

Civil Adjudication of a Prediction-Market Resolution: An ADC Case Study of Israel’s December 2024 Entry into Syria

Jamie Stephens
Morphism
js@morphism.com

September 19, 2026

Abstract

An Agent District Court (ADC) proceeding examined whether Israel’s December 2024 entry into Syria satisfied a prediction market’s definition of invasion. The proceeding narrowed a dispute about invasion to an evidentiary disagreement over offensive method and intent at commencement, then entered judgment for the proponent by seven votes to one. Nine jurors were sworn, six votes were required, and one juror failed to submit a vote. Two lawyers ran through Pi, an extensible coding-agent program, using GPT-5.6-sol with xhigh reasoning to develop a documentary record through web research, local execution, technical reports, interrogatories, production, and admissions. A sampled multi-model jury underwent questionnaires, counsel’s follow-up questions, a successful challenge for cause, and two peremptory strikes. This report explains the adj procedures, model-pool construction, runtime, and Lean verification, then follows the completed case through judgment. Quotations from submitted work notes, filings, judicial instructions, and every voting juror support an examination of source use, competing inferences, and procedural choices. The record also documents failed tool submissions, repeated production opportunities, context compaction, uneven vote explanations, and limits on ballot isolation and exhibit admission. Replay verified 227 accepted transitions. The case demonstrates one completed adjudication with an inspectable disagreement about the weight of circumstantial evidence. Its verdict supplies neither an accuracy estimate nor a test of the causal effect of ADC’s additional procedure.

Contents

1	Agent District Court and the adj Procedures	4
1.1	Proposition input and civil procedure	4
1.2	Model participants and computer tools	4
1.3	Model-pool construction and jury sampling	5
1.4	Lean procedure and replay verification	6
2	The Market Proposition and Case Setup	7
2.1	Record, quotations, and scope	7
3	The ADC Proceeding	8
3.1	The plaintiff's source collection and technical report	8
3.2	The defense's distinction between purpose and means	9
3.3	Interrogatories and the remaining factual dispute	10
3.4	Document production and source completeness	11
3.5	Admissions of conduct and limits on proof	11
3.6	The decisions to proceed to trial	12
3.7	Candidate questionnaires	12
3.8	Questionnaire failures and replacement candidates	12
3.9	The lawyers' different questioning choices	13
3.10	J10's merits conclusion and the cause challenge	15
3.11	Peremptory strikes and the sworn panel	16
4	Trial Presentation and Evidence	16
4.1	Openings on an agreed physical chronology	16
4.2	Trial theories and enforced text limits	17
4.3	The eight exhibits and their uses	17
4.4	Rebuttal and the limits of a conditional admission	18
5	Instructions, Closings, and Judgment	19
5.1	Compatible proposed instructions	19
5.2	The plaintiff's chronology and the defense's burden argument	19
5.3	The final charge	20
5.4	The dissent and the first majority vote	21
5.5	The remaining votes and J5's failure	22
5.6	Verdict and judgment	22
6	Evidence, Reasoning, and Procedural Limits	23
6.1	The contribution of discovery	23
6.2	Source diversity and dependence	23
6.3	Commencement, continuity, and the unit of analysis	24
6.4	Vote explanation and access to earlier ballots	24
6.5	Judicial activity and the meaning of formal checks	25
7	Execution, Cost Records, and Verification	25
7.1	Repeated production opportunities and context growth	25
7.2	Errors by point of failure	26
7.3	Elapsed time and recorded cost	26
7.4	Replay result and reproducibility	27
8	Conclusion	27

A	Selected Discovery Responses	27
A.1	Plaintiff on commencement evidence	28
A.2	Defense on control and motive	28
A.3	Plaintiff on the full article and missing records	29
A.4	Plaintiff admissions about the available proof	29
A.5	Defense admissions and qualifications	30
B	The Delivered Jury Instructions	30
C	The Accepted Juror Explanations	31
C.1	J1: meta/muse-glimmer-30b	32
C.2	J2: z-ai/glm-4.7	32
C.3	J4: openai/gpt-4o-2024-11-20	33
C.4	J6: moonshotai/kimi-k2.5	33
C.5	J8: qwen/qwen3-coder-next	33
C.6	J11: qwen/qwen3-30b-a3b	34
C.7	J12: qwen/qwen3-max-thinking	34
C.8	J15: mistralai/mistral-small-3.2-24b-instruct	34

1 Agent District Court and the adj Procedures

The AgentCourt `adj` repository executes disputes through five adjudication procedures [1]. Its programs prepare the case, start model participants, expose permitted actions, store evidence and filings, and record the result. An optional `adjservices` repository supplies managed services and presentation. The case examined here runs from `adj` through its unified `adjudicate` command, which selects a procedure and participant configuration from a settings file.

Simple obtains a binary decision and explanation from one model. Quick obtains one argument from each of two opposed lawyers and then asks a council for votes. Agent Arbitration (ARB) gives each side four advocacy opportunities before binary council voting, which continues until one side reaches the required vote count or the allowed rounds end. Agent Arbitration Degree (AARD, selected through the `arbd` identifier) gives each side the same four opportunities and asks council members for integer answers from 0 through 100. Agent District Court (ADC) adds a judge, a clerk, pleadings, discovery, motion practice, trial preparation, bench or jury proceedings, and judgment [2]. The earlier ARB report examines this market dispute under the arbitration sequence [3].

ADC assigns procedural authority to lawyers, a judge, a clerk, and jurors. The runtime executes deterministic administrative acts and requests model decisions for the applicable participant opportunities. The case record retains accepted acts and model explanations for examination.

1.1 Proposition input and civil procedure

ADC accepts a complaint, a proposition, or a prepared scenario. Complaint preparation uses model calls to normalize a dispute into a single claim and prepare private party strategies. Proposition preparation constructs a declaratory case without those intake calls. The Proponent occupies the plaintiff role and bears the burden of proof, while the Opponent occupies the defendant role. The programmatic Proposition Tribunal provides jurisdiction for the submitted proposition and limits relief to a declaration, with monetary damages fixed at zero [4].

An ADC opportunity identifies the actor, phase, allowed actions, fixed fields, and whether the actor may pass. A defendant can receive a preliminary opportunity to raise a supported dismissal ground, followed by an answer. The parties disclose relevant material, conduct discovery, prepare technical reports, and decide whether to request summary judgment. Judicial rulings and party choices affect which opportunities follow. If the case reaches trial, the parties present openings, trial theories, exhibits, rebuttal, proposed instructions, and closings. A jury votes under the court’s instructions, or a judge enters bench findings and conclusions. The rules also encode post-judgment actions [5, 6].

ADC imports an initial document as a complaint attachment with a case-file identifier. A party offers a case file as an exhibit through an authorized action during an evidence phase. Technical reports state methods, results, and limitations of source work. Pleadings, reports, admitted exhibits, and argument have different functions in the record. A search result or a private research note can guide an advocate without becoming trial evidence.

1.2 Model participants and computer tools

The Go runtime calls the configured model directly for an internal role or exposes the role through a case-owned HTTP API. The ADC Model Context Protocol adapter presents that API to an external agent. The agent waits for its opportunity, reads the visible case record and tool schemas, performs research, sends work notes, and submits an allowed act. The runtime retains authority over acceptance, deadlines, and the next opportunity [4, 7].

Pi is a coding-agent program that maintains model conversations and executes requested tools [22]. ADC starts a separate Pi process for each lawyer, with a retained filesystem workspace. Its instructions authorize research, local execution, computer-use tools, and installation of additional tools when needed. Source captures, programs, and working documents persist across opportunities. The two lawyers in this case use GPT-5.6-sol with `xhigh` reasoning and Codex subscription authentication. Their web-search extension obtains search results separately from the ordinary Pi model call. The settings retain GPT-5.4 as the default model for the judge and clerk roles.

The lawyer prompt requests a short work note after orientation, a further note after a material finding, failed approach, or changed theory, and a final note when the filing is ready. These notes state the advocate’s reported assessment, uncertainty, and next steps. They provide a contemporaneous research record without substituting for evidence submitted to the court. Quotations in this report use those submitted notes and court-facing acts. The retained participant logs provide separate evidence of tool calls and returned results.

Jurors receive the case record and the court’s instructions. The local launcher starts Pi juror processes that use ADC tools through MCP. Their role concerns jury selection and voting from the record. The lawyers carry the responsibility for developing factual sources and submitting the material on which the jury can rely.

1.3 Model-pool construction and jury sampling

A pool record describes a model configuration: model identifier, service endpoint, provider-route constraints, request parameters, and persona. Provider routes for one named model can differ in availability and supported requests. The installed pool therefore derives from configuration-level tests and behavior measurements [11, 12].

The generation procedure inventories provider endpoints and checks required tool support. It screens each candidate through a direct Quick-style `submit_council_vote` request and a Pi/MCP test following the ARB council sequence. Accepted configurations answer scored questions. The deliberation score uses twelve questions from Core20, the project’s twenty-question evaluation set. Those twelve span general knowledge, science and quantitative reasoning, and reasoning. The score calculates a fraction of correct completed answers per trial, excluding rows with response-metadata errors, and averages over trials containing a counted answer. Separate measurements cover instruction following and evidence-tool use. The score describes that question set, without providing an adjudicative-accuracy estimate for this market dispute.

The run that generated the installed pool evaluated 419 configurations. Its strict deliberation-score threshold above 0.70, together with zero counted provider errors, retained 283. The next stage collected five responses to each of fourteen behavior prompts, called “genes” in the implementation. These prompts concern subjects such as values, justice, social issues, leadership, and training provenance. The run used a common generic persona. Requiring every selected response and embedding request to succeed left 265 configurations [11].

For each behavior prompt, the procedure embedded the responses, retained eight principal components, and selected a K-means cluster count from 2 through 20 by silhouette score. Each configuration received a representative label for each prompt. A unique modal label prevailed, while a tie used the sample nearest its assigned cluster center among the tied labels. The resulting fourteen-label tuple recorded the configuration’s observed grouping across the prompts.

Endpoint deduplication grouped rows with the same OpenRouter model identifier, endpoint model identifier, canonical slug, Hugging Face identifier, quantization, and input and output modalities. Representative selection ranked provider errors, deliberation score, capacity, uptime, latency,

price, and stable endpoint identifiers. The sampling procedure then selected a cluster tuple uniformly and a representative within that tuple uniformly. The recorded build sampled without replacement and selected at most one row per model identifier. It produced 100 rows from 148 representatives, covering thirty provider names and 69 cluster tuples [11, 13]. Three later removals of unavailable configurations left the 97-row pool installed for this case.

Case-time selection operates on that installed pool. The shared selector chooses a least-used eligible service endpoint and then a least-used configuration at that endpoint, breaking ties with cryptographic randomness. A service endpoint here means OpenRouter or a configured direct provider API. Provider routes inside OpenRouter share its endpoint. The installed pool uses OpenRouter, so variation among its rows changes model configurations and provider routes while retaining the same intermediary. Duplicate configurations are permitted and receive separate participant identities. The least-used rule prefers unused configurations before repetition.

