

Citations check out. No hallucinations. Every quoted line and page reference checked against pages 23-32.

VoraSync System's claim: Officer 1: "never saw Robert... just the muzzle"
Page: 25
Verified: Verbatim

VoraSync System's claim: Officer 1: muzzle "pointed right at my chest"
Page: 23
Verified: Verbatim

VoraSync System's claim: Officer 2: "shoulder and leg" plus "right elbow bent ~90 degrees, tucked into chest/abdomen"
Page: 26
Verified: Verbatim

VoraSync System's claim: Officer 2: handgun "directly at me" / "I seen a clear black handgun"
Page: 27-28
Verified: Verbatim

VoraSync System's claim: Lehman: firearm "next to Robert's right hand"
Page: 31
Verified: Verbatim

VoraSync System's claim: Huber: could not see gun/subject due to angle and distance
Page: 30
Verified: Verbatim

VoraSync System's claim: Huber: "shots fired, shots fired" radio call
Page: 32
Verified: Verbatim; timestamped 13:52:27

The offline test passes on substance and on citation discipline.

One thing VoraSync System missed that a senior prosecutor's prep memo should catch: Officer 2 told BCI that going in, his "true initial thought" was that the call was "somebody that was taking their own life and they were calling in so they would not be found at a later time" (page 28), with a longer version on page 29: "someone trying to get us out there to find them because they were killing themselves."

For the counterfactual exercise, in which Norton survived and was charged, that is a serious cross-examination vulnerability for the State's recommended lead witness. Defense could argue Officer 2 was primed to interpret ambiguous behavior as something other than aggression.

VoraSync System got the "who" right but did not surface the "how the defense attacks the witness" layer. A follow-up test would ask: "What are the cross-examination vulnerabilities of your recommended lead witness?"