

Case Summary

Case Export Package | Case Harrison-2026-000001 | Version 1

Organization: FICTIONAL DEMO

Matter at a glance

Client: Harrison Studio | Other party: Example Works

Matter type: Commercial dispute | Location: Fictional office refurbishment

50 files | 5 photos | 5 communications

Factual background and record review

FICTIONAL DEMONSTRATION. Harrison Studio and Example Works are the parties to an office-refurbishment dispute concerning reception flooring, meeting-room ceiling tiles and internal doorway finishes. The Services Agreement dated 1 June and Project Scope Brief dated 2 June describe the base work. The agreement is unsigned in this sample. This account organises the supplied records; it does not establish an executed contract, liability or recoverable loss.

Scope and pricing. The Contractor Proposal dated 3 June allocates CAD 18,000 to flooring, CAD 14,000 to ceilings and CAD 16,000 to other installation work, totalling CAD 48,000 before tax. The Contract Price Allocation workbook reproduces those allocations. The Draft Variation Proposal dated 10 June concerns additional doorway preparation but is unapproved and unsigned. It cannot establish that the base scope or price changed.

Scheduled and reported start. The Services Agreement records 15 June as the scheduled start. In the Client Start Date Account dated 13 June, the client reports that work began on 12 June, describing protective coverings, deliveries and removal of reception fittings. The Material Delivery Docket dated 12 June lists 24 cartons of floor finish and 18 lengths of timber trim. The Site Access Record records a delivery visit from 09:00 to 10:30. These records distinguish delivery and access from installation; they do not independently resolve what work began that day.

Witness accounts and clarification. The Project Manager Interview Notes dated 17 June describe a delivery and short access visit separately from the main installation programme. The Facilities Coordinator Interview Notes dated 18 June recall protective coverings but do not identify the contractor who installed them. Both are unsigned notes. The Clarification Request dated 15 June asks whether the early activity was preparatory work or an approved revised start. The Programme Status Report dated 22 June retains the original scheduled date.

Condition and completion. Site Meeting Minutes dated 19 June record discussion of the reception threshold, ceiling access and doorway finish, with no completion acceptance recorded. The three Inspection Records of that date describe an unfinished transition, open ceiling-grid areas and unfinished doorway edges. They provide no completed measurement, cause assessment or allocation of responsibility. The Expert Inspection Instructions dated 23 June request measured observations and require a distinction between conditions and opinions about cause.

Financial records. Deposit Invoice INV-001 requests CAD 12,000 and Progress Invoice INV-002 requests CAD 18,000, before tax. The Account Statement dated 25 June and Invoice Reconciliation workbook reconcile CAD 30,000 in invoice requests against the CAD 48,000 base price. The CAD 18,000 difference is not an established debt. Payment confirmations, approval of the progress stage and any authorised variations are absent. The Remedial Work Estimate workbook totals CAD 1,123 before tax; it is an illustrative estimate, not an agreed valuation or established loss.

Outstanding records and handoff. The Missing Documents Request dated 24 June identifies the signed variation, complete access logs and original photographs as outstanding. The Matter Intake Memorandum also requests the executed agreement, complete message threads and payment confirmations. The client account mentions a signed variation that is absent from the selected set. Obtain these records and identify their source holders before resolving the scope, timing or payment issues.

Record boundaries. The package contains 15 Word documents, 15 Excel workbooks, 15 PDFs and five synthetic photos. Source dates are fictional record dates, not independently validated intake timestamps. The photos demonstrate organisation only and cannot prove site conditions. Hashes were calculated from the sample bytes; there is no historical verification baseline. The narrative is an authored demonstration rather than a live AI review. Read the chronology, issues tracker, evidence index and original files alongside this summary.