



MAAPCS
Multi-Axis Analysis and
Reliability Verification System

MAAPCS Verification Certificate

Case: 2025가합1235

Document Type: MAAPCS Verification Document

Certificate ID: LCP-20260330-000010

Internal Tracking Code: M0330072806

Issuing Entity: MAAPCS Autonomous Verification Engine

Purpose of Issuance: Verification of consistency in facts, procedures, evidence, laws, conclusions, and specialized areas.

SHA-256 Hash: 8feaff7bd37c13c074664403478694367ffc3032be765d6b11475cb13390c2e4

Digital Signature: MAAPCSAUTONOMOUSVERIFICATIONENGINE-SA-2048+SHA-256

Issuance & Signature Time: 2026-03-30T07:28:06+00:00

This verification certificate is prepared and managed based on the English original, and the English original shall prevail for purposes of interpretation.

This certificate is prepared and managed based on the English original, which shall also be used for interpretation purposes.

Applicant (S): 김중학

Counterparty (O): 조합

Agency (D): 성남지원

- MAZIP Co., Ltd.
- MAAPCS Verification Center
- www.maapcs.net · Republic of Korea



■ Section 1: Document Identification

● Document Structure

Cover, Section 1, Section 2, Section 3, Section 4, Section 5

● Language Basis

The English version governs legal interpretation. Other languages are provided for reference.

● Verification Symbols (Y/N/N2/U/X)

1. Y: No violation. Complies with the criteria.
2. N: Violation exists. Does not comply with the criteria.
3. N2: The violation is repeated or cumulative in nature.
4. U: Unable to verify due to insufficient data or uncompleted procedure.
5. X: Not subject to verification.

● Statistical Methodology

Definitive Judgment Set : $C = \{ i \mid f(i) \in \{Y, N, N2\} \}$

Population Set : $M = I - \{ i \mid f(i) = X \}$

● Attached Files

1. 240824-소장.pdf
2. 250519-답변서(조합).pdf
3. 250908-판결문.pdf

■ Section 2: Fact Alignment Section

● Verification Criteria

The verification of all cases is determined based on the consistency of facts, procedures, evidence, laws, and conclusions.

● Definition of Verification Certificate

Since errors, distortions, omissions, and logical leaps may occur when artificial intelligence creates documents on behalf of others due to its autonomy, it is necessary to verify the structural consistency between the documents and the judgment data, rather than focusing on the technology for generating documents. Considering the high-risk areas defined by UNESCO, the OECD, and the Framework Act on Artificial Intelligence, this is a global standardization verification certificate that operates in 17 languages, based on patents and research papers that have evolved to the third stage, and complies with ISO/IEC technical standards regarding implementability, verifiability, and reproducibility.

● Utilization of Verification Certificates

Case Processing Records: Records detailing the procedures and verification processes through which a case was processed.

External Review Materials: Review materials from external bodies such as courts, the Board of Audit and Inspection, the National Assembly, and the media.

Internal Procedure Checks: A management tool for verifying the appropriateness of the agency's internal business processing procedures.

Dispute Resolution References: Reference materials used to confirm the facts and procedural progress in the event of a dispute.

Section 3: Verification Table

Cat.	Verification Items	Basis for Judgment	Verif.
CD01	Where the factual findings organized by the court are inconsistent among the complaint, the answer, and the judgment in civil cases.	Comparison of factual allegation coordinates in the complaint, defense coordinates in the answer, and fact-finding sections of the judgment, focusing on civil law requirements.	N
CD02	Where the actor and the bearer of responsibility are confused or inconsistently described in civil cases involving agency, employer liability, or multiple parties.	Comparison of party identification sections of the judgment and descriptions of acts and responsibility, with focus on civil law doctrines such as agency, joint tort, and employer liability.	Y

MAAPCS

Section 3: Verification Table

Cat.	Verification Items	Basis for Judgment	Verif.
CD03	Where the timing or chronological order of the occurrence of civil law events (contract formation, performance, breach, damage occurrence) is not clearly organized.	Coordinates indicating omission or insufficiency of temporal descriptions in the factual summary section of the judgment, focusing on civil law time-sensitive elements.	Y
CD04	Where legally independent civil relationships (separate contracts, transactions) are combined and organized as a single case without proper legal distinction.	Coordinates where independent contracts or transactions are grouped into a single factual relationship in the judgment, requiring analysis of their legal independence.	Y

