MAAPCS STRUCTURAL VERIFICATION CERTIFICATE

■ MAAPCS Verification Certificate (V)

● Case: 2025Gahap1235 Objection to Claim

● Document Type: MAAPCS Type V Verification Document

● Certificate ID: MAAPCS-V-20251210-M08073150-002

● Internal Tracking Code: M08073150-TC-001

● Issuing Entity: MAAPCS Autonomous Verification Engine

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

● Applicant (S): Kim Joong-hak

● Counterparty (O): Seongnam Seongwon Officetel Apartment Reconstruction Association.

● Agency (D): Court, etc.

● Definition of Verification Certificate:

This verification certificate defines artificial intelligence as a computational system and autonomy as a technical attribute, and has been executed accordingly.
It is consistent with the concepts and responsibility structures of artificial intelligence as premised by UNESCO's AI Ethics Recommendation, OECD's AI Recommendation, and the Republic of Korea's Framework Act on Artificial Intelligence.

● Date of Issue: December 10, 2025

• Senior Analyst: kim joong-hak • Reviewer: kim joong-hak

MAAPCS Verification Institute • Seongnam, Republic of Korea • cgiso@naver.com

■ Section 1: Document Identification

• This verification certificate is an automatically generated document created to verify the facts, procedures, evidence, legal principles, conclusions, and specialized aspects of a case in a descriptive, repeatable, and bias-eliminating manner, in accordance with the forward structure of MAAPCS (Multi-Axis Alignment Proof & Certification System).

• Document Type: MAAPCS Verification Certificate (Forward-based V-Type)

• Certificate ID: MAAPCS-V-20251210-M08073150-002

• Purpose of Issuance: Verification of consistency in the structure of facts, procedures, evidence, legal principles, conclusions, and specialized aspects, and attribution of responsibility.

• Issuing Entity: MAAPCS Autonomous Verification Engine

• Operating Platform: Revision 8 Fact Alignment Engine

• Document Structure: Section 1: Document Identification, Section 2: Fact Alignment, Section 3: Verification Table, Section 4: Verification Description, Section 5: Mapping Table, Section 6: Verification Log

• Formal Layout: A4, Margins (Top: 25mm / Bottom: 20mm / Left & Right: 20mm), Font: Noto Sans KR, Line Spacing: 160%

■ Section 2: Fact Alignment

• This According to MAAPCS forward structure items, this aligns the structures of Fact, Procedure, Evidence, Law, and Case-specific aspects based on a single standard.

• Judgment in all cases is determined by the consistency of the alignment below.

1) Fact Alignment – Fact Alignment (LD01~LD05)

2) Procedure Alignment – Procedure Alignment (LD06~LD10)

3) Evidence Alignment – Evidence Alignment (LD11~LD15)

4) Law Alignment – Law Alignment (LD16~LD18)

5) Conclusion Alignment – Judgment Structure Alignment (LD19~LD20)

6) Specialized Alignment – Case-Specific Supplement (LD21~LD25)

• Judgment Symbol System (S/O/D × N/N2/Y/Y2)

1) Judging Entity (D)

▫ D (Agency): Court, Prosecution, Police, etc.

2) Violation (N/N2/Y/Y2)

▫ N: Violation exists. Does not meet the standard. Structural inconsistency is identified.

▫ N2: Violations are identified as repeated, cumulative, or structural.

▫ Y: No violation. Meets the standard. Structurally consistent.

▫ Y2: The possibility of violation itself is structurally excluded.

3) Responsibility Attribution Matrix

▫ S Responsibility (Applicant): When the applicant exaggerates or omits.

▫ O Responsibility (Counterparty): When there is falsehood, forgery, or omission.

▫ D Responsibility (Agency): When there is procedural omission, exclusion of evidence, dereliction of duty, etc.

