



TRANSACTIONAL FORENSIC CERTIFICATE

Artificial Intelligence Dossier

OFFICIAL CERTIFICATE ID

SURE-RMA-374164

AUDITED ENTITY (TARGET)

[REDACTED INVESTIGATED ENTITY]

VALIDATED TAX IDENTIFIER

[REDACTED FOR SECURITY]

REPORT ISSUE DATE

5/11/2026

CONFIDENTIAL. This dossier has been autonomously generated by the SURE Forensics AI agent network. Designed exclusively for corporate capital protection and SME transactional due diligence.

EXECUTIVE RISK SUMMARY

<h1 style="color: red; font-size: 2em;">96</h1> <p>SCORE / 100</p>	<p style="color: red; font-weight: bold; margin: 0;">RED ALERT - HIGH RISK OPERATION</p> <p>The multi-agent ecosystem has detected high-caliber red flags, indicating potential fraud, predatory asymmetry, or fictitious existence. We advise freezing transfers.</p>
--	--

<p>INVESTIGATED ENTITY NAME [REDACTED INVESTIGATED ENTITY]</p>	<p>VAT / TAX REGISTRATION [REDACTED FOR SECURITY]</p>
<p>GEOREFERENCED DOMAIN SPECTRUM [REDACTED DOMAIN]</p>	<p>AGENTS INVOLVED Roberto (KYC), Moisés (Legal)</p>

ANOMALIES AND DETECTED FRAUD VECTORS

1. Residential Apartment as Corporate Headquarters — Critical Identity Vacuum CRITICAL ALERT

The entity lists its registered and operational address as a residential apartment unit ([REDACTED]), not a commercial trading office, industrial facility, or port-adjacent logistics hub. An entity simultaneously claiming capacity to supply up to 3,000,000 barrels of crude oil per month and multiple petroleum products totaling hundreds of millions of dollars in monthly value — from a residential address — presents a credibility contradiction of the highest order. Under FATF Recommendations 10 and 12, a residential address for an entity claiming bulk petroleum export capacity constitutes a Category 1 Enhanced Due Diligence (EDD) trigger. This pattern is statistically associated with shell or front entity architectures documented in FATF, Egmont Group, and FinCEN typology publications. The compound effect is amplified critically by the confirmed zero commercial footprint (Finding 17) and zero named loading infrastructure (Finding 18), producing a compound identity vacuum consistent with a non-operational entity.

2. ESPO Crude Oil Attributed to Kazakhstan Origin — Geographic Impossibility and Active Sanctions Exposure

CRITICAL ALERT

The offer designates 'ESPO Crude Oil' with origin listed as Kazakhstan. ESPO stands for Eastern Siberia–Pacific Ocean — a Russian Federation pipeline infrastructure asset operated by [REDACTED], running from [REDACTED] to the [REDACTED] export terminal. ESPO-grade crude oil is definitionally and geographically of Russian origin. Kazakhstan has no pipeline access to, no allocation rights over, and no physical connection to ESPO-branded crude. Legitimate Kazakhstani crude exports are traded under the grades Tengiz, Kashagan, KEBCO, or Kumkol via the Caspian Pipeline Consortium (CPC). The relabeling of ESPO crude as Kazakhstani-origin represents either a fundamental product misidentification or a deliberate attempt to disguise Russian-origin crude to circumvent sanctions. Since February 2022, ESPO crude has been subject to G7 price caps, OFAC secondary sanction risk under Executive Orders 14024, 14066, 14068, and 14071, and EU import restrictions under Council Regulation 833/2014 (as amended). Any purchase of ESPO crude — regardless of how the origin is labeled — creates a structural legal exposure that activates upon engagement. This finding alone constitutes a mandatory escalation trigger to sanctions compliance counsel and may create a mandatory reporting obligation to OFAC or equivalent national financial intelligence units.

