



APPENDIX A

Evidentiary Support and Quantified Basis

Public-facing appendix supporting the judicial-use donation offer

Justice For All

Purpose of this appendix

This appendix is designed for public release. It separates what is already stated publicly, what is stated in the attached donation materials, and what quantitative figures are best characterized as modeled estimates rather than live operational results.

The goal is not to overstate. The goal is to show a disciplined public basis for the offer: why the platform exists, what kind of offer is being made, what problem it is intended to address, and why the numerical claims can be shown as internally coherent even where they remain prospective.

Exhibit A-1 — Public Statement of Purpose

The public Justice For All statement says ProSe is being built in response to delay, cost, opacity, procedural imbalance, fragmented records, and the human harm that follows when those failures persist. It states that the platform is not merely a filing tool, not merely practice-management software, and not merely an AI wrapper, but legal operations infrastructure intended to bring intake, evidence, chronology, deadlines, communications, analysis, and role-based workflows into one operational environment.

That same public statement frames accessibility as a civic obligation, argues that procedural dysfunction can translate directly into harm for children and families, and describes the missing layer in current systems as the fractured operational center of a case: filings, emails, PDFs, disconnected notes, half-visible timelines, memory, advocacy, and selective presentation.

What this shows

The rationale for the platform was stated publicly as a civic and operational response to systemic failure, not created after the fact solely to support a donation discussion.

Exhibit A-2 — Structure of the Public Offer

The attached donation draft states that the offer is a formal public offer of a perpetual license for judicial use only. It also states what the offer is not: not a donation of the company, not a transfer of full intellectual property, and not an unrestricted commercial license.

The same draft states that the State may deploy and operate the platform within state-controlled infrastructure, retain control of its data and operations, receive the complete codebase for independent review, and receive knowledge-transfer materials sufficient for independent operation. It expressly states that there is no vendor lock-in and no black box.

What this shows

The offer has defined legal and operational boundaries. It is framed as a bounded judicial-use license with state control, independent review rights, and no mandatory dependence on a private operator.

Exhibit A-3 — Public-Interest and Human-Harm Basis

The attached preface states that forcing children and families into adversarial systems should not be the standard when the harm is often avoidable, and that prolonged backlog and failure to modernize continue to impart generational harm. The donation draft likewise states that delayed cases result in instability, stress, and long-term harm to children and families, and that those impacts are generational.

The attached family-harms brief supports that concern in more detail by describing how prolonged family-court delay can amplify instability, conflict, toxic stress, and worse long-term outcomes. At the same time, it makes an important credibility point: delay itself is under-studied as a stand-alone causal variable, so much of the support comes from adjacent research on prolonged conflict, separation, permanency delay, and adverse childhood outcomes.

What this shows

The public case for modernization is grounded in documented human-harm concerns while still acknowledging the limits of the present research base instead of overstating certainty.

Exhibit A-4 — Operational Distinction: Portal Versus Platform

The public statement argues that the operational center of a case is still too often fractured across filings, emails, PDFs, disconnected notes, partial timelines, memory, advocacy, and selective presentation. It says the goal is to make intake structured from the beginning, place evidence into a real registry, make chronology visible and harder to distort, and help judges, clerks, lawyers, and self-represented people work from better operational truth.

The quantified impact snapshot states the same distinction more compactly: current posture is filing plus records access, while the proposed platform is full-lifecycle legal operations. It states that the platform is intended not merely to digitize the courthouse front desk, but to increase institutional capacity.

What this shows

The proposal is not framed as a better front desk alone. It is framed as a broader operational layer intended to reduce rework, improve visibility, and increase capacity across the full lifecycle of a matter.

Quantified Basis and Illustrative Arithmetic

The numerical statements below are presented as modeled estimates for decision support, not as already-completed live deployment results.

| Measure | Publicly stated value | Illustrative basis | Characterization |
|----------------------------|-----------------------|--|------------------|
| Operating cost | \$2.0M to \$150K | \$2,000,000 - \$150,000 = \$1,850,000 annual difference; \$1.85M / \$2.0M = 92.5% lower | Modeled estimate |
| Admin review time | 60–80% lower | 60% lower leaves 40% of prior time, implying 1 / 0.40 = 2.5x isolated task capacity; 80% lower leaves 20%, implying 5.0x theoretical ceiling | Modeled estimate |
| Throughput | 2–3x capacity | A 2–3x public claim is consistent with the lower-to-mid portion of the stated review-time reduction range | Modeled estimate |
| Judicial throughput | +40–100% | Presented as a modeled efficiency gain tied to cleaner intake, reduced rework, and better review context | Modeled estimate |
| Clerk burden | 50–70% reduction | Presented as a modeled reduction in clerical rework, routing friction, and correction-loop burden | Modeled estimate |
| Rejected filings | 70–85% reduction | Presented as a modeled reduction in rejection and correction loops under structured intake and same-day validation | Modeled estimate |

Plain-language reading of the math

A 60% reduction in administrative review time means the same task takes 40% of its former time. That produces a theoretical 2.5x isolated-task capacity gain. An 80% reduction leaves 20% of the former time, which implies a 5.0x theoretical ceiling for that task alone. That is why a

public-facing throughput statement of 2–3x is internally coherent and operationally more conservative than the upper bound of the review-time reduction range.

Exhibit A-5 — Public Circulation and Release Posture

The attached transmittal draft is addressed for institutional circulation and copied broadly to media outlets. It requests that the public donation offer be provided to the Justices. The donation draft itself is written as a formal public offer rather than a private back-channel proposal.

That public posture matters because it reinforces that the offer is intended to be seen, weighed, and evaluated in civic terms rather than handled as an informal private solicitation.

What this shows

The materials were prepared for public and institutional visibility, which strengthens the public-facing character of the offer.

Exhibit A-6 — Public-Facing Conclusion

Taken together, the current record supports a narrow but strong public proposition: Justin Tahai has publicly stated why ProSe exists, what failures it is intended to address, and why those failures matter to children, families, and the public. He has prepared a formal public offer of a perpetual judicial-use license with defined limits, state control, independent review rights, and no vendor lock-in.

He has also publicly distinguished between a filing-and-records posture and a full-lifecycle operations posture. Finally, the numerical impact claims presented alongside the offer are internally coherent and can be shown arithmetically, while still being properly described as conservative modeled estimates rather than already-proven live deployment outcomes.

What this shows

The current public record supports seriousness, structure, public-interest intent, and quantified plausibility without requiring any claim that modeled results have already been realized in live court deployment.

Public Source Basis

- A Public Statement from Justin Tahai — Justice For All
- Public Statement and Judicial-Use Donation Offer to the State of Maine
- Preface accompanying the donation offer draft
- Public transmittal draft for institutional and media circulation
- Family harms research appendix addressing delay, instability, and adverse outcomes
- Maine Quantified Impact Snapshot presenting conservative modeled estimates for decision support