■ Section 3: Verification Table

No.	Category	Verification Item	Basis for Judgment	Judgment	Violation Y/Y2/N/N2	Responsibility S/O/D
1	LD01	When there are mutual conflicts regarding key facts among case records, party statements, and agency documents.	Coordinates of identical fact group in judgment fact-finding section, applicant statement relevant items, agency disposition document fact-entry items.	D	N	D
2	LD02	When falsehood, exaggeration, or self-contradiction exists in the counterparty's claims, statements, or submitted documents.	Coordinates of mutual comparison between items in counterparty's submitted documents, coordinates of inconsistent statements within the same document.	D	N	D/O
3	LD03	When the applicant's factual claims align with objective records, but the agency or counterparty exaggerates, omits, or distorts the facts.	Coordinates of correspondence between applicant's claims and judgment fact entries, coordinates of omitted/reduced entry items in agency documents.	D	N	D/O
4	LD04	When a new circumstance significantly affecting the judgment has arisen, but the agency has not reflected it.	Coordinates of new evidence submission list, coordinates of location where said circumstance is not reflected in the judgment.	D	N	D
5	LD05	When the agency or court selectively cites only some parts of identical fact groups or applies only facts unfavorable to the applicant, picking and omitting facts.	Coordinates comparing cited parts and omitted parts of identical fact groups in the judgment.	D	N	D
6	LD06	When the agency fails to legally notify, explain, or inform the applicant about case progress, decisions, or objection methods.	Coordinates of notice items in disposition/decision documents, coordinates of records confirming omission of objection method notification.	D	-	-
7	LD07	When procedural rights such as the applicant's statement of opinion, evidence request, or document production order are unjustly restricted or denied.	Coordinates of opinion/evidence request submission records, coordinates of court records confirming omission or restriction of judgment thereon.	D	N	D

8	LD08	When the agency delays case processing without just cause or leaves it in a prolonged pending state.	Coordinates of case filing date/processing progress chart, coordinates of procedural records confirming prolonged pending status.	D	N2	D
9	LD09	When legally mandatory procedures such as hearing, evidence investigation, pronouncement, notification, or deemed admission are omitted.	Coordinates of hearing/evidence investigation progress records, coordinates of records confirming omission of judgment/decision notification procedure.	D	N	D
10	LD10	When the agency's neutrality, independence, or fairness is compromised during procedure operation.	Coordinates of procedure progress chart, coordinates comparing records confirming favorable/unfavorable treatment to specific party.	D	N	D
11	LD11	When evidence is not collected, secured, or submitted in accordance with legally prescribed methods.	Coordinates of evidence submission background records, coordinates of documents confirming evidence collection/submission method.	D	N	D
12	LD12	When verification of evidence authenticity, consistency, or credibility is inadequate, or the agency fails to fulfill its verification duty.	Coordinates of evidence adoption/rejection judgment section, coordinates of judgment confirming omission of authenticity/credibility review.	D	N	D
13	LD13	When documents with potential for forgery, alteration, or false creation are used as a basis for judgment.	Coordinates of problematic document identification number, coordinates in judgment where said document is cited as basis.	D	N	D
14	LD14	When verification of originality/integrity of digital/documentary evidence is not performed.	Coordinates of digital evidence submission list, coordinates of records confirming omission of originality/integrity review.	D	N	D
15	LD15	When the agency or counterparty conceals, withholds, or refuses to submit decisive evidence.	Coordinates of document production request details, coordinates of procedural records confirming non-submission/non-disclosure.	D	N2	D/O

16	LD16	When interpretation of applied laws/requisite facts is unsuitable for the case or conflicts with higher laws/superior precedents.	Coordinates of law application section in judgment, coordinates of mapping table comparing with higher laws/superior precedents.	D	N	D
17	LD17	When judgment is rendered unfavorably by selectively citing without fair comparison of precedents with identical legal principles/structure.	Coordinates of cited precedent list, coordinates of mapping table comparing omitted precedents.	D	N	D
18	LD18	When logical leaps, misinterpretation, or misapplication exist in the process of interpreting laws/precedents.	Coordinates of legal principle development section, coordinates in judgment confirming disconnect between premise and conclusion.	D	N	D
19	LD19	When the agency fails to take appropriate action regarding the applicant's lawful application/request (dereliction of duty/nonfeasance).	Coordinates of application/request receipt records, coordinates of procedural records confirming non-processing or nonfeasance.	D	N	D
20	LD20	When even one major violation occurs in facts, procedures, evidence, or laws, causing the justification/logic of the entire judgment to collapse.	Set of mapping table coordinates where violations are identified across multiple verification items.	D	N2	D
21	LD21	When res judicata is recognized based solely on formality without confirming substantive rights.	Coordinates of res judicata judgment section in judgment, coordinates of records confirming omission of substantive judgment.	D	N	D
22	LD22	When legal effects such as deemed admission are not applied despite the counterparty's non-compliance with a document production order.	Coordinates of document production order decision, coordinates of records confirming non-compliance fact and non-application of effect.	D	N	D/O
23	LD23	When reasons are not sufficiently presented in evidence exclusion/adoption, and the process of forming conviction is unclear.	Coordinates of evidence judgment reasoning section in judgment, coordinates confirming omission/insufficiency of reasons.	D	N	D