3. JP54 'Colonial Grade 54' — Non-Existent Commercial Aviation Fuel Designation

CRITICAL ALERT

The offer lists 'Jet Fuel Aviation Kerosene Colonial Grade 54 (JP54)' as a commercially available product originating from Kazakhstan. JP-54 'Colonial Grade 54' does not appear in IATA Guidance Material for Aviation Turbine Fuels, DEF STAN 91-091 (UK MoD Aviation Fuel Standard), or ASTM D1655 as a recognized commercial international aviation fuel grade. It is not produced by any verified Kazakhstani refinery. Under the UN Convention on Contracts for the International Sale of Goods (CISG) Art. 35, goods must conform to the description in the contract; a product with a non-existent grade designation cannot conform to any enforceable standard and cannot be the subject of a valid, enforceable commercial sale contract. The designation 'Colonial Grade' is documented as a typological marker in commodity fraud scheme identification databases maintained by regulatory and law enforcement bodies. Its inclusion in the same offer alongside Jet A-1 at identical pricing and volumes further confirms its template-derived, non-inventory character.

4. Advance Payment Architecture (2% / 5% / 10% via MT103 to Seller-Nominated Accounts) — Advance-Fee Scheme Structure

CRITICAL ALERT

Three distinct transaction procedures (CIF, TTO, and Escrow TTO) each require the buyer to transfer an upfront percentage deposit to seller-nominated accounts before any independent product verification, vessel departure, or delivery confirmation. CIF Procedure §4 demands 2% of total first cargo value via MT103; TTO Procedure §5 demands 5%; Escrow TTO §4 demands 10% to a seller-nominated escrow company. In the Escrow TTO, the seller nominates and selects the escrow agent, eliminating the independence that defines legitimate escrow protection — rendering the 'escrow' arrangement legally illusory. MT103 SWIFT transfers are unconditional and irrevocable; no chargeback or reversal mechanism exists once funds are credited. In legitimate international bulk commodity trade governed by ICC Incoterms, payment security is provided through irrevocable Documentary Letters of Credit (DLC), Standby Letters of Credit (SBLC), or Bank Guarantees — none of which are offered, mentioned, or available anywhere in this document. This payment architecture is structurally consistent with advance-fee commodity fraud schemes documented in FTC, Interpol, and specialist trade fraud advisory publications. The arrangement is also a structurally leonine (one-sided) contractual structure that would likely be deemed unenforceable or voidable in most jurisdictions due to lack of consideration and unconscionability.

5. LPG Specification — Logically and Physically Impossible Methane MIN/MAX Range

CRITICAL ALERT

The LPG specification table (GOST 20448-90) declares Methane with a MINIMUM value of 85.0 Mol% and a MAXIMUM value of 9.6 Mol%. This is a mathematically and physically impossible specification range — the declared minimum (85.0%) exceeds the declared maximum (9.6%) by a factor of approximately nine. Furthermore, a gas mixture with 85%+ methane content does not correspond to any commercial LPG formulation under GOST 20448-90 or any international standard; it describes pipeline-quality Natural Gas. Commercial LPG is predominantly propane and butane; the declared propane maximum of 3.0 Mol% and butane maximum of 2.0 Mol% are inconsistent with any recognized LPG product. The spelling error ('MATHANE' for 'METHANE') further evidences absence of subject-matter expert review. No accredited laboratory LIMS, no GOST-certified testing body, and no competent document author could generate this error through routine operations. The probability that this arose from legitimate laboratory output approaches zero. A specification sheet with self-contradictory parameters has no legal operative meaning and would fail document examination at any compliant letter of credit bank under ICC UCP 600.

6. Page 14 Multi-Product Specification Collision — Solid Fuel Data Embedded Under ESPO Crude Heading

CRITICAL ALERT

The document page bearing the heading 'EASTERN SIBERIA-PACIFIC OCEAN OIL (ESPO CRUDE) SPECIFICATION' contains a data table with parameters characteristic of a solid or semi-solid carbonaceous material: Real Density 2.10 g/cm³, Ash % at 1,300°C: 0.31, Moisture %: 6.40, Volatile Matter at 850°C: 9.40, Oil Content %: 7.20, Iron 220 ppm, Silicon 245 ppm, Vanadium 84 ppm, Calcium 120 ppm, Particle size >8mm: 45.60. A Real Density of 2.10 g/cm³ is physically impossible for any liquid petroleum product — liquid crude oil density is approximately 0.82–0.87 g/cm³. Water itself is 1.00 g/cm³; petroleum coke (a solid) reaches 1.8–2.1 g/cm³, which matches the declared value. The presence of 'Particle size >8mm' data and Volatile Matter at 850°C confirms this table describes a solid material, consistent with petroleum coke or a coal-like solid fuel — not crude oil. Any Sales and Purchase Agreement incorporating this TDS by reference would contain irreconcilably contradictory product descriptions. This pattern confirms document assembly from internet-sourced generic specification templates without professional editorial oversight.

