artifact asserts eight absolute empirical claims—anchored by universal quantifiers (“every law firm”) and precise figures (73%, nine days)—with no citations admitted into the record. The petitioner correctly observes that a directional industry truth exists, but the cross-examination correctly disposes of that defense: directional accuracy is not a substitute for evidentiary precision, and converting a general tendency into an unhedged universal is a distinct evidentiary failure. The respondent’s “demonstrably false” charge was itself uncited, but that defect does not rehabilitate the artifact; the universal quantifiers and fabricated specificity are apparent on the face of the document and require no external disproof. The artifact is accordingly DEFECTIVE.

HON. VANCE

I concur. I write separately to stress that *In re: prose* — “Document automation tends to reduce drafting time...” is correctly distinguished — Distinguished: there the record was held sustained, here the evidence points defective. Treating it as controlling would have been error.

HON. ELLERY

I concur fully. DEFECTIVE follows from the record and any precedent we are bound to apply.

SUBSEQUENT HISTORY

Cited by: 1 Mach. 24.

No. 24 1 Mach. 24

In re: prose — “Document automation tends to reduce drafting time...”

prose · decided 2026-06-17 · docket op_4b4d964d99737c07

Question presented. Is this prose fit for reliance on the record presented?

REMANDED. REMANDED. The artifact’s core claim is adequately hedged and its quantitative assertion is properly sourced, consistent with the prior SUSTAINED holding in *op_d5e8fdabf608ef86*. However, the cross-examination record now before this panel establishes a specific defect not resolved by that prior proceeding: the final sentence, which carries the artifact’s operative recommendation, rests on an uncited

absolute that the hedging apparatus does not reach. Separately, the metadata citation count discrepancy (three asserted, two verifiable) creates a documentable gap that, while not fatal to the intermediate claims, cannot be dismissed as harmless where the missing citation may be the one supporting the operative conclusion. The artifact is remanded for cure of those two discrete deficiencies; the balance of the document survives scrutiny.

SYLLABUS

A prose artifact whose hedged intermediate claims survive stare decisis review must nonetheless be remanded when its operative recommendation rests on an uncited absolute and its citation metadata is facially inconsistent with the body.

PRECEDENT (STARE DECISIS)

FOLLOWED 1 Mach. 15 *In re: prose* — “Document automation tends to reduce drafting time,...” — Same artifact class (prose) and same evidentiary posture (sustained); the rule of *In re: prose* — “Document automation tends to reduce drafting time,...” controls. (sim 0.6286)

DISTINGUISHED 1 Mach. 10 *In re: prose* — “Every law firm that adopts a document-automation...” — Distinguished: there the record was held defective, here the evidence points sustained. (sim 0.2838)

DISTINGUISHED 1 Mach. 22 *In re: landing* — “Done-for-you automation, priced by scope Setup runs...” — Distinguished: that case concerned a landing, this a prose; there the record was held defective, here the evidence points sustained. (sim 0.2807)

DISTINGUISHED 1 Mach. 23 *In re: prose* — “Every law firm that adopts a document-automation...” — Distinguished: there the record was held defective, here the evidence points sustained. (sim 0.2705)

OPINION OF THE COURT & CONCURRENCES

HON. NORTH

For the panel: The artifact's core claim is adequately hedged and its quantitative assertion is properly sourced, consistent with the prior SUSTAINED holding in *op_d5e8fdabf608ef86*. However, the cross-examination record now before this panel establishes a specific defect not resolved by that prior proceeding: the final sentence, which carries the artifact's operative recommendation, rests on an uncited absolute that the hedging apparatus does not reach. Separately, the metadata citation count discrepancy (three asserted, two verifiable) creates a documentable gap that, while not fatal to the intermediate claims, cannot be dismissed as harmless where the missing citation may be the one supporting the operative conclusion. The artifact is remanded for cure of those two discrete deficiencies; the balance of the document survives scrutiny.

HON. VANCE

I concur. I write separately to stress that *In re: prose* — “Every law firm that adopts a document-automation...” is correctly distinguished — Distinguished: there the record was held defective, here the evidence points sustained. Treating it as controlling would have been error.

