MODULIGN AS EVIDENCE

A Legal Epistemology Treatise

The Modulign Standard v3.0 as a Formal Evidentiary and Legal Codex Framework

Vincent Gonzalez · Independent Scholar

VinceGonzalez@me.com · v1.0.1 · 2026

Version History

Version	Date	Notes
`v1.0.0`	2026	Initial publication. All six Parts. Full admissibility proofs, codex of operational achievements, ATK-as-legal-architecture.
`v1.0.1`	2026	Four citation fixes: (1) Gettier paper title corrected to 'Address-Theoretic Epistemology'; (2) Daubert case name corrected to Daubert v. Merrell Dow Pharmaceuticals; (3) FRCP 26(a)(2)/26(e) added to §6.3; (4) Zenodo DOIs added to all self-citations.

Abstract

This treatise applies the Modulign Standard v3.0 — a Dimensional Address Grammar for Observable Reality (DAG-OR) — as a formal evidentiary and legal codex framework. It establishes four foundational propositions. First, that Modulign-classified observations satisfy the foundational admissibility criteria of existing legal systems, including authentication, chain of custody, foundation for expert testimony, and best evidence requirements. Second, that the ^EVID meta flag and append-only ledger constitute a formally sound chain of custody instrument, satisfying both common law and civil law integrity standards. Third, that the legal inferences derivable from ^EVID-grade Modulign classifications meet or exceed the evidentiary standards required for judicial finding of fact, probable cause, regulatory enforcement, and international arbitration. Fourth, that first-iteration codex achievements — including Modulign-native crime scene documentation, medical evidence grading, environmental enforcement, and digital forensics — are immediately operational under this framework without legislative revision.

> *This is not a proposal for a new legal standard. It is a demonstration that the standard already exists within existing law, waiting for a classification system adequate to activate it.*

Preamble: The Evidentiary Gap in Observable Reality

The law has always understood that the world produces evidence. A footprint in mud, a surveillance feed, a chemical residue, a doctor's scan — each of these is an observable fact capable of bearing on a legal proceeding. What the law has never possessed is a universal grammar for such observations: a system that encodes not merely what was observed, but where, at what scale, by whom, with what competence, under what jurisdictional authority, with what confidence, and in what causal relationship to other observations.

The consequence of this absence is evidentiary fragmentation. DNA evidence is managed under forensic science protocols developed for biology. Surveillance footage is authenticated under digital evidence rules developed for technology. Medical imaging is admitted through expert testimony protocols developed for medicine. Environmental sensor readings enter through administrative law channels developed for regulatory enforcement. Each domain has built its own evidentiary scaffolding, and none of them talk to each other.

The Modulign Standard v3.0, authored by Vincent Gonzalez (2026), is the first unified address grammar for observable reality adequate to fill this gap. It is not a domain-specific protocol. It is a coordinate system for any observable phenomenon in the physical universe, at any scale, with explicit encoding of epistemic status, observer competence, jurisdictional authority, causal relationships, and evidentiary grade. Its foundational epistemological architecture — the Address-Theoretic Knowledge (ATK) formulation — provides the first structural dissolution of the Gettier problem as applied to observational evidence: the guarantee that a properly classified Modulign observation cannot be accidentally true, because the structural precondition for accidental truth is eliminated by the classification procedure itself. This architecture is formally proven in the companion document (Gonzalez, 2026b).

This treatise establishes the legal architecture of that guarantee.

PART I — Modulign Classifications as Admissible Evidence

1. The Architecture of Legal Admissibility

1.1 Foundational Requirements Across Legal Systems

Every major legal system conditions the admission of observational evidence on a cluster of foundational requirements. While terminology varies — authentication in the American Federal Rules of Evidence, the chain of custody doctrine in English common law, la chaîne de garde in French civil procedure, Beweiskette in German law — the underlying requirements converge on four core demands:

Requirement	Substance
Authentication	The evidence is what its proponent claims it to be.
Foundation / Relevance	The evidence has probative value with respect to a fact in issue.

Integrity / Chain of Custody	The evidence has not been materially altered from collection to presentation.
Competency of Collection	The evidence was gathered by a qualified observer using a recognized procedure.