24	LD24	When actions by the counterparty or agency violate the principle of good faith/abuse of rights prohibition.	Coordinates of problematic action details, coordinates in judgment confirming good faith judgment.	D	N	D/O
25	LD25	When a major violation in the original trial is not corrected in the appellate trial or retrial.	Coordinates identifying original trial judgment violation, coordinates of records confirming non-correction in appellate/retrial judgment.	D	N	D

■ Section 4: Verification Description

LD01: When there are mutual conflicts regarding key facts among case records, party statements, and agency documents.
1. Judgment Standard: Basis sentences: Case record fact-finding section, party statements, agency document fact-entry section. Comparison sentence: Compare entries of case records , statements, agency documents based on identical fact groups.
2. Fact Comparison: Comparison sentence: Compare entry content for identical fact groups item by item across documents. Conclusion sentence: Mutual inconsistency in entries regarding key facts is identified.
3. Logical Development: Comparison sentence: Arrange mutually consistent entries and mutually conflicting entries separately. Conclusion sentence: Existence of mutual conflict in key factual areas is structurally identified.
4. Final Judgment: Violation N, Responsibility

DLD02: When falsehood, exaggeration, or self-contradiction exists in the counterparty's claims , statements, or submitted documents.
1. Judgment Standard: Basis sentences: Counterparty submitted documents, counterparty statements, entry items within same document. Comparison sentence: Compare consistency of entries for identical claims.
2. Fact Comparison: Comparison sentence: Compare claim content item by item within same document or across multiple documents. Conclusion sentence: Inconsistency between entry content for identical claims is identified.
3. Logical Development: Comparison sentence: Compare and arrange preceding claims and subsequent claims. Conclusion sentence: Self-contradiction or exaggerated entries are structurally identified.
4. Final Judgment: Violation N, Responsibility D/O

LD03: When the applicant's factual claims align with objective records, but the agency or counterparty exaggerates, omits, or distorts the facts.
1. Judgment Standard: Basis sentences: Applicant's claim document, objective records, agency document fact-entry section. Comparison sentence: Compare each entry content based on identical fact groups.
2. Fact Comparison: Comparison sentence: Compare entry content of applicant's claims and objective records. Conclusion sentence: Alignment between applicant's claims and objective records is identified.

3. Logical Development: Comparison sentence: Compare and arrange entry status of objective records and agency/counterparty documents. Conclusion sentence: Exaggerated, omitted, or distorted entries by agency or counterparty are identified.
4. Final Judgment: Violation N, Responsibility D/O

LD04: When a new circumstance significantly affecting the judgment has arisen, but the agency has not reflected it.
1. Judgment Standard: Basis sentences: New evidence submission list, judgment fact-finding section. Comparison sentence: Compare occurrence of new circumstance and reflection in judgment.
2. Fact Comparison: Comparison sentence: Compare new circumstance and judgment entry content item by item. Conclusion sentence: Fact that new circumstance is not reflected in judgment is identified.
3. Logical Development: Comparison sentence: Compare and arrange factual state before and after judgment. Conclusion sentence: Exclusion of circumstance significantly affecting judgment is identified.
4. Final Judgment: Violation N, Responsibility D

LD05: When the agency or court selectively cites only some parts of identical fact groups or applies only facts unfavorable to the applicant, picking and omitting facts.
1. Judgment Standard: Basis sentences: Judgment cited fact section, records related to omitted facts. Comparison sentence: Compare citation status within identical fact groups.
2. Fact Comparison: Comparison sentence: Compare cited facts and omitted facts item by item. Conclusion sentence: Selective citation of only some facts is identified.
3. Logical Development: Comparison sentence: Compare and arrange entire fact group and judgment citation scope. Conclusion sentence: Structure of picking and omitting facts is identified.
4. Final Judgment: Violation N, Responsibility D

LD06: When the agency fails to legally notify, explain, or inform the applicant about case progress, decisions, or objection methods.
1. Judgment Standard
Not applicable.