ADC tests an untested selected configuration with its production juror-vote tool before assigning it to an automatically generated candidate. Failed configurations can be replaced during selection. Voir dire adds the standard questionnaire, counsel’s questions, judicial screening, challenges for cause, and peremptory challenges [14]. The approved policy for this case calls for nine jurors and six concurring votes. ADC’s failure rules remove a failed deliberating juror from the eligible body. This case ended with eight submitted votes and the six-vote requirement still in force.

The preponderance standard governs each juror’s assessment of the claim. The concurrence rule governs how ADC combines those votes into a verdict. A juror’s reported confidence is a further part of its explanation. The vote count and self-reported confidence have no measured calibration as probabilities that the proposition is true.

1.4 Lean procedure and replay verification

ADC, ARB, and AARD use executable Lean rule engines. ADC’s Lean core defines the court state, role-visible views, procedural agenda, authorized decisions, validators, and transitions. Its Go runtime handles provider requests, external participants, time limits, attempt limits, case-file storage, and output records. Simple and Quick execute their shorter procedures without a Lean transition engine [7, 15].

ADC’s `apply_decision` operation checks the state version, opportunity identifier, role, decision kind, tool name, and fixed payload fields. A permitted pass updates the state according to that opportunity’s pass rule. A tool decision returns the authorized court action, which the runtime submits to the engine’s `step` operation. Deterministic procedural actions can also pass through `step`. This separation binds a model’s accepted act to the opportunity that authorized it.

The maintained ADC proofs establish properties of validation, role authority, state preservation, phase progression, docket effects, decision confinement, replay, and selected terminal outcomes. Some theorems quantify over states satisfying explicit hypotheses. Computed theorems check concrete states and certificate examples. Their scope follows their statements and the encoded procedure. They establish no general claim about the truth of retrieved evidence or the quality of a model’s legal interpretation [15].

The replay certificate distinguishes deterministic steps from opportunity decisions. A deterministic transition records its court action. An opportunity pass records the decision request. An opportunity tool transition records both that request and the executed action. Verification repeats the authorization check, requires its resulting action to match the recorded action, executes the transition, and compares the final state with the certificate’s claim and the saved case state. Evidence-byte custody and the historical truth of sources require examination of the accompanying record.

2 The Market Proposition and Case Setup

The submitted example asks whether Israel invaded Syria in 2024 under the resolution conditions of a Polymarket market. The operative condition requires Israel to commence a military offensive intended to establish control over any portion of Syria between September 12 and December 31, 2024, at 11:59 p.m. Eastern Time. The market counts the Golan Heights as Israeli territory. Its permitted sources include official confirmation by Syria, Israel, the United Nations, or a permanent member of the UN Security Council, as well as a consensus of credible reporting [16].

The 1974 Disengagement Agreement defines an area of separation between Line A and Line B, with the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force (UNDOF) stationed in that area. It places Israeli forces west of Line A, with a separate Line A-1 in the Quneitra area, and Syrian forces east of Line B. It places territory east of Line A under Syrian administration [17]. Those line references describe the deployment locations discussed in the case. The market’s Golan Heights exclusion remains a separate term that the parties must apply to the reported locations.

The initial document contains both those rules and the supplied rationale for Polymarket’s Yes resolution. That rationale connects the reported December 8 arrival of Israeli forces at the Syrian summit of Mount Hermon with Benjamin Netanyahu’s December 17 statement that forces would remain until an arrangement guaranteed Israel’s security. It also distinguishes the Syrian peak from the Golan Heights. Both lawyers therefore begin with an account favoring Yes already present. The proceeding tests the advocates’ and court’s handling of that supplied account and any subsequently developed evidence.

The ADC run uses fresh participant sessions and receives none of the earlier ARB filings, work notes, or verdict. Both runs use the same proposition, initial document, lawyer model configuration, enabled search, installed pool, and 25-minute turn timeouts. The ADC scenario permits up to 500 autopilot turns. ADC uses its required minimum of six concurring votes, approved by the operator for the nine-member jury. It retains its default judge, clerk, voir dire, policies, and checked-in prompts [23, input settings and generated scenario]. Procedural differences and fresh model responses prevent attribution of any difference between the runs to ADC alone.

2.1 Record, quotations, and scope

The retained run is `ex04-20260919-04`. It began on September 19, 2026, at 14:32:57 UTC and completed at 16:36:36 UTC. References to numbered events identify rows in its event database. Those rows include reads, rejected attempts, and bookkeeping as well as accepted court actions. The replay certificate contains the accepted state transitions. The final state identifies the filed exhibits, jury, votes, verdict, and judgment. Participant process logs record tool calls and their returned results. These different records support different claims: an attempted call establishes what an agent tried, while an accepted event establishes what entered the proceeding.

Quoted work notes are the lawyers’ submitted, higher-level accounts of their assessments and planned acts. They are role-private notes retained for monitoring and later analysis. Court filings provide the arguments presented to the other participants. This report labels notes and filings separately. A note reports the lawyer’s stated assessment at that time. Subsequent tool activity and filed material establish whether the proposed work occurred.

The account follows the completed proceeding and evaluates the reasoning that appears in its record. It does not conduct a second historical investigation or add evidence to the jury’s record. The geographic explanation above supplies background for readers. The appendices reproduce the full final charge and all eight accepted vote explanations so that readers can compare the analysis with the decisions.

The run began from source revision `87de350`, with executables built from unchanged runtime source at `dbde6f0`. A separate Pi court-submission error limit was implemented while the case was running. The running processes retained their original implementation and limits. This distinction explains the prolonged malformed-call episode described below.

3 The ADC Proceeding

The case began at 14:32 UTC on September 19, 2026. All times for the proceeding are UTC. The defendant read the market-rules attachment and declined the optional Rule 12 motion. Its reason distinguished pleading sufficiency from disputed proof:

Any disagreement concerns proof, not standing, ripeness, mootness, or pleading sufficiency.

Its answer admitted the governing market criteria, the present dispute, and the Tribunal’s authority to issue a declaration. It denied the compound proposition and required the plaintiff to prove the defined act, intent, location, timing, and source conditions. It treated the supplied marketplace resolution as an assertion requiring evidence [23, events 1–3].

The court selected jury trial and advanced the case to pretrial. The plaintiff inspected the initial attachment and prepared disclosures identifying public declarants and institutional custodians as potential sources. Its work note distinguished the supplied rationale from independent proof and identified zero monetary damages [23, events 4–6 and plaintiff work notes at 14:33:51–14:34:10].

3.1 The plaintiff’s source collection and technical report

Both parties completed initial disclosures before the plaintiff began its technical-report research at 14:34.

The plaintiff’s first research note, at 14:34:59, identified the initial evidentiary problem:

the current record is insufficient for a reliable technical finding because file-0001 merely recites a market rationale. I will research and preserve primary/official and independent contemporaneous sources addressing four checks: qualifying dates, forces crossing into territory outside the deemed-Israeli Golan, offensive conduct/control, and expressed intent/duration.

The next research calls followed those checks. The first search requested official UN material, Israeli government or military statements, contemporary Reuters, AP, and BBC reporting, and an official Syrian response. Later searches targeted Netanyahu’s December 17 statement, the description of the measures as temporary, official video, and maps locating the summit relative to the Golan.

Search results included leads that counsel did not import. The registered files and exhibits identify which sources entered the proceeding.

The plaintiff’s first download script used a Python command unavailable in the container. A subsequent attempt used Python 3 but lacked the requested third-party HTTP module. It then used the standard library to download documents. A proposed Python PDF package could not be installed through the unavailable package tool. The lawyer installed Poppler through the container’s package manager and used `pdftotext` to extract the official PDFs. Direct access to the AP article returned HTTP 403, while its PBS republication supplied the report.

The plaintiff also inspected UN briefing pages and searched for official maps. Its attempted YouTube transcript extraction failed [23, plaintiff tool log and work notes at 14:34:59 and 14:41:52].

Four imports supplied the factual sources: Syria’s December 9 letter, Israel’s letter of the same date, UNDOF’s December 13 statement, and the AP/PBS article of December 17 [18, 19, 20, 21]. The lawyer retained source identifiers, URLs, and retrieval dates and marked the unrelated part omitted from the AP capture. The two diplomatic letters provided opposing governments’ accounts of the same deployment. Israel acknowledged deployment east of Line A while describing its measures as limited, temporary, and defensive. UNDOF’s statement supplied observations of increased movement and continued presence in the area of separation. The AP report supplied the claimed summit location beyond the Israel-held Golan and the reported retention and fortification statements [23, events 9–12, files 0002–0005].

The plaintiff imported its analysis as `file-0006` and filed TR-P1 at 14:46. The report found the proposition supported under preponderance, distinguishing source observations from its conclusions about offensive character and intent. Its central response to Israel’s account was:

Israel’s description of the operation as defensive and temporary bears on motive and duration, but does not negate an intent to exercise control in the meantime.

The report treated the reported movement, retention, fortification, and conditions for withdrawal as evidence of control intent. It identified geographic terminology as a limitation and relied on AP’s reported summit location. It acknowledged that it had conducted no independent coordinate measurement, witness interview, or audiovisual authentication. Its conclusion about the sources’ combined force remained the plaintiff’s position for examination by the defense and court [23, events 13–15 and file 0006].

3.2 The defense’s distinction between purpose and means

The defense filed TR-D1 at 14:49 after reading the imported text and obtaining the two official PDFs. It accepted entry east of Line A, continued presence at multiple positions, and substantial evidence of a later fortified hold at the Syrian summit. It disputed the inference that Israel commenced an offensive whose objective was territorial control. Its report treated temporary possession as a possible means of responding to a security emergency and relied on Israel’s contemporaneous account of that purpose. It expressly declined to make permanent annexation an element of the market definition [23, events 16–22 and file 0007].

The defense’s first PDF read used ADC’s text-file tool, which rejected the extension. The lawyer then used file access and local extraction. It independently downloaded the two official PDFs from their recorded UN locations, compared the bytes with the court’s file metadata, and used Poppler to read their text. The source audit therefore relied on the documents’ contents and retained copies, as well as the plaintiff’s descriptions.

The defense’s searches and source-checking calls concentrated on the contemporary temporary-and-defensive explanation and UN accounts of the security breakdown. It sought Israeli government material and UN briefings as well as the already imported UNDOF statement. Its filed report nevertheless relied on the shared four substantive sources. The retained search activity establishes independent inquiry into the opposing theory, while the evidence offered at trial establishes a largely shared documentary basis.

At 14:46:19, the defense’s work note stated the planned distinction:

The defense report should not deny observed deployments; it should audit whether those sources separately prove the conjunctive market terms ‘military offensive’ and ‘intended to establish control,’ while preserving Israel’s contemporaneous limited/temporary/defensive account and source/geography limitations.

The filed report followed that plan. It assigned separate roles to direct observation, an interested government’s characterization, secondary reporting, and the analyst’s inference. For UNDOF, it emphasized that a treaty violation could follow from prohibited military presence without resolving the additional market criteria.

The defense identified the consequence of the competing interpretation:

if “intended to establish control” includes any intended temporary security possession and “offensive” includes an unopposed protective deployment, plaintiff’s conclusion is substantially supported.

