

## Unauthorized Filing Refusal at the Final Submit Boundary

### A narrow use case for SEAL Legal Runtime

SEAL is designed to sit in front of the final filing step and return one governed outcome — approve, refuse, or route for supervision — before a motion or submission leaves the firm.

**In the 30-day Phase 1 review, those outcomes are observe-only: SEAL records what would have happened without disrupting legal work.**

If the wrong actor appears under the wrong authority, SEAL can identify the condition before the filing leaves the firm. In Phase 1, that becomes a reviewable **would-have-refused** finding; controlled enforcement may later prevent the action under separate written scope.

### What this controls

SEAL controls one very specific, high-risk legal action boundary: the final file / submit step for court and regulator filings.

SEAL acts at the pre-execution authority boundary between the firm's existing systems and the outside world. Before a governed filing or submission leaves the firm, SEAL evaluates whether the action satisfies the firm's configured role, authority, consent, and policy conditions.

**During Phase 1, SEAL observes that decision boundary and records what would have been approved, refused, or routed for supervision. It does not disrupt legal work. Controlled enforcement is a later, separately scoped posture.**

This is the narrow wedge:

**wrong-authority filing refusal at the final submit boundary.**

## Where SEAL sits

SEAL is not another application for lawyers to learn. It is an upstream control layer your systems call in the background. The firm's own policy, identity, and matter systems remain the sources of truth. Your workflow sends a structured intent to act, and SEAL returns one governed outcome at the final-submit boundary. **In observe-only mode, that outcome is recorded for review** without controlling whether the production filing proceeds.

## The three possible outcomes

- **Approve**

In observe-only mode, SEAL records that the action would have satisfied the configured authority conditions. A reviewable approval artifact is produced. In controlled enforcement, an approved action may proceed through the governed workflow.

- **Refuse**

In observe-only mode, SEAL records a would-have-refused finding without production-blocking the filing. A reviewable refusal artifact records the reason and evidence surface. In controlled enforcement, the governed workflow can prevent the scoped action from proceeding.

- **Supervise**

In observe-only mode, SEAL records that the action would have required supervised review. The firm owns the review and supervision process. In controlled enforcement, the firm may require an authorized supervised path before the scoped action proceeds.

## Why this matters

Legal actions are different from ordinary workflow events. Identity is strict. Authority matters. Rules overlap. And once something is filed or submitted externally, it often cannot be un-filed or unseen. That is why policy documents and after-the-fact review are not enough. Firms need a governed checkpoint at the moment before execution — one they can evaluate safely before deciding whether any refusal category should become enforceable. SEAL provides that checkpoint for a narrow, externally consequential action boundary.

Once a filing leaves the firm, the problem is no longer internal. SEAL is designed to identify wrong-authority conditions at the point before external submission and create reviewable evidence of what the control saw. **Where controlled enforcement is later activated under written scope**, that same governed boundary can prevent the unauthorized action from proceeding.

## What SEAL does not do

SEAL does **not** draft legal content, give legal advice, choose litigation strategy, replace lawyers, replace your matter systems, or replace your GRC and identity systems. It does **not** become the system of record for your matters or your org chart. It does **not** decide what is lawful or advisable in a jurisdiction. The firm's legal leadership and advisors remain responsible for the rules, supervision model, and substantive legal judgment. SEAL enforces those firm-owned rules at runtime for designated high-risk actions.

**SEAL can refuse; it cannot file.**

## What changes for lawyers and staff

Day-to-day practice changes very little.

Lawyers and staff continue working in the systems they already use. Before a governed filing or submission goes out, that system calls SEAL in the background with the minimum context needed to evaluate the request. During the 30-day observe-only review, SEAL evaluates the final-submit request and records what **would have been approved, refused, or routed for supervision** while the production workflow remains non-blocking.

If the firm later adopts controlled enforcement, the scoped workflow can require the applicable governed outcome before the action proceeds. The firm remains responsible for supervision, routing, escalation, and workflow operation.

There is no new drafting workflow here. No new legal-reasoning interface. No requirement that attorneys surrender judgment to a vendor runtime. SEAL inserts one governed checkpoint before one high-risk action leaves the firm.

## What the firm keeps control of

The firm keeps control of its policies and authority rules, identity and role sources, matter and workflow context, supervision model, and artifact retention and review posture. SEAL is designed to evaluate that governance posture at runtime and, where separately approved for controlled enforcement, make the governed outcome authoritative for the scoped action. It does not replace the firm's policy or judgment.

### In plain terms

**SEAL inserts one governed checkpoint before a motion or submission leaves the firm.**

It does not replace legal judgment or the firm's existing systems. It evaluates whether a designated filing satisfies the firm's configured authority and policy conditions and records that outcome in a reviewable decision artifact.

**In the 30-day observe-only review, SEAL shows what would have been approved, refused, or routed for supervision without production blocking.** If the firm later activates controlled enforcement under separate written scope, the same checkpoint can govern whether the scoped action proceeds before it leaves the firm.