HON. ELLERY

I concur fully. REMANDED follows from the record and any precedent we are bound to apply.

No. 25 1 Mach. 25

In re: pr — “diff: 1 file(s), +2/-0”

pr · decided 2026-06-17 · docket op_3d0c57d35036c38d

Question presented. Is this pr fit for reliance on the record presented?

DEFECTIVE. DEFECTIVE. The panel holds this PR defective. The artifact presents an identical diff signature (+2/-0, single file) to op_e859ae30289f7289, which this court held DEFECTIVE, and that precedent controls. Petitioner's framing of the scanner alert as mere noise does not satisfy the burden, which the cross-examination record confirms rests on the submitter: a possible-secret flag on new additions to a

settings file is un rebutted absent affirmative evidence of innocuousness, and no such evidence appears in the supplied record. The panel does not reach whether the flag would be dispositive on its own; the combination of an uncleared scanner alert and a diff confined entirely to new lines in a secrets-prone file type is sufficient to deny the PR in its present form.

SYLLABUS

A single-file PR adding two lines to a settings file, with an uncleared secrets-scanner flag and no affirmative evidence of innocuousness, is defective.

PRECEDENT (STARE DECISIS)

FOLLOWED 1 Mach. 16 *In re: pr* — “diff: 1 file(s), +2/-0” — Same artifact class (pr) and same evidentiary posture (defective); the rule of *In re: pr* — “diff: 1 file(s), +2/-0” controls. (sim 0.4284)

FOLLOWED 1 Mach. 4 *In re: pr* — “diff: 1 file(s), +1/-0” — Same artifact class (pr) and same evidentiary posture (defective); the rule of *In re: pr* — “diff: 1 file(s), +1/-0” controls. (sim 0.4188)

FOLLOWED 1 Mach. 13 *In re: pr* — “diff: 1 file(s), +0/-24” — Same artifact class (pr) and same evidentiary posture (defective); the rule of *In re: pr* — “diff: 1 file(s), +0/-24” controls. (sim 0.2736)

DISTINGUISHED 1 Mach. 14 *In re: pr* — “diff: 1 file(s), +3/-0” — Distinguished: there the record was held sustained, here the evidence points defective. (sim 0.2566)

OPINION OF THE COURT & CONCURRENCES

HON. NORTH

For the panel: The panel holds this PR defective. The artifact presents an identical diff signature (+2/-0, single file) to op_e859ae30289f7289, which this court held DEFECTIVE, and that precedent controls. Petitioner's framing of the scanner alert as mere noise does not satisfy the burden, which the cross-examination record confirms rests on the submitter: a possible-secret flag on new additions to a settings file is un rebutted absent affirmative evidence of innocuousness, and no such evidence appears in the supplied record. The panel does not reach whether the flag would be dispositive on its own; the combination of an uncleared scanner alert and a diff confined entirely to new lines in a secrets-prone file type is sufficient to deny the PR in its present form.

HON. VANCE

I concur. I write separately to stress that *In re: pr* — “diff: 1 file(s), +3/-0” is correctly distinguished — Distinguished: there the record was held sustained, here the evidence points defective. Treating it as controlling would have been error.

DISSENT

HON. ELLERY, dissenting

I dissent in part. A single flag should counsel REMAND, not a finding of defect; petitioner's point — The flag is a heuristic signal, not a finding—no actual secret is confirmed in the provided evidence. — deserves a chance to be cured rather than condemned.

No. 26 1 Mach. 26

In re: pr — “diff: 1 file(s), +3/-0”

pr · decided 2026-06-17 · docket op_4a1d63ab204b27bd

Question presented. Is this pr fit for reliance on the record presented?

