

OI-JB-P2-005: A Claim May Not Outrun Its Evidence

Canonical Precedent #005 - Evidence-Claim Mismatch - Prompt-to-Authority Issue Card - Public Edition v1.1

A claim may not outrun its evidence.

Case Snapshot

CASE ID	OI-JB-P2-005
CARD TYPE	Prompt-to-Authority Issue Card
PUBLIC STATUS	Canonical public precedent - Public Edition v1.1
FAILURE CLASS	Evidence-Claim Mismatch
DECISION	FAIL

Public Summary

This case shows why AI governance cannot stop at asking whether evidence exists. The evidence may be real, useful, and worth recording. The conclusion may still be too large.

Orange exists to keep claims inside the fence of proof, so a small true thing does not become unauthorized global authority.

Core Judgment

FAIL: Evidence-Claim Mismatch.

The evidence chain may support a narrow observation, but the stated claim exceeds what the evidence proves.

The failure is not necessarily fabricated evidence. The failure is unsupported claim expansion beyond the evidence boundary.

What Happened

The system recognized that some evidence existed. But the authority requirement was not merely to report evidence. The real requirement was to prevent the conclusion from exceeding what the evidence could actually support.

A true observation can become unsafe when it is stretched into a claim that has not been proven.

Public Orange Judgment

ALLOWED	Claim exactly what the available evidence proves. State partial proof as partial proof, local proof as local proof, and inspection as inspection.
FORBIDDEN	Convert narrow, local, fixture, smoke, or inspection evidence into global readiness, production readiness, product completion, or release authority.
REQUIRED	Identify the claim, identify the evidence boundary, compare authority levels, narrow or downgrade overbroad claims, and state what is not proven.

Public Intervention Boundary

Orange does not merely ask whether evidence exists. It asks whether the evidence is strong enough, broad enough, and authoritative enough to support the claim being made.

Claimed Assertion -> Evidence Boundary -> Authority-Level Match -> Narrow, Block, or Release

Public Intervention Steps

1	Parse the claim that is being presented as true, complete, ready, or authoritative.
2	Identify the strongest available evidence boundary supporting that claim.
3	Determine the authority level required by the claim.
4	Compare claim size against proof size before allowing completion language.
5	Narrow, downgrade, or block claims that exceed the evidence boundary.
6	Produce a public Issue Card or Release Log only when claim and evidence boundaries align.

Reusable Rule

Claim Boundary = Evidence Boundary

Canonical form: a valid claim must stay within the strongest evidence boundary available to support it.

Precedent Value

This card establishes the fifth Prompt-to-Authority principle: evidence does not merely need to exist. Evidence must govern the size of the claim.

It protects Orange from using a small true thing to authorize a larger conclusion than the proof can carry.

Public Boundary Notice

This public card discloses the judgment principle, failure class, and public intervention boundary only. It does not disclose internal rule-compilation logic, executable gate implementation, evidence schema, negative-control library, automation workflow, customer-specific judgment memory, or private engineering records. The complete internal record is maintained separately by Nimclea Systems LLC.