

# Copyright and License

© 2026 InnoVadens, LLC. All rights reserved.

This specification is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution–NoDerivatives 4.0 International License (CC BY-ND 4.0).

You are free to copy and redistribute this document in any medium or format, provided that you:

- Attribute the work to InnoVadens, LLC, and
- Do not remix, transform, or build upon the material.

No modifications of this specification may be distributed. Implementations may reference this specification, but derivative specifications or altered versions may not be published under the ADAC name or imply ADAC endorsement.

A copy of the license is available at: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nd/4.0/>

## Status of This Document

This document defines the ADAC Specification for version 0.9.0-draft.1.

**Status: Draft** This profile is functionally complete but has not yet undergone jurisdictional legal review. It is released for evaluation, testing, and community feedback. Breaking changes may occur before the 1.0.0 legal-stable release.

InnoVadens, LLC is the steward of this specification. Only documents published at <https://adac-standard.com/specs/> are considered official and normative.

This specification may be referenced by third-party software, libraries, and services. However, no external party may publish modified versions of this specification or claim compatibility beyond what is explicitly defined in the normative text.

Normative requirements in this document use the keywords MUST, MUST NOT, SHOULD, SHOULD NOT, and MAY as defined in RFC 2119.

## Trademark Notice

“ADAC” and the ADAC logo are trademarks of InnoVadens, LLC. Use of the ADAC name in derivative specifications, competing standards, or modified versions of this document is prohibited.

Software implementations may state that they “implement the ADAC Specification” provided such statements are accurate and not misleading.

## Revision History

Version 0.9.0-draft.1 — Draft release for evaluation, testing, and community feedback pending jurisdictional legal review.

# ADAC-Legal-US v0.9.0 — United States Jurisdiction Profile

### Editor & Steward

John Vaden

Genealogist and Technical Workflow Contributor

InnoVadens, LLC — Cedar Lake, Michigan, USA

### Contributors

AI-assisted drafting and refinement

Community feedback (ongoing)

### Status

This document is maintained by InnoVadens, LLC as the official steward of the ADAC Standard.

John Vaden has decades of experience in genealogical research and in contributing to standards, workflows, and data practices across analyst and software development teams. He serves as the editor and steward of the ADAC Standard. InnoVadens, LLC is the legal steward of ADAC.

*This specification defines metadata structures for representing legal documents and their provenance. It does not provide legal advice, does not interpret law, and does not establish legal authority. Users should consult qualified legal professionals for legal guidance.*

**Version:** v0.9.0 **Status:** Draft **Copyright:** © 2026 InnoVadens, LLC. All rights reserved. **Date:** 2026

**Base Profile:** [ADAC-Legal 0.9.0-draft.1 — Legal Document Profile Specification](#)

---

## Abstract

The **ADAC-Legal-US** jurisdiction profile extends the [ADAC-Legal 0.9.0-draft.1](#) base profile with terminology, well-known value sets, field guidance, and privilege categories specific to the United States federal and state legal systems. This includes Federal Rules of Civil Procedure document types,

US-specific privilege doctrine values (attorney-client privilege, work-product doctrine), multi-tier protective order confidentiality designations, FOIA-based redaction reasons, US bankruptcy chapter matter types, class action and multidistrict litigation matter types, FRE 502 clawback custody actions, and guidance on populating matter references using PACER conventions and federal court naming standards.

This specification is a **companion document** to ADAC-Legal 0.9.0-draft.1. It does not define a separate profile file or container format. Containers using this jurisdiction profile still use `metadata/profiles/legal.json` with `profileType: "legal"` and `jurisdictionProfile: "us"`.

---

## Table of Contents

1. [Introduction](#)
  2. [Conformance](#)
  3. [Terminology](#)
  4. [Relationship to ADAC-Legal](#)
  5. [Jurisdiction Profile Identifier](#)
  6. [US-Specific Well-Known Values](#)
  7. [US-Specific Field Guidance](#)
  8. [EDRM Lifecycle Alignment](#)
  9. [US Court System Reference](#)
  10. [Subdivision Profiles](#)
  11. [Complete US Container Example](#)
  12. [Validation](#)
  13. [References](#)
  14. [Version History](#)
- 

## 1. Introduction

### 1.1 Problem Statement

The United States legal system presents unique characteristics that the jurisdiction-neutral ADAC-Legal base specification intentionally does not capture:

- **Federal Rules of Civil Procedure** define specific discovery mechanisms — Rule 30(b)(6) depositions, Rule 26(a) initial disclosures, Rule 33 interrogatories, Rule 34 requests for production — that produce distinct document types not found in other legal traditions.