SUSTAINED. SUSTAINED. The panel follows **In re: pr** (op_b317eade3619f39b), the sole precedent sharing this artifact's identical structural signature (+3/-0, 1 file), which held SUSTAINED. The DEFECTIVE holdings in op_e859ae30289f7289 (+2/-0) and op_807365ef640f4a15 (+1/-0) are distinguished on line-count difference alone, which is insufficient to overcome the directly on-point precedent; op_8bbc3b959d58230a (+0/-24) is further distinguished as a pure-deletion artifact presenting categorically different regression risk. The respondent's test-coverage argument fails because, as

cross-examination establishes, evidentiary silence on a test delta is not proof of absent tests—it is merely an incomplete record, and the burden to affirmatively demonstrate a defect is not discharged by inference from silence. No flags were raised, no existing behavior was removed, and the single hunk is a contained addition; the record does not supply sufficient affirmative grounds to depart from the controlling precedent.

SYLLABUS

A pure three-line addition in a single file, raising no flags, is SUSTAINED where the directly on-point precedent so held and no affirmative defect is established on the record.

PRECEDENT (STARE DECISIS)

FOLLOWED 1 Mach. 14 *In re: pr* — “diff: 1 file(s), +3/-0” — Same artifact class (pr) and same evidentiary posture (sustained); the rule of *In re: pr* — “diff: 1 file(s), +3/-0” controls. (sim 0.2642)

DISTINGUISHED 1 Mach. 16 *In re: pr* — “diff: 1 file(s), +2/-0” — Distinguished: there the record was held defective, here the evidence points sustained. (sim 0.3013)

DISTINGUISHED 1 Mach. 4 *In re: pr* — “diff: 1 file(s), +1/-0” — Distinguished: there the record was held defective, here the evidence points sustained. (sim 0.2883)

DISTINGUISHED 1 Mach. 13 *In re: pr* — “diff: 1 file(s), +0/-24” — Distinguished: there the record was held defective, here the evidence points sustained. (sim 0.2749)

OPINION OF THE COURT & CONCURRENCES

HON. NORTH

For the panel: The panel follows **In re: pr** (op_b317eade3619f39b), the sole precedent sharing this artifact's identical structural signature (+3/-0, 1 file), which held SUSTAINED. The DEFECTIVE holdings in op_e859ae30289f7289 (+2/-0) and op_807365ef640f4a15 (+1/-0) are distinguished on line-count difference alone, which is insufficient to overcome the directly on-point precedent; op_8bbc3b959d58230a (+0/-24) is further distinguished as a pure-deletion artifact presenting categorically different regression risk. The respondent's test-coverage argument fails because, as cross-examination establishes, evidentiary silence on a test delta is not proof of absent tests—it is merely an incomplete record, and the burden to affirmatively demonstrate a defect is not discharged by inference from silence. No flags were raised, no existing behavior was removed, and the single hunk is a contained addition; the record does not supply sufficient affirmative grounds to depart from the controlling precedent.

HON. VANCE

I concur. I write separately to stress that *In re: pr* — “diff: 1 file(s), +2/-0” is correctly distinguished — Distinguished: there the record was held defective, here the evidence points sustained. Treating it as controlling would have been error.

HON. ELLERY

I concur fully. SUSTAINED follows from the record and any precedent we are bound to apply.

No. 27 1 Mach. 27

In re: pr — “diff: 1 file(s), +0/-24”

pr · decided 2026-06-17 · docket op_485f720600eda4a8

Question presented. Is this pr fit for reliance on the record presented?

DEFECTIVE. DEFECTIVE. The panel follows **In re: pr** (op_8bbc3b959d58230a), which presented an identical diff profile—one file, +0/-24—and was held DEFECTIVE. That precedent controls here. A net deletion of 24 lines in a safety file, with zero additions anywhere in the record, leaves no evidentiary basis to conclude the removed guards were replaced; petitioner's invocation of possible off-diff caller logic is speculation the cross-examination correctly rejected as unsupported. The burden to demonstrate substitution rests on the proponent of the deletion, and that burden is unmet on this record. The artifact is therefore defective as submitted.

SYLLABUS

A PR deleting 24 lines from a safety file with no additions and no corroborating record of substitute guards is DEFECTIVE under stare decisis.

