

Software IP exposure assessment

Demonstration 01 · October 2026

FICTIONAL EXAMPLE. No client engagement, software analysis, verified finding, or legal opinion is represented.

01 / THE DECISION

Is a bounded investigation justified?

A fictional enterprise software business notices that another product has a similar export workflow. Its leadership wants to understand what information would help decide whether further investigation is proportionate.

Current position: insufficient evidence.

Interface similarity alone does not establish copying, access, ownership, infringement, or trade secret misappropriation. No allegation or escalation is supported by this example.

Scope of this example

This brief assumes only a reported visual similarity. No artifacts, source code, agreements, access logs, ownership records, or version histories were supplied or reviewed. All entries below illustrate a proposed review format.

02 / THE EVIDENCE REGISTER

Separate observations from open questions.

Illustrative evidence gaps; no materials collected	
Question	Material to consider
What was created, and when?	Authorized release records, version history, authorship records
Which rights and permissions apply?	Assignments, licenses, agreements, applicable restrictions
Is the similarity meaningful?	A defined comparison, relevant versions, third-party dependency inventory
Is there evidence of access?	Authorized records, dates, context, competing explanations

An actual register should document provenance, collector, authorized source, timestamps and timezone, version, integrity digest, access restrictions, and transfers. The appropriate collection protocol requires counsel and a qualified practitioner.

Test the explanation before advancing a claim.

- Common user requirements or industry design conventions.
- A shared third-party library or open-source dependency.
- Licensed use, authorized access, or another applicable permission.
- Independent development or a similarity too general to support a useful comparison.

A defensible review records evidence that challenges the initial concern as well as evidence that supports further questions.

04 / A PROPOSED NEXT STEP

Agree the question, scope, and stopping point.

1. **Screen first.** Confirm conflicts, professional qualifications, jurisdiction, and service availability before substantive intake.
2. **Define the question.** Identify the business decision, relevant products and versions, and materials that may lawfully be reviewed.
3. **Preserve context.** Agree a handling protocol and authorized collection process with counsel and qualified practitioners.
4. **Commission a bounded comparison.** Set deliverables, responsibilities, exclusions, fees, and stopping criteria in writing.
5. **Review the result.** Separate technical observations, unresolved limitations, and any legal analysis by qualified counsel.

Illustrative deliverables

An evidence inventory, comparison methodology, observations with limitations, alternative explanations, and an executive decision brief. Litigation, recovery, response times, and outcomes are not promised.

Limits of this document

This fictional format is educational, primarily U.S.-focused, and is not legal advice, a privilege determination, or a statement that a service is currently available. No fees are quoted and no software has been analyzed.