FILED
AT 2:30 PM
OCT 08 2026
MEAGAN MOORE, DISTRICT CLERK, ANGELINA COUNTY, TX
BY: _____ DEPUTY

STANDING ORDER FOR ANGELINA COUNTY COURT AT LAW NO. 2 REGARDING THE USE OF GENERATIVE ARTIFICAL INTELLIGENCE

I. The Duty Rests with the Attorney and Litigant, Not the Technology.

To practice law in the State of Texas, every attorney must swear under oath to honestly demean themselves in the practice of law, accepting a strict professional duty to serve their client to the best of their ability while conducting themselves with integrity and civility in all communications with the Court and all parties. Generative Artificial Intelligence (AI) takes no such oath and is bound by no such ethical obligations.

While self-represented litigants do not take this oath and owe no duties to clients, they are bound by the exact same statutory requirements, procedural rules, and institutional standards as licensed attorneys. All participants before this Court – whether representing themselves or acting as counsel – bear personal, non-delegable responsibility for the accuracy and integrity of their filings. Technology may assist in document preparation, but it cannot dilute human accountability.

II. Notice and Disclaimer of Ignorance.

All attorneys and self-represented litigants appearing before this Court are hereby put on formal notice of the technical limitations and risks associated with artificial intelligence. By entering an appearance or filing a document in this Court, parties and counsel acknowledge their ongoing duty to understand the technology they utilize. No party or counsel may claim ignorance, technological illiteracy, or an unverified reliance on an AI platform's output as an excuse or defense for submitting inaccurate, fabricated, or misleading material to the Court.

III. Notice of Technical Flaws and "Hallucinations".

If an attorney or self-represented litigant chooses to utilize generative AI in their work product, legal research, or the drafting of pleadings, that person is expressly put on notice that generative AI platforms may suffer from severe technical flaws known as "hallucinations".

- A hallucination occurs when generative AI provides answers to user prompts that are either wholly or partially inaccurate.
- Studies and empirical data demonstrate that 100% of general-purpose generative AI programs are susceptible to these hallucinations.

- Within the legal system, these errors have repeatedly manifested themselves in court filings as misstated statutes, misrepresented case law holdings, and the citation of entirely nonexistent "phantom" case law.

To better understand the systemic dangers, severe operational liabilities, and sanctionable risks associated with utilizing unverified generative AI in legal proceedings, parties should review the following educational analyses:

- The operational pitfalls of AI-drafted pleadings outlined by ***Esquire Deposition Solutions.***
- The direct consequences and judicial landscape of AI-related sanctions evaluated by ***Spellbook Legal.***
- The broader threat to the administration of justice detailed in the risk warnings provided by ***Pavey Law.***

IV. Accountability, Show Cause, and Sanctions.

If an attorney or self-represented litigant chooses to use generative AI in their pleadings and the Court subsequently determines that those filings contain misrepresentations, errors, or fabricated authority, the filer is strictly prohibited from claiming ignorance or blaming a software error. Under no circumstances will a technological defect excuse a violation of court rules. Furthermore, it is the human filer – the attorney of record or the self-represented litigant – who remains personally subject to an immediate Order to Show Cause and potential judicial sanctions, not the technology.

Accordingly, the Court emphasizes that the following strict duties apply to all attorneys and litigants appearing before this Court:

- **Duty of Meritorious Filings:** Litigants and counsel owe a mandatory duty to file only good-faith claims, ensuring that every pleading, motion, and brief has a firm basis in both law and fact. Because generative AI is prone to "hallucinations" and the fabrication of legal authority, thorough human verification of every citation, case law reference, and record fact is strictly required before submission.
- **Duty of Candor:** Litigants and counsel owe an absolute duty of candor toward the Court and opposing counsel. Litigants must communicate honestly and are strictly

prohibited from misrepresenting facts, legal authority, or the authenticity of any text, image, audio, or video generated by technology.