LD07: When procedural rights such as the applicant's statement of opinion, evidence request, or document production order are unjustly restricted or denied.
1. Judgment Standard: Basis sentences: Opinion submission record, evidence request document, document production order record. Comparison sentence: Compare exercise of procedural rights and processing status.
2. Fact Comparison: Comparison sentence: Compare applicant's procedural requests and processing results. Conclusion sentence: Restriction of procedural rights is identified.
3. Logical Development: Comparison sentence: Compare and arrange timing of rights exercise and status of judgment omission. Conclusion sentence: Restriction of procedural rights is structurally identified.
4. Final Judgment: Violation N, Responsibility D

LD08: When the agency delays case processing without just cause or leaves it in a prolonged pending state.
1. Judgment Standard: Basis sentences: Case filing date, processing progress chart, procedural records. Comparison sentence: Compare standard processing period and actual elapsed period .
2. Fact Comparison: Comparison sentence: Compare case processing progress chronologically. Conclusion sentence: Prolonged pending status is identified.
3. Logical Development: Comparison sentence: Compare and arrange necessary processing timepoint and actual processing timepoint. Conclusion sentence: Unjust delay status is structurally identified.
4. Final Judgment: Violation N2, Responsibility D

LD09: When legally mandatory procedures such as hearing, evidence investigation, pronouncement, notification, or deemed admission are omitted.
1. Judgment Standard: Basis sentences: Hearing record, evidence investigation record, notification procedure record. Comparison sentence: Compare fulfillment status of legally mandatory procedures.
2. Fact Comparison: Comparison sentence: Compare mandatory procedure items and actual fulfillment status. Conclusion sentence: Omission of procedure is identified.
3. Logical Development: Comparison sentence: Compare and arrange required procedures and actual procedures. Conclusion sentence: Structure of mandatory procedure omission is identified.
4. Final Judgment: Violation N, Responsibility D

LD10: When the agency's neutrality, independence, or fairness is compromised during procedure operation.
1. Judgment Standard: Basis sentences: Procedure progress chart, party treatment records. Comparison sentence: Compare procedural treatment status between parties.
2. Fact Comparison: Comparison sentence: Compare procedural application status for each party. Conclusion sentence: Circumstances compromising fairness are identified.
3. Logical Development: Comparison sentence: Compare and arrange bias in procedure operation method. Conclusion sentence: Structure compromising neutrality is identified.
4. Final Judgment: Violation N, Responsibility D

LD11: When evidence is not collected, secured, or submitted in accordance with legally prescribed methods.
1. Judgment Standard: Basis sentences: Evidence submission background record, document describing collection method. Comparison sentence: Compare legally required evidence collection method and actual collection method.
2. Fact Comparison: Comparison sentence: Compare collection, securing, submission background of submitted evidence item by item. Conclusion sentence: Collection/submission according to legal method is not confirmed.
3. Logical Development: Comparison sentence: Compare and arrange legal collection requirements and actual collection process. Conclusion sentence: Lack of evidence legality is structurally identified.
4. Final Judgment: Violation N, Responsibility D

LD12: When verification of evidence authenticity, consistency, or credibility is inadequate, or the agency fails to fulfill its verification duty.
1. Judgment Standard: Basis sentences: Judgment evidence judgment section, evidence review records. Comparison sentence: Compare evidence verification requirements and actual verification performance.
2. Fact Comparison: Comparison sentence: Compare presence of authenticity/credibility judgment entries for each evidence. Conclusion sentence: Insufficient evidence verification is identified.
3. Logical Development: Comparison sentence: Compare and arrange required verification stages and actual judgment stages. Conclusion sentence: Structure of verification duty non-fulfillment is identified.
4. Final Judgment: Violation N, Responsibility D