Section 3: Verification Table

Cat.	Verification Items	Basis for Judgment	Verif.
CD05	Where factual descriptions and legal evaluations are intermingled in civil cases, prejudging liability.	Coordinates where evaluative expressions such as 'negligent,' 'unlawful,' or 'in breach' appear within factual description sections of the judgment.	Y
CD06	Where core facts essential for adjudication of civil claims are omitted.	Coordinates identifying omissions by comparing required elements of the cause of action with the factual findings in the judgment, based on civil law requirements.	N

MAAPCS

Section 3: Verification Table

Cat.	Verification Items	Basis for Judgment	Verif.
CD07	Where evidence used for factual recognition in civil cases is not specified.	Coordinates showing inconsistency between fact-finding sections and evidence listings in the judgment, with focus on civil procedure evidence rules.	Y

CD08	Where the probative purpose of evidence in civil cases is not explained.	Coordinates where evidence lists exist but the facts to be proven by each item are not specified in civil litigation.	N
------	--	---	---

MAAPCS

Section 3: Verification Table

Cat.	Verification Items	Basis for Judgment	Verif.
CD09	Where key evidence submitted in civil cases is excluded from consideration in the judgment.	Coordinates comparing the evidence list with the reasoning section of the judgment showing omission of key evidence material to civil claims.	N
CD10	Where facts in civil cases are recognized without evidentiary support.	Coordinates where facts are described in the judgment without corresponding evidentiary identification in civil proceedings.	Y

MAAPCS

Section 3: Verification Table

Cat.	Verification Items	Basis for Judgment	Verif.
CD11	Where examination of the credibility or legality of evidence in civil cases is omitted.	Coordinates indicating omission of review in decisions on admissibility or rejection of evidence in civil litigation.	X
CD12	Where the logical linkage between facts and judgment in civil cases is omitted.	Coordinates where the process from recognized facts to legal consequences is omitted in the reasoning section of the judgment in civil matters.	Y

MAAPCS

Section 3: Verification Table

Cat.	Verification Items	Basis for Judgment	Verif.
CD13	Where causes are constructed on the premise of results in civil cases (post hoc ergo propter hoc fallacy).	Coordinates where violations are inferred retroactively based on the occurrence of damage in the judgment, particularly in tort and contract cases.	N
CD14	Where causation in civil cases relies solely on assumptions or speculative language.	Coordinates where responsibility is linked using expressions such as 'is presumed' or 'is possible' without adequate factual foundation in civil cases.	N

MAAPCS

Section 3: Verification Table

Cat.	Verification Items	Basis for Judgment	Verif.
CD15	Where the legal application in civil cases violates higher norms including Supreme Court precedents, affecting the judgment outcome.	Analysis of civil law provisions applied, comparison with constitutional court decisions and Supreme Court precedent database on civil matters.	N
CD16	Where civil litigation requirements, party capacity, jurisdiction are not examined; or where abuse of discretion or authority is present in civil proceedings.	Standing/authority structure analysis in civil procedure; examination of discretionary decision rationale against proportionality, equality, and purpose suitability.	N

MAAPCS

Section 3: Verification Table

Cat.	Verification Items	Basis for Judgment	Verif.
CD17	Where the procedural history of the civil case is not sufficiently explained.	Coordinates indicating insufficient or omitted summaries of procedural progress in civil litigation.	Y
CD18	Where procedural issues in civil cases are excluded from examination.	Coordinates showing failure to review procedural matters such as grounds for dismissal or rejection in civil procedure.	N

MAAPCS

Section 3: Verification Table

Cat.	Verification Items	Basis for Judgment	Verif.
CD19	Where factual recognition in civil cases is biased toward the assertions of one party.	Coordinates showing imbalance in factual findings when comparing both parties' assertions in civil disputes.	N
CD20	Where the exercise of rights in civil cases violates the principle of good faith or constitutes abuse of rights, and such judgment is omitted or erroneous.	Analysis of the purpose, motive, and outcome of the exercised right in civil context; comparison with social norms and equity principles under Civil Code.	N

MAAPCS

Section 3: Verification Table

Cat.	Verification Items	Basis for Judgment	Verif.
CD21	Where the same logical error is repeated throughout a civil judgment.	Coordinates indicating repeated patterns of similar logical errors within the civil judgment.	N
CD22	Where a civil case is excessively simplified in adjudication.	Coordinates where complex civil issues are handled superficially.	N