7. Systematic Unit Assignment Errors Across Multiple Technical Data Sheets — Metrological Impossibilities

CRITICAL ALERT

A pattern of physically and metrologically impossible unit assignments recurs across multiple product specification sheets. In the LCO TDS: Aromatics content is declared in 'Deg C(°C)' — aromatics content is a compositional parameter expressed in %vol or %mass per ASTM D1319/IP 156, never in degrees Celsius; Gross Heat Value is declared in '%wt' citing test method ASTM D1250, which is a petroleum measurement table standard for density/volume correction — it has no calorimetric function and produces no heat value output. The correct test methods are ASTM D4868, ASTM D240, or IP 12. In the Jet A-1 TDS: Smoke Point is declared in 'Mj/Lkg' — smoke point is a flame height measurement expressed exclusively in millimeters (mm) per ASTM D1322; DEF STAN 91-091 requires a minimum of 25mm. Net Specific Energy is declared in 'Mm' (megameters — a unit of distance), which is not a recognized energy unit; the correct unit is MJ/kg with a minimum of 42.8 MJ/kg per DEF STAN 91-091. Certified laboratory instrumentation software (LIMS) automatically assigns correct SI and ASTM/IP units to all parameters at output. The recurrence of physically nonsensical units across multiple product sheets is statistically inconsistent with output from accredited laboratory analysis equipment and is consistent with manual data entry into a generic document template.

8. EN590 Diesel Distillation Data — Internal Contradiction: Dual Mutually Exclusive Values in a Single Field

CRITICAL ALERT

The EN590 10PPM Diesel specification sheet declares 'Recovered @ 150°C: 85.0(2) / 2.0 % vol.' This entry is internally contradictory. EN590:2013 specifies a maximum of 2% vol recovered at 150°C; a physically compliant EN590 diesel has an Initial Boiling Point typically above 160–180°C, meaning virtually zero material is recovered at 150°C. A figure of 85.0% vol at 150°C would describe a very light naphtha or solvent-range material — categorically not a diesel fuel. The co-presence of both '85.0' and '2.0' in the same data field confirms a data entry collision — two values from different rows or source documents merged into a single cell — a pattern characteristic of copy-paste document assembly. Under ICC UCP 600 and ISBP 745, this data field is legally indeterminate and would fail examination at any compliant letter of credit bank. No inspection certificate or Certificate of Quality incorporating this data could be accepted as valid documentation.

9. Implausible Aggregate Supply Volumes — D6 Virgin Fuel Oil and Multi-Product Simultaneity Claim

CRITICAL ALERT

The offer claims simultaneous monthly supply capacity across ten distinct hydrocarbon product categories, including D6 Virgin Fuel Oil at 100,000,000 to 800,000,000 US Gallons per month (approximately 285,000 to 2,285,000 MT/month), ESPO Crude at 500,000 to 3,000,000 barrels/month, Jet Fuel A-1 and JP54 at the same range simultaneously, EN590 at up to 300,000 MT/month, and LPG, LNG, Mazut 100, and LCO at up to 300,000 MT/month each. The aggregate implied monthly export capacity across all products simultaneously would exceed the documented production and export capacity of many mid-sized national oil companies. 'D6 Virgin Fuel Oil' is not a recognized international petroleum product grade under ASTM, ISO, EN, OPEC, IEA, or EIA commodity classifications; no technical data sheet for D6 has been provided. Unsubstantiated capacity claims at this magnitude, made without reference to any named production facility, export license, storage infrastructure, or vessel charter, constitute material misrepresentation under contract law.

10. Missing Technical Data Sheets for Five of Ten Listed Products

CRITICAL ALERT

The offer lists ten commercial products but provides technical data sheets for only five (LCO, EN590 Diesel, Jet A-1, ESPO Crude, LPG). No specification sheets are provided for: Green Petcoke (the first-listed product), Liquefied Natural Gas (GOST 5542-87), Mazut 100 (GOST 10585-75/10585-99), JP54 (Aviation Kerosene Colonial Grade 54), and D6 Virgin Fuel Oil. The absence of specification documentation for 50% of the offered product portfolio — particularly for a product as complex as LNG, which has critical cryogenic transport and safety parameters — means that no buyer could conduct commercially prudent due diligence before being required by the document's own procedures to issue an ICPO, submit banking details, and transfer advance funds. This sequencing asymmetry — disclosure of buyer financial information before seller product documentation — is a documented red flag in advance-fee commodity fraud typologies.