LD13: When documents with potential for forgery, alteration, or false creation are used as a basis for judgment.
1. Judgment Standard: Basis sentences: Problematic document identification number, judgment cited document section. Comparison sentence: Compare document authenticity review status and use as judgment basis.
2. Fact Comparison: Comparison sentence: Compare preparation background of said document and citation status in judgment. Conclusion sentence: Use as judgment basis without authenticity review is identified.
3. Logical Development: Comparison sentence: Compare and arrange documents requiring authenticity verification and documents actually used for judgment. Conclusion sentence: Structure of use without excluding possibility of forgery/alteration is identified.
4. Final Judgment: Violation N, Responsibility D

LD14: When verification of originality/integrity of digital/documentary evidence is not performed.
1. Judgment Standard: Basis sentences: Digital evidence submission list, verification records. Comparison sentence: Compare originality/integrity verification requirement and actual verification status.
2. Fact Comparison: Comparison sentence: Compare existence of verification records for submitted digital evidence. Conclusion sentence: Originality/integrity verification is not confirmed.
3. Logical Development: Comparison sentence: Compare and arrange necessary verification stages and actual procedure performance. Conclusion sentence: Structure of verification omission is identified.
4. Final Judgment: Violation N, Responsibility D

LD15: When the agency or counterparty conceals, withholds, or refuses to submit decisive evidence.
1. Judgment Standard: Basis sentences: Document production request record, non-submission confirmation record. Comparison sentence: Compare requested evidence and actual submission status.
2. Fact Comparison: Comparison sentence: Compare request items and submission results item by item. Conclusion sentence: Non-submission of decisive evidence is identified.
3. Logical Development: Comparison sentence: Compare and arrange evidence submission duty and actual actions. Conclusion sentence: Structure of concealment/non-disclosure is identified.

4. Final Judgment: Violation N2, Responsibility D/O

LD16: When interpretation of applied laws/requisite facts is unsuitable for the case or conflicts with higher laws/superior precedents.
1. Judgment Standard: Basis sentences: Judgment law application section, list of higher laws/precedents. Comparison sentence: Compare applied laws and higher norms.
2. Fact Comparison: Comparison sentence: Compare interpretation content in judgment and content of higher norms. Conclusion sentence: Conflict in law interpretation is identified.
3. Logical Development: Comparison sentence: Compare and arrange required interpretation structure and actual application structure. Conclusion sentence: Structure of unsuitable law interpretation is identified.
4. Final Judgment: Violation N, Responsibility D

LD17: When judgment is rendered unfavorably by selectively citing without fair comparison of precedents with identical legal principles/structure.
1. Judgment Standard: Basis sentences: Cited precedent list, omitted precedent list. Comparison sentence: Compare comparison status of precedents with identical legal principles.
2. Fact Comparison: Comparison sentence: Compare cited precedents and omitted precedents item by item. Conclusion sentence: Omission of precedent comparison is identified.
3. Logical Development: Comparison sentence: Compare and arrange entire precedent group and actual citation scope. Conclusion sentence: Structure of selective precedent citation is identified.
4. Final Judgment: Violation N, Responsibility D

LD18: When logical leaps, misinterpretation, or misapplication exist in the process of interpreting laws/precedents.
1. Judgment Standard: Basis sentences: Judgment legal principle development section. Comparison sentence: Compare connection structure between overall facts and conclusion.
2. Fact Comparison: Comparison sentence: Compare logical connection at each stage of legal principle development. Conclusion sentence: Logical disconnect or leap is identified.
3. Logical Development: Comparison sentence: Compare and arrange normal legal principle development structure and actual development. Conclusion sentence: Structure of misinterpretation/misapplication is identified.
4. Final Judgment: Violation N, Responsibility D

LD19: When the agency fails to take appropriate action regarding the applicant's lawful application/request (dereliction of duty/nonfeasance).
1. Judgment Standard: Basis sentences: Application receipt record, processing result record. Comparison sentence: Compare application content and processing status.
2. Fact Comparison: Comparison sentence: Compare action status for each application item by item. Conclusion sentence: Failure to take appropriate action is identified.
3. Logical Development: Comparison sentence: Compare and arrange timepoint requiring action and actual processing status. Conclusion sentence: Structure of nonfeasance is identified.
4. Final Judgment: Violation N, Responsibility D