- **Protective orders** in US litigation commonly define multi-tier confidentiality designations ("Confidential", "Highly Confidential — Attorneys' Eyes Only", "Highly Confidential — Source Code") that exceed the base specification's classification vocabulary.
- **Attorney-client privilege** and the **work-product doctrine** are the specific US formulations of legal professional privilege, with established scope rules (Upjohn, Hickman v. Taylor) that differ from the UK's legal professional privilege test and civil law equivalents.
- **FOIA exemptions** provide a structured set of redaction reasons specific to US government document production.
- **Bankruptcy chapters** (7, 11, 13) represent procedurally distinct matter types with different document requirements.
- **Class actions** (FRCP Rule 23) and **multidistrict litigation** (28 U.S.C. § 1407) have unique procedural concepts without direct equivalents in other systems.
- **FRE 502 clawback** provides a specific mechanism for addressing inadvertent privilege waiver that has no direct counterpart in most other jurisdictions.
- **PACER** (Public Access to Court Electronic Records) establishes conventions for case numbering and court identification that applications should follow for interoperability.
- **Bates numbering** is the US-standard sequential page numbering system for document productions, with specific formatting conventions.

## 1.2 Solution

ADAC-Legal-US addresses these needs by defining:

- Additional well-known values for document types, confidentiality levels, matter types, custody actions, privilege categories, and redaction reasons specific to US federal and state practice.
- Field guidance for populating base ADAC-Legal fields using US conventions (PACER matter numbers, PACER court names, Bates numbering format, state naming).
- US privilege doctrine values that restore the jurisdiction-specific terms moved out of the international base spec.
- An EDRM lifecycle alignment table mapping US e-discovery phases to ADAC-Legal-US mechanisms.
- A reference model for the US court system hierarchy to guide `matterReference.tribunalName` and `jurisdiction` population.
- Identification of subdivisions (Louisiana, Puerto Rico) that warrant their own companion specifications.

## 1.3 Scope

This specification defines:

- The "us" jurisdiction profile identifier and its scope
- US-specific additions to ADAC-Legal well-known value sets: document types, confidentiality levels, matter types, custody actions, privilege categories, and redaction reasons

- US privilege doctrine terminology (attorney-client privilege, work-product doctrine, FRE 502 clawback)
- Guidance on populating base ADAC-Legal fields for US practice
- Bates numbering format conventions
- An EDRM lifecycle alignment table
- A reference model for the US federal and state court hierarchy
- US-specific validation rules
- The relationship to subdivision profiles ("us-la" for Louisiana, "us-pr" for Puerto Rico)

This specification does **not** define:

- The ADAC core container format (see [ADAC 1.0](#))
- The base ADAC-Legal profile schema (see [ADAC-Legal 0.9.0-draft.1](#))
- State-specific legal concepts that require structural schema differences (those are defined by subdivision companion specifications)
- Application-level APIs, user interfaces, or enforcement mechanisms

## 1.4 Audience

This specification is intended for:

- Software developers implementing US legal document management features in ADAC readers and writers
- Legal technologists at US law firms, corporate legal departments, and litigation support vendors
- E-discovery platform developers integrating ADAC-Legal containers into US review workflows
- Compliance officers managing US document retention, litigation hold, and FOIA compliance

---

## 2. Conformance

The key words "MUST", "MUST NOT", "REQUIRED", "SHALL", "SHALL NOT", "SHOULD", "SHOULD NOT", "RECOMMENDED", "MAY", and "OPTIONAL" in this document are to be interpreted as described in [RFC 2119](#).

### 2.1 Jurisdiction Profile Conformance

An ADAC-Legal container conforms to this jurisdiction profile when:

1. It conforms to ADAC-Legal 0.9.0-draft.1 (valid ADAC container with `profileType`: "legal" and `profileId`: "urn:adac:profile:legal:v1").
2. The `jurisdictionProfile` field in `legal.json` data is set to "us".