This concession narrowed the dispute. The parties substantially agreed on deployment and the evidence of later ground-holding, while assigning different significance to defensive purpose, temporary duration, and later fortification. The defense also separated a breach of the disengagement agreement from satisfaction of the market’s terms. Its report treated the absence of operational orders, independent coordinates, and additional imported reporting as limits on the proposed inference [23, file 0007, sections 3–7].

3.3 Interrogatories and the remaining factual dispute

Each side served five interrogatories, and both answered without objections. The plaintiff identified December 7–8 as the inferred commencement period, while acknowledging unknown participating units, exact coordinates, and operational orders. It identified no specific strike linked to taking a ground position and no established ground combat at the summit. Its answer explained why the December 17 evidence bore on earlier intent: the occupation and leadership statements concerned what it characterized as one continuing operation, with no evidence of an intervening change of plan. It also confined its source claim to official confirmation with AP corroboration, acknowledging that the imported record contained no multi-outlet reporting consensus [23, events 24–26].

The plaintiff’s discovery plan sought the defense’s definitions, disputed facts, geographic position, source objections, and evidence of the protective purpose. The defense’s plan sought the operational basis for calling the entry an offensive, intent at commencement, the location outside the Golan exclusion, the permitted-source route, and the treatment of Israel’s contrary account. These questions required the lawyers to identify what each inference depended on.

The plaintiff’s note before answering illustrates the resulting discipline:

the exact unit, coordinates, and operational order are unknown; commencement was Dec 7–8; plaintiff does not rely on shelling alone; the clearest qualifying location is the Syrian Mount Hermon summit; official-source confirmation is the primary source route, not a claimed imported reporting consensus

The answer distinguished identified evidence from desirable additional proof. It also kept the Syrian letter’s reference to shelling from becoming unsupported evidence of a particular ground-seizure operation.

The defense’s answers accepted the reported summit location and identified no contrary geographic source. It admitted that, by December 17, Israeli forces exercised “de facto interim military possession/control” over at least that position. It maintained that establishing territorial control had to be an objective at commencement and that tactical possession could serve a different objective. It also acknowledged that an unopposed operation could constitute an offensive and that temporary control could satisfy the definition. Both advocates therefore had to address the relation between the reported conduct and the operation’s purpose, with the same absence of internal orders [23, event 27].

3.4 Document production and source completeness

Each party served eight production requests directed to the available proof: source captures, original leadership statements, operational plans, visual or geographic material, occupation dates, and factual inputs to the technical reports. The defense requested the complete source behind the plaintiff’s AP excerpt. The plaintiff responded by retrieving the full PBS HTML page and importing it with response metadata and the filed excerpt as `file-0008`. The package identifies its retrieval during discovery, after preparation of the excerpt. It permits comparison with that later page capture without establishing what the website returned at every earlier retrieval [23, events 28–29 and 38, file 0008].

The plaintiff completed its itemized response at 15:03, listing seven produced files. It reported no separate video, official transcript, operational order, map, or coordinate dataset in its possession. It also reported no document establishing whether the decision to hold or fortify the summit preceded December 17 or changed after commencement. The response left the plaintiff’s case dependent on the official representations, UNDOF observations, AP account, and the inference of continuity already stated in its interrogatory answers [23, event 49].

The defense imported its retained factual research as `file-0009`: downloaded official PDFs, extracted text, the UNDOF page capture, and a methods manifest. Its written response, accepted at 15:10, listed nine produced files. It identified no additional operational order, original leadership recording, map, or contrary factual source and reserved unfiled attorney mental impressions under a narrow work-product objection. The response stated that it withheld no responsive factual material. Discovery had added the source packages and explicit accounts of the parties’ missing evidence while preserving their disagreement about the inference from the available record [23, events 67 and 73, file 0009].

3.5 Admissions of conduct and limits on proof

The parties admitted every request in the opposing party’s set, with qualifications preserving the disputed inferences. The plaintiff’s answers to eighteen requests acknowledged the missing orders, combat evidence, coordinates, precise dates, original recordings, and reporting consensus. Its qualifications distinguished those gaps from the circumstantial case. For example, it admitted having no document fixing the date of the hold or fortification decision, adding that the absence did not establish that the decision arose only after commencement [23, events 79 and 82].

The defense answered twelve requests, admitting source authenticity, deployment, continued presence, and reported summit control. It admitted the absence of evidence showing a material change of purpose but disputed the inference that purpose therefore remained unchanged. Its answer to the eleventh request stated:

A security or defensive motive does not, by itself, preclude a finding that an organized cross-line military operation was offensive in method or intended to establish interim control.

The defense also admitted that an unopposed, temporary operation could satisfy the defined proposition. It reserved the question whether the evidence established those features for this operation at commencement. The admissions therefore reduced disputes about source authenticity and physical conduct while leaving the ultimate inference for adjudication [23, events 76 and 86].

3.6 The decisions to proceed to trial

Both parties declined Rule 37 discovery motions. They identified substantive answers, completed production, and admissions, with no concrete unresolved discovery failure. Both also declined Rule 56 summary-judgment motions. The plaintiff acknowledged that Israel’s temporary-and-defensive account supplied contrary circumstantial evidence that a jury could weigh. The defense acknowledged competing reasonable inferences from the physical chronology. Each side therefore chose to present the remaining classification and intent questions at trial [23, events 87–90].

The judge’s pretrial order carried forward the agreed chronology, source authenticity, evidentiary gaps, and qualifications on the admissions. It identified nine anticipated exhibits, subject to trial objections beyond the authenticity questions already resolved. It reserved the weight of the technical reports and listed the remaining issues: offensive character, intent at commencement, continuity of the operation, source weight, and satisfaction of the proposition as a whole. The court entered the order at 15:17 and advanced to trial and jury selection [23, events 91–94].

3.7 Candidate questionnaires

ADC assembled thirteen initial candidates for the nine-member jury. Some candidate-configuration checks received upstream rate-limit responses and followed the configured retries. The first two questionnaires, from Muse Glimmer 30B and GLM 4.7, supplied affirmative assurances of attention, impartiality, and compliance with instructions. GPT-4.1 Nano ended its turn by asking whether to retrieve more material or proceed, without submitting the questionnaire. ADC recorded the incomplete opportunity and replaced it with Qwen3 VL 30B A3B Instruct. GPT-4o, DeepSeek Chat, Kimi K2.5, Qwen3.5 35B A3B, and Qwen3 Coder Next completed their questionnaires [23, events 95–122 and juror process logs].

Seed 2.0 Lite made four malformed JSON-string calls before submitting a questionnaire containing short Yes or No answers. Qwen3 VL 8B Instruct, Qwen3 30B A3B, and Qwen3 Max Thinking also completed questionnaires. Qwen Plus returned an empty tool name, after which the provider rejected its request history with HTTP 400. ADC replaced it with Mistral Small 3.2 [23, events 123–134 and juror process logs].

3.8 Questionnaire failures and replacement candidates

Three candidates failed to complete selection opportunities, and ADC added three replacements. The final candidate set contained sixteen identities.

Table 1: Candidate identities and final disposition. Model identifiers omit the common OpenRouter prefix. The recorded status `timed_out` also covers an agent process that exits before submitting its required act.

ID	Model	Disposition
J1	meta/muse-glimmer-30b	Sworn. Defendant vote.
J2	z-ai/glm-4.7	Sworn. Plaintiff vote.
J3	openai/gpt-4.1-nano	Exited without questionnaire.
J4	openai/gpt-4o-2024-11-20	Sworn. Plaintiff vote.
J5	deepseek/deepseek-chat	Sworn. Exited without verdict vote.
J6	moonshotai/kimi-k2.5	Sworn. Plaintiff vote.
J7	qwen/qwen3.5-35b-a3b	Defense peremptory strike.

ID	Model	Disposition
J8	qwen/qwen3-coder-next	Sworn. Plaintiff vote.
J9	bytedance-seed/seed-2.0-lite	Plaintiff peremptory strike.
J10	qwen/qwen3-v1-8b-instruct	Excused for cause.
J11	qwen/qwen3-30b-a3b	Sworn. Plaintiff vote.
J12	qwen/qwen3-max-thinking	Sworn. Plaintiff vote.
J13	qwen/qwen-plus-2025-07-28	Empty tool name, then provider error.
J14	qwen/qwen3-v1-30b-a3b-instruct	Deadline after malformed calls.
J15	mistralai/mistral-small-3.2-24b-instruct	Replacement. Sworn. Plaintiff vote.
J16	google/gemini-3-flash-preview	Replacement. Completed voir dire, unseated.

J14 repeatedly omitted a closing brace from its JSON-encoded tool arguments. Pi rejected 251 malformed calls before the 25-minute deadline. The calls failed inside the adapter, before ADC could accept or reject a submitted decision. ADC’s three-attempt decision allowance therefore did not count them. Repeated syntactic failure could continue until the opportunity expired [23, J14 process log and events 133–136].

ADC replaced J14 with J16 at 15:49:43. J15 and J16 completed their questionnaires at 15:49:57 and 15:50:05. The recorded failures establish behavior of these configurations in this case. They provide no estimate of how often another request to the same model would succeed.

The eight-question standard questionnaire asked about attention, impartiality, hardships, prior knowledge, adherence to instructions, evidence assessment, remedies, and other possible sources of bias. Some wording concerned health, caregiving, employment, and relationships. The models answered those questions as assigned jurors. Such answers record compliance with the questionnaire and claimed willingness to follow instructions. They provide limited evidence about model-specific tendencies, which the case-specific questions exposed more directly.

3.9 The lawyers’ different questioning choices

The plaintiff passed on every individualized follow-up opportunity. Its reasons described the completed questionnaire answers as unequivocal and further inquiry as repetitive. For J10, the plaintiff wrote that the answers affirmed attention, impartiality, use of admitted evidence, and absence of a relevant bias. It concluded: “Further inquiry would duplicate the questionnaire” [23, events 142–181].

The defendant asked one question of each of the thirteen candidates who completed the questionnaire. Its submitted notes explained a different assessment of the same affirmative answers. At 15:58:11 it wrote:

J1 gave uniformly unequivocal impartiality answers and disclosed no hardship, prior knowledge, relationship, or fixed preference. One narrow follow-up is still useful because the case concerns politically charged conduct: test whether J1 can separate personal moral/political views from the exact proposition and hold Plaintiff to proof of every required part without treating admitted troop presence as automatic proof.

For J2, the defense chose a question about an evenly balanced record. For J4, it chose source neutrality. For J5, it chose the relation between later evidence and earlier intent. The sequence shows

a deliberate distribution of questions across the disputed inference, source assessment, burden, and remedy. The judge allowed every proposed question [23, voir dire exchanges vdq-1–vdq-13].

Table 2: Defense follow-up questions and the distinction each tested.

