

LAW OFFICES OF  
JOSE S. CANSECO, ESQ.  
*www.cansecolaw.com*

Jose S. Canseco, Esq.  
(504) 432-8096  
[jose@cansecolaw.com](mailto:jose@cansecolaw.com)

Lisa Robinson, Esq.  
(504) 554-6887  
[lisa@cansecolaw.com](mailto:lisa@cansecolaw.com)

May 21, 2026

OFFICERREPORTS, Inc.  
C/O Courtney Sparkman, CEO  
7117 Florida BLVD  
Baton Rouge, La. 70806

RE.: Analysis of using AI to generate security guard reports on OfficerReports platform

Dear Mr. Sparkman;

We have been tasked by OfficerReports, Inc. ("OR") to analyze the propriety and risks associated with using artificial intelligence algorithms and platforms ("AI") imbedded into the OR software to help generate reports. Our understanding is that the OR software is used by OR customers in the security guard industry, and their employees, to document incidents and encounters and generate reports of the incidents/encounters. We also understand from representing OR for years, that the encounters documented by OR customer employees are subject to be obtained, subpoenaed and used during various civil and criminal proceedings in courts having jurisdiction where the documented incidents happen.

OUR ANALYSIS FOLLOWS:

The reports generated by security guards are considered legal documents that potentially may be used in civil and criminal courts and are subject to being subpoenaed by the parties involved. These reports are usually challenged by parties for accuracy, bias, and evidentiary integrity.

Using AI to generate these reports is fraught with risks that may make them useless when sought to be used in court proceedings, including, but not limited to:

I. AI can invent facts ("hallucinate")

The accuracy, and first-person views of these reports, are very important elements of whether the reports have any use or even admissible in court proceedings. AI software sometimes generates details that were never observed. In a report that may be used in a court proceeding, even small inaccurate details such as: a timeline; a quote; list of witnesses, or description of an event, can potentially lead to damage or create liability to the companies generating these reports by making the reports useless in court proceedings.

II. Reports must reflect the security guard's actual observations

A report by security guards of incidents they investigate, is supposed to document what the security guard personally observed, heard, or did during his/her investigation of or response to an incident. If AI rewrites, embellishes, or expands what the security guard observed or learned during an incident, it may blur the line between actual memory/observations and machine-generated wording. JUST THE MERE FACT THAT AI WAS USED IN THE PREPARATION OF A REPORT COULD BE PROBLEMATIC, EVEN IF THE REPORT IS ACCURATE, BY CASTING DOUBT OF ITS ACCURACY, GIVEN THE TIME THAT PASSES BETWEEN AN INCIDENT AND WHEN THE REPORT IS USED. You must keep in mind that the use of these reports often occur years after an incident and the security guards are not expected to have direct recollection when testifying regarding the incident. Many times, the security guard may not work for the company any longer. The law of evidence has taken this into account. These types of reports are technically hearsay, and hearsay is not generally admissible in court, as the person testifying is speaking about what someone else did or saw. The law has developed exceptions to this rule, codified in Louisiana in LA Code Ev Art. 803. These exceptions include, but are not limited to:

Recorded recollection. A memorandum or record concerning a matter about which a witness **once had knowledge but now has insufficient recollection to enable him to testify fully and accurately**, shown to have been made or adopted by the witness when the matter was fresh in his memory and to reflect that knowledge correctly. If admitted, the memorandum or record may be read into evidence and received as an exhibit but may not itself be taken into the jury room. ....

Records of regularly conducted business activity. A memorandum, report, record, or data compilation, in any form, including but not limited to that which is stored by the use of an optical disk imaging system, of acts, events, conditions, opinions, or diagnoses, made at or near the time by, or **from information transmitted by, a person with knowledge, if made and kept in the course of a regularly conducted business activity**, and if it was the regular practice of that business activity to make and to keep the memorandum, report, record, or data compilation, all as shown by the testimony of the custodian or other qualified witness, **unless the source of information or the method or circumstances of preparation indicate lack of trustworthiness**. This exception is inapplicable unless the recorded information was furnished to the business either by a person who was routinely acting for the business in reporting the information or in circumstances under which the statement would not be excluded by the hearsay rule. The term "business" as used in this Paragraph includes business, institution, association, profession, occupation, and calling of every kind, whether or not conducted for profit...

AI-assisted reports can be challenged by arguing that: the security guard did not independently author the report; wording may not reflect the security guard's recollection; the report could contain machine-generated inaccuracies; or the security guard relied on technology instead of direct observation.

III. Chain-of-evidence and disclosure problems

If AI tools are used, users may have to disclose: what system was used; what prompts were entered; whether data was stored externally; and how the final report was edited. This can complicate discovery and add expense and time to the security guard company.

IV. Privacy and confidentiality risks

Many AI systems send data to external servers. Entering witness names, juvenile information, medical details, privacy law protected information, or investigative facts into a public AI tool could violate privacy laws and expose the security guard, his company, and OR to civil liability.

V. Specific wording matters

Reports often hinge on precise phrasing, for example: "appeared to reach" vs. "reached" or "I observed" vs. "it seemed". AI algorithms may use language in ways that unintentionally change the legal meaning.

The opinions expressed herein are limited by and subject to the following:

- This opinion is limited to the laws of the State of Louisiana. To the extent to which this opinion deals with matters governed by or relating to the laws of jurisdictions other than Louisiana, we have assumed that such laws are the same as the laws of the State of Louisiana.
- Whenever any opinion expressed herein with respect to the existence or absence of facts is qualified by the phrase "to our knowledge" or the phrase "of which we have knowledge", such phrase indicates that no information has come to the attention of any attorney of this firm who has devoted substantive legal attention to issues addressed in this letter that has given such person a conscious awareness of the existence of contrary facts.
- This opinion is given as of the date hereof, and we assume no obligation to update or supplement this opinion to reflect any facts or circumstances which may hereafter come to our attention or any changes in laws which may hereafter occur.
- This opinion is delivered to you solely in connection with your role as CEO of Officerreports, Inc. to assist you in performing your duties as such.
- The opinions set forth above are limited to matters expressly set forth and no opinion is to be implied or may be inferred beyond the matters expressly stated.

If you have any question, please feel free to call.

Sincerely

---

Jose S. Canseco