3. The `jurisdiction.country` field, when populated, is "US".

## 2.2 Additive Inheritance

This specification follows the additive inheritance model defined in ADAC-Legal 0.9.0-draft.1 Section 8.3:

- Adds US-specific well-known values to existing value sets
- Provides US-specific guidance on populating base fields
- Defines US-specific concepts, privilege terminology, and EDRM alignment
- Does NOT remove or redefine any base ADAC-Legal fields or values
- Does NOT modify the ADAC-Legal JSON schema
- Does NOT modify the ADAC core specification

All base ADAC-Legal well-known values remain valid and available in US containers.

## 2.3 Forward Compatibility

Readers MUST tolerate unknown JSON properties in all structures, consistent with ADAC-Legal 0.9.0-draft.1 Section 2.3. US-specific values that appear in well-known value set fields are ordinary strings — applications that do not recognize them MUST preserve them during round-trip serialization.

# 3. Terminology

Term	Definition
<b>FRCP</b>	Federal Rules of Civil Procedure — the procedural rules governing civil litigation in U.S. federal courts.
<b>FRE</b>	Federal Rules of Evidence — the rules governing the admissibility of evidence in U.S. federal courts.
<b>PACER</b>	Public Access to Court Electronic Records — the U.S. federal judiciary's electronic case management and filing system.
<b>MDL</b>	Multidistrict Litigation — consolidation of related civil actions from multiple federal districts before a single transferee judge (28 U.S.C. § 1407).
<b>FOIA</b>	Freedom of Information Act (5 U.S.C. § 552) — the U.S. federal law providing public access to government records, with nine enumerated exemptions.
<b>Protective Order</b>	A court order under FRCP Rule 26(c) restricting disclosure of confidential discovery material. U.S. protective orders commonly establish tiered confidentiality designations.

<b>Term</b>	<b>Definition</b>
<b>Bates Number</b>	A sequential page-numbering system used in U.S. document productions, named after the Bates Manufacturing Company that produced the original numbering stamps. The ADAC-Legal base field <code>sequentialNumberStart / sequentialNumberEnd</code> captures Bates numbers in US containers.
<b>AEO</b>	"Attorneys' Eyes Only" — a common confidentiality tier in U.S. protective orders restricting document access to outside counsel and their staff, excluding in-house attorneys and party representatives.
<b>Attorney-Client Privilege</b>	The US-specific formulation of legal professional privilege protecting confidential communications between an attorney and client made for the purpose of seeking or rendering legal advice (Upjohn Co. v. United States, 449 U.S. 383 (1981)). ADAC-Legal-US value: "attorneyClientPrivilege".
<b>Work-Product Doctrine</b>	Protection for documents and tangible things prepared in anticipation of litigation or for trial by or for a party or its representative (Hickman v. Taylor, 329 U.S. 495 (1947); FRCP Rule 26(b)(3)). ADAC-Legal-US value: "workProductDoctrine".
<b>FRE 502 Clawback</b>	A mechanism under Federal Rule of Evidence 502 allowing a party to claw back inadvertently disclosed privileged material without waiving the privilege. Captured as "clawback" custody action.
<b>CUI</b>	Controlled Unclassified Information — sensitive government information that requires safeguarding per Executive Order 13556 but is not classified under Executive Order 13526.
<b>Qui Tam</b>	A lawsuit brought by a private citizen (relator) on behalf of the government under the False Claims Act (31 U.S.C. §§ 3729–3733), where the relator receives a portion of any recovery.
<b>Section 1983</b>	42 U.S.C. § 1983 — the federal civil rights statute allowing individuals to sue state actors for constitutional violations.
<b>Rule 30(b)(6) Deposition</b>	FRCP Rule 30(b)(6) — a deposition mechanism where an organization designates one or more representatives to testify on specified topics on behalf of the organization.
<b>EDRM</b>	Electronic Discovery Reference Model — the US-originated industry framework for managing electronic discovery.

## 4. Relationship to ADAC-Legal

### 4.1 Inheritance Chain

A container with "jurisdictionProfile": "us" is simultaneously:

- A valid **ADAC 1.0** container
- A valid **ADAC-Legal 0.9.0-draft.1** container (base profile — all base fields and values apply)
- A valid **ADAC-Legal-US 0.9.0-draft.1** container (this specification — US additions apply on top)

An application that understands only the base ADAC-Legal specification can still read and process a US container — US-specific values appear as ordinary strings in well-known value set fields and are preserved during round-trip serialization.