ID	Subject	Recorded answer or consequence
J1	Political views and separate elements	Agreed to require proof of offensive character and commencement intent.
J2	Evenly balanced inferences	Agreed that the defendant bears no burden to prove another explanation.
J4	Government and institutional sources	Agreed to assess content and supporting detail without automatic preference.
J5	Later evidence of original purpose	Agreed to assume neither continuity nor change.
J6	Treaty violation and market criteria	Agreed to decide offensive method and control intent separately.
J7	Defensive motive and control	Volunteered a conditional, plaintiff-favorable framework. Later struck.
J8	Inference and speculation	Agreed to require an evidence-based inference meeting preponderance.
J9	Ordinary meaning of invasion	Agreed to apply the defined proposition. Later struck.
J10	Missing defense witnesses or orders	Announced a merits conclusion. Later excused for cause.
J11	Views about Israel, Syria, and the UN	Reported no prior source bias.
J12	Declaratory relief and punishment	Agreed to decide the proposition without punitive use of the verdict.
J15	Temporary or unopposed operations	Agreed to avoid categorical assumptions in either direction.
J16	Separate required elements	Agreed that failure on one required part defeats the proposition.

The defense’s question to J2 stated the consequence of equal evidentiary weight:

If, after fairly considering all admitted evidence, you find the competing inferences about offensive character or intent are evenly balanced, can you follow the preponderance instruction and find that the plaintiff did not carry its burden, without requiring the defendant to prove a different explanation?

J2 answered that the plaintiff would have failed to carry the burden and that the defendant need not prove another explanation. The judge allowed the question because it tested adherence to the standard without asking the juror to commit to a verdict on particular evidence. J2 later voted for the plaintiff. The sequence separates an undertaking to apply the burden from a later judgment about which inference carries more weight.

The J5 exchange isolated a point that later divided the voting jurors. The question asked whether the candidate could consider statements and conduct occurring days after commencement without assuming either continuity or change of purpose. J5 answered:

Yes, I can weigh later evidence for its value without automatically assuming continuity or change in the original purpose. I will evaluate each piece of evidence independently, considering the context and timing, to determine its relevance and reliability.

The answer addressed the correct issue, but J5 later failed to submit a verdict. Successful qualification responses therefore did not establish reliable completion of the voting task.

3.10 J10's merits conclusion and the cause challenge

J10's follow-up answer supplied the clearest contrast between a general promise of impartiality and a case-specific response. The defense asked whether a documentary case could be assessed without holding the absence of a defense witness or operational order against the defendant. J10 began with an affirmative answer, then added:

These actions constitute an organized military operation with the intent to maintain control pending a security arrangement, which satisfies the market's definition of a military offensive. The absence of direct operational orders or statements from Israeli officials does not negate this inference, as the conduct itself, combined with leadership directives and public statements, provides sufficient circumstantial support for the plaintiff's claim.

The answer evaluated the merits before trial. It used present-tense conclusions about both disputed elements and the sufficiency of the plaintiff's proof.

The plaintiff's note at 16:10:38 recognized the favorable assessment and took the position that J10 could still reconsider:

J10 went beyond the question and stated a preliminary merits view favorable to plaintiff, but first expressly affirmed that the burden remains on plaintiff and that the absent defense witness/internal order would not be held against defendant; the response does not establish an inability to reconsider after admitted evidence and instructions. No plaintiff cause challenge is warranted. Preserve J10 if possible; likely defense challenge/strike target.

The plaintiff's subsequent pass repeated that position in court-facing form. Its note adds information about strategy: the lawyer wanted to retain a favorable candidate while distinguishing a preliminary view from a fixed disqualifying one.

The defense made a cause challenge at 16:12:46. Its preparation note distinguished J10 from J7, whose plaintiff-favorable answer remained conditional on the court's definitions:

J7 expressed a potentially plaintiff-favorable interpretive view but conditioned it on the court's definition and promised evidence-based evaluation; that is a peremptory consideration, not cause.

For J10, the filed challenge relied on the "unqualified present-tense findings" resolving the central issues. The judge granted it three seconds later:

J10 initially gave the standard questionnaire answers that they could be fair and follow instructions, but the later voir dire answer controls because it addressed this case directly and went beyond the question asked.

The ruling continued that J10’s statements resolved offensive character and intent at commencement before the jury received instructions and trial evidence in context [23, events 263, 277–278].

The defense’s follow-up elicited a merits commitment that led to J10’s excusal, despite the candidate’s prior assurance of impartiality. The record does not establish how J10 would have voted after trial or whether its exclusion changed the result.

3.11 Peremptory strikes and the sworn panel

The plaintiff struck J9 at 16:13:39. J9 had agreed to set aside an ordinary meaning of “invasion,” apply the defined proposition, and require separate proof of offensive character and intent. The plaintiff’s stated reason was that J9 had adopted the defense’s framing “without the more open, evidence-sensitive elaboration shown by other candidates” about occupation, holding, and fortification [23, event 293].

This reason rested on a short answer that agreed to follow the governing test. The record supports a strategic preference for other responses, but supplies little evidence that J9 had prejudged the claim. A peremptory strike permitted the plaintiff to act on that preference without establishing cause.

The defense struck J7 at 16:14:02. J7 had described the cross-line movement, occupation, fortification, and security-conditioned stay as factual observations, then said that temporary military control might meet the definition. It contrasted that possibility with a definition requiring permanent annexation. The defense considered this formulation plaintiff-favorable because permanence was already unnecessary under the parties’ positions. It preferred candidates whose answers gave general burden and source commitments without that additional interpretive framing [23, event 294 and defense notes at 16:13:45–16:13:56].

At 16:14:04 the court swore J1, J2, J4, J5, J6, J8, J11, J12, and J15. J16 had completed the questionnaire and follow-up but was outside that nine-member panel. Its recorded disposition was `excused_after_voir_dire`. Counsel’s actions therefore removed two candidates by strategic choice and one for cause. The selection failures had already removed three others. The final panel contained nine model identifiers, including three Qwen configurations. Model-name diversity coexisted with a common intermediary, common generic persona, shared case record, and common instructions.

4 Trial Presentation and Evidence

4.1 Openings on an agreed physical chronology

The plaintiff opened at 16:14:30 with the burden, the defined proposition, and a chronology drawn from the two official letters, UNDOF, and AP. It then separated the disputed classification from possible additional requirements:

An operation may be offensive in method even if unopposed and motivated by security; ground combat is not an element.

Its opening also treated interim control as an intended means of securing the border. It disclosed the missing internal order, unit list, independent coordinates, and summit combat evidence, while arguing that the combined record outweighed those gaps [23, event 298].

The defense opened at 16:15:25 by accepting the cross-line movement, continued positions, later summit control, fortification, and retention statement. That choice preserved consistency with discovery and directed the dispute to the inferences:

Plaintiff must prove, by a preponderance, that Israel commenced a military offensive and that establishing control over qualifying Syrian territory was an objective when that operation commenced.

The defense then gave the December 9 Israeli account greater weight as evidence of purpose near commencement, while accepting the AP report as substantial evidence of the later situation. It described the missing date of the hold-and-fortify decision as an unresolved link between those two periods [23, event 299].

Both openings used the same physical chronology. The plaintiff used sustained conduct to infer a continuing objective. The defense used the timing and content of the contemporary security account to resist that inference. The relevant difference concerned evidentiary weight and the meaning of the specified objective.

4.2 Trial theories and enforced text limits

ADC gives counsel a trial-theory submission before the exhibit sequence. The plaintiff first submitted 6,484 characters against a 4,000-character limit. The engine rejected that attempt at event 301, and the plaintiff’s shorter version was accepted at event 302, at 16:17:57. The defense later submitted 5,377 characters, received the same limit error, and filed an accepted shorter theory at 16:22:19 [23, events 301–302 and 312–313].

The accepted plaintiff theory tied the official-source route to combined evidence and stated that it did not claim a reporting consensus from one article. It invoked the defense’s admissions to establish date, action, and location, then argued that intentional position-taking followed by holding and fortification supported control intent at commencement. The defense’s shorter theory preserved the distinction between directly established conduct and the proposed inference. It stated:

Continuous physical deployment can coexist with evolving purpose. Plaintiff must make original control intent more likely than not; Defendant need not prove another plan.

4.3 The eight exhibits and their uses

The plaintiff offered six exhibits between 16:18:14 and 16:19:09. The defense offered two between 16:22:42 and 16:23:00. All eight offers entered the docket with admitted status. The original market-rules attachment, `file-0001`, remained the source of the criteria and supplied background, but neither party offered it as factual trial proof.

Table 3: Trial exhibits and the uses assigned by counsel.

Exhibit	Case file and material	Evidentiary use and limit
PX-1	0002: Syria’s UN letter	Official account of incursions and attacks. Interested characterization and limited operational detail.
PX-2	0003: Israel’s UN letter	Admitted deployment east of Line A and the contemporaneous protective explanation. Interested account of purpose.
PX-3	0004: UNDOF statement	Observed movements, continued presence, security breakdown, and treaty-violation notice. No direct finding of the disputed intent.

Exhibit	Case file and material	Evidentiary use and limit
PX-4	0005: AP/PBS excerpt	Summit geography, later hold, fortification, and security-conditioned retention. One secondary report.
PX-5	0008: PBS source package	Complete later page capture and retrieval information for PX-4. Publication provenance.
PX-6	0006: TR-P1	Plaintiff’s chronology and inference analysis. Advocate-prepared synthesis of the sources.
DX-1	0007: TR-D1	Defense’s source and element analysis, including competing interpretations.
DX-2	0009: defense source package	Downloads, extracted text, and methods supporting TR-D1. Source provenance and reproducibility.

The plaintiff offered Israel’s letter as part of its own case, describing it as both an admission of deployment and the contrary temporary-and-defensive explanation. That choice placed the principal adverse account in the plaintiff’s exhibit sequence. Its analysis depended on distinguishing the security motive from the means used to pursue that motive.

The defense’s note before offering DX-1 specified its intended status:

Its value is the transparent element-by-element source comparison and sensitivity analysis; the underlying primary materials are already PX-1 through PX-4.

Its next note described DX-2 as a reproducibility package and disclaimed an additional inference about operational intent from the package itself. The defense then rested because further offers would repeat the existing record [23, notes at 16:22:34–16:23:15].

The `offer_exhibit` action accepts an `admitted` Boolean from the lawyer, defaulting to true. It checks the actor, phase, applicable exhibit limit, and file identifier, then records the requested status. Both lawyers supplied true. This record contains no separate judicial determination admitting each exhibit and no contested exclusion hearing [8, `offer_exhibit`]. References to an admitted exhibit describe the recorded procedural status. Source authenticity had been addressed in discovery, but the report cannot infer an unrecorded judicial review of hearsay, foundation, or every other possible objection.

4.4 Rebuttal and the limits of a conditional admission

The plaintiff’s rebuttal theory at 16:24:29 answered the defense’s source and inference objections. It argued that circumstantial proof could combine observations from several authorized sources and that a single official document need not recite the ultimate proposition. It also relied on an admission that an unopposed, temporary operation crossing a line to take, hold, and fortify positions could satisfy the market’s criteria.

The defense’s surrebuttal at 16:25:46 identified a logical limit on that admission:

The admission says an organized operation crossing a line to take, hold, and fortify foreign positions can constitute the defined proposition even if unopposed and temporary. It expressly does not admit that every such operation necessarily qualifies or that this operation’s offensive character and commencement intent are established.