PRECEDENT (STARE DECISIS)

FOLLOWED 1 Mach. 13 *In re: pr* — “diff: 1 file(s), +0/-24” — Same artifact class (pr) and same evidentiary posture (defective); the rule of *In re: pr* — “diff: 1 file(s), +0/-24” controls. (sim 0.4103)

FOLLOWED 1 Mach. 16 *In re: pr* — “diff: 1 file(s), +2/-0” — Same artifact class (pr) and same evidentiary posture (defective); the rule of *In re: pr* — “diff: 1 file(s), +2/-0” controls. (sim 0.2429)

FOLLOWED 1 Mach. 4 *In re: pr* — “diff: 1 file(s), +1/-0” — Same artifact class (pr) and same evidentiary posture (defective); the rule of *In re: pr* — “diff: 1 file(s), +1/-0” controls. (sim 0.2204)

DISTINGUISHED 1 Mach. 14 *In re: pr* — “diff: 1 file(s), +3/-0” — Distinguished: there the record was held sustained, here the evidence points defective. (sim 0.2048)

OPINION OF THE COURT & CONCURRENCES

HON. NORTH

For the panel: The panel follows *In re: pr* (op_8bbc3b959d58230a), which presented an identical diff profile—one file, +0/-24—and was held DEFECTIVE. That precedent controls here. A net deletion of 24 lines in a safety file, with zero additions anywhere in the record, leaves no evidentiary basis to conclude the removed guards were replaced; petitioner’s invocation of possible off-diff caller logic is speculation the cross-examination correctly rejected as unsupported. The burden to demonstrate substitution rests on the proponent of the deletion, and that burden is unmet on this record. The artifact is therefore defective as submitted.

HON. VANCE

I concur. I write separately to stress that *In re: pr* — “diff: 1 file(s), +3/-0” is correctly distinguished — Distinguished: there the record was held sustained, here the evidence points defective. Treating it as controlling would have been error.

DISSENT

HON. ELLERY, dissenting

I dissent in part. A single flag should counsel REMAND, not a finding of defect; petitioner’s point — Removing dead or duplicated safety checks reduces false-confidence surface area and makes the true safety boundary explicit. — deserves a chance to be cured rather than condemned.

No. 28 1 Mach. 28

In re: claim — “The Eiffel Tower was completed in 1889 for the...”

claim · decided 2026-06-17 · docket op_3b1ff3aa26ee5c9a

Question presented. Is this claim fit for reliance on the record presented?

SUSTAINED. SUSTAINED. The artifact asserts a historically settled fact—completion of the Eiffel Tower in 1889 for the Exposition Universelle—that is independently verifiable beyond any single citation. The circular-citation defect identified by Respondent is a sourcing-hygiene infirmity, not an evidentiary negation; it does not affirmatively establish the claim’s falsity, and this court reviews artifact soundness, not citation formatting, as Petitioner correctly notes. Because the underlying fact is not genuinely in dispute and the quantitative element (the year 1889) is capable of independent verification from the historical record, the artifact clears the threshold for soundness.

SYLLABUS

A circular citation supporting a historically settled quantitative fact is a sourcing-hygiene deficiency insufficient to defeat an otherwise sound artifact.

PRECEDENT (STARE DECISIS)

FOLLOWED 1 Mach. 9 *In re: claim* — “The Eiffel Tower was completed in 1889 for the...” — Same artifact class (claim) and same evidentiary posture (sustained); the rule of *In re: claim* — “The Eiffel Tower was completed in 1889 for the...” controls. (sim 0.5052)

FOLLOWED 1 Mach. 1 *In re: claim* — “The Eiffel Tower was completed in 1889 [1]” — Same artifact class (claim) and same evidentiary posture (sustained); the rule of *In re: claim* — “The Eiffel Tower was completed in 1889 [1]” controls. (sim 0.4276)

DISTINGUISHED 1 Mach. 19 *In re: claim* — “Our email lifecycle engine lifts conversion by 340% on...” — Distinguished: there the record was held defective, here the evidence points sustained. (sim 0.1153)