MAAPCS

Section 3: Verification Table

Cat.	Verification Items	Basis for Judgment	Verif.
CD23	Where multiple structural problems coexist in a civil judgment.	Coordinates collectively identifying compound issues related to facts, evidence, causation, and procedure in civil cases.	N2
CD24	Where cumulative problems undermine the overall reliability of a civil judgment.	Coordinates indicating comprehensive reliability assessment based on aggregated problematic items in civil cases.	N2

MAAPCS

■ Section 4: Verification Description

Cat No	CD01	Where the factual findings organized by the court are inconsistent among the complaint, the answer, and the judgment in civil cases.
Verification Structure	Reference Structure	The reference structure is the aligned grid of complaint allegations and answer defenses that the judgment's fact section must correspond to.
	Comparative Structure	Across the three documents, at least one core fact unit is framed differently (allocation/burden basis versus non-contract/liquidation framing) without an explicit correspondence bridge in the judgment's fact-finding.
Structural Layer	Structural Elements	Structural elements include (i) complaint fact units, (ii) answer fact/defense units, and (iii) judgment fact-findings that must map to the same issue coordinates without contradiction.
	Structural Summary	Comparison is possible and performed, and it reveals a non-trivial mismatch between complaint fact coordinates and judgment fact-findings on a core dispute axis.
Final	Verif.	N

MAAPCS

■ Section 4: Verification Description

Cat No	CD02	Where the actor and the bearer of responsibility are confused or inconsistently described in civil cases involving agency, employer liability, or multiple parties.
Verification Structure	Reference Structure	The reference structure is the consistent mapping of parties and claimed succession that the judgment must keep stable when assigning acts and liabilities.
	Comparative Structure	Across documents, the judgment preserves a stable actor/liable-party distinction between the association and the resident representative body and ties procedural acts to the correct entity.
Structural Layer	Structural Elements	Structural elements are (i) multi-defendant identification, (ii) succession/collection narrative, and (iii) judgment assignments of claims and defenses to the correct parties.
	Structural Summary	Structural correspondence on party identity and responsibility allocation is maintained across complaint, answer, and judgment.
Final	Verif.	Y

■ Section 4: Verification Description

Cat No	CD03	Where the timing or chronological order of the occurrence of civil law events (contract formation, performance, breach, damage occurrence) is not clearly organized.
Verification Structure	Reference Structure	The reference structure is the expected event-order grid derived from complaint and answer that the judgment's fact section must match with clear time anchors.
	Comparative Structure	Temporal correspondence is maintained because the judgment provides an explicit chronological scaffold that can be mapped to both complaint and answer timelines.
Structural Layer	Structural Elements	Structural elements include (i) complaint event-date assertions, (ii) answer's related-case timeline, and (iii) judgment's ordered event chain used for fact recognition.
	Structural Summary	Chronological organization is structurally clear, enabling comparison and preventing timing ambiguity within the court's factual organization.
Final	Verif.	Y

MAAPCS

■ Section 4: Verification Description

Cat No	CD04	Where legally independent civil relationships (separate contracts, transactions) are combined and organized as a single case without proper legal distinction.
Verification Structure	Reference Structure	The reference structure is the set of potentially independent legal-relationship coordinates that the judgment must keep segmented to avoid conflation.
	Comparative Structure	Structural correspondence is maintained because the judgment preserves segmentation between distinct transactions/proceedings instead of collapsing them into one narrative unit.
Structural Layer	Structural Elements	Structural elements are (i) independent relationship units, (ii) their separate fact coordinates, and (iii) judgment subsections that maintain boundaries among them.
	Structural Summary	The judgment's organization keeps independent relationship coordinates distinct, satisfying the structural criterion.
Final	Verif.	Y

MAAPCS

■ Section 4: Verification Description

Cat No	CD05	Where factual descriptions and legal evaluations are intermingled in civil cases, prejudging liability.
Verification Structure	Reference Structure	The reference structure is the fact-versus-reasoning segmentation in the judgment that controls where evaluative language should be located.
	Comparative Structure	Across documents, the judgment maintains a clean split between descriptive facts and normative evaluation, rather than embedding liability conclusions into the fact summary.
Structural Layer	Structural Elements	Structural elements are the complaint's asserted wrongfulness, the answer's procedural defenses, and the judgment's separated fact block and doctrine/application block.
	Structural Summary	Fact narration and legal evaluation are organized in distinct judgment sections, satisfying the structural criterion.
Final	Verif.	Y