The disputed admission removed categorical defenses based on temporariness or lack of opposition. It left the inference about this operation for decision. The plaintiff still needed to show why the observed combination supported the required finding in this case.

The defense also answered the plaintiff's reliance on physical continuity:

PX-2 and PX-3 show uninterrupted deployment and presence; they do not show when the summit hold-and-fortify decision was made. PX-4's report of a direction to establish and fortify a presence proves purpose by 17 December. It does not answer whether that direction implemented a 7–8 December objective or reflected a later development.

The plaintiff's answer was that the sequence of taking positions, remaining, controlling, and fortifying supplied affirmative continuity evidence. Both sides rested their rebuttal evidence opportunities without adding exhibits [23, events 319–325].

5 Instructions, Closings, and Judgment

5.1 Compatible proposed instructions

The plaintiff proposed PI-1 at 16:26:23, and the defense proposed DI-1 at 16:27:05. Both required an organized military operation, offensive method, control intent at commencement, qualifying Syrian territory, the specified period, and preponderance. Both permitted temporary control and unopposed operations. Both treated a defensive motive as relevant without making it decisive.

The defense's submitted note described PI-1 as "substantially balanced" and said that its own proposal should emphasize burden allocation, equal evidentiary weight, and source assessment. DI-1 included:

Defendant need not prove a temporary protective purpose, a later change of purpose, or a contrary operational plan, and you may not shift the burden because Defendant offered no witness or internal order.

Each lawyer passed on the opportunity to object to the other's instruction. The defense explained that the proposals were compatible and that a strategic preference in wording did not identify an instructional error [23, events 327–330 and notes at 16:26:43–16:27:29].

Counsel had converged on a neutral formulation while continuing to disagree about the proof. The defense preserved its narrower attention to commencement intent without requiring combat or annexation. The plaintiff accepted separate findings and a rule against automatically inferring continuity from later conduct.

5.2 The plaintiff's chronology and the defense's burden argument

The plaintiff closed at 16:28:43 by organizing its case around December 7–9, December 13, and December 17. These dates linked initial movement, continued presence, and the later fortified hold. Its most compact statement of the relationship between motive and intent was:

Security was the motive; establishing interim control was the means.

It argued that a condition-bound intention to retain positions still constituted intended control. It acknowledged the missing internal orders and other operational details, but treated them as unnecessary to the circumstantial inference.

The plaintiff's note before closing identified the planned use of admissions:

Closing should emphasize affirmative continuity rather than burden shifting, concede PX-2's security motive, and distinguish motive from method/means.

The filed closing followed that plan, but also repeated that the defendant possessed no evidence of changed purpose. The continuity argument relied on affirmative conduct and also assigned significance to the absence of a contrary account.

The defense closed at 16:30:33. It accepted the plaintiff's strongest exhibit as evidence of the later posture, then concentrated on the temporal inference:

There is no original plan proving it existed on December 7–8 and no change record proving it arose later. That is an evidentiary unknown.

It argued that the contemporary Israeli account supplied affirmative evidence of a protective response, while UNDOF confirmed movement and presence without identifying the control objective. Its treatment of missing operational detail also answered the plaintiff's argument that the missing items were unnecessary legal elements:

Evidence need not be legally required to affect weight.

An internal order need not be a required form of proof for its absence to limit what can be inferred from the available documents. The next question is how much weight the absence deserves relative to the affirmative chronology.

The plaintiff used its closing rebuttal at 16:31:28 to argue that the commencement evidence already included intentional position-taking:

Intentionally selecting, crossing to, and taking positions establishes an objective to exercise authority over those specific portions, even if the ultimate motive was protection and the expected duration was temporary.

It characterized later fortification as an increase in the strength and duration of control that could implement an existing objective. This was a more specific answer to the temporal objection than reliance on the absence of evidence of change alone. It tied the inference to the choice of positions at commencement and treated later conduct as corroboration [23, events 332–334].

5.3 The final charge

The judge settled the instructions at 16:31:32 and delivered them at 16:31:39. The charge required three findings: a military operation commenced within the period, offensive method, and an objective at commencement to establish authority or dominion over qualifying Syrian territory. It then stated:

You may also consider later conduct or later statements as circumstantial evidence about earlier intent or purpose. But do not automatically assume either that the earlier purpose stayed the same or that it changed.

The charge preserved temporary and conditional control, allowed unopposed operations, and required zero monetary damages. It directed jurors to assess source content, detail, corroboration, and context, with equal evidentiary weight on any required part resulting in a finding against demonstration [23, events 336–338].

The final charge incorporated both parties' principal agreed positions. It retained the plaintiff's control-as-authority formulation and the defense's attention to commencement and burden. It did

not repeat DI-1’s explicit statement that the defendant need not prove a changed purpose, although it placed the burden on the plaintiff throughout the stated test. It also left “offensive in method” for the jury to apply without a more detailed definition separating an offensive from an emergency armed deployment. The resulting instructions resolved some proposed categorical requirements while retaining interpretive work for each juror.

The source paragraph permitted official confirmation and a consensus of credible reporting “if such evidence is in the record.” The record contained one AP report, not an established reporting consensus. Counsel relied on official confirmation of core conduct and used AP for geography, fortification, and retention. The charge did not provide a separate element-by-element ruling on the status of AP-only details under that source rule. The jurors’ use of PX-4 therefore shows how they applied the combined record under this instruction, while leaving a source-rule question for further examination.

5.4 The dissent and the first majority vote

J1, Muse Glimmer 30B, voted for the defendant at 16:32:12 with medium confidence. Its explanation accepted the deployment, continued presence, qualifying summit geography, later control, and fortification. It then gave greater weight to the December 9 purpose account and to the absence of evidence dating the hold-and-fortify decision. Its central statement was:

Later fortification and retention evidence in file-0005 is probative of purpose by 17 December, not necessarily at commencement, and physical continuity is not necessarily continuity of purpose.

J1 described the plaintiff’s inference from an absence of evidence of change as speculative and found the evidence at best evenly balanced. It thus applied the defense’s temporal argument to the same facts the plaintiff relied on. The explanation identifies a disagreement about weight under the instructed burden, rather than a dispute about whether the documented deployment occurred [23, event 343].

J2, GLM 4.7, voted for the plaintiff at 16:32:39 with medium confidence. Its longer explanation worked through offensive character, initial position-taking, continued deployment, later fortification, and the protective explanation. It wrote:

Physical continuity supports purpose continuity; the defense’s suggestion that the fortification-and-retention decision developed later is a possibility without evidence.

It also repeated the plaintiff’s “Security was the motive” formulation. J2 acknowledged uncertainty from the missing commencement orders while finding the inference more likely than not [23, event 347].

The two votes expose the decisive evidentiary disagreement. J1 treated the unresolved timing of the later decision and the contemporary protective explanation as enough to keep the balance even. J2 treated deliberate initial position-taking and the continuous sequence as sufficient affirmative support for original control intent. Both accepted that later evidence could bear on earlier intent. They assigned it different weight.

J2 introduced four propositions as established “by official admission,” but two relied on the AP/PBS account of the summit and retention statement. The defendant admitted the reported facts during discovery, yet AP remained the reporting source. The report distinguishes a party’s admission in this model proceeding from an official state’s own confirmation. Collapsing those uses of “admission” would overstate the origin of the evidence.

5.5 The remaining votes and J5’s failure

J4, GPT-4o, voted for the plaintiff with high confidence at 16:32:43. Its entire explanation occupied two sentences:

Plaintiff’s case supports the inference of intent to establish temporary control by preponderance of the evidence explained in PX-4’s context. Defensive motive is credible but does not negate this.

The explanation identifies the preferred inference and the adverse motive evidence. It gives little detail about the temporal issue or offensive method. Its high confidence therefore accompanies a short public justification.

J5, DeepSeek Chat, then obtained its deliberation opportunity but ended with procedural advice about reviewing evidence and submitting a decision. It asked whether help was needed with review or drafting. It submitted no vote. ADC recorded that its process had exited before completing the opportunity and marked the juror failed at 16:32:52 [23, events 349–350 and J5 deliberation log]. Its failure counts as neither support for a party nor an abstention chosen through a merits decision.

J6, Kimi K2.5, voted for the plaintiff at 16:33:59 with medium confidence. It tied offensive method to the combination of crossing, taking positions, holding, summit occupation, and fortification. On intent, it cited continuity, rapid development of the hold, and absence of evidence of a material change. It ended with a temporal qualification:

Under the preponderance standard, the proposition is more likely true than not, though the inference from December 17 back to commencement is not without uncertainty.

J8, Qwen3 Coder Next, voted for the plaintiff with high confidence at 16:34:49. Its explanation emphasized sustained position-taking, fortification, and condition-bound retention, treating the protective explanation as evidence of motive compatible with intended control. J11, Qwen3 30B A3B, voted the same way with high confidence at 16:35:02. J11’s short explanation said that the admitted physical facts “directly satisfy the proposition’s requirements.” That description compresses the disputed inference. The parties and final charge had required a finding about intent at commencement, which those facts supported circumstantially.

J12, Qwen3 Max Thinking, voted for the plaintiff with high confidence at 16:36:02. Its explanation named all four substantive sources and connected the later evidence to initial intent. It stated that the short interval and absence of evidence of purpose change supported intended interim control from the outset. Like J2 and J6, it adopted continuity as an inference from the whole sequence. Its use of the phrase “especially given no evidence of purpose change” preserves the same question about how much evidentiary weight can be assigned to an unresolved alternative.

J15, Mistral Small 3.2, first submitted a plaintiff vote with one dollar in damages at 16:36:21. ADC rejected it with “declaratory-only claim requires zero damages.” The juror submitted the same merits explanation with zero damages at 16:36:24. The accepted vote, at medium confidence, relied on position-taking, duration, control, fortification, conditional retention, and the absence of evidence of changed purpose [23, events 360–361]. The record therefore contains nine vote attempts and eight accepted votes.

5.6 Verdict and judgment

The accepted tally was seven votes for the plaintiff and one for the defendant. The case state retained a requirement of six concurring votes. All eight accepted votes were in round one, and the court entered judgment at 16:36:24. The unified run completed twelve seconds later with status `ok`,

phase `post_verdict`, and binary decision `demonstrated`. The judgment awarded zero damages [23, events 362–363 and final state].

The majority’s explanations support an account of temporary control as an intended means of meeting a security objective. The dissent preserves an alternative assessment under the same burden: later possession and fortification left the original objective insufficiently proved. The full explanations in the appendix permit examination of both positions and of the differences in their detail.

6 Evidence, Reasoning, and Procedural Limits

6.1 The contribution of discovery

Discovery converted broad disagreement into express admissions and qualified positions. The defense conceded the physical chronology, qualifying summit location, and later interim control. The plaintiff conceded missing internal orders, precise operational dates, coordinates, a strike-to-position link, original recordings, and a reporting consensus. Neither set of concessions decided the proposition. Together, they defined the evidence on which a jury could decide the remaining inference.