## 4.2 What This Specification Adds

The following table shows additions relative to the internationalized ADAC-Legal 0.9.0-draft.1 base. Base value counts reflect the new international base specification.

Category	Base ADAC-Legal	ADAC-Legal-US Additions
Document types	15 base values	14 US-specific values
Confidentiality levels	7 base values	3 US-specific values
Matter types	13 base values	10 US-specific values
Custody actions	11 base values	3 US-specific values
Privilege / redaction reasons	9 base values	10 US-specific values
Field guidance	General / neutral	PACER conventions, federal court naming, Bates format
Lifecycle alignment	General lifecycle table	Full EDRM phase mapping

## 4.3 Field Name Alignment

The ADAC-Legal international base specification uses jurisdiction-neutral field names. The following table maps them to the equivalent US terminology for implementers familiar with US legal practice:

ADAC-Legal Base Field	US Legal Equivalent
<code>matterReference</code>	Case reference
<code>matterNumber</code>	Case number
<code>tribunalName</code>	Court name
<code>matterCaption</code>	Case caption

ADAC-Legal Base Field	US Legal Equivalent
matterType	Matter type / case type
sequentialNumberStart / sequentialNumberEnd	Bates range start / end
holdActive	Litigation hold
holdNotices[].holdType: "litigation"	Litigation hold notice
parties[].role: "claimant"	Plaintiff
parties[].role: "defendant"	Defendant
parties[].legalRepresentative	Counsel / attorney

## 4.4 Container Format

No changes from the base. US containers use the same structure as base ADAC-Legal containers:

- File extension: .adac
- Profile file: metadata/profiles/legal.json
- profileType: "legal"
- profileId: "urn:adac:profile:legal:v1"
- jurisdictionProfile: "us" (inside data)

## 5. Jurisdiction Profile Identifier

Property	Value
Identifier	"us"
Full name	ADAC-Legal-US
Scope	United States federal legal system and common law state systems
ISO 3166-1	US
Legal tradition	Common law (except Louisiana — see <a href="#">Section 10</a> )

### 5.1 When This Profile Applies

Use "jurisdictionProfile": "us" when:

- The legal matter is governed by US federal law or procedure.

- The legal matter is in a US state court following the common law tradition.
- The document was produced, filed, or stored under US legal authority.

Use a subdivision profile ("us-la", "us-pr") instead when the matter involves jurisdiction-specific structural differences that the base US profile cannot capture. See [Section 10](#).

## 6. US-Specific Well-Known Values

The following value sets extend the base ADAC-Legal well-known values defined in ADAC-Legal 0.9.0-draft.1 Section 20. All base values remain valid — these are **additions only**. Jurisdiction profiles **MUST NOT** remove or redefine base values.

### 6.1 Document Types

Additions to `classification.documentType` (base values in ADAC-Legal 0.9.0-draft.1 Section 20.1).

Value	Description	Legal Basis
"complaint"	Initial complaint or petition commencing a civil action.	FRCP Rule 3, Rule 8
"answer"	Answer to a complaint, including affirmative defenses and counterclaims.	FRCP Rule 8, Rule 12
"summons"	Court-issued summons directing a party to appear or respond.	FRCP Rule 4
"rule26InitialDisclosure"	Mandatory initial disclosure of witnesses, documents, computation of damages, and insurance agreements.	FRCP Rule 26(a)(1)
"interrogatoryResponse"	Written answers to interrogatories under oath.	FRCP Rule 33
"requestForProduction"	Request for production of documents, electronically stored information (ESI), or tangible things; or responses thereto.	FRCP Rule 34
"requestForAdmission"	Request for admission of facts or genuineness of documents; or responses thereto.	FRCP Rule 36
"rule30b6Deposition"	Deposition of an organization through a designated representative on specified topics.	FRCP Rule 30(b)(6)
"stipulation"	Written agreement between parties, often filed with the court.	FRCP Rule 29

Value	Description	Legal Basis
"protectiveOrder"	Court order restricting disclosure of confidential information produced during discovery.	FRCP Rule 26(c)
"indictment"	Formal criminal charge issued by a grand jury.	U.S. Const. Amend. V; Fed. R. Crim. P. 6, 7
"informationCharge"	Criminal charge filed by a prosecutor without a grand jury indictment.	Fed. R. Crim. P. 7
"pleaBargainAgreement"	Written plea agreement between a defendant and the prosecution.	Fed. R. Crim. P. 11
"sentencingMemorandum"	Memorandum to the court regarding sentencing factors and recommendations.	18 U.S.C. § 3553(a); Fed. R. Crim. P. 32

## 6.2 Confidentiality Levels

Additions to `classification.confidentialityLevel` (base values in ADAC-Legal 0.9.0-draft.1 Section 20.2).