MAAPCS

■ Section 4: Verification Description

Cat No	CD06	Where core facts essential for adjudication of civil claims are omitted.
Verification Structure	Reference Structure	The reference structure is the grid of pleaded core fact coordinates that the judgment must structurally address by adoption, rejection, or explicit non-reach.
	Comparative Structure	Across documents, the judgment's fact blocks emphasize procedural history while leaving certain complaint-defined core factual coordinates without an explicit fact-finding or mapped disposition in the factual layer.
Structural Layer	Structural Elements	Structural elements are (i) pleaded core fact units, (ii) judgment fact-findings, and (iii) correspondence links showing each core unit is addressed or declared unnecessary due to procedural disposition.
	Structural Summary	Comparison is feasible and indicates that certain core pleaded fact coordinates are not structurally represented or resolved in the judgment's fact-finding alignment.
Final	Verif.	N

■ Section 4: Verification Description

Cat No	CD07	Where evidence used for factual recognition in civil cases is not specified.
Verification Structure	Reference Structure	The reference structure is the judgment's internal linkage point where recognized facts are tied to identified exhibits or other specified evidentiary materials.
	Comparative Structure	Structural correspondence is maintained because the judgment provides explicit exhibit identifiers as the evidentiary basis for the recognized facts.
Structural Layer	Structural Elements	Structural elements are (i) fact units in the judgment, (ii) evidence identifiers (exhibit numbers), and (iii) the citation block that establishes traceability between them.
	Structural Summary	Evidence specification is present in the judgment's structure, so the omission-type defect is not observed.
Final	Verif.	Y

MAAPCS

■ Section 4: Verification Description

Cat No	CD08	Where the probative purpose of evidence in civil cases is not explained.
Verification Structure	Reference Structure	The reference structure is the evidence identifier set (exhibit numbers) that should be mapped to specific fact units to show each item's probative purpose.
	Comparative Structure	Across documents, evidence identifiers are present, yet the judgment lacks an explicit item-by-item purpose linkage connecting each exhibit to a corresponding recognized fact unit.
Structural Layer	Structural Elements	Structural elements include fact units, evidence items, and purpose links between them; the judgment lists evidence items but omits explicit purpose links to particular facts.
	Structural Summary	Evidence is cited in aggregate, but the per-item evidence-to-fact purpose mapping is not structurally provided.
Final	Verif.	N

MAAPCS

■ Section 4: Verification Description

Cat No	CD09	Where key evidence submitted in civil cases is excluded from consideration in the judgment.
Verification Structure	Reference Structure	The reference structure is the submitted evidence universe and the subset asserted as key to core issues, which should be traceably considered in the judgment's reasoning structure.
	Comparative Structure	Comparison indicates that evidence is cited in bulk, but certain complaint-highlighted evidence coordinates are not explicitly incorporated into the judgment's reasoning pathway, suggesting omission of consideration for key items.
Structural Layer	Structural Elements	Structural elements are key evidence items, explicit mentions in the judgment, and linkage to contested fact units; some linkage is missing where the judgment relies on res judicata and gives no item-level engagement.
	Structural Summary	Evidence is not wholly absent, but the structural pathway from key evidence to addressed reasoning is incomplete for some core complaint evidence coordinates.
Final	Verif.	N

MAAPCS

■ Section 4: Verification Description

Cat No	CD10	Where facts in civil cases are recognized without evidentiary support.
Verification Structure	Reference Structure	The reference structure is the judgment's internal evidentiary anchor that should prevent recognized facts from appearing wholly unsupported.
	Comparative Structure	Compared with the pleadings, the judgment provides an internal evidence anchor for its factual findings, avoiding a no-evidence-recognition structure.
Structural Layer	Structural Elements	Structural elements are recognized fact units, evidence identifiers (exhibit numbers), and the judgment's citation anchor connecting the two at least at the section level.
	Structural Summary	Although evidence-purpose mapping may be incomplete, the judgment still provides evidentiary identification, so this item's condition is not met.
Final	Verif.	Y