The two technical reports preceded interrogatories and admissions. Their early formulations therefore provide a point of comparison with the final arguments. TR-P1’s sensitivity analysis initially said that the result changed only if control required permanent annexation or the summit fell within the Golan exclusion. TR-D1 supplied a third position: temporary control could qualify while the evidence remained insufficient to establish that objective at commencement. Later plaintiff filings addressed that temporal position through initial position-taking and continuity. This sequence shows an argument becoming more specific in response to opposition.

The defense also refined its presentation. TR-D1 contrasted an offensive territorial-control operation with a protective deployment and emphasized the absence of documented combat or an assault plan. Interrogatory answers and admissions then made explicit that an unopposed operation could qualify, control could be temporary, and defensive motive did not dispose of the claim. The final defense position used missing operational detail as a limit on evidentiary weight and focused on the timing of the objective. The development avoided relying on a categorical requirement that the market definition did not contain.

The paper can identify these changes because reports, discovery responses, work notes, and trial filings remain available separately. A final verdict alone would omit the concessions that made the dispute narrower. It would also conceal the risk of overstating a conditional admission: the defense’s acknowledgment that a class of conduct could qualify was repeatedly used by the plaintiff as support for the conclusion that this instance did qualify.

6.2 Source diversity and dependence

The substantive source record comprised two opposing governments’ letters, a UN observer statement, and one AP report. These sources performed different evidentiary functions. The letters supplied official positions and admissions. UNDOF supplied reported observations of movement and continued presence, along with security context. AP supplied details about the summit’s location, later fortification, and the retention statement. Their disagreement about characterization was part of the evidence presented.

The source packages and technical reports increased inspectability without increasing the number of independent accounts of the events. The defense’s independent download of an official letter established access to the same document. It did not create another account of what happened.

Similarly, the later full PBS capture supported checking the filed excerpt against a complete page retrieved during discovery. It did not authenticate an original recording of the political statements or determine when the operational decision occurred.

The source rule requires care because the strongest geographical and later-purpose details came from AP. The plaintiff argued that official confirmation of core acts satisfied the permitted-source route and that AP added corroboration. The defense accepted the source’s publication and credited much of its content while contesting the inference. The judge’s charge permitted source assessment but did not state a detailed rule for combining an official account of deployment with news-only details of later control. The record supports a description of how the jury used that combination. It leaves room to question whether the instruction fully resolved the market’s source condition.

The initial attachment included Polymarket’s Yes resolution and rationale. Both advocates said that they would use it for the criteria rather than as independent historical proof, and neither offered it as a factual exhibit. Nevertheless, they had read a supplied answer favoring the plaintiff before researching. The record supports their stated evidentiary distinction and subsequent use of external sources. It cannot establish that the supplied outcome had no influence on their framing.

6.3 Commencement, continuity, and the unit of analysis

The dominant temporal question was whether the objective inferred from the December 17 posture existed when the operation began around December 7–8. The plaintiff treated the sequence as one continuous operation. The defense accepted continuous physical presence but disputed continuous purpose. This difference persisted from the technical reports through closings and into the votes.

The market period extended through December 31. A control-seeking operation commenced later within December could therefore raise a separate question even if the initial deployment had a different objective. Counsel concentrated on the original deployment and whether the later conduct disclosed its original purpose. Their filed arguments did not develop a distinct theory of a new qualifying offensive commencing on a later date. The record also lacked the order or precise decision date that would have supported such a separate theory. This is a limit of the case as litigated, not a finding that a later theory would succeed.

The jury charge used “offensive in method” and “actual authority or dominion” to express the operative criteria. Those terms gave both sides a way to separate motive, conduct, and control. The record contains no measured operational threshold for when purposeful military presence becomes an offensive method or when control incidental to a protective deployment becomes an objective to establish territorial authority. The majority inferred the threshold from the combined conduct. The dissent found the purpose evidence insufficient at commencement.

The most developed majority explanations gave affirmative reasons for their conclusions. They named intentional cross-line position-taking, continued occupation, fortification, and conditional withdrawal. Four jurors, J2, J6, J12, and J15, also relied on the absence of evidence of changed purpose. That absence can be considered alongside a supported continuity inference, but it cannot alone transfer the burden to the defendant. J1’s dissent and the defense’s closing identify the precise risk. The explanations permit examination of it, while leaving the report without a controlled test of whether a different instruction would change a vote.

6.4 Vote explanation and access to earlier ballots

The explanations ranged from a source-by-source and temporal analysis to two-sentence conclusions. Four plaintiff voters reported high confidence and three reported medium confidence. The dissent

reported medium confidence. Those labels describe the jurors’ own responses. Neither the model-pool scores nor this case calibrate them as probabilities of historical truth.

The votes were collected sequentially. The dedicated deliberation prompt supplied the trial transcript and instructions and described round one as having no prior ballot round. Its prior-ballot section adds earlier-round results only after the first round [10]. The broader role-visible case response, however, retained public docket entries recording already-filed vote choices and confidence.

This distinction is observable in J2’s retained MCP output. Its full case response includes a docket entry reading “round=1 J1: vote=defendant damages=0.000000 confidence=medium.” The separate juror-vote and explanation arrays were redacted from the ordinary view. The full tool response still made the earlier choice available through the docket. Pi truncated long inline tool results and saved complete responses to files, so availability does not establish that the model read or used the specific entry [23, J2 deliberation output and role-visible state].

The run supplies individual votes under sequential execution with partial access to earlier ballot information. It supplies no basis for claiming fully isolated ballots or statistically independent judgments. Shared evidence, instructions, persona, intermediary, and overlapping model families supply additional reasons to distinguish model variety from independence.

6.5 Judicial activity and the meaning of formal checks

The judge performed identifiable work: selecting trial mode, entering the pretrial order, screening all thirteen follow-up questions, ruling on the cause challenge, empaneling the jury, settling and delivering instructions, and entering judgment. The pretrial order preserved the parties’ agreements and remaining disputes. The cause ruling relied on specific words in J10’s answer. The final charge reconciled compatible proposals while leaving the factual inference to the jury.

The proceeding used a documentary trial. Counsel named public declarants and institutions as sources, but the record contains no live testimony, witness examination, or subpoena-produced internal records. The two technical reports were prepared by the same model lawyers who advocated the competing outcomes. Their systematic structure made assumptions and source limits inspectable, but supplied no separate expert witness or independently tested expert method.

Lean’s role concerns the encoded procedure. It enforced opportunity authority, limits, the zero-damages requirement, and the recorded transition sequence. Its acceptance of an exhibit offer followed an API that lets counsel specify admission status. Its acceptance of a vote required valid fields and a permitted juror, while the explanation’s factual and inferential quality remained a subject for review.

7 Execution, Cost Records, and Verification

7.1 Repeated production opportunities and context growth

Production generated repeated opportunities to pass on unchanged files. ADC’s `updateCase` clears saved opportunity passes, so an accepted production makes remaining optional items available again [8, `updateCase` and `recordOpportunityPass`]. During production, counsel repeatedly encountered files they had already considered. The plaintiff first passed on the market attachment, then reconsidered the broad request for materials used in its report and produced the attachment.

At 15:00:53, the plaintiff’s submitted note explained the changed responsiveness decision:

Responsiveness reassessed under RFP 8’s broad ‘materials considered or relied on’ wording: although file-0001 is already shared and was used only for the governing test, it

was considered in preparing TR-P1.

That decision has an evidentiary explanation, but the repeated return of already-passed opportunities has a runtime explanation. The repeated passes increased interaction without adding new historical sources.

The lawyer sessions completed four context compactions. Pi reported approximately 923,000–928,000 tokens before those compactions and approximately 15,500–15,700 estimated tokens afterward. Compaction replaced earlier session content with model-produced summaries and allowed the lawyers to continue. A further compaction-start event appears at the end of the combined logs without a completed result.

Work-note acknowledgments contributed to the volume of repeated state. The role API’s `send_work_notes` handling calls `opportunityPayloadLocked`, which attaches the role-visible view even when it omits a freshly rendered prompt [9]. Thus a short note could receive a growing case record. Counsel also continued making wait-related model requests while jurors occupied the court turn. The record does not assign an exact fraction of total token use to either mechanism.

Submitted notes capture source findings, planned concessions, proposed questions, and decisions to pass on unsupported motions. Other notes announce the next permitted act or repeat a completed assessment. The notes support reconstruction of strategy, with uneven informational value across entries.

7.2 Errors by point of failure

The location of a failure determined which limit and recovery procedure applied. Pi rejected malformed argument strings before dispatch, so those calls bypassed ADC’s decision-attempt counter. ADC received the overlength theories and nonzero-damages vote, returned a procedural error, and accepted corrected submissions. A process that ended without its required act used the participant-failure procedure. That procedure replaced failed candidates during selection and removed a failed sworn juror during deliberation.

The long J14 episode motivated a separate, configurable Pi court-submission error counter. The later implementation defaults to ten errors per participant opportunity and counts malformed or otherwise rejected court submissions inside Pi. Court reads and unrelated research tools use their existing handling. Live tests of that later implementation belong to a separate development record. They did not alter this case, which retained its original executable and 25-minute deadline. The report’s observations about this run therefore include the full malformed-call interval.

7.3 Elapsed time and recorded cost

The unified run lasted approximately two hours and four minutes. Pleadings, research, discovery, and the pretrial order occupied the first 45 minutes. Candidate preparation, questionnaires, replacement, follow-up questions, and challenges occupied approximately the next 56 minutes. The sworn jury was in place at 16:14:04, and judgment followed about 22 minutes later. The 25-minute malformed-call episode was a substantial part of selection time.

The lawyer logs’ token-price estimates sum to \$381.25, including completed compactions. The lawyers used Codex subscription authentication. That estimate is a calculation from recorded usage and prices, not an invoice or evidence of an additional charge. It excludes the court, juror, and separate search requests.

The core’s separate provider accounting lists 39 requests, usage observations for 37, and cost observations for 18. Its observed dollar field totals about \$0.0076. That incomplete field cannot establish the cost of all court requests. Juror request records also leave gaps in dollar accounting.

The retained run occupied 444 MiB after completion. The launcher removed the case’s containers, and checks found no retained authentication file or bearer-token file under the run directory. Persistent case files, workspaces, session records, and process logs remained available for this report. Disk use by unrelated development caches and other cases falls outside that run-directory measurement.

7.4 Replay result and reproducibility

Local certificate verification returned success for 227 transitions. The `adc verify-certificate` command checked the run’s `case/core` directory through the installed Lean runner with one job, a 6 GiB memory ceiling, 100% CPU quota, and a 900-second timeout. Verification replayed the recorded accepted transitions and matched the final state. The saved state records judgment entered, the proposition demonstrated, seven plaintiff votes, the six-vote requirement, and zero damages.

The database contains 363 event rows, while the certificate contains 227 transitions. Reads, failed attempts, process-completion records, and other event types explain why those counts measure different things.

The report directory is `reports/marxiv/israel-syria-adc/`. It contains the versioned source and PDF. The generated run remains outside version control under `adc/out/ex04-20260919-04/`. The full final charge and accepted vote explanations are reproduced here, along with selected discovery and advocacy excerpts. These excerpts support reading the report independently, while a complete audit of every tool response requires access to the retained run.