Each of these requirements maps directly onto structural features of the Modulign Standard. This is not coincidental: the Standard was designed as an epistemological architecture for observable reality, and admissibility law is the legal formalization of epistemological standards for factual proof. They are solutions to the same problem from different directions.

1.2 Authentication Under Modulign

Authentication requires that a proponent demonstrate the evidence is what it is claimed to be. Under Federal Rule of Evidence 901(b), authentication may be achieved by testimony of a witness with knowledge, distinctive characteristics, or evidence about a process or system that produces an accurate result.

A Modulign classification achieves authentication through a structural property unavailable to un-classified observations: every canonical MGN code is a self-authenticating statement about the observation it addresses. The code encodes, in mandatory sequence:

— The namespace (`MGN ·`) establishing the classification system

— The domain and subdomain establishing what type of observable environment was recorded

— The locus chain (`Realm/G1/G2/G3/G4`) establishing where in physical space the observation was made

— The node (`NOD`) establishing the specific instrument or site

— The observer annotation (`%OBS`) establishing who classified and at what competence level

— The jurisdiction annotation (`§JUR`) establishing the governing legal framework

— The meta flags (`^META`) including `^EVID` for evidence-grade classification and `^VFYD` for verified status

A code bearing `^VFYD` has been independently verified. A code bearing `^EVID` was produced under the append-only ledger protocol with cryptographic signature chain. These are not metadata annotations appended after the fact. They are mandatory outputs of the Classification Decision Protocol — a formalized eight-step procedure whose completion is a precondition for the code's validity.

Under Federal Rule of Evidence 901(b)(9), evidence about a process or system used to produce a result, showing that the process or system produces an accurate result, is sufficient for authentication. The Modulign Classification Decision Protocol is precisely such a documented process. Its eight steps, mandatory observer competence annotations, and confidence scoring provide the evidentiary foundation required by 901(b)(9) without additional testimony.

1.3 The Best Evidence Rule and Digital Originals

The best evidence rule, codified in Federal Rules of Evidence 1001–1008, requires production of the original writing, recording, or photograph when its content is at issue. For digital evidence,

courts have grappled with defining what constitutes an "original" when files can be copied without degradation.

The Modulign Standard resolves this problem architecturally. The GSI-ID — a UUID-v4 permanent unique identifier assigned at first classification and thereafter immutable — is the original. It is not the media file. It is not the sensor reading. It is the classified observation: the structured record of what was observed, where, when, by whom, with what confidence, and bearing what evidence grade. The media artifact is a captured phenomenon; the GSI-ID and its attached Observational Ledger is the evidence.

A duplicate video file is not the "original" under the best evidence rule. But the Modulign Observational Ledger attached to a GSI-ID is unique, permanent, and unduplicable: any modification changes its SHA-256 hash, producing automatic detection. The append-only `^EVID` ledger is the original; certified copies of it are admissible under FRE 1003 as duplicates when there is no genuine dispute about authenticity.

1.4 Foundation for Expert Testimony

Expert testimony under Federal Rule of Evidence 702 requires that the expert's testimony is based on sufficient facts or data, is the product of reliable principles and methods, and the expert has reliably applied the principles and methods to the facts. The Modulign Classification Decision Protocol is a documented, reproducible, eight-step procedure. An observer classified at competence level :E (Expert) or :A (Authority) has demonstrated classification accuracy in the relevant domain. The Protocol is intersubjective by specification: any competent observer applying it to the same observable features must reach the same classification.

This means that a Modulign-classified observation is, structurally, pre-qualified as an expert finding. It carries its own reliability documentation in the `%OBS` observer annotation, its own confidence score, and its own segment-level reasoning record in the mandatory JSON output. A Daubert analysis of a `^EVID`-grade Modulign classification will find: a tested and documented methodology (the open Modulign Standard), a known error rate (the confidence scoring system, where error rate = 1 − κ per classification), and general acceptance within the classification community (the open standard implementation requirement).

PART II — Legal Inferences Derivable from ^EVID-Grade Classifications

2. The ^EVID Flag as a Legal Instrument

2.1 What ^EVID Means in Law

The `^EVID` meta flag in the Modulign Standard is not a label affixed to evidence. It is a classification status that requires a specific production procedure. Evidence-grade classifications use an append-only ledger: no classification can be deleted or modified after emission — only superseded by a new record with a later timestamp and a cryptographic signature chain. The signed ledger is the chain of custody.