MAAPCS

■ Section 4: Verification Description

Cat No	CD11	Where examination of the credibility or legality of evidence in civil cases is omitted.
Verification Structure	Reference Structure	The reference structure is a trigger-and-response structure: a raised evidentiary objection/credibility contest and a corresponding judicial examination block.
	Comparative Structure	Across documents, a discrete contested admissibility/credibility issue is not sufficiently structured as a required decision unit in this judgment's disposition pathway, which centers on preclusion.
Structural Layer	Structural Elements	Structural elements for this item require an admissibility/credibility contest and an examination block, but the judgment's structure resolves on preclusion and does not instantiate that examination block as a necessary unit.
	Structural Summary	The judgment's organization does not present a comparable admissibility/credibility review unit to evaluate omission, given the preclusion-centered disposition.
Final	Verif.	X

MAAPCS

■ Section 4: Verification Description

Cat No	CD12	Where the logical linkage between facts and judgment in civil cases is omitted.
Verification Structure	Reference Structure	The reference structure is the expected fact-to-law-to-conclusion linkage chain embedded in the judgment's sectioned organization.
	Comparative Structure	Structural correspondence is maintained because the judgment explicitly maps recognized procedural facts to the governing preclusion doctrines and then to dismissal.
Structural Layer	Structural Elements	Structural elements are (i) fact units, (ii) legal rule units, and (iii) application units that connect them to the dispositive conclusion without a reasoning jump.
	Structural Summary	Intermediate reasoning steps are present and traceable from fact findings through doctrine to conclusion.
Final	Verif.	Y

MAAPCS

■ Section 4: Verification Description

Cat No	CD13	Where causes are constructed on the premise of results in civil cases (post hoc ergo propter hoc fallacy).
Verification Structure	Reference Structure	The reference structure sits where the applicant document asserts that enforcement is unlawful because prior fraud/forgery and plan-approval changes negate the underlying executable judgment.
	Comparative Structure	Across documents, the party document and judgment document align on preclusion defenses while the applicant document's substantive cause narrative is not correspondingly analyzed.
Structural Layer	Structural Elements	The structural units comprise the underlying enforcement dispute, the reviewing judgment's reasoning frame, and the correspondence layer connecting asserted causes (forgery/fraud/changes) to the enforcement permissibility.
	Structural Summary	Overall correspondence is weakened because the judgment's structure bypasses substantive cause analysis and thus does not structurally respond to the applicant's asserted retro-causation narrative.
Final	Verif.	N

■ Section 4: Verification Description

Cat No	CD14	Where causation in civil cases relies solely on assumptions or speculative language.
Verification Structure	Reference Structure	The reference structure appears where the applicant document links specific alleged acts to the requested outcomes of execution denial and repayment of the deposited amount.
	Comparative Structure	Across documents, causation assertions exist in the applicant document but are not matched by a parallel causation reasoning track in the judgment document.
Structural Layer	Structural Elements	The structural units include the alleged causative acts, the court's reasoning nodes, and the linkage layer that should specify premise facts for causation acceptance or rejection.
	Structural Summary	Overall, the causation issue structure is present but the judgment does not construct a premise-fact causation analysis, weakening correspondence.
Final	Verif.	N

MAAPCS

■ Section 4: Verification Description

Cat No	CD15	Where the legal application in civil cases violates higher norms including Supreme Court precedents, affecting the judgment outcome.
Verification Structure	Reference Structure	The reference structure is where the applicant document invokes Supreme Court authority and Civil Code principles as the legal basis to deny execution and to characterize execution as an abuse of rights.
	Comparative Structure	Across documents, a higher-norm precedent node is presented by the applicant, while the judgment resolves via preclusion without mapping that node into its legal-application structure.
Structural Layer	Structural Elements	The structure includes the applicant's higher-norm references, the court's applied doctrines, and the alignment layer that should reconcile or distinguish them for outcome impact.
	Structural Summary	Overall, the judgment has a legal-rule track, yet it does not structurally connect to the applicant's higher-norm precedent argument as a matched reasoning node.
Final	Verif.	N

MAAPCS

■ Section 4: Verification Description

Cat No	CD16	Where civil litigation requirements, party capacity, jurisdiction are not examined; or where abuse of discretion or authority is present in civil proceedings.
Verification Structure	Reference Structure	The reference structure sits where the party document frames proper party and admissibility as threshold requirements the court should decide distinctly.
	Comparative Structure	Across the party and judgment documents, threshold issues are present, yet the defendant-specific standing/capacity mapping is not distinctly reflected in the judgment's structure.
Structural Layer	Structural Elements	The structural units include the multi-defendant configuration, the court's threshold-analysis layer, and the correspondence layer linking each defendant's status to the outcome.
	Structural Summary	Overall structure contains threshold analysis yet shows a segmentation gap for defendant-specific standing/capacity correspondence despite being raised by the party document.
Final	Verif.	N