These tiers reflect the multi-level confidentiality designations commonly established by US protective orders in commercial litigation. They add specificity to the base "highlyConfidential" concept.

Value	Description	Typical Protective Order Tier
"aéoAttorneysEyesOnly"	Restricted to outside counsel and their staff; in-house counsel and party representatives are excluded.	"Highly Confidential — Attorneys' Eyes Only" (AEO)
"aéoSourceCode"	Further restricted beyond AEO: viewable only in a controlled inspection environment (typically an air-gapped workstation). Common in IP litigation involving proprietary source code.	"Highly Confidential — Source Code"
"controlledUnclassified"	Sensitive government information requiring safeguarding per Executive Order 13556 but not classified under Executive Order 13526. Used in FOIA contexts and government litigation.	CUI (Controlled Unclassified Information)

## 6.3 Matter Types

Additions to `matterReference.matterType` (base values in ADAC-Legal 0.9.0-draft.1 Section 20.3).

Value	Description	Legal Basis
"chapter7Bankruptcy"	Chapter 7 liquidation — debtor's non-exempt assets are sold to pay creditors.	11 U.S.C. §§ 701–784
"chapter11Bankruptcy"	Chapter 11 reorganization — debtor proposes a plan to restructure debts while continuing operations.	11 U.S.C. §§ 1101–1174
"chapter13Bankruptcy"	Chapter 13 individual debt adjustment — wage earner's plan for individuals with regular income.	11 U.S.C. §§ 1301–1330
"chapter15Bankruptcy"	Chapter 15 ancillary and cross-border insolvency proceedings.	11 U.S.C. §§ 1501–1532
"classAction"	One or more representative plaintiffs suing on behalf of a similarly situated class.	FRCP Rule 23
"multidistrictLitigation"	Consolidation of related civil actions from multiple federal districts before a single transferee judge.	28 U.S.C. § 1407
"quiTam"	False Claims Act action brought by a private relator on behalf of the US government.	31 U.S.C. §§ 3729–3733
"section1983"	Civil rights action against state actors for deprivation of constitutional rights.	42 U.S.C. § 1983
"socialSecurityAppeal"	Appeal of a Social Security Administration determination (disability, retirement, survivor benefits) in federal district court.	42 U.S.C. § 405(g)
"federalHabeasCorpus"	Federal habeas corpus petition challenging the legality of state or federal custody.	28 U.S.C. §§ 2241–2255

## 6.4 Custody Actions

Additions to `custodyChain[]`.action (base values in ADAC-Legal 0.9.0-draft.1 Section 20.4).

Value	Description	Legal Basis
"producedInDiscovery"	Document produced to opposing party pursuant to a discovery request or subpoena.	FRCP Rule 34
"lodgedWithCourt"	Document lodged (submitted but not yet filed) with the court, pending a ruling on admissibility or sealing.	Local court rules
"filedUnderSeal"	Document filed with the court under seal, restricting public access.	FRCP Rule 5.2; local court rules
"clawback"	Document recalled from opposing counsel following inadvertent production of privileged material.	Fed. R. Evid. 502; FRCP Rule 26(b)(5)

Value	Description	Legal Basis
		(B)

## 6.5 Privilege Categories and Redaction Reasons

Additions to `privilegeLog[].claim`, `legal:privilege.claim`, and `legal:redaction.reason` (base values in ADAC-Legal 0.9.0-draft.1 Section 20.5).

These values restore the US-specific privilege and redaction terminology that was removed from the international base specification.