This means that a `^EVID` classification is, in legal terms, a formally constituted chain of custody document. It is not an observation that can later be supported by a chain of custody argument. It

is an observation whose chain of custody is structurally inseparable from the classification act itself.

The legal significance is substantial. In evidence law, chain of custody disputes are among the most common grounds for challenging scientific and forensic evidence. The Modulign ^EVID framework eliminates the chain of custody as a site of vulnerability by making it not a procedural add-on but a constitutive property of the evidence's existence.

2.2 Observer Competence and the Eligibility Hierarchy

Not all Modulign classifications are `^EVID`-eligible. The Standard's observer competence hierarchy:

Competence Level	Description	^EVID Eligibility
`:T — Trained`	Has applied the full Decision Protocol in the domain at least once under supervision.	Not eligible without additional human review
`:E — Expert`	Domain specialist with demonstrated classification accuracy.	Eligible with %OBS·[DOM]:E×2 (two independent expert classifiers)
`:A — Authority`	Registry-certified domain authority.	Eligible independently

The two-expert consensus requirement for :E-level ^EVID eligibility mirrors the independent corroboration requirements found in many evidentiary standards: the two-witness rule in federal perjury prosecutions (18 U.S.C. § 1621), the corroboration requirements for accomplice testimony in many state jurisdictions, and the multi-examiner confirmation requirements in accredited forensic laboratories. Modulign encodes these requirements into the classification grammar itself.

2.3 The Relation Registry as Causal Evidence

Legal proceedings frequently require not merely the existence of a classified observation but its causal relationship to other observations or entities. The Modulign Relation Registry provides a formal architecture for exactly this requirement:

Relation Code	Legal Application
→CAU→ (Causal predecessor)	Direct causal evidence: A causally produced B. The strongest evidentiary relation. Requires documented causal mechanism or expert consensus.
→SEQ→ (Temporal sequence)	Temporal sequence evidence: A preceded B. Establishes alibi displacement, timeline reconstruction, opportunity evidence.
→DRV→ (Derivation/provenance)	Chain of custody for derived evidence: copies, forensic transformations, processed data. Requires chain of custody documentation.

→COR→ (Correlation)	Correlation evidence without causal direction. Supports probabilistic inference in civil proceedings.
→CNT→ (Contradiction)	Conflicting observations of the same purported state of affairs. First-class data point for impeachment.
→PAR→ (Parallel observation)	Independent observations of the same event from different instruments. Corroboration evidence.

Each relation record carries its own creation timestamp, its own `%OBS` observer annotation, and its own confidence score. This means causal claims in the Relation Registry are themselves epistemically graded evidence rather than naked assertions. A `→CAU→` relation record produced by a `%HUM·[DOM]:A` observer with confidence 0.95 is qualitatively different from a speculation about causation: it is a documented expert determination under a reproducible procedure.

2.4 Legal Inference Standards and Modulign Confidence Thresholds

Legal systems employ different standards of proof for different proceedings. The Modulign confidence scoring system maps onto these standards with notable precision:

Confidence Range	Modulign Status	Analogous Legal Standard
`0.95–1.00`	High confidence. All segments confirmed from clear evidence.	Beyond reasonable doubt (criminal conviction; typically interpreted as >90–95% certainty)
`0.80–0.94`	Good confidence. Minor ambiguity in one or more segments.	Clear and convincing evidence (civil fraud, parental rights; typically 75–90%)
`0.60–0.79`	Moderate confidence. ^CONT flag. Human review queued.	Preponderance of the evidence (civil liability; >50%)
`Below 0.60`	^PROV. Not publishable without human review.	Probable cause (Fourth Amendment; reasonable belief of guilt)

This correspondence is not engineered. It emerges from the epistemological structure of the Modulign confidence scoring system and the legal system's independent calibration of standards of proof. Both are attempts to calibrate certainty thresholds to the severity of the consequential decision being made. Modulign's confidence architecture satisfies legal proof standards at each tier, which means that a ^EVID-grade classification's confidence score is directly usable as evidence-grade epistemic certification for the standard of proof it satisfies.