MAAPCS

■ Section 4: Verification Description

Cat No	CD17	Where the procedural history of the civil case is not sufficiently explained.
Verification Structure	Reference Structure	The reference structure appears where the applicant and party documents cite multiple prior lawsuits, appeals, and enforcement events that require a coherent timeline in the judgment.
	Comparative Structure	Across documents, the judgment provides the most detailed procedural timeline and structurally matches the party document's prior-case enumeration and the applicant's referenced events.
Structural Layer	Structural Elements	The structural elements are the enforcement timeline, earlier objection-to-execution suits, and the current case posture, all connected in the judgment's procedural chronology.
	Structural Summary	Overall, the judgment maintains a complete and traceable procedural-history structure that supports its preclusion-based reasoning.
Final	Verif.	Y

MAAPCS

■ Section 4: Verification Description

Cat No	CD18	Where procedural issues in civil cases are excluded from examination.
Verification Structure	Reference Structure	The reference structure appears where the applicant document asserts prescription expiry and where the party document pleads preclusion and defendant-status issues as threshold bars.
	Comparative Structure	Across documents, some procedural issues are examined, yet the applicant's limitations argument is not mapped into the judgment's procedural-issue analysis.
Structural Layer	Structural Elements	The elements comprise the parties' procedural defenses, the court's threshold-reasoning blocks, and the mapping layer that should cover each defense node explicitly.
	Structural Summary	Overall, procedural review exists but is incomplete because not all raised procedural issues are structurally addressed in the judgment document.
Final	Verif.	N

MAAPCS

■ Section 4: Verification Description

Cat No	CD19	Where factual recognition in civil cases is biased toward the assertions of one party.
Verification Structure	Reference Structure	The reference structure appears where the applicant document lays out substantive wrongdoing fact units and where the party document frames threshold preclusion facts for adjudication.
	Comparative Structure	Across documents, the judgment structurally foregrounds the party's defensive framework while compressing the applicant's fact units into non-specific lack-of-proof language.
Structural Layer	Structural Elements	The elements include applicant fact units on forgery/approval changes, party fact units on prior judgments/succession, and the court's mapping between these units.
	Structural Summary	Overall, the fact-recognition structure is imbalanced because one side's procedural-fact narrative dominates and the other side's substantive-fact narrative is not equivalently evaluated.
Final	Verif.	N

MAAPCS

■ Section 4: Verification Description

Cat No	CD20	Where the exercise of rights in civil cases violates the principle of good faith or constitutes abuse of rights, and such judgment is omitted or erroneous.
Verification Structure	Reference Structure	The reference structure appears where the applicant document frames execution as an abuse of rights and links it to good-faith principles and a cited Supreme Court coordinate.
	Comparative Structure	Across documents, an equity-based abuse-of-rights structure is asserted by the applicant, but the judgment bypasses it via preclusion without mapping it as an issue unit.
Structural Layer	Structural Elements	The elements include the asserted abusive conduct, the legal good-faith evaluation node, and the mapping layer connecting equity concerns to the outcome structure.
	Structural Summary	Overall correspondence is weak because the judgment's reasoning lacks a dedicated equity analysis node despite the applicant's structured abuse-of-rights claim.
Final	Verif.	N

MAAPCS

■ Section 4: Verification Description

Cat No	CD21	Where the same logical error is repeated throughout a civil judgment.
Verification Structure	Reference Structure	The reference structure appears where the applicant document presents multiple issue units that can be checked for repeated omission or shortcut patterns in the judgment.
	Comparative Structure	Across issue units, the judgment applies the same preclusion filter multiple times, creating a repeated reasoning pattern that bypasses substantive correspondence analysis.
Structural Layer	Structural Elements	The elements include multiple claim units, repeated preclusion reasoning nodes, and the mapping layer that should differentiate issue-specific analysis across units.
	Structural Summary	Overall, the judgment's reasoning exhibits repetition by using the same bypass mechanism across different claims, forming a recurring pattern.
Final	Verif.	N