LD20: When even one major violation occurs in facts, procedures, evidence, or laws, causing the justification/logic of the entire judgment to collapse.
1. Judgment Standard: Basis sentences: Records identifying violations across multiple verification items. Comparison sentence: Compare individual violations and overall judgment structure.
2. Fact Comparison: Comparison sentence: Compare existence of each violation item. Conclusion sentence: Major violations are identified across multiple items.
3. Logical Development: Comparison sentence: Compare and arrange connection between individual violations and judgment structure. Conclusion sentence: Structure of overall judgment collapse is identified.
4. Final Judgment: Violation N2, Responsibility D

LD21: When res judicata is recognized based solely on formality without confirming substantive rights.
1. Judgment Standard: Basis sentences: Judgment res judicata judgment section. Comparison sentence: Compare presence of substantive judgment and formal judgment.
2. Fact Comparison: Comparison sentence: Compare presence of substantive right judgment entries. Conclusion sentence: Omission of substantive judgment is identified.
3. Logical Development: Comparison sentence: Compare and arrange structure requiring substantive judgment and actual judgment structure. Conclusion sentence: Structure of formal recognition of res judicata is identified.
4. Final Judgment: Violation N, Responsibility D

LD22: When legal effects such as deemed admission are not applied despite the counterparty 's non-compliance with a document production order.
1. Judgment Standard: Basis sentences: Document production order decision record, non-compliance confirmation record. Comparison sentence: Compare non-compliance fact and legal effect application status.
2. Fact Comparison: Comparison sentence: Compare non-compliance fact and judgment content. Conclusion sentence: Non-application of legal effect is identified.
3. Logical Development: Comparison sentence: Compare and arrange application structure upon non-compliance and actual judgment. Conclusion sentence: Structure of effect exclusion is identified.
4. Final Judgment: Violation N, Responsibility D/O

LD23: When reasons are not sufficiently presented in evidence exclusion/adoption, and the process of forming conviction is unclear.
1. Judgment Standard: Basis sentences: Judgment evidence judgment reasoning section. Comparison sentence: Compare requirement for reason presentation and actual entry status.
2. Fact Comparison: Comparison sentence: Compare presence of judgment reasoning entries for each evidence. Conclusion sentence: Insufficient presentation of reasons is identified.
3. Logical Development: Comparison sentence: Compare and arrange structure requiring conviction formation and actual entry structure. Conclusion sentence: Structure of unclear judgment is identified.
4. Final Judgment: Violation N, Responsibility D

LD24: When actions by the counterparty or agency violate the principle of good faith/abuse of rights prohibition.
1. Judgment Standard: Basis sentences: Problematic action details, judgment judgment section. Comparison sentence: Compare action details and good faith standard.
2. Fact Comparison: Comparison sentence: Compare action process and legal principle standard. Conclusion sentence: Circumstances violating good faith are identified.
3. Logical Development: Comparison sentence: Compare and arrange normal rights exercise and actual actions. Conclusion sentence: Structure of rights abuse is identified.
4. Final Judgment: Violation N, Responsibility D/O

LD25: When a major violation in the original trial is not corrected in the appellate trial or retrial.

1. Judgment Standard: Basis sentences: Original trial violation identification record, appellate/retrial judgment record. Comparison sentence: Compare original trial violation and correction status.

2. Fact Comparison: Comparison sentence: Compare original trial violation matters and appellate/retrial judgment content. Conclusion sentence: Violation not corrected is identified.

3. Logical Development: Comparison sentence: Compare and arrange structure requiring correction and actual judgment result. Conclusion sentence: Structure of remedy non-fulfillment is identified.