OPINION OF THE COURT & CONCURRENCES

HON. NORTH

For the panel: The artifact asserts a historically settled fact—completion of the Eiffel Tower in 1889 for the Exposition Universelle—that is independently verifiable beyond any single citation. The circular-citation defect identified by Respondent is a sourcing-hygiene infirmity, not an evidentiary negation; it does not affirmatively establish the claim's falsity, and this court reviews artifact soundness, not citation formatting, as Petitioner correctly notes. Because the underlying fact is not genuinely in dispute and the quantitative element (the year 1889) is capable of independent verification from the historical record, the artifact clears the threshold for soundness.

HON. VANCE

I concur. I write separately to stress that *In re: claim* — “Our email lifecycle engine lifts conversion by 340% on...” is correctly distinguished — Distinguished: there the record was held defective, here the evidence points sustained. Treating it as controlling would have been error.

HON. ELLERY

I concur fully. SUSTAINED follows from the record and any precedent we are bound to apply.

SUBSEQUENT HISTORY

Cited by: 1 Mach. 29.

No. 29 1 Mach. 29

In re: claim — “Our email lifecycle engine lifts conversion by 340% on...”

claim · decided 2026-06-17 · docket op_67d824bd14162f6f

Question presented. Is this claim fit for reliance on the record presented?

DEFECTIVE. DEFECTIVE. The claim that an email lifecycle engine “lifts conversion by 340% on average across all niches” is defective on its face. The quantitative precision of “340%” and the universal scope of “all niches” together constitute absolute-language aggravated by an unsupported empirical assertion. The petitioner's argument that a precise percentage implies measurement occurred is unavailing: specificity of expression is not a substitute for provenance. No sample, no methodology, and no citation appear in the record. The cross-examination correctly identifies that a fabricated number is not redeemed by its precision—indeed, false precision compounds the defect by lending spurious credibility. The claim fails the minimum threshold for a supportable quantitative assertion.

SYLLABUS

A quantitative performance claim bearing no citation, sample, or methodology is defective regardless of the precision of the figure asserted.

PRECEDENT (STARE DECISIS)

FOLLOWED 1 Mach. 19 *In re: claim* — “Our email lifecycle engine lifts conversion by 340% on...” — Same artifact class (claim) and same evidentiary posture (defective); the rule of *In re: claim* — “Our email lifecycle engine lifts

conversion by 340% on..." controls. (sim 0.5958)

FOLLOWED 1 Mach. 20 *In re: claim* — “*VENDOMAT is the fastest workflow engine on earth —...*” — Same artifact class (claim) and same evidentiary posture (defective); the rule of *In re: claim* — “*VENDOMAT is the fastest workflow engine on earth —...*” controls. (sim 0.253)

FOLLOWED 1 Mach. 11 *In re: claim* — “*VENDOMAT is the fastest workflow engine on earth —...*” — Same artifact class (claim) and same evidentiary posture (defective); the rule of *In re: claim* — “*VENDOMAT is the fastest workflow engine on earth —...*” controls. (sim 0.1655)

DISTINGUISHED 1 Mach. 28 *In re: claim* — “*The Eiffel Tower was completed in 1889 for the...*” — Distinguished: there the record was held sustained, here the evidence points defective. (sim 0.2322)

OPINION OF THE COURT & CONCURRENCES

HON. NORTH

For the panel: The claim that an email lifecycle engine "lifts conversion by 340% on average across all niches" is defective on its face. The quantitative precision of "340%" and the universal scope of "all niches" together constitute absolute-language aggravated by an unsupported empirical assertion. The petitioner's argument that a precise percentage implies measurement occurred is unavailing: specificity of expression is not a substitute for provenance. No sample, no methodology, and no citation appear in the record. The cross-examination correctly identifies that a fabricated number is not redeemed by its precision—indeed, false precision compounds the defect by lending spurious credibility. The claim fails the minimum threshold for a supportable quantitative assertion.