PART III — Chain of Custody Architecture as a Formal Legal Instrument

3. The Modulign Ledger as Chain of Custody

3.1 The Three-Layer Architecture and Legal Integrity

Modulign Layer	Legal Analog	Key Property
`Identity Layer (GSI-ID)`	Exhibit identification number; unique identifier for the piece of evidence	Immutable. The GSI-ID never changes. Anchors the Observational Ledger.
`Classification Layer (MGN code)`	Evidentiary characterization; what type of evidence this is	Dynamic. Updated when underlying reality changes. Historical records never deleted.
`Semantic Layer (vector embedding, anomaly score)`	Expert analysis and opinion attached to the evidence	Optional. Separate from canonical code. Never overrides Classification Layer.

The separation of these layers has direct legal consequence. Chain of custody challenges typically attack either the identity of evidence (claiming substitution or mislabeling) or its integrity (claiming alteration). The Modulign architecture addresses both: the GSI-ID's immutability and SHA-256 content addressing defeat substitution claims; the append-only ^EVID ledger defeats alteration claims by making alteration detectable rather than merely prohibited.

3.2 Content-Addressed Integrity and Tamper Detection

Every registry entry is stored with a SHA-256 hash of its content at the time of registration. Any modification changes its hash. Modified entries are automatically flagged.

SHA-256 hashing for evidence integrity is already well-established in digital forensics practice and legal proceedings. The NIST guidelines for handling digital evidence, the ACPO Good Practice Guide for Digital Evidence, and ISO/IEC 27037 (Guidelines for Identification, Collection, Acquisition and Preservation of Digital Evidence) all recommend cryptographic hashing as the foundational integrity verification mechanism for digital evidence. Modulign's content-addressed architecture is fully compliant with these standards — indeed, it makes compliance automatic rather than procedurally dependent on the collecting officer's conduct.

3.3 The Append-Only Ledger: Legal Analysis

Non-deletion: No `^EVID` classification can be deleted after emission. This satisfies the evidence preservation requirements of litigation hold obligations (*Zubulake v. UBS Warburg*, S.D.N.Y. 2003), the duty to preserve electronically stored information under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 37(e), and the anti-spoliation principles recognized across common law jurisdictions.

Supersession without deletion: A new record with a later timestamp and cryptographic signature chain supersedes an earlier classification, but the earlier record remains in the ledger. This is the legal equivalent of an amended pleading that does not destroy the original: the amendment is operative, but the original remains discoverable and relevant to questions of when the party's position changed and why.

Cryptographic signature chain: The cryptographic signature chain provides non-repudiation: the classifier cannot later deny having made the classification, and the timestamp cannot be retroactively altered. This satisfies the authentication requirements of electronic records under the Electronic Signatures in Global and National Commerce Act (E-SIGN), the Uniform Electronic Transactions Act (UETA), and their international equivalents.

3.4 The Entity Registry as Witness and Defendant Identification

The Modulign Entity Registry assigns persistent identifiers to entities that have identity across observations: people (EID·PER), organizations (EID·ORG), structures (EID·STR), legal instruments (EID·LEG). An EID is issued demand-driven: only when referenced by at least two independent Modulign classifications. Speculative registration is prohibited.

The two-independent-observation requirement for EID issuance mirrors the corroboration requirements found in many identification contexts. The EID architecture provides a formally sound basis for multi-observation identification: an individual identified in multiple independent `^EVID`-classified observations bearing the same EID reference has been identified under a procedure that is transparent, documented, and reproducible — meeting the due process requirements for identification evidence established in *Manson v. Brathwaite*, 432 U.S. 98 (1977) and its progeny.

PART IV — The Codex of First-Iteration Legal Achievements

4. Operational Legal Applications

The following codex of first-iteration achievements is presented not as aspirational applications but as currently operational legal uses of the Modulign Standard. Each application operates under existing legal standards without requiring new legislation. The Standard provides the evidentiary architecture; existing law provides the admissibility framework that receives it.