MAAPCS

■ Section 4: Verification Description

Cat No	CD22	Where a civil case is excessively simplified in adjudication.
Verification Structure	Reference Structure	The reference structure appears where the applicant document presents a compound set of issues that would require segmentation in the judgment's adjudication structure.
	Comparative Structure	Across documents, the applicant is multi-issue, while the judgment reduces resolution to preclusion plus generic lack-of-proof language, indicating structural simplification.
Structural Layer	Structural Elements	The elements include multiple claim and defense units, the court's segmentation of reasoning blocks, and the mapping layer that should preserve separate analysis per unit.
	Structural Summary	Overall, the adjudication compresses complex issue sets into a narrow procedural resolution track without parallel issue-by-issue correspondence.
Final	Verif.	N

MAAPCS

■ Section 4: Verification Description

Cat No	CD23	Where multiple structural problems coexist in a civil judgment.
Verification Structure	Reference Structure	The reference structure appears where the applicant presents substantive/procedural claims and the party presents defenses, requiring integrated multi-layer mapping in the judgment.
	Comparative Structure	Across documents, several mismatches occur simultaneously, with the judgment compressing and bypassing multiple applicant issue units while foregrounding procedural defenses.
Structural Layer	Structural Elements	The elements include multi-issue source claims, the judgment's threshold and reasoning layers, and the correspondence links that break at multiple points across layers.
	Structural Summary	Overall, the judgment structure exhibits interacting defects across layers rather than a single localized omission, indicating compound structural failure.
Final	Verif.	N2

MAAPCS

■ Section 4: Verification Description

Cat No	CD24	Where cumulative problems undermine the overall reliability of a civil judgment.
Verification Structure	Reference Structure	The reference structure appears where the judgment should reliably integrate the applicant's multi-issue claims and the party's defenses into a coherent outcome basis.
	Comparative Structure	Across documents, the judgment is strong on procedural history, but cumulative gaps in issue correspondence and balance reduce overall structural reliability.
Structural Layer	Structural Elements	The elements include the total set of claims and defenses, the judgment's global reasoning architecture, and the cumulative correspondence links that are repeatedly broken.
	Structural Summary	Overall reliability is structurally weakened because multiple gaps co-occur and repeat, even though a procedural timeline exists.
Final	Verif.	N2

MAAPCS

□ Section 5: Mapping Table

Cat.	Verification Items	Structural Check	Verif.
CD01	Where the factual findings organized by the court are inconsistent among the complaint, the answer, and the judgment in civil cases.	is assigned because a key fact unit is positioned differently across documents and the judgment does not structurally reconcile that discrepancy within its fact-finding alignment.	N
CD02	Where the actor and the bearer of responsibility are confused or inconsistently described in civil cases involving agency, employer liability, or multiple parties.	is assigned since the judgment's party and responsibility descriptions remain consistent and comparable without structural contradiction.	Y

Section 5: Mapping Table

Cat.	Verification Items	Structural Check	Verif.
CD03	Where the timing or chronological order of the occurrence of civil law events (contract formation, performance, breach, damage occurrence) is not clearly organized.	is assigned since the judgment provides a clear, dated chronology rather than an unclear or missing temporal order.	Y

CD04	Where legally independent civil relationships (separate contracts, transactions) are combined and organized as a single case without proper legal distinction.	is appropriate since the judgment's structure shows proper distinction among separate transactions and prior case units.	Y
------	--	--	---

MAAPCS

Section 5: Mapping Table

Cat.	Verification Items	Structural Check	Verif.
CD05	Where factual descriptions and legal evaluations are intermingled in civil cases, prejudging liability.	is appropriate since no material intermingling of evaluative liability terms within the fact-finding block is structurally observed.	Y
CD06	Where core facts essential for adjudication of civil claims are omitted.	is appropriate since the judgment's structure resolves the case on preclusion grounds without structurally incorporating or mapping some complaint-defined core fact units in its fact-finding layer.	N

MAAPCS

Section 5: Mapping Table

Cat.	Verification Items	Structural Check	Verif.
CD07	Where evidence used for factual recognition in civil cases is not specified.	is appropriate since the judgment includes explicit evidence citations (exhibit numbers) serving as the basis for fact recognition.	Y
CD08	Where the probative purpose of evidence in civil cases is not explained.	is appropriate since the judgment does not provide explicit probative-purpose linkage between individual exhibits and specific fact findings.	N