4. Final Judgment: Violation N, Responsibility D

■ Section 5: Mapping Table

No.	Category	Verification Item	Factual Relationship	Violation
1	LD01	When there are mutual conflicts regarding key facts among case records, party statements, and agency documents.	Entries for identical fact groups differ among judgment fact-finding section, applicant statement relevant items, agency disposition document fact-entry items	N
2	LD02	When falsehood, exaggeration, or self-contradiction exists in the counterparty's claims, statements, or submitted documents.	Mutual comparison results between items in counterparty's submitted documents confirm inconsistent statements within same document.	N
3	LD03	When the applicant's factual claims align with objective records, but the agency or counterparty exaggerates, omits, or distorts the facts.	Correspondence results between applicant's claims and judgment fact entries confirm omission/reduction entries in agency documents.	N
4	LD04	When a new circumstance significantly affecting the judgment has arisen, but the agency has not reflected it.	New evidence submission list exists, but location not reflected in judgment is confirmed.	N
5	LD05	When the agency or court selectively cites only some parts of identical fact groups or applies only facts unfavorable to the applicant, picking and omitting facts.	Comparison with judgment confirms cited parts and omitted parts within identical fact groups.	N
6	LD06	When the agency fails to legally notify, explain, or inform the applicant about case progress, decisions, or objection methods.	Not applicable.	-
7	LD07	When procedural rights such as the applicant's statement of opinion, evidence request, or document production order are unjustly restricted or denied.	Opinion/evidence request submission records exist, and omission or restriction of judgment is confirmed.	N
8	LD08	When the agency delays case processing without just cause or leaves it in a prolonged pending state.	Case filing date/processing progress chart confirms prolonged pending status.	N2
9	LD09	When legally mandatory procedures such as hearing, evidence investigation, pronouncement, notification, or deemed admission are omitted.	Comparison with hearing/evidence investigation progress records confirms omission of judgment/decision notification procedure.	N
10	LD10	When the agency's neutrality, independence, or fairness is compromised during procedure operation.	Comparison with procedure progress chart confirms favorable/unfavorable treatment to specific party.	N

11	LD11	When evidence is not collected, secured, or submitted in accordance with legally prescribed methods.	Evidence submission background records confirm issues with collection/submission method.	N
12	LD12	When verification of evidence authenticity, consistency, or credibility is inadequate, or the agency fails to fulfill its verification duty.	Evidence adoption/rejection judgment section confirms omission of authenticity/credibility review.	N
13	LD13	When documents with potential for forgery, alteration, or false creation are used as a basis for judgment.	Confirmation that problematic document is cited as basis in judgment coordinates.	N
14	LD14	When verification of originality/integrity of digital/documentary evidence is not performed.	Comparison with digital evidence submission list confirms omission of originality/integrity review.	N
15	LD15	When the agency or counterparty conceals, withholds, or refuses to submit decisive evidence.	Comparison with document production request details confirms non-submission/non-disclosure.	N2
16	LD16	When interpretation of applied laws/requisite facts is unsuitable for the case or conflicts with higher laws/superior precedents.	Comparison results between judgment law application section and higher laws/superior precedents confirm conflict.	N
17	LD17	When judgment is rendered unfavorably by selectively citing without fair comparison of precedents with identical legal principles/structure.	Comparison with cited precedent list confirms omitted precedents.	N
18	LD18	When logical leaps, misinterpretation, or misapplication exist in the process of interpreting laws/precedents.	Legal principle development section confirms disconnect between premise and conclusion.	N
19	LD19	When the agency fails to take appropriate action regarding the applicant's lawful application/request (dereliction of duty/nonfeasance).	Comparison with application/request receipt records confirms non-processing or nonfeasance.	N
20	LD20	When even one major violation occurs in facts, procedures, evidence, or laws, causing the justification/logic of the entire judgment to collapse.	Mapping results confirm violations identified across multiple verification items.	N2
21	LD21	When res judicata is recognized based solely on formality without confirming substantive rights.	Judgment res judicata judgment section confirms omission of substantive judgment.	N
22	LD22	When legal effects such as deemed admission are not applied despite the counterparty's non-compliance with a document production order.	Comparison with document production order decision confirms non-compliance fact and non-application of effect.	N

23	LD23	When reasons are not sufficiently presented in evidence exclusion/adoption, and the process of forming conviction is unclear.	Evidence judgment reasoning section confirms omission/insufficiency of reasons.	N
24	LD24	When actions by the counterparty or agency violate the principle of good faith/abuse of rights prohibition.	Comparison with problematic action details confirms good faith judgment.	N
25	LD25	When a major violation in the original trial is not corrected in the appellate trial or retrial.	Comparison with original trial violation identification coordinates confirms non-correction in appellate/retrial judgment.	N