### 6.5.1 US Privilege Categories

Value	Description	Legal Basis
"attorneyClientPrivilege"	US attorney-client privilege — protects confidential communications between attorney and client made for the purpose of seeking or rendering legal advice. Maps to the base "legalProfessionalPrivilege" but names the US-specific doctrine.	<i>Upjohn Co. v. United States</i> , 449 U.S. 383 (1981); FRCP Rule 26(b)(1)
"workProductDoctrine"	US work-product doctrine — protects documents and tangible things prepared in anticipation of litigation by or for a party's attorney. Maps to the base "litigationPrivilege" but names the US-specific doctrine.	<i>Hickman v. Taylor</i> , 329 U.S. 495 (1947); FRCP Rule 26(b)(3)
"jointDefensePrivilege"	Communications shared among co-defendants or co-respondents and their counsel in connection with a common defense strategy.	Common law; <i>In re Grand Jury Subpoena</i> , 274 F.3d 563 (1st Cir. 2001)
"commonInterestPrivilege"	Extends attorney-client privilege to communications shared among parties with aligned legal interests, even absent formal joint defense.	Common law; varies by circuit

### 6.5.2 US-Specific Redaction Reasons

Value	Description	Legal Basis
"foiaExemption1"	National defense or foreign policy information properly classified under Executive Order 13526.	5 U.S.C. § 552(b)(1)

Value	Description	Legal Basis
"foiaExemption5"	Inter-agency or intra-agency memorandums or letters that would be privileged in civil litigation (deliberative process, attorney-client, work product).	5 U.S.C. § 552(b) (5)
"foiaExemption6"	Personnel, medical, or similar files where disclosure would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy.	5 U.S.C. § 552(b) (6)
"foiaExemption7c"	Law enforcement records where disclosure could reasonably be expected to constitute an unwarranted invasion of personal privacy.	5 U.S.C. § 552(b) (7)(C)
"grandJurySecret"	Grand jury material protected from disclosure.	Fed. R. Crim. P. 6(e)
"sealedIndictment"	Grand jury indictment sealed pending arrest or other judicial action.	Fed. R. Crim. P. 6(e)(4)
"taxReturnConfidentiality"	Tax return information protected from unauthorized disclosure.	26 U.S.C. § 6103
"juvenileRecord"	Juvenile court or delinquency records protected from public disclosure.	State-specific statutes; 18 U.S.C. § 5038

## 7. US-Specific Field Guidance

### 7.1 Matter Reference

#### 7.1.1 Matter Number (US Case Number)

The base field `matterReference.matterNumber` holds the US case number. It SHOULD follow US federal court conventions when the matter is in federal court:

Format	Example	Description
PACER short form	"2026-CV-04521"	Year, case type, sequential number.
PACER full form	"1:26-cv-04521-LTS"	District division, two-digit year, case type, number, judge initials.

Common PACER case type abbreviations:

Abbreviation	Description
cv	Civil
cr	Criminal
bk	Bankruptcy
ap	Adversary proceeding (bankruptcy)
mc	Miscellaneous
mj	Magistrate judge

For state court matters, use the case number format assigned by the filing court. For MDL matters, both the individual case number and the MDL docket number SHOULD be recorded — individual case number in `matterNumber`, MDL docket in `docketIdentifier`.

### 7.1.2 Tribunal Name (US Court Name)

The base field `matterReference.tribunalName` holds the US court name. It SHOULD use the official court name as listed in PACER:

Example	Notes
"U.S. District Court, Southern District of New York"	Federal district court.
"U.S. Court of Appeals, Second Circuit"	Federal appellate court.
"U.S. Bankruptcy Court, District of Delaware"	Federal bankruptcy court.
"Supreme Court of the United States"	Highest federal court.
"U.S. Tax Court"	Specialized federal court.
"Supreme Court of the State of New York, New York County"	State trial court (New York — note: NY "Supreme Court" is a trial court).
"Superior Court of California, County of Los Angeles"	State trial court (California).
"Circuit Court of Cook County, Illinois"	State trial court (Illinois).

### 7.1.3 Jurisdiction

When `jurisdictionProfile` is "us":

Field	Guidance
jurisdiction.country	MUST be "US".
jurisdiction.subdivision	SHOULD use the full state name (e.g., "New York", "California", "Ohio"). SHOULD NOT use postal abbreviations in this field.
jurisdiction.localUnit	SHOULD use the county name without a suffix (e.g., "Cook", not "Cook County"). For Louisiana, see ADAC-Legal-US-LA.