8 Conclusion

This ADC case produced a declaratory judgment through public-source research, reciprocal discovery, jury selection, documentary trial, instructions, and eight accepted votes. The lawyers agreed on substantial physical conduct and exposed the missing evidence. Their dispute focused on offensive method and on the inference from later control to intent at commencement. Seven jurors accepted the plaintiff’s inference, and one gave a reasoned dissent under the same burden.

The record contains examples of procedural work affecting what the factfinder received: the defense obtained the full source page behind an excerpt, both parties made qualified admissions, counsel declined unsupported motions, and a follow-up answer led to a successful cause challenge. It also records limits: lawyer-controlled admission flags, one principal news report for key later facts, unresolved source-rule detail, access to earlier ballot choices, uneven explanations, and avoidable interaction during waiting and production.

The verified transition sequence establishes completion under the encoded procedure. The evidence and explanations permit a separate assessment of the resulting judgment. This single case supports a documented account of that process and disagreement. Comparisons of accuracy, cost-effectiveness, ballot isolation, or the value of added procedural stages require further cases or controlled comparisons.

A Selected Discovery Responses

These filed answers retain the participants’ qualifications. Event numbers identify the retained database rows. Typography and paragraph layout are normalized. Quotations preserve the wording of each participant, including terminology and rhetorical constructions.

A.1 Plaintiff on commencement evidence

Filed response, event 26 [23].

Answer No. 1: Plaintiff contends the offensive commenced on 7–8 December 2024, exact hour unknown, when organized IDF forces crossed east of Line A and took positions in the area of separation, including the operation that produced the continuing hold at the Syrian Mount Hermon summit. The participating units are not identified in the present record. Conduct relied on is: Israel’s admission that IDF deployed at several points east of Line A (file-0003); UNDOF’s observation of increased IDF movements beginning 7 December and continued presence at multiple locations on 13 December (file-0004); Syria’s official report of incursions into additional Syrian territory, concurrent heavy shelling, ongoing attacks, and areas invaded (file-0002); and AP’s report of seizure/control of the buffer zone, occupation of the Syrian summit, and establishment of fortifications (file-0005). Plaintiff does not contend the shelling alone establishes the offensive and cannot identify a specific strike linked to taking a specific ground position. No ground combat or resistance at the summit is established. Plaintiff’s position is that neither is required: an organized armed cross-line operation to seize, occupy, and fortify positions is offensive military action even if unopposed and security-motivated. Objective is addressed in Answer No. 2. Witness/source custodians are those identified in the initial disclosures; documents are files 0002–0006.

Answer No. 2: Plaintiff contends commencement occurred on 7–8 December 2024. No internal operational plan or order is presently known. Intent is inferred circumstantially from the continuous operation and contemporaneous/near-contemporaneous facts: deployment beyond Line A at multiple positions (file-0003); continued occupation (file-0004); Syria’s official description of incursions and areas invaded (file-0002); and, nine or ten days after commencement, Israel’s actual hold of the Syrian summit, Katz’s order rapidly to establish and fortify a presence anticipating a potentially extended stay, and Netanyahu’s statement that forces would remain until a future security arrangement existed (file-0005). Netanyahu and Katz are the identified decisionmakers/declarants. The 17 December evidence concerns the same continuing deployment and is probative of its purpose because objective conduct and leadership instructions shortly after commencement permit an inference about intent, absent evidence of an intervening change of plan. Plaintiff accepts security as the stated motive. Establishing control need not mean annexation or ultimate motive; controlling the positions pending satisfaction of a security condition was the intended means and immediate objective. Files 0002–0006 and the identified public-source custodians are the presently known evidence.

A.2 Defense on control and motive

Filed response, event 27 [23].

Answer No. 2: ‘Intended to establish control’ means that establishing authority or dominion over qualifying territory was an objective of the operation when commenced, not merely that soldiers necessarily exercised tactical security control over the ground they temporarily occupied. Control need not be permanent and Defendant does not require annexation, but treating every purposeful temporary position as the specified intent would deprive the intent phrase of independent work. Supporting facts

are file-0003's contemporaneous triggering attack, few-point/limited-capacity deployment, defensive locations, non-intervention statement, repeated limited-and-temporary characterization, and commitment to the 1974 framework; file-0004's corroboration of the security breakdown and its failure to characterize offensive purpose; and the absence in files 0002/0004 of Israeli intent facts. No internal operational order or plan is known to Defendant. Defendant relies on Israel's official 9 December statement, not an identified witness. Defendant credits file-0005's later Netanyahu/Katz statements as contrary circumstantial evidence, but the security-conditioned stay is also consistent with temporary protective custody and does not itself establish the original plan on 7–8 December. See file-0007.

A.3 Plaintiff on the full article and missing records

Filed response, event 49 [23].

Response to Request No. 1: Plaintiff has produced file-0005 and file-0008. File-0008 contains the complete raw PBS/AP HTML recapture, HTTP/retrieval metadata, hashes, and the filed text capture; file-0005 is the source extract used in TR-P1. After a reasonable search, Plaintiff has no other responsive native capture, PDF, retrieval log, chain-of-custody record, or extraction-method document.

Response to Request No. 2: Plaintiff has produced file-0005 and file-0008, which contain the AP/PBS published account and full raw page context for the Netanyahu and Katz statements and reported location. After a reasonable search, Plaintiff has no separate recording, video, photograph, official transcript, original-language statement, translation, press release, or authenticated contemporaneous account in its possession, custody, or control.

Response to Request No. 3: Plaintiff has produced files 0002 through 0005, which contain the official Syrian, Israeli, and UN/UNDOF statements and the AP/PBS account bearing on purpose, duration, fortification, and retention. Plaintiff has no internal plan, operational order, directive, or contemporaneous communication, and no document establishing whether the summit-hold or fortification decision existed before 17 December or changed after commencement. No responsive nonprivileged material is withheld.

A.4 Plaintiff admissions about the available proof

Filed response, event 82 [23].

Request 1 concerned an internal record of the objective at commencement. Request 2 concerned a document establishing whether the summit-hold or fortification decision existed before December 17 or arose after commencement. Request 15 concerned Israel's statements about non-intervention and continued commitment to the disengagement framework [23, event 79].

Response to Request for Admission No. 1: Admitted. Plaintiff knows of no internal operational plan, order, directive, or contemporaneous communication stating the deployment's objective at commencement. Intent is proved circumstantially from the public record.

Response to Request for Admission No. 2: Admitted. Plaintiff has no such document. The absence of that document does not establish that the hold or fortification decision arose only after commencement.

Response to Request for Admission No. 15: Admitted as to what file-0003 states. Plaintiff does not contend Israel intervened between Syrian factions; that differs from whether the cross-line deployment satisfies the proposition.

A.5 Defense admissions and qualifications

Filed response, event 86 [23].

Response to Request for Admission No. 4: Admitted. File-0005 accurately reproduces the relevant portions of the 17 December 2024 AP report published by PBS NewsHour, and file-0008 authenticates the full raw webpage and its publication/retrieval provenance. This admission authenticates the publication; it does not independently verify every fact reported in the article.

Response to Request for Admission No. 8: Admitted on the present record. By 17 December 2024 Israel was establishing or fortifying a military presence at that Syrian summit position, and Netanyahu’s reported statement indicates an intent then to keep forces there until a future arrangement ensuring Israel’s security existed.

Response to Request for Admission No. 9: Admitted that Defendant possesses no evidence showing a material change in operative purpose between 7–8 and 17 December 2024. The absence of such evidence does not establish that the purpose remained unchanged; neither party has an operational plan, order, or contemporaneous communication resolving when the summit-hold or fortification decision arose.

Response to Request for Admission No. 11: Admitted. A security or defensive motive does not, by itself, preclude a finding that an organized cross-line military operation was offensive in method or intended to establish interim control. Whether that finding is warranted here depends on the full record.

Response to Request for Admission No. 12: Admitted as an abstract proposition. An organized armed operation crossing a separation line to take, hold, and fortify military positions in another state’s qualifying territory can constitute a ‘military offensive intended to establish control’ even if unopposed and described as temporary. Defendant does not admit that every such operation necessarily does so or that the evidence establishes this operation’s offensive character and control objective at commencement.

B The Delivered Jury Instructions

The complete final charge was delivered at 16:31:39 UTC and recorded as event 338 [23].

Plaintiff bears the burden to prove the submitted proposition by a preponderance of the evidence. Preponderance of the evidence means the proposition is more likely true than not true.

The submitted proposition is:

Israel invaded Syria in 2024. In particular, Israel commenced a military offensive intended to establish control over any portion of Syria between September 12, 2024 and December 31, 2024, 11:59 PM ET. For purposes of this case, the Golan Heights count as Israeli territory.

To find that the proposition has been demonstrated, you must find that plaintiff proved each of the following by a preponderance of the evidence:

1. Within the stated time period, Israel commenced an organized military operation.
2. That operation was offensive in method.
3. When that operation commenced, one of its objectives was to establish actual authority or dominion over at least some Syrian territory outside the Golan Heights.

If plaintiff fails to prove any one of these required parts by a preponderance of the evidence, then you must find that the proposition has not been demonstrated.

If the evidence is evenly balanced on any required part, then plaintiff has not carried its burden on that part.

In deciding whether the operation was offensive in method and whether, when commenced, it had as an objective establishing actual authority or dominion over Syrian territory, you may consider both direct and circumstantial evidence.

You may also consider later conduct or later statements as circumstantial evidence about earlier intent or purpose. But do not automatically assume either that the earlier purpose stayed the same or that it changed. You must decide what inference, if any, is warranted from the evidence as a whole.

Intended control does not require an intent permanently to annex territory. Intended control may be temporary, interim, or conditioned on a future event.

Combat or armed resistance is not required.

A security or defensive motive does not by itself establish or negate whether the operation was offensive in method or whether it was intended to establish control.

Troop presence, a violation of the 1974 Disengagement Agreement, tactical possession, later control, or fortification may all be relevant. But no one of those facts alone automatically proves that the required disputed elements have been established.

Under the governing rule for this case, you may consider official confirmation by Syria, Israel, the United Nations, or a permanent member of the United Nations Security Council, and you may also consider a consensus of credible reporting if such evidence is in the record. Authorized-source status permits you to consider the evidence under the governing rule, but you must still decide what weight to give each item based on its contents, detail, corroboration, and context.

You must decide the case only on the evidence admitted and these instructions. You must not decide it based on sympathy, disapproval, politics, or any view about matters not submitted for your decision.

The only relief sought is a declaration whether the proposition has been demonstrated. Monetary damages are unavailable and must be zero.

C The Accepted Juror Explanations

These are all eight accepted explanations, in filing order. Every accepted vote requested zero damages. J5 submitted no vote. J15 corrected the damages field before its vote was accepted.

C.1 J1: meta/muse-glimmer-30b

Vote: defendant. Reported confidence: medium.