11. Signatory Name Inconsistency — Three Distinct Renderings Within a Single Document

CRITICAL ALERT

The General Director's name is rendered in three distinct forms within the same 15-page document: the body text instructs the ICPO be addressed with one romanization, the printed signature block contains a second distinct rendering, and the physical company stamp contains a third Cyrillic-derived form. While transliteration variations from Kazakh/Russian to Latin script can account for minor phonetic differences, the simultaneous co-existence of three distinct romanizations within a single legally intended document creates a fundamental KYC/AML screening problem. Under FATF Recommendation 10, financial institutions must identify and verify the identity of counterparties; a signatory whose name cannot be consistently determined across three instances of the same document cannot be reliably screened against PEP lists, sanction designations, or adverse media databases. In contract law, a signature block that does not unambiguously identify the signatory may undermine document enforceability and the ability to attribute legal liability.

12. Legal Entity Name Inconsistency — Three Distinct Formulations Within One Document Package

CRITICAL ALERT

The legal name of the contracting entity is presented in three distinct formulations within the same document package: one form in document headers and body text, a second form (with LLP suffix) in the final signature block, and a third abbreviated form in the BIN stamp. The inconsistency in the formal legal name of the contracting party across a single document is a structural document integrity failure. Any contract referencing this entity by a name that does not match its registered name in the Kazakhstan Ministry of Justice registry may be unenforceable against the registered entity. Each distinct name variant must also be screened independently against sanction lists and adverse media, raising the probability of screening gaps. This finding creates material complications for KYC/AML screening, contract enforcement, and any subsequent legal proceedings.

13. Jet Fuel A-1 and JP54 Listed as Two Separate Products with Identical Pricing and Identical Volumes

CRITICAL ALERT

The offer lists Jet Fuel A-1 and JP54 as two distinct commercial products with separate line items, yet both are assigned completely identical pricing (CIF \$80 GROSS/\$76 NET per BBL; FOB \$76 GROSS/\$74 NET per MT) and identical monthly quantity ranges (500,000 to 3,000,000 barrels/month x 12 months). In legitimate commodity trading, Jet A-1 and JP-54 are distinct specifications with different production processes, quality parameters, and market pricing. The assignment of identical pricing and identical volumes to two nominally different products — combined with the non-standard 'Colonial Grade 54' designation, the absence of a TDS for JP54, and a unit inconsistency ('Per MT' applied to a barrel-traded liquid) — is consistent with a product catalog populated by template line-item duplication rather than actual inventory management.

14. Asymmetric Contractual Obligation Structure — Non-Binding 'Soft Offer' with Immediately Binding Buyer Commitments

CRITICAL ALERT

The document is explicitly titled a 'Soft Corporate Offer (SCO),' which carries no binding legal obligation on the seller to supply any product and constitutes an expression of intent only. However, the procedural sections that follow (CIF, TTO, Escrow TTO, FOB variants) impose multiple binding, time-sensitive, and financially consequential obligations on the buyer: issuance of an ICPO with banking details and passport copies within 24–72 hours; submission of Proof of Funds; and advance deposit payments of 2%–10% of cargo value via irrevocable MT103 wire transfer. This structural asymmetry — in which the seller assumes no binding commitment while the buyer is directed to undertake costly and irreversible actions immediately — fails the basic requirement of mutuality of obligation under contract law. In common law jurisdictions such an arrangement may be void for lack of consideration; in civil law jurisdictions it may be voidable for unconscionability or violation of good faith obligations. The 24–72 hour deadline is a documented pressure tactic that forecloses the buyer's ability to conduct independent due diligence before committing personal and financial data to an unverified counterparty. This is the most legally significant structural finding in the document package.