- **Duty of Competence:** Texas attorneys owe a specific duty of competence to represent their clients with the necessary legal knowledge, skill, thoroughness, and preparation. Generative AI possesses no independent competence and cannot replace human legal judgment.
- **Duty of Confidentiality:** Texas attorneys owe a strict duty of confidentiality to their clients. This requires absolute diligence when inputting information into generative AI systems to ensure that privileged, proprietary, or confidential case information is not inadvertently exposed, stored, or used to train external databases.

For the purposes of this Order, Generative AI refers to any computer program, software, or algorithm that generates new content – including text, images, video, or audio – based on user – end prompts and machine learning models trained on large datasets. This includes standalone applications (such as Google Gemini, ChatGPT, Microsoft Copilot, and Claude) as well as generative AI features embedded within specialized legal research platforms (such as LexisNexis+ AI and Westlaw Precision).

V. Mandatory Verification and Consequence of Non-Compliance.

As a result of generative AI's systemic tendency to fabricate authority and malfunction, the Court hereby **ORDERS** that any attorney or self-represented litigant who chooses to utilize generative AI in their work product, legal research, or the drafting of any document intended for filing must include the following verbatim verification, in **bold** print, within or attached to their pleading:

Verification Regarding Use of Generative Artificial Intelligence

My name is _____, My address is _____, I am over 18 years of age, of sound mind, and capable of making this verification. I swear under penalty of perjury that the statements contained in this verification are true and correct and based on my personal knowledge. I have used _____ (list generative AI programs used) in either my work product, research, and/or drafting of this pleading before the Court. I have reviewed the entire pleading and represent to the Court and opposing side that it contains no misstatements of law, misrepresentations of legal holdings, nor improper citations. I further verify that this pleading contains no sensitive, confidential

information from any person involved, nor have I attached evidence that was created, edited, enhanced, or altered using generative AI.

So Sworn on _____

Signature: _____

VI. Consequence of Non-Compliance.

If an attorney or self-represented litigant utilizes generative AI in their work product, research, or drafting of a pleading, and that pleading fails to contain the exact, verbatim verification in **bold** print as set forth above, the pleading **will not be considered by the Court.**

VII. Court-Ordered Prohibitions Regarding Generative AI.

To protect the integrity of the judicial process, maintain absolute confidentiality, and ensure the reliability of evidence, the Court hereby enters the following mandatory prohibitions. A violation of any of the following provisions constitutes a direct violation of this Standing Order and may subject the offending party or counsel to contempt of court, the striking of pleadings, monetary fines, or other appropriate judicial sanctions:

- **Failure to File Verification:** It is a violation of this Standing Order if an attorney or self-represented litigant uses generative AI in their work product, research, or drafting of a pleading and fails to include the mandatory verbatim verification in **bold** print.
- **Filing Fabricated or Inaccurate Pleadings:** Attorneys and self-represented litigants are strictly prohibited from filing pleadings, motions, or briefs that contain misstatements of law, misrepresentations of case law holdings, or citations to non-existent case law.
- **Inputting Confidential Data into AI Systems:** Attorneys and self-represented litigants are strictly prohibited from entering or disclosing any sensitive, confidential, or privileged information of any person involved in the case into any generative AI program, large language model, or external machine learning database.
- **Fabricating or Altering Evidence via AI:** Attorneys and self-represented litigants are strictly prohibited from using artificial intelligence to create, edit, enhance, or alter any evidence (including text, documents, images, audio, or video) to be submitted or admitted in any hearing (whether oral or by submission) or trial.

- **AI-Generated and AI-Assisted Interpretation:** Attorneys and self-represented litigants are strictly prohibited from utilizing any language interpreter or translation service that relies on a voice-recognition or generative AI program to translate documents intended for admission as evidence, or to provide interpretation during a live hearing or trial.
- **Reliance on AI by Expert Witness:** Attorneys and self-represented litigants are strictly prohibited from offering or using an expert witness who relies on generative AI programs within their methodology or work product to form opinions intended to be introduced as evidence during a hearing or trial.
- **Unauthorized Audio or Video Recording for AI Analysis:** No audio or video recordings of court proceedings are allowed for the purpose of feeding such data into an AI analysis program, large language model, or for any other purpose, unless explicit written permission is specifically granted by the presiding Judge.