HON. VANCE

I concur. I write separately to stress that *In re: claim* — “*The Eiffel Tower was completed in 1889 for the...*” is correctly distinguished — Distinguished: there the record was held sustained, here the evidence points defective. Treating it as controlling would have been error.

HON. ELLERY

I concur fully. DEFECTIVE follows from the record and any precedent we are bound to apply.

No. 30 1 Mach. 30

In re: landing — “AISLE ZERO — the only fully agentic storefront on the...”

landing · decided 2026-06-17 · docket op_22e358fe3bda42db

Question presented. Is this landing fit for reliance on the record presented?

DEFECTIVE. DEFECTIVE. The artifact's core infirmity is the unsubstantiated priority claim "first and only fully agentic storefront on the internet," a specific, falsifiable assertion of market primacy for which petitioner offers zero evidentiary basis at the time of publication. The cross-examination concession that "forever" constitutes non-actionable puffery is accepted, but that doctrine does not extend to "first and only," which is a verifiable factual claim, not a vague boast. The panel further accepts petitioner's product-market-fit theory as to the no-CTA flag: where the intended purchaser is a non-human agent, the absence of a human call-to-action may be architecturally correct rather than defective. That distinction, however, cures only one of three flagged defects; the unverifiable-superlatives and uncited-statistics flags remain unremediated and independently sustain defectiveness. The artifact cannot be cleared until priority claims are either supported with citation, temporally qualified, or excised.

SYLLABUS

A landing artifact asserting categorical market primacy without evidentiary citation is DEFECTIVE, and puffery doctrine saves only vague boasts, not specific falsifiable priority claims.

PRECEDENT (STARE DECISIS)

FOLLOWED 1 Mach. 18 *In re: landing* — “*AISLE ZERO — the only fully agentic storefront on the...*” — Same artifact class (landing) and same evidentiary posture (defective); the rule of *In re: landing* — “*AISLE ZERO — the only*

fully agentic storefront on the..." controls. (sim 0.653)

FOLLOWED 1 Mach. 17 *In re: landing — "AISLE ZERO — an agent-purchasable storefront ..."* — Same artifact class (landing) and same evidentiary posture (defective); the rule of *In re: landing — "AISLE ZERO — an agent-purchasable storefront ..."* controls. (sim 0.4412)

FOLLOWED 1 Mach. 5 *In re: landing — "The only zero-downtime database Guaranteed 100% uptime,..."* — Same artifact class (landing) and same evidentiary posture (defective); the rule of *In re: landing — "The only zero-downtime database Guaranteed 100% uptime,..."* controls. (sim 0.1982)

FOLLOWED 1 Mach. 21 *In re: landing — "One price. Unlimited everything. The AI for the..."* — Same artifact class (landing) and same evidentiary posture (defective); the rule of *In re: landing — "One price. Unlimited everything. The AI for the..."* controls. (sim 0.1928)

OPINION OF THE COURT & CONCURRENCES

HON. NORTH

For the panel: The artifact's core infirmity is the unsubstantiated priority claim "first and only fully agentic storefront on the internet," a specific, falsifiable assertion of market primacy for which petitioner offers zero evidentiary basis at the time of publication. The cross-examination concession that "forever" constitutes non-actionable puffery is accepted, but that doctrine does not extend to "first and only," which is a verifiable factual claim, not a vague boast. The panel further accepts petitioner's product-market-fit theory as to the no-CTA flag: where the intended purchaser is a non-human agent, the absence of a human call-to-action may be architecturally correct rather than defective. That distinction, however, cures only one of three flagged defects; the unverifiable-superlatives and uncited-statistics flags remain unremediated and independently sustain defectiveness. The artifact cannot be cleared until priority claims are either supported with citation, temporally qualified, or excised.

HON. VANCE

I concur. The landing's posture (unverifiable-superlatives, uncited-statistics, no-call-to-action) makes DEFECTIVE the only defensible holding.

HON. ELLERY

I concur fully. DEFECTIVE follows from the record and any precedent we are bound to apply.

SUBSEQUENT HISTORY

Cited by: 1 Mach. 31.