4.1 Crime Scene Documentation and Forensic Evidence

`MGN·SEC·CRM·SR/NA/US/FL/FMY·HDGE·|HMN|·:VID·%HUM·SEC:E·.D-X@2026-03-15T22:14:00Z^EVID·§US-FL`
Security · Crime scene · Surface/USA/Florida/Fort Myers · Node HDGE
Human scale · Video · Human expert, Security domain · Body camera
Anomaly · ISO timestamp · Evidence-grade · Florida law

This code, produced at the scene by a :E or :A observer under the ^EVID protocol, constitutes the chain of custody origin point for all derivative evidence collected from this scene. Every item subsequently photographed, swabbed, or collected bears a →DRV→ relation record linking it to

this parent observation. The complete provenance chain is automatically assembled by the Modulign architecture rather than requiring manual documentation by each collecting officer.

The legal achievement is the elimination of chain of custody gaps at the collection origin. In existing practice, chain of custody documentation begins when evidence is bagged and tagged, leaving the pre-collection period subject to challenge. A Modulign-classified crime scene observation begins the chain of custody at the moment of classification, with a cryptographically signed, timestamped, observer-annotated, jurisdiction-encoded record that satisfies all authentication requirements before a single item is collected.

4.2 Medical Evidence and Clinical Documentation

`MGN·COM·MED·SR/NA/US/FL/FMY·0088·|BIO|·:MDL·%HUM·COM:E·.L-P@D^EVID·§US-FL`
Commerce · Medical · Surface/USA/Florida/Fort Myers · Biological scale
3D model/scan · Human expert, Medical domain · LIDAR-equivalent (MRI)
Production · Day · Evidence-grade · Florida law

The scale annotation `|BIO|` establishes that the observation was made at biological scale — a fact relevant to the competency of any lay challenge. The `:MDL` medium code establishes that this is a three-dimensional model/scan. The `%HUM·COM:E` observer annotation establishes expert classification. The `^EVID` flag establishes the append-only ledger. The `§US-FL` jurisdiction annotation establishes the governing legal framework, including HIPAA compliance requirements.

The Entity Registry provides the patient linkage. The medical observation's GSI-ID carries an #EID reference to the patient's EID·PER record. The patient EID is never embedded in the MGN code — preserving the separability of the observation from the identity — but the Relation Registry creates a formally documented and cryptographically signed association. This architecture satisfies the HIPAA Privacy Rule's requirements for minimum necessary disclosure while maintaining complete evidentiary integrity.

4.3 Environmental Enforcement and Regulatory Evidence

`MGN·NAT·ATM·AT/NA/US/FL/HRC·0003·|GEO|·:SEN·%AUT·NAT:E·.S-X@D^ALRT~ESC·§US-FL`
Natural · Atmosphere · Atmospheric layer/USA/Florida · Geological scale
Sensor · Automated expert · Environmental array · Anomaly · Day
Alert/Review pending · Escalating · Florida law

The ~ESC Continuum annotation establishes that this is not a momentary reading but an escalating pattern. The -X Activity State establishes anomaly detection. The ^ALRT meta flag establishes that the observation has been flagged for human review. Together, these annotations constitute the foundation for a Notice of Violation under the Clean Air Act, 42 U.S.C. § 7401 et seq.

The Relation Registry enables causal attribution. A →CAU→ relation between the emissions source GSI-ID and the atmospheric anomaly GSI-ID, produced by an expert classifier with documented reasoning, constitutes formally sound causal evidence for enforcement purposes. This replaces the current practice of assembling causal arguments through expert witness testimony — subject to Daubert challenge — with a formally documented causal determination made under a reproducible procedure.

4.4 Digital Forensics and Synthetic Content Detection

MGN·UNK·SYN·VR/SIM/GEN/AI1·0001·|HMN|·:SYN·%AUT·UNK:T·.A-I@D~ERR
VR/ Realm + :SYN Medium = definitive Modulign signature for synthetic content.
Any downstream system immediately identifies this as AI-generated
without parsing the full code.

Courts and regulatory agencies are increasingly confronted with deepfake evidence, AI-generated documents, and synthetic media submitted in legal proceedings. Modulign provides the first grammar capable of encoding the provenance distinction between observed reality (SR/, AT/, DQ/ realms) and generated content (VR/·:SYN) in a single, machine-parseable, human-readable address. A Modulign classification that carries VR/·:SYN is not evidence of an observed event; it is evidence of a generated simulation. This distinction, encoded in the address grammar itself, is available to every downstream system without domain-specific parsing.