VIII. Existing Statutory Frameworks and Inherent Authority.

The Court emphasizes that it need not fashion novel rules to address the filings of misleading pleadings or the introduction of fictitious evidence resulting from the use of Generative Artificial Intelligence (AI). The State of Texas maintains a robust statutory and procedural framework designed to preserve judicial integrity and deter abuses of the judicial process. This Standing Order operates in tandem with, and explicitly incorporates, the following authorities:

- **Abuse of the Judicial Process:** The Court retains its inherent authority to protect the integrity of its proceedings and guard against abuses of the judicial process.
- **Frivolous Pleadings and Motions:** *Chapter 10 of the Texas Civil Practice and Remedies Code* governs the Imposition of sanctions for frivolous pleadings and motions.
- **Effect of Signing Pleadings:** *Rule 13 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure* dictates the legal effect of signing pleadings, motions, and other papers, and provides for sanctions against non-compliant filers.
- **Perjury and False Declarations:** *Section 37.02 of the Texas Penal Code* establishes criminal penalties for perjury concerning testimony, affidavits, or unsworn declarations.

- **Fabrication of Evidence:** *Section 37.09 of the Texas Penal Code* governs the tampering with or fabrication of physical evidence in an official proceeding.
- **Confidentiality and Professional Conduct:** All filings remain subject to the established rules governing the mishandling of sensitive data and the Texas Disciplinary Rules of Professional Conduct referenced herein.

IX. Violations, Show Cause Proceedings, and Available Sanctions.

Upon a preliminary finding that an attorney or self-represented litigant has violated any provision of this Standing Order, the Court will issue a Notice to Show Cause and conduct a hearing to determine whether a violation occurred. If a violation is found, the Court will consider all available legal and equitable remedies. Authorized sanctions and enforcement actions include, but are not limited to the following:

- **Statutory and Procedural Sanctions:** The imposition of monetary or behavioral sanctions under Chapter 10 of the Civil Practice and Remedies Code and Rule 13 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure, up to and including death penalty sanctions that strike pleadings and/or dismiss claims with prejudice.
- **Audit of Billing Practices:** Due to the risk of utilizing generative AI to improperly reduce labor while overbilling clients, the Court may order an attorney to produce all invoices, fee agreements, and contemporaneous time logs associated with the pleading in question to verify the absence of fraudulent billing practices.
- **Mandatory Case-Law Compilations:** The Court may require the non-compliant attorney or self-represented litigant to physically attach full-text copies of all cited case law, with the precise portions referenced explicitly highlighted, for all future pleadings filed in this Court.
- **Referrals for Prosecution and Discipline:** The Court will actively consider reporting verified violations of criminal law or disciplinary rules to the appropriate law enforcement authorities, the Chief Disciplinary Counsel of the State Bar of Texas, or Unauthorized Practice of Law Committee.

X. Judicial Reciprocity and Ethical Imperatives.

- **Judicial Commitment to Compliance:** The Court leads by example and holds itself to the same rigorous standards imposed upon the bar. Accordingly, the Court is

strictly prohibited from utilizing Generative Artificial Intelligence (AI) in the research, drafting, or preparation of its Orders, Judgments, or work product, and shall not utilize county-owned equipment or resources for such purposes. The Court does not require any attorney or self-represented litigant practicing before it to perform any act or assume any duty that is not already mandated by law, or that the Court itself is not obligated to perform.

- **Preservation of Judicial Resources:** Strict compliance with this Standing Order is necessary to prevent the unconscionable waste of valuable judicial resources, protect the integrity of the record, and maintain public trust in the legal profession and the administration of justice.

- **A Note to the Bar:** To my fellow attorneys: remember that you entered the profession of law to serve the public and ensure that clients can rely safely on your independent legal judgment. You did not go to law school to be replaced by a faulty microchip. The Court looks forward to each of you practicing ethically, honorably, and responsibly in the zealous pursuit of truth and justice.

Signed on the 16th day of September, 2026.

Presiding Judge, Jimmy A. Cassels
County Court at Law No. 2