

14.2.3.3.2 WWMBL3 Protocol

14.2.3.3.2.1 Making Odyssey User-Friendly -- AI-Assisted Front-End Complaint Generation and Service

While, again, WWMBL3 can be used far beyond the Courts and Legal System, I will use the Odyssey Filing System as an Immediate Example of how this Protocol can be Implemented Quickly and to the Benefit of All users, but especially *pro se* petitioners.

By simply having a “Front-End AI-Assisted Odyssey Program, users would be able to enter the basic Demographic Information (names, addresses, phone numbers, emails, etc.) for themselves and all of the parties involved. In most cases, the AI Assistant can quickly locate most of this information and enter it into the appropriate places if the user simply identifies the Parties involved.

A next step in the process would be for the AI-Assisted Program to Ask generally WHAT the applicant wish to do (e.g., Submit a Complaint, Petition, Affidavit, etc.).

The AI-Assistant could then ask simple questions (e.g., Names, Dates, Specific Issues involved to generate a “basic” Complaint that can be expanded upon later as needed. If AI Programs can currently generate Shakespearean sonnets in Iambic Pentameter, they can already generate Basic Complaints.

Once the Basic Complaint fills all of the “Basic Requirements” in sufficient Detail for the Satisfaction of the Plaintiff, the AI system can Automatically take the appropriate steps for Serving the Defendants according to the Requirements of any particular Jurisdiction (e.g., Electronically, Certified Mail, Sheriff, etc.). Only once these steps have been completed and the process go on to DIALOG.

14.2.3.3.2.2 Defining a “Problem” and Gathering ALL Evidence

Just as with GOOD SCIENCE in general, WWMBL3 would make the FIRST STEP to Gather and Evaluate ALL of the EVIDENCE BEFORE “Ruling” on a case and/or Deciding what is to be done concerning ANY Problem. To the extent that there is Any Pertinent Information that can help in Fully Evaluating a “Problem,” the AI Assistant can help in Obtaining and Storing such Evidence (e.g., Particular Documents, Citations, Cases, Rulings, etc.) that might be relevant to a particular case.

While such an “Evidence Gathering” Process might well be Lengthy and Ongoing, the AI Assistant can be very helpful in ensuring that all such Data is Stored Properly and Available to all Parties at All Times.

If some specific information (e.g., Affidavits from Particular Witnesses) might need to remain “Confidential” for a period of time (e.g., Prior to Discovery and Depositions, etc.) for the Safety of a Witness, for instance, a General Statement can be Entered into the Record stating that “Additional Information is Pending and will be Provided at the Appropriate Time,” etc.

In more Complicated Cases (e.g., Criminal) or where further FACTS are necessary (e.g., Forensic Tests, Polling Results or even “Clinical Trials,” etc.), an AI-Assistant can help in Identifying such Evidence and, again, Storing it for Further Review by All Parties when Available.

A simple example of the above could include the Secret Service Formally Interviewing All Known Individuals with a Known Drug History who might be among the, e.g., “500” Individuals entering the Special Access Door near the White House Situation Room and leaving Cocaine in a Pouch of some sort BEFORE releasing ANY information concerning Test Results for Fingerprints and/or DNA. Thus, individuals would be on Record BEFORE knowing if they had left any Incriminating Evidence or Not. If, e.g., Hunter were to Admit UNDER OATH that the Crack was his, so much the Better.

While such Steps in an Official Forensic Investigation might seem “Obvious,” apparently the Secret Service, let alone the FBI, could not be “bothered” to do an Investigation “by the book.” An AI Assistant could “Remind” them of their Sworn DUTY to Avoid even the Appearance of DOUBLE STANDARDS if they could not simply do this on their own. Given that Hunter was supposed to have a Hearing on a “Plea Agreement” just Weeks later, the Results of such an Investigation would have been quite TIMELY.