15. ESPO Crude Pour Point — Critical Mandatory Parameter Absent from Technical Data Sheet

CRITICAL ALERT

The ESPO Crude Oil technical data sheet is missing the Pour Point value entirely — the corresponding field is blank. Pour Point is a mandatory parameter in any crude oil Certificate of Quality, particularly for a crude oil claimed to originate from a cold-climate pipeline system. It determines pipeline transportability, vessel heating requirements, and storage compatibility in receiving terminals. Its complete absence from a submitted crude oil assay is unacceptable by industry standards and would not appear in a legitimate, laboratory-generated crude oil Certificate of Quality. A buyer contracting on the basis of this TDS would have no enforceable quality guarantee for one of the most operationally critical parameters of cold-climate crude oil logistics. This omission, compounded by the physically impossible density value (2.10 g/cm³) documented under the same heading, confirms that the ESPO TDS was not generated from actual laboratory instrumentation.

16. Mazut 100 Pricing Anomaly — FOB Gross Price Equals CIF Net Price, Implying Zero Freight and Insurance Cost

CRITICAL ALERT

The Mazut 100 pricing structure reveals an internal commercial impossibility. The CIF price is listed at \$220 GROSS/\$210 NET per MT and the FOB price at \$210 GROSS/\$200 NET per MT. This means the FOB Gross price (\$210) is numerically equal to the CIF Net price (\$210). Under standard trade economics and ICC Incoterms 2020, CIF must exceed FOB by the sum of ocean freight, marine insurance, and related shipping costs for the same cargo. For Mazut 100 — a heavy, high-viscosity fuel oil requiring heated tankers — industry freight rates from Caspian/Black Sea ports range from \$8–\$30/MT depending on voyage distance and vessel class. The equivalence of FOB Gross and CIF Net implies that combined freight and insurance cost zero dollars — a physical and commercial impossibility. This pricing incoherence further confirms that the price tables were populated from a generic template without commercial review and would create unresolvable contractual ambiguity if incorporated into a Sale and Purchase Agreement.

17. No Verifiable Digital or Commercial Footprint — Complete Absence of Operational Evidence

CRITICAL ALERT

No active, independently verifiable commercial website was confirmed for the entity's domain. No professional profile was identified for the General Director on [REDACTED] or any professional trade directory. No vessel charter records, port state control entries, port call histories, or Q88 vessel data were found associated with this entity in available databases. No trade publications, cargo tracking records, or third-party commercial references were identified. A legitimate exporter claiming simultaneous supply capacity across nine petroleum product categories at volumes reaching up to 3,000,000 barrels per month and 800 million gallons per month would generate an auditable and extensive commercial footprint across vessel tracking services ([REDACTED]), port authority databases, trade registries, and industry publications. The complete absence of any such footprint constitutes actionable misrepresentation under principles of pre-contractual good faith and misrepresentation law, and represents a textbook high-risk customer profile under FATF Recommendation 10 requiring mandatory Enhanced Due Diligence.

18. Loading Port and Storage Facility Designated as TBA Across All Products and All Transaction Procedures

CRITICAL ALERT

Across all ten product categories and all four transaction procedure variants (CIF, TTO, Escrow TTO, FOB), the loading port and storage facility are listed as 'TBA' (To Be Announced) or left entirely unspecified. No terminal name, port designation, tank farm address, GPS coordinates, or storage operator is identified at any point in the 15-page document. A named loading port is a legally mandatory element of an FOB or CIF contract under ICC Incoterms 2020; without a named port, the risk transfer point — the central operative clause of any such contract — is legally undefined and unenforceable. For a commercial entity claiming operational bulk export capacity across multiple product lines at volumes reaching hundreds of millions of gallons per month, the complete absence of any named physical loading infrastructure at the Soft Corporate Offer stage is commercially atypical and materially undermines the claim of operational export readiness. Legitimate bulk commodity exporters name their export terminals at or before the SCO stage. This finding confirms that no physical loading infrastructure has been secured by the seller at the time of offer issuance.

19. Multi-Layered Broker Chain Architecture (NCNDA/IMFPA 50/50) — Non-Deliverable Commodity Offer Dissemination Pattern

CRITICAL ALERT

The embedding of an NCNDA/IMFPA (Non-Circumvention Non-Disclosure Agreement / Irrevocable Master Fee Protection Agreement) with a 50/50 commission split structure within a Soft Corporate Offer is a structural marker specific to commodity broker-chain distribution networks. These networks disseminate identical or near-identical templated offers across multiple buyer targets simultaneously. The NCNDA/IMFPA structure imposes legal obligations on the buyer — non-circumvention and non-disclosure — in favor of broker intermediaries before any product has been verified or any legitimate transaction has occurred, adding yet another layer of asymmetric obligation extraction. The statistical profile of this document, combining template-derived product designations (JP54 Colonial Grade 54, D6 Virgin Fuel Oil), TBA loading ports, advance-fee payment architecture, and a 50/50 NCNDA/IMFPA commission split, is consistent with a templated non-deliverable commodity offer being disseminated across multiple buyers through a multi-layered broker chain. Full KYCC verification of all introducing brokers and intermediaries is mandatory.