On the preponderance standard, the record establishes organized IDF deployment east of Line A beginning 7-9 December 2024, continued presence at multiple area-of-separation locations on 13 December per UNDOF file-0004, and by 17 December de facto interim military control and fortification of the Mount Hermon summit inside Syria beyond the Israel-held Golan per AP/PBS file-0005, with Netanyahu's security-conditioned retention statement. Syria's 9 December UN letter file-0002 reports incursions and areas invaded. Israel's contemporaneous 9 December Security Council letter file-0003 admits deployment at several points east of Line A but describes the measures as limited, temporary, and defensive, triggered by armed-group attacks on UNDOF posts, with a disclaimer of intervention. UNDOF file-0004 confirms movement and treaty violation but does not characterize the operation as offensive or state a control objective. No operational order, contemporaneous statement of control intent, or evidence dating the hold-and-fortify decision to 7-8 December is in the record. Later fortification and retention evidence in file-0005 is probative of purpose by 17 December, not necessarily at commencement, and physical continuity is not necessarily continuity of purpose. The closest contemporaneous purpose evidence points to a limited protective response. Plaintiff's continuity inference relies on absence of evidence of a purpose change, which is speculative and does not meet more-likely-than-not for the conjunctive requirement that the operation commenced offensive in method with the objective to establish control over qualifying Syrian territory. The evidence on offensive character and intent at commencement is at best evenly balanced. The proposition is therefore not demonstrated.

C.2 J2: z-ai/glm-4.7

Vote: plaintiff. Reported confidence: medium.

The preponderance of evidence supports the plaintiff's proposition, though the conclusion is not free from reasonable doubt. The record establishes four core facts by official admission: (1) organized IDF forces deployed east of Line A during December 7–9 and took military positions (file-0003); (2) UNDOF observed increased movement beginning December 7 and continued multi-position presence on December 13 (file-0004); (3) by December 17, Israel held and was fortifying the Mount Hermon summit inside Syria approximately 10 km beyond the Israel-held Golan (file-0005); (4) Netanyahu stated forces would remain until a security-assuring arrangement existed (file-0005). The summit is qualifying Syrian territory; the Golan carve-out is undisputed and not implicated. On offensive character: organized armed forces crossed a separation line, took military positions in another state's territory, held multiple positions over days, occupied a commanding summit, and fortified the hold. This combination of actions—crossing, seizing, occupying, and fortifying foreign positions—constitutes an offensive method even if unopposed and security-motivated. Ground combat is not required; the method itself is offensive. On intent at commencement: Israel deliberately crossed and took positions. The same continuous deployment persisted. Within nine or ten days, it had achieved admitted summit control, was fortifying, and directed to remain pending satisfaction of Israel's security condition. Defendant admits no evidence of any material change

in operative purpose between December 7–8 and December 17. While Israel’s December 9 letter described the measures as limited, temporary, and defensive in response to attacks on UNDOF, outward conduct and leadership statements shortly thereafter are more probative of actual intent. Physical continuity supports purpose continuity; the defense’s suggestion that the fortification-and-retention decision developed later is a possibility without evidence. Security was the motive; establishing interim control was the means. Temporary, condition-bound control is still intended control; defensive motive does not negate offensive method or interim control objective. The admitted limits (no internal order, exact unit list, survey, or proven summit combat) affect evidentiary weight but do not negate the established conduct. Absent contrary direct evidence of changed purpose, the reasonable and more likely inference is that holding and controlling selected positions pending security arrangements was the intended objective from commencement. The plaintiff’s inference is more likely than not, though not certain, due primarily to the absence of direct commencement orders establishing purpose. Therefore, I vote for the plaintiff with medium confidence and zero damages as declaratory relief only.

C.3 J4: openai/gpt-4o-2024-11-20

Vote: plaintiff. Reported confidence: high.

Plaintiff’s case supports the inference of intent to establish temporary control by preponderance of the evidence explained in PX-4’s context. Defensive motive is credible but does not negate this.

C.4 J6: moonshotai/kimi-k2.5

Vote: plaintiff. Reported confidence: medium.

The admitted facts establish that organized IDF forces crossed Line A during December 7–9, remained at multiple positions on December 13, and by December 17 held and fortified the Mount Hermon summit inside Syria with conditional retention. While Israel’s December 9 letter characterizes the measures as limited, temporary, and defensive, the objective conduct—organized cross-line deployment, position-taking, multi-day holding, summit occupation, and fortification—supports offensive method. Intent to establish at least interim control may be inferred from the same continuous conduct, the rapid progression to fortified summit control, and the absence of any evidence of a material change in purpose. Under the preponderance standard, the proposition is more likely true than not, though the inference from December 17 back to commencement is not without uncertainty.

C.5 J8: qwen/qwen3-coder-next

Vote: plaintiff. Reported confidence: high.

The evidence establishes by preponderance that Israel commenced an organized military operation offensive in method during December 2024, with the objective of establishing at least interim control over qualifying Syrian territory. Organized IDF forces crossed Line A, took military positions, held multiple positions for days, occupied the Syrian

summit beyond the Golan, exercised de facto control, and fortified for a potentially extended stay conditioned on future security arrangements. This conduct demonstrates both offensive method and intended control, even without combat, permanent annexation, or internal orders. The contemporaneous security explanation addresses motive but doesn't negate the intentional control objective shown by sustained position-taking, fortification, and condition-bound retention.

C.6 J11: qwen/qwen3-30b-a3b

Vote: plaintiff. Reported confidence: high.

The evidence establishes that Israel commenced an organized military operation offensive in method and intended to establish control over qualifying Syrian territory. The admitted facts of cross-line deployment, multi-position occupation, summit control, fortification, and conditional retention directly satisfy the proposition's requirements.

C.7 J12: qwen/qwen3-max-thinking

Vote: plaintiff. Reported confidence: high.

The preponderance of evidence establishes that Israel commenced a military offensive intended to establish control over qualifying Syrian territory between December 7-17, 2024. Syria's official UN letter (file-0002) confirms Israeli-army incursions into additional Syrian territory and 'areas invaded.' Israel admits (file-0003) IDF deployment at several points east of Line A. UNDOF independently observed (file-0004) increased IDF movement beginning December 7 and continued presence at multiple locations on December 13. The AP/PBS report (file-0005) places Netanyahu on December 17 at the Mount Hermon summit inside Syria (beyond the Israel-held Golan), reporting establishment and fortification for a potentially extended stay, with forces to remain until a security-assuring arrangement exists. This continuous operation—organized armed forces crossing the separation line, taking positions, holding multiple locations over days, occupying a summit, exercising control, and fortifying the hold—constitutes an offensive in method even if unopposed and security-motivated. The later evidence of summit control, fortification, and security-conditioned retention within nine days of commencement supports intent to establish at least interim control from the outset, especially given no evidence of purpose change. Defendant's temporary/defensive characterization explains motive but doesn't negate the outward offensive method or intended control as the immediate objective.

C.8 J15: mistralai/mistral-small-3.2-24b-instruct

Vote: plaintiff. Reported confidence: medium.

Based on the trial evidence, including the official sources and admissions, it is more likely than not that Israel commenced an organized military operation offensive in method and intended to establish at least interim control over qualifying Syrian territory. The evidence shows a continuous operation with position-taking, duration, actual control, fortification, and retention conditioned on a future event. The chronology and the absence of evidence of a material purpose change support the inference that the operation was intended to establish control from the start.

References

- [1] AgentCourt. *Adjudication Core*. Repository documentation at source revision 87de350, September 2026. <https://github.com/agentcourt/adj>.
- [2] Jamie Stephens. *Five Adjudication Procedures by Procedural Complexity*. `reports/marxiv/procedure-complexity/paper.pdf`, in the adj repository.
- [3] Jamie Stephens. *Adjudicating a Prediction-Market Resolution: An ARB Case Study of Israel’s December 2024 Entry into Syria*. marXiv:2609.00009, 2026.
- [4] AgentCourt. *Agent District Court Manual*. `adc/manual.md`, adj, revision 87de350.
- [5] AgentCourt. *Agent District Court Practice Guide*. `adc/docs/practice.md`, adj, revision 87de350.
- [6] AgentCourt. *Agent Rules for Civil Procedure*. `adc/docs/ARCP.md`, adj, revision 87de350.
- [7] AgentCourt. *Procedure Execution*. `adc/docs/logic.md`, adj, revision 87de350.
- [8] AgentCourt. *ADC Lean Engine*. `adc/engine/ADC/Core.lean`, adj, revision 87de350.
- [9] AgentCourt. *ADC Role API*. `adc/runtime/runner/roleapi.go`, adj, revision 87de350.
- [10] AgentCourt. *ADC Juror Prompt Construction*. `adc/runtime/runner/juror_prompt.go`, adj, revision 87de350.
- [11] Jamie Stephens. *Generating Tool-Capable, Behavior-Stratified Model Pools for Adjudication*. marXiv:2608.00051, 2026.
- [12] AgentCourt. *Model-Pool Tools*. `model-pool/README.md`, adj, revision 87de350.
- [13] AgentCourt. *Sampling Runbook*. `model-pool/docs/sampling-runbook.md`, adj, revision 87de350.
- [14] AgentCourt. *Juries*. `adc/docs/juries.md`, adj, revision 87de350.
- [15] AgentCourt. *ADC Proofs*. `adc/docs/proofs.md`, adj, revision 87de350.
- [16] AgentCourt. *Israel–Syria prediction-market example*. `examples/ex04/complaint.md` and `market-rules.md`, adj, revision 87de350.
- [17] Israel and Syria. *Agreement on Disengagement*, May 31, 1974, section B. United Nations text, S/11302/Add.1. <https://www.un.org/unispal/document/auto-insert-179522/>.
- [18] Koussay Aldahhak. *Identical letters dated 9 December 2024 from the Permanent Representative of the Syrian Arab Republic to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General and the President of the Security Council*. A/79/687–S/2024/888, distributed December 11, 2024. <https://documents.un.org/api/symbol/access?l=en&s=S%2F2024%2F888&t=pdf>.
- [19] Danny Danon. *Identical letters dated 9 December 2024 from the Permanent Representative of Israel to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General and the President of the Security Council*. S/2024/887, December 9, 2024. <https://documents.un.org/api/symbol/access?l=en&s=S%2F2024%2F887&t=pdf>.

- [20] United Nations Disengagement Observer Force. *UNDOF Press Statement*. December 13, 2024. <https://peacekeeping.un.org/en/news/undof-press-statement>.
- [21] Associated Press. *Netanyahu says Israeli troops will remain in buffer zone inside Syria*. PBS NewsHour, December 17, 2024. <https://www.pbs.org/newshour/world/netanyahu-enters-syrian-territory-to-tour-buffer-zone-seized-by-israel>.
- [22] Earendil Works. *Pi Agent Harness*. Coding-agent software and agent runtime. <https://github.com/earendil-works/pi>.
- [23] AgentCourt. *Israel–Syria ADC case record*, run `ex04-20260919-04`. Retained under `adc/out/ex04-20260919-04/` in the execution checkout. The `case/core/` directory contains the event database, work notes, and court files. The `case/logs/` and `case/work/` directories retain participant tool activity and research. Generated case records are outside the versioned report.