

CounselCore Partner FAQ

Common questions partners, CIOs, risk officers, and client teams ask when evaluating an in-house legal AI system.

Is CounselCore a Public AI Tool?

No. CounselCore is positioned as an in-house AI infrastructure layer. The core design goal is to keep matter data, prompts, outputs, and retrieval artifacts under firm control rather than sending them to public AI systems.

Does In-House AI Remove All Risk?

No technology removes all legal risk. The point is to reduce avoidable risk by controlling where data goes, what sources are used, how outputs are verified, and what records are retained.

Why Not Let Lawyers Use Public AI With Warnings?

Warnings help, but they do not create infrastructure. Public AI use can still produce privilege questions, hallucinated authority, missing usage records, and inconsistent verification practices.

What Makes CounselCore Defensible?

A defensible posture comes from firm-controlled deployment, permissions-aware retrieval, source citations, attorney review, and retained audit trails that can be explained later.

Why These Cases Are Relevant

The sources below are included because they frame the questions clients and courts are now asking: Where did the data go? Was the AI output verified? Were records preserved? Who controlled the system? Could the work be explained?

Practical FAQ Answer

- Use in-house systems for privileged and client-sensitive work.
- Do not rely on unsupported AI output for legal citations or court-facing arguments.
- Keep records that show prompts, sources, outputs, and review steps when preservation may matter.
- Make governance part of the product, not an afterthought.

Sources Cited

United States v. Heppner

Public generative AI use raised privilege and work-product concerns when prompts and outputs were sought in discovery.

<https://harvardlawreview.org/blog/2026/03/united-states-v-heppner/>

Miller v. Regions Bank

The court treated AI-generated fake citations and deleted ChatGPT records as a sanctions and preservation issue.

https://websitedc.s3.amazonaws.com/documents/Miller_v_Regions_Bank_USA_21_May_2026.pdf

Mata v. Avianca

The court sanctioned lawyers who submitted non-existent judicial opinions generated by ChatGPT.

<https://law.justia.com/cases/federal/district-courts/new-york/nysdce/1%3A2022cv01461/575368/54/>

Park v. Kim

The Second Circuit referred counsel to its grievance panel after a brief cited a non-existent ChatGPT-generated case.

<https://law.justia.com/cases/federal/appellate-courts/ca2/22-2057/22-2057-2024-01-30.html>

Kruse v. Karlen

The Missouri Court of Appeals dismissed an appeal and awarded damages after fictitious AI-generated cases appeared in briefing.

<https://www.courts.mo.gov/file.jsp?id=205457>

Kohls v. Ellison

A federal court rejected reliance on an expert declaration after GPT-4o generated fake academic citations.

<https://www.law.berkeley.edu/wp-content/uploads/archive/2025/12/Kohls-v-Ellison.pdf>