FORENSIC CONCLUSIONS & RECOMMENDATIONS

CONSOLIDATED EXECUTIVE DETERMINATION: The convergence of findings from all three subordinate agents — Agent [REDACTED] (Due Diligence & Compliance), Agent [REDACTED] (Contractual Forensics and Financial Legitimacy), and Agent [REDACTED] (Chemical, Thermodynamic,

and Physical Verification) — produces an irreversible, high-confidence adverse risk determination at maximum saturation. All 18 Critical Alerts documented in source dossier [REDACTED] have been independently confirmed and cross-validated across all three analytical layers. No mitigating factors were identified. We estimate that it is not possible to reverse this trend found regarding the eligibility of this supplier. The following mandatory actions are issued: (1) DO NOT issue any Irrevocable Corporate Purchase Order (ICPO) or Letter of Intent (LOI) in response to this Soft Corporate Offer under any circumstances. (2) DO NOT transfer any funds whatsoever — whether 2%, 5%, 10%, or any other percentage — to any bank account or escrow company nominated by or affiliated with this entity. MT103 wire transfers are unconditional, irrevocable, and practically unrecoverable once executed. No chargeback mechanism exists. (3) DO NOT disclose banking details, passport copies, or Proof of Funds to any party associated with this offer. The 24–72 hour ICPO/passport submission deadline is a documented pressure tactic designed to foreclose independent due diligence. (4) ESCALATE immediately to your organization's Chief Compliance Officer, General Counsel, and AML Officer. The ESPO crude origin misrepresentation creates a real and actionable secondary sanctions exposure under OFAC Executive Orders 14024, 14066, 14068, and 14071, and EU Council Regulation 833/2014 (as amended). This exposure is not probabilistic — it is structural and activates upon engagement. Qualified sanctions compliance counsel must be engaged before any further action. (5) CONDUCT mandatory independent corporate verification of the entity's Business Identification Number (BIN) through the Kazakhstan Ministry of Justice official registry ([REDACTED]) and the State Revenue Committee ([REDACTED]) to confirm the registered address, beneficial ownership structure, and operational status. (6) REJECT the JP54 'Colonial Grade 54' product designation categorically. This designation does not appear in IATA Guidance Material for Aviation Turbine Fuels, DEF STAN 91-091, or ASTM D1655 and is a documented typological marker in non-deliverable commodity offer schemes. (7) REJECT any advance payment mechanism via MT103 to seller-nominated accounts. Insist on an irrevocable, confirmed Documentary Letter of Credit (DLC) or Standby Letter of Credit (SBLC) through a first-class independent correspondent bank as the sole acceptable payment instrument. (8) DO NOT commission an independent laboratory assay ([REDACTED], [REDACTED], or [REDACTED]) at this stage. Agent [REDACTED] has determined that the document foundations do not meet the minimum technical credibility thresholds required to justify inspection-stage engagement. The deficiencies identified are pre-inspection in nature and would need to be resolved at source before any inspection protocol could be meaningfully designed. (9) CONDUCT full Know-Your-Counterparty (KYCC) verification on any broker, intermediary, or agent who introduced this offer to your organization. The multi-layered NCNDA/IMFPA 50/50 commission structure embedded in this document is consistent with a broker-chain dissemination model used in the distribution of templated non-deliverable commodity offers. (10) ASSESS with legal counsel whether the ESPO crude origin misrepresentation and apparent sanctions evasion typology create a mandatory reporting obligation to OFAC, FinCEN, or relevant national financial intelligence units in your jurisdiction. (11) ARCHIVE this offer, this dossier, and all associated correspondence in your organization's compliance management

system, with a formal record of the adverse determination. No further engagement should occur without legal supervision.

[CONFIDENTIALITY NOTE: This is a real audit report generated by the SURE platform. Corporate names, emails, physical addresses, phone numbers, and actual registration data have been redacted by AI to protect professional secrecy and client privacy].