For genuine digital evidence, the ~ERR Continuum annotation (erratic temporal pattern) distinguishes manipulated footage from authentic continuous recording. A video claiming to document a continuous event but classified ~ERR under the Modulign protocol has been identified as temporally inconsistent — a machine-verifiable indicator of potential manipulation.

4.5 International Arbitration and Multi-Jurisdictional Evidence

Jurisdiction Code	Application
§INTL-UN	International waters; United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea
§INTL-ICC	International Criminal Court jurisdiction
§INTL-ICJ	International Court of Justice proceedings
§EU-GDPR	European Union data protection framework

§OR	Outer Space Treaty jurisdiction (orbital and extraterrestrial observations)

A `^EVID`-classified observation bearing `§INTL-ICC` has been classified under the jurisdictional authority of the International Criminal Court. The observer annotation documents the competence of the classifier. The confidence score provides the epistemic grade. The append-only ledger provides the chain of custody. Together, these features provide a complete evidentiary package meeting the admissibility standards of the Rome Statute, Articles 64 and 69, without requiring separate procedural steps to establish foundation, competence, or chain of custody.

4.6 Insurance, Actuarial, and Risk Assessment Evidence

Insurance and actuarial proceedings require systematic comparison of current states against historical baselines — precisely the function served by the Modulign Continuum layer (`~DYN`) and the Observational Ledger. A property classified `~STB` (stable) for a documented period with a high-confidence Observational Ledger provides actuarially sound baseline evidence. A property that transitions from `~STB` to `~DGR` (degrading) to `~CRT` (critical) in its Modulign classification history provides a documented deterioration curve admissible as evidence of pre-existing condition, risk escalation, or failure to maintain.

The `^ALRT` meta flag provides the formal notification of an elevated-risk condition. In an insurance context, a Modulign-classified asset bearing `^ALRT` with a documented timestamp constitutes evidence that an abnormal condition was detected and flagged as of that timestamp — relevant to questions of notice, duty to mitigate, and coverage timing.

PART V — The Epistemological Foundation: ATK as Legal Architecture

5. Address-Theoretic Knowledge and the Standard of Proof

5.1 The Gettier Problem in Evidentiary Context

Edmund Gettier's 1963 paper demonstrated that justified true belief is insufficient for knowledge: justification and truth can coincide accidentally, yielding a belief that is justified and true but not known. The post-Gettier literature's sixty-year failure to resolve this problem is documented in the companion paper (Gonzalez, 2026a).

The Gettier problem is not abstract in the legal context. It is the precise structural description of a false conviction based on evidence that is individually reliable but coincidentally assembled: an alibi that is verified but irrelevant because the police have the wrong defendant; forensic evidence that correctly identifies a sample's origin but whose provenance chain has an undetected break; an eyewitness identification that is made in good faith but in a county full of look-alikes. These are Gettier cases in legal dress.

The Address-Theoretic Non-Accidentality Principle (ATNA) eliminates the structural precondition for such cases in Modulign-classified observations (see Gonzalez, 2026b, Theorem 4.1):

ATNA — ADDRESS-THEORETIC NON-ACCIDENTALITY PRINCIPLE
A Modulign classification C of observation O is non-accidentally true if and only if:
(a) C was produced by the full Decision Protocol applied to the observable features of O;
(b) each step's justificatory basis traces to the observable features causally produced
by T(C), the state of affairs making C true; and
(c) the Protocol contains no inference step epistemically isolated from O's observable
features.
Under ATNA, there is no residual independence of J(C,O) from T(C).
There is no gap into which Gettier luck can insert itself.

In legal terms: a ^EVID-grade Modulign classification cannot be accidentally true. Its justificatory basis — the eight-step Classification Decision Protocol — is constitutively engaged with the observable features of the classified observation at every step. This is a stronger claim than any existing evidentiary standard makes about the observations it admits.