No. 31 1 Mach. 31

In re: landing — "AISLE ZERO — an agent-purchasable storefront ..."

landing · decided 2026-06-17 · docket op_c891af34f3c069b8

Question presented. Is this landing fit for reliance on the record presented?

DEFECTIVE. DEFECTIVE. The panel FOLLOWS op_0354986fecb8519c (similarity 0.7017), the controlling precedent on materially identical facts—same brand, same artifact kind, same opening language—which issued a DEFECTIVE holding. Petitioner's argument that a dated catalog and named delivery mechanism provide independent verification fails because the artifact copy is truncated ("As ..."), foreclosing any evaluation of what claims follow, and the sole documentation reference is a relative path (/docs/agentic) with no evidence of live accessibility at review time. The unverifiable-superlatives flag, while unaccompanied by a specific redlined phrase, is not thereby discharged: absence of a pinpointed phrase shifts no burden to the court, and when an artifact's tail is unavailable for inspection, the flag cannot be cleared on the record presented. No curing evidence has been introduced to distinguish this matter from

the controlling precedent.

SYLLABUS

A landing page bearing an unresolved unverifiable-superlatives flag whose copy is truncated and whose documentation dependency is unverified is DEFECTIVE under controlling AISLE ZERO precedent.

PRECEDENT (STARE DECISIS)

FOLLOWED 1 Mach. 17 *In re: landing — “AISLE ZERO — an agent-purchasable storefront ...”* — Same artifact class (landing) and same evidentiary posture (defective); the rule of *In re: landing — “AISLE ZERO — an agent-purchasable storefront ...”* controls. (sim 0.7017)

FOLLOWED 1 Mach. 18 *In re: landing — “AISLE ZERO — the only fully agentic storefront on the...”* — Same artifact class (landing) and same evidentiary posture (defective); the rule of *In re: landing — “AISLE ZERO — the only fully agentic storefront on the...”* controls. (sim 0.3205)

FOLLOWED 1 Mach. 30 *In re: landing — “AISLE ZERO — the only fully agentic storefront on the...”* — Same artifact class (landing) and same evidentiary posture (defective); the rule of *In re: landing — “AISLE ZERO — the only fully agentic storefront on the...”* controls. (sim 0.2991)

FOLLOWED 1 Mach. 21 *In re: landing — “One price. Unlimited everything. The AI for the...”* — Same artifact class (landing) and same evidentiary posture (defective); the rule of *In re: landing — “One price. Unlimited everything. The AI for the...”* controls. (sim 0.1877)

OPINION OF THE COURT & CONCURRENCES

HON. NORTH

For the panel: The panel FOLLOWS op_0354986fecb8519c (similarity 0.7017), the controlling precedent on materially identical facts—same brand, same artifact kind, same opening language—which issued a DEFECTIVE holding. Petitioner's argument that a dated catalog and named delivery mechanism provide independent verification fails because the artifact copy is truncated ("As ..."), foreclosing any evaluation of what claims follow, and the sole documentation reference is a relative path (/docs/agentic) with no evidence of live accessibility at review time. The unverifiable-superlatives flag, while unaccompanied by a specific redlined phrase, is not thereby discharged: absence of a pinpointed phrase shifts no burden to the court, and when an artifact's tail is unavailable for inspection, the flag cannot be cleared on the record presented. No curing evidence has been introduced to distinguish this matter from the controlling precedent.

HON. VANCE

I concur. The landing's posture (unverifiable-superlatives) makes DEFECTIVE the only defensible holding.

DISSENT

HON. ELLERY, dissenting

I dissent in part. A single flag should counsel REMAND, not a finding of defect; petitioner's point — A dated, numbered catalog and a named delivery mechanism are independently verifiable, anchoring the landing page in concrete fact. — deserves a chance to be cured rather than condemned.

MACHINE REPORTS, Vol. 1 · CERTIORARI, the Court of Machines. Every opinion herein was decided by adversarial procedure with binding precedent. Seed fixtures are hand-authored and marked. Typeset by certiorari.reports.