### 7.1.4 Matter Caption

The base field `matterReference.matterCaption` holds the US case caption (e.g., "Smith v. Jones Corp. "). In US practice:

- Federal civil: "[Plaintiff] v. [Defendant]" — e.g., "Ashcroft v. Iqbal"
- Federal criminal: "United States v. [Defendant]" — e.g., "United States v. Windsor"
- In rem: "United States v. [Property Description]"

### 7.1.5 Party Roles

The base role values "claimant" and "respondent" are valid in US containers. US-specific aliases:

Base Value	US Alias / Preferred Term	Context
"claimant"	plaintiff	Civil litigation
"defendant"	defendant	Civil and criminal
"petitioner"	petitioner	Habeas corpus, certiorari
"respondent"	respondent	Appellate, administrative
"appellant"	appellant	Appeals
"appellee"	appellee	Appeals
"intervenor"	intervenor	Intervention under FRCP Rule 24

The `legalRepresentative` field holds the name of the attorney or law firm of record (US equivalent: "counsel of record" or "attorney of record").

## 7.2 Document Classification

### 7.2.1 Bates Numbering

US Bates numbering conventions for the base fields `sequentialNumberStart` and `sequentialNumberEnd`:

Guideline	Description
<b>Prefix</b>	A party-identifying abbreviation — typically the producing party's surname or entity abbreviation (e.g., "SMITH", "JONES_CORP", "DEF").
<b>Digits</b>	Six to eight zero-padded digits (e.g., "000001" through "00000001"). Eight digits recommended for large productions.
<b>Separator</b>	No separator between prefix and digits is the most common US convention (e.g., "SMITH000123"). Some productions use a hyphen or underscore; be consistent within a production.
<b>Range</b>	For multi-page documents, <code>sequentialNumberStart</code> is the first page and <code>sequentialNumberEnd</code> is the last page. For single-page documents, both SHOULD be the same value.
<b>Consistency</b>	Bates prefixes SHOULD be consistent across all containers in the same production set.

### 7.2.2 Exhibit Number (US Convention)

The base field `classification.exhibitIdentifier` holds the US exhibit number or designation:

- Trial exhibits: "Plaintiff's Exhibit 42", "Defense Exhibit A", "Joint Exhibit 1"
- Deposition exhibits: "Deposition Exhibit 5" (numbered sequentially across the deposition)
- Hearing exhibits: "Government's Exhibit 3", "Respondent's Exhibit B"

### 7.2.3 Confidentiality Tier Mapping

When a US protective order establishes tiered confidentiality, map the tiers to ADAC-Legal-US confidentiality levels as follows:

Protective Order Tier	ADAC-Legal-US Value
"Confidential"	"confidential" (base)
"Highly Confidential — Attorneys' Eyes Only"	"aeoAttorneysEyesOnly" (US)
"Highly Confidential — Source Code"	"aeoSourceCode" (US)
Sealed by court order	"sealed" (base)

Protective Order Tier	ADAC-Legal-US Value
Controlled Unclassified Information (CUI)	"controlledUnclassified" (US)

For protective orders with custom tiers not listed above, use "restricted" (base) and describe the restriction in the notes field.

## 7.3 Retention Policy

### 7.3.1 Federal Records

Federal records retention is governed by National Archives and Records Administration (NARA) records schedules. Common reference periods:

Record Type	Typical Retention	Authority
Federal court case files	Varies by court and case type — typically 1–15 years after case closure	NARA GRS 5.9
Federal tax records	6–7 years	IRS Publication 583; 26 U.S.C. § 6501
Employment records (EEOC)	1 year after termination; 2 years for ADEA records	29 C.F.R. § 1627.3
OSHA injury/illness records	5 years from end of the calendar year	29 C.F.R. § 1904.33

### 7.3.2 State Records

State retention requirements vary significantly. The `retentionPolicy.period` field SHOULD include the governing authority when the retention period is driven by a state statute or rule (e.g., "7 years per NY CPLR § 213", "4 years per Texas Business & Commerce Code § 16.004").

### 7.3.3 Litigation Hold

When `retentionPolicy.holdActive` is true in a US container, applications MUST suppress any automated destruction workflows regardless of the `retentionPolicy.period` or `retentionPolicy.expiresOn` values. This reflects the US duty to preserve evidence once litigation is reasonably anticipated (*Zubulake v. UBS Warburg LLC*, 220 F.R.D. 212 (S.D.N.Y. 2003); FRCP Rule 37(e)).