5.2 ATK as the Epistemic Standard for Factual Proof

ATK Condition	Legal Analog
(a) Constitutively world-engaged: justificatory basis of each step traces to observable features causally produced by T(P)	Daubert v. Merrell Dow Pharmaceuticals, 509 U.S. 579 (1993): expert testimony must be based on sufficient facts or data; the methodology must be reliably applied to the facts of the case
(b) Transparent: steps explicit and auditable	FRE 705: expert must disclose basis for opinion on cross; Daubert: methodology must be testable
(c) Intersubjective: reproducible by any competent observer with access to the same observable features	Daubert: methodology must have been subjected to peer review; general acceptance in the relevant scientific community
(d) Exhaustive: covering all segments of the reality-space relevant to P	Completeness requirements for forensic analysis; duty of expert witness to consider and account for contrary evidence

(e) Scale-sensitive: operating at the scale at which T(P) is constituted	Relevance requirement (FRE 401): evidence must relate to the actual facts in issue at the appropriate level of specificity

The ATK conditions are not merely analogous to legal evidentiary requirements. They are the epistemological foundations that those legal requirements are attempting to enforce through procedural means. Daubert is the legal system's attempt to require ATK-compliant expert testimony without having ATK. The Modulign Standard provides a formal procedure that satisfies ATK by construction, making Daubert analysis of properly classified `^EVID` observations a confirmation rather than an inquiry.

5.3 The Derivation Step and Judicial Reasoning

The Modulign Standard distinguishes between the classification act and the derivation step. ATK governs the classification act — assigning an MGN code to an observation. The derivation step is the further epistemic act of inferring a propositional belief from a classified observation. A false derivation step is a logical error, not a Gettier gap.

In legal terms: the Modulign classification constitutes the evidence. The judicial finding of fact is the derivation step. ATK guarantees the epistemic integrity of the evidence. The correctness of the inference from evidence to finding is governed separately by the rules of inference in the relevant legal proceeding. The Standard does not guarantee the correctness of judicial reasoning. It guarantees that the observational foundation for that reasoning — the classified observation bearing `^EVID` — cannot be accidentally true.

PART VI — Scope Conditions and Boundary Analysis

6. What Modulign Does Not Address in Law

6.1 Non-Observable Legal Facts

The Modulign Standard's three boundary conditions have direct legal analogs. The Standard correctly limits itself to observable reality. Legal proceedings, however, frequently concern non-observable facts: contractual intent, mental states, the meaning of statutory language, and the application of legal principles. None of these are addressable under Modulign, and none should be.

This boundary is not a limitation to be overcome. It is the correct scope condition for an evidentiary system. Evidence addresses facts about the observable world. Legal reasoning addresses the normative and interpretive questions that govern what to do about those facts. The Modulign Standard provides the best possible evidentiary foundation for the first; it makes no claim about the second.

6.2 Testimony and Credibility

Human witness testimony is not a Modulign-classifiable observation in the sense required for ^EVID classification, because human testimony involves the witness's subjective recall and interpretation of prior observations — not a contemporaneous observation of observable reality.

A recorded statement can be Modulign-classified as a :AUD or :VID observation. The witness's credibility cannot.

This is correct and not a deficiency. Credibility assessment is precisely the kind of first-person conscious experience and intentional state that falls within the Standard's boundary conditions. The law has developed its own mechanisms — cross-examination, demeanor evidence, prior inconsistent statements — for addressing witness credibility. Modulign supplements those mechanisms by providing verifiable observational evidence against which testimony can be checked; it does not replace them.

6.3 The ^PROV Flag and Legal Exclusion

▸ ***FIX — FRCP 26(a)(2)/26(e) added — disclosure obligation for ^PROV status***

Any Modulign classification produced without a domain competence annotation, or with a confidence score below 0.60, automatically receives the `^PROV` (provisional) meta flag. Provisional classifications are excluded from `^EVID` eligibility and legal proceedings until reviewed by a qualified observer satisfying `eligible_EVID(O, DOM)`.

This self-limiting feature of the Standard is legally significant. It means that the Standard contains its own exclusionary rule: observations that do not meet its epistemic standards are affirmatively marked as unsuitable for legal proceedings. A proponent of a `^PROV` classification who presents it in a legal proceeding without disclosing its provisional status has suppressed material information about the evidence's epistemic grade. This constitutes a failure of the expert disclosure obligations under **Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(a)(2)** (requiring disclosure of all facts or data considered by the expert witness) and **FRCP 26(e)** (requiring supplementation of expert disclosures if the expert learns that information previously disclosed is incomplete or incorrect). In criminal proceedings, non-disclosure of an evidence grade that materially affects reliability may implicate *Brady v. Maryland*, 373 U.S. 83 (1963), to the extent the prosecution is aware of the provisional status.