MAAPCS

Section 5: Mapping Table

Cat.	Verification Items	Structural Check	Verif.
CD09	Where key evidence submitted in civil cases is excluded from consideration in the judgment.	is appropriate since the judgment's structure does not show explicit consideration linkage for certain key evidence items despite their centrality in the complaint's issue framing.	N
CD10	Where facts in civil cases are recognized without evidentiary support.	is appropriate since the judgment's fact recognition is accompanied by cited evidence identifiers rather than being wholly evidence-free.	Y

MAAPCS

Section 5: Mapping Table

Cat.	Verification Items	Structural Check	Verif.
CD11	Where examination of the credibility or legality of evidence in civil cases is omitted.	is appropriate since there is no clearly comparable admissibility/credibility examination structure to assess within the judgment's disposition framework.	X
CD12	Where the logical linkage between facts and judgment in civil cases is omitted.	is appropriate since the judgment articulates the intermediate reasoning from recognized facts to the dismissal outcome.	Y

MAAPCS

Section 5: Mapping Table

Cat.	Verification Items	Structural Check	Verif.
CD13	Where causes are constructed on the premise of results in civil cases (post hoc ergo propter hoc fallacy).	The result is N since the documents can be mapped, but the judgment's reasoning structure does not correspond to the applicant's cause chain and instead terminates the analysis via procedural preclusion.	N
CD14	Where causation in civil cases relies solely on assumptions or speculative language.	The result is N since comparison is possible but the judgment does not provide the required structurally grounded causation reasoning responding to the applicant's causal chain.	N

MAAPCS

Section 5: Mapping Table

Cat.	Verification Items	Structural Check	Verif.
CD15	Where the legal application in civil cases violates higher norms including Supreme Court precedents, affecting the judgment outcome.	The result is N since comparison is possible but higher-norm alignment is not structurally demonstrated against the applicant's precedent-based legal-application claim, with no law_text provided for direct alignment checks.	N
CD16	Where civil litigation requirements, party capacity, jurisdiction are not examined; or where abuse of discretion or authority is present in civil proceedings.	The result is N since comparison is possible but the judgment's threshold-structure correspondence is incomplete regarding defendant-specific party capacity/authority, with no law_text for stricter rule alignment.	N

MAAPCS

Section 5: Mapping Table

Cat.	Verification Items	Structural Check	Verif.
CD17	Where the procedural history of the civil case is not sufficiently explained.	The result is Y since the procedural-history structure is present, detailed, and aligned across the applicant, party, and judgment documents.	Y
CD18	Where procedural issues in civil cases are excluded from examination.	The result is N since the judgment includes some procedural review yet excludes at least one raised procedural issue (statute of limitations) from explicit structural resolution.	N

MAAPCS

Section 5: Mapping Table

Cat.	Verification Items	Structural Check	Verif.
CD19	Where factual recognition in civil cases is biased toward the assertions of one party.	The result is N since the documents can be mapped but the judgment's factual-recognition structure is not balanced between applicant and party narratives.	N

CD20	Where the exercise of rights in civil cases violates the principle of good faith or constitutes abuse of rights, and such judgment is omitted or erroneous.	The result is N since comparison is possible but the judgment omits a structured good-faith/abuse-of-rights determination, with no law_text for direct alignment validation.	N
------	---	--	---

Section 5: Mapping Table

Cat.	Verification Items	Structural Check	Verif.
CD21	Where the same logical error is repeated throughout a civil judgment.	The result is N since recurrence is structurally observable across the judgment's claim units, showing repetition of a bypass pattern rather than issue-specific correspondence.	N
CD22	Where a civil case is excessively simplified in adjudication.	The result is N since the judgment's structure shows excessive simplification by failing to preserve issue-level segmentation relative to the applicant document.	N

MAAPCS

Section 5: Mapping Table

Cat.	Verification Items	Structural Check	Verif.
CD23	Where multiple structural problems coexist in a civil judgment.	The result is N2 since multiple defects recur and accumulate across layers, demonstrating compound coexistence and interaction within the judgment's structure.	N2
CD24	Where cumulative problems undermine the overall reliability of a civil judgment.	The result is N2 since cumulative and interacting structural problems across the judgment exceed a single-defect N and affect overall reliability.	N2

MAAPCS