A more “Complicated” Case might be the FACT that “17% of people Interviewed stated that the Might have CHANGED THEIR VOTE had they known the TRUTH about Hunter’s Laptop BEFORE the 2020 election.” A similar poll could determine the Percent of People who might have CHANGED THEIR VOTE had they known about Obama and the MURDER of Don Young BEFORE Elections in 2008, 2012, 2016, 2020, and even 2022. Such “Evidence” could be used to Demonstrate to a COURT and a JURY the clear RESULTS of Election Interference. Of course, a Judge would have to “Allow” such EVIDENCE to be Heard BEFORE they “Ruled” on a Particular Case. Thus, WWMBL3 could have a DIRECT BENEFICIAL IMPACT on PREVENTING Deliberate Judicial Dysfunctionality (DJD) in the future. And, if such EVIDENCE is “Allowed” NOW Before a “Final Ruling,” *it Might Persuade Judge O’Malley to Move my Defamation Case against the Chicago Sun Times to Discovery WITHOUT the need for Appeal up to and including SCOTUS.*

If, however, my current case Does need to go to SCOTUS, just as with Tarasoff, it will be Interesting to see if Case Law can be Established as to the DUTIES of Judges to not only WARN the PEOPLE as to Information Relevant to them and Elections, but also their DUTY to “Allow” the TRUTH to be Known while there is Still Time to Make A Difference. Time will Tell.

14.2.3.3.2.3 WWMBL3 Win-Win Algorithms

-- Proposed Win-Win Options

While, obviously, All Parties to a Suit would be welcome to propose Win-Win Options at Any Time, including during Discovery, an AI Assistant could also generate multiple potential Win-Win Options that might not have been considered to date. While the Parties would be free to Accept, Reject or Modify any Proposals made, simply put, the More Options Available to the Parties, the Better.

Again, an AI Assistant and/or the Parties Themselves could also propose gathering further Evidence that could be Useful in coming to a Win-Win Resolution of a Particular Problem. Thus, for instance, Politicians have “Argued” literally for YEARS about the “Best” way to Fight Crime. If a Pilot Program of Safe Haven e.g., in Chicago Can CUT Crime >50% in 2023, this would be an Excellent Argument for replicating it in Multiple Sites Across the Country in 2024. Thus, the PEOPLE could Decide if such programs were Better or Not than the Current Status Quo. **In a Democracy, this is as it should be.**

-- AI-Cost/Benefits Analysis Algorithm

Again, while PARTIES to a Suit Can and Should do at least a Rough "Cost/Benefit Analysis" (CBA) of "Winning" or "Losing" a Case in Court, it would be Useful to have *Multiple* CBA's available for not only the Parties but, potentially, even the Judge to Consider BEFORE a Costly and often Lengthy Trial occurs.

An AI Assistant using Bayesian Analysis can help compute the potential likelihoods of various Jury Outcomes as a way of "Informing" both Cost/Benefit Analysis and potential Settlement Talks. As Sun Tzu correctly noted some 2500 years ago, "The Greatest Victory is that which Requires No Battle."

Whether it is the individual parties and/or an AI, it is useful to generate Probabilities of Success (PISuccess) based on both Historical Data and the Individual Litigant's "Best Guess."

-- Comparable Cases (P I success)

- Settlements -- Historical
- Jury awards-- Historical
- Defendants -- "Best guess"
- Plaintiffs -- "Best guess"
- Judge -- Based on Past Experience, Analysis of the Issues and Wisdom
- Vox Populi -- Polling Data?

14.2.3.3.4 WWMBL3 Applications -- Win-Win Econometric Modeling

While the current discussion focuses primarily on the Courts, as noted below, WWMBL3 has Applications in Many Situations including:

- Court
- Business
- Nations
- Global

Simply put, the More that We as Individuals, Countries and a World Deliberately SEEK Win-Win Resolutions to our Disputes, the Better a Win-Win World we will Build for ALL. Time will Tell.

KLSTARTSWWMBL3Prot20Feb24