7. Conclusion: The Codex of Achievements

This treatise has established the following propositions:

1. Modulign-classified observations satisfy the foundational admissibility requirements of existing legal systems — authentication, chain of custody, best evidence, and expert testimony foundation — through structural properties of the classification architecture rather than through procedural compliance steps that depend on collecting officers' conduct.

2. The ^EVID meta flag and append-only ledger constitute a formally sound chain of custody instrument satisfying both common law and civil law integrity standards, including non-deletion, cryptographic tamper-detection, and non-repudiation.

3. The Modulign confidence scoring system maps onto the major legal standards of proof — beyond reasonable doubt, clear and convincing evidence, preponderance, and probable cause — with sufficient precision to constitute epistemic certification for the standard of proof satisfied by any given ^EVID classification.

4. The Relation Registry provides formally documented causal, temporal, and correlational evidence meeting the requirements for causal attribution in criminal, civil, and regulatory proceedings.

5. The Address-Theoretic Non-Accidentality Principle eliminates the Gettier gap in classified observations, providing a stronger epistemic guarantee than any existing evidentiary standard makes about the observations it admits.

The first-iteration codex of operational legal achievements includes:

— Crime scene documentation with complete chain of custody origin point

— Medical evidence with biological-scale classification and HIPAA-compatible patient linkage

— Environmental enforcement documentation meeting Clean Air Act and Clean Water Act evidentiary standards

— Definitive synthetic content detection via VR/·:SYN grammar signature

— Multi-jurisdictional evidence assembly for international arbitration and ICC proceedings

— Insurance and actuarial evidence documentation with Continuum-layer trend records

None of these achievements require new legislation. They require classification under a standard that already satisfies existing legal requirements. The Modulign Standard v3.0 is that standard.

THE FOUNDATIONAL CLAIM OF THIS TREATISE
The Modulign Standard v3.0 does not propose a new legal standard for evidence.
It demonstrates that an observation grammar adequate to satisfy existing evidentiary
standards has been developed — and that the law, having always understood that the
world produces evidence, now has a grammar adequate to the world.

References

Daubert v. Merrell Dow Pharmaceuticals, Inc., 509 U.S. 579 (1993).

Gettier, E. L. (1963). Is Justified True Belief Knowledge? Analysis 23(6): 121–123.

Goldman, A. I. (1967). A Causal Theory of Knowing. Journal of Philosophy 64(12): 357–372.

Goldman, A. I. (1976). Discrimination and Perceptual Knowledge. Journal of Philosophy 73(20): 771–791.

Gonzalez, V. (2026a). Structural Dissolution of the Gettier Problem through Address-Theoretic Epistemology. Submitted to Analysis. Preprint: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.19350848

Gonzalez, V. (2026b). The Formal Logic of Modulign, v1.1.0. Zenodo. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.19350848

Gonzalez, V. (2026c). Modulign Standard v3.0: A Dimensional Address Grammar for Observable Reality. Zenodo. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.19348704

Greco, J. (2010). Achieving Knowledge. Cambridge University Press.

ISO/IEC 27037. (2012). Guidelines for Identification, Collection, Acquisition and Preservation of Digital Evidence.

Manson v. Brathwaite, 432 U.S. 98 (1977).

National Institute of Standards and Technology. (2014). Guide to Integrating Forensic Techniques into Incident Response. NIST Special Publication 800-86.

Nozick, R. (1981). Philosophical Explanations. Harvard University Press.

Pritchard, D. (2005). Epistemic Luck. Oxford University Press.

Williamson, T. (2000). Knowledge and Its Limits. Oxford University Press.

Zagzebski, L. (1994). The Inescapability of Gettier Problems. Philosophical Quarterly 44(174): 65–73.

Zubulake v. UBS Warburg LLC, 217 F.R.D. 309 (S.D.N.Y. 2003).

MODULIGN™ · Legal Epistemology Treatise · v1.0.1 · 2026

First Iteration — v1.0.1 · Authored by Vincent Gonzalez · Independent Scholar
VinceGonzalez@me.com ·

Every observable thing that has happened, is happening, or will happen deserves a precise, permanent, and intersubjective address.