When a litigation hold is issued, the corresponding `holdNotices[]` entry SHOULD also have `holdType`: "litigation" and SHOULD reference the triggering matter in `matterReference`.

## 7.4 Privilege Log

US privilege logs produced in discovery (FRCP Rule 26(b)(5)) must typically identify: the nature of the privilege claim, the date of the communication, the author, the recipient(s), and a description sufficient to assess the claim without revealing the privileged content. Map these to ADAC-Legal privilege log fields:

US Privilege Log Element	ADAC-Legal Field
Privilege claimed	<code>privilegeLog[].claim</code> (use US values: "attorneyClientPrivilege", "workProductDoctrine")
Basis for claim	<code>privilegeLog[].basis</code>
Asserting party / counsel	<code>privilegeLog[].claimedBy</code>
Date asserted	<code>privilegeLog[].claimedOn</code>
Scope	<code>privilegeLog[].scope</code>
Waiver (if applicable)	<code>privilegeLog[].waivedOn</code> + <code>privilegeLog[].waiverBasis</code>

## 7.5 FRE 502 Clawback

When privileged material is inadvertently produced and then recalled under Federal Rule of Evidence 502(b), the sequence SHOULD be recorded in the custody chain:

1. The original "producedInDiscovery" entry records the production.
2. A "clawback" entry records the recall, with notes referencing the FRE 502(b) demand letter and any court order.
3. A `legalPrivilegeDetermination` event SHOULD be appended to the ADAC provenance log.
4. The `privilegeLog[]` entry SHOULD record `waivedOn`: `null` (privilege not waived) and `waiverBasis` referencing the 502(b) clawback.

---

## 8. EDRM Lifecycle Alignment

The Electronic Discovery Reference Model (EDRM) is the US industry standard framework for managing electronic discovery. The following table maps EDRM phases to ADAC-Legal-US mechanisms.

EDRM Phase	Description	ADAC-Legal-US Mechanism
<b>Information Governance</b>	Policies and controls for managing ESI before litigation arises	<code>retentionPolicy</code> , base ADAC provenance + checksum integrity
<b>Identification</b>	Locating potentially relevant ESI	<code>holdNotices</code> ( <code>holdType</code> : "litigation")
<b>Preservation</b>	Suspending routine destruction of potentially relevant ESI	<code>holdNotices</code> , <code>retentionPolicy.holdActive</code> : true
<b>Collection</b>	Gathering preserved ESI into a controlled environment	<code>custodyChain</code> entries: "received", "scanned", "stored"
<b>Processing</b>	Reducing ESI volume and converting to review-ready format	<code>custodyChain</code> entries: "copied", "transferred" + ADAC provenance
<b>Review</b>	Assessing ESI for relevance, responsiveness, and privilege	<code>classification.confidentialityLevel</code> , <code>privilegeLog</code> , <code>legal:privilege</code> annotations
<b>Analysis</b>	Evaluating patterns in the ESI collection	Application-level (uses ADAC-Legal-US metadata)
<b>Production</b>	Disclosing relevant, non-privileged ESI to requesting parties	<code>productions[]</code> , <code>legal:redaction</code> annotations, <code>custodyChain</code> : "producedInDiscovery"
<b>Presentation</b>	Using ESI at depositions, hearings, and trial	<code>legal:exhibit</code> annotations, <code>custodyChain</code> : "lodgedWithCourt", <code>custodyChain</code> : "filedUnderSeal"

## 9. US Court System Reference

This section provides a reference model for the US court hierarchy to guide population of `matterReference.tribunalName` and `jurisdiction` fields.

## 9.1 Federal Court Hierarchy

Level	Courts	Example tribunalName Values
<b>Supreme Court</b>	U.S. Supreme Court	"Supreme Court of the United States"
<b>Appellate</b>	13 Courts of Appeals (11 numbered circuits + D.C. Circuit + Federal Circuit)	"U.S. Court of Appeals, Ninth Circuit"
<b>Trial — General</b>	94 District Courts (50 states, D.C., and territories)	"U.S. District Court, Eastern District of Virginia"
<b>Trial — Bankruptcy</b>	Bankruptcy courts within each district	"U.S. Bankruptcy Court, Southern District of New York"
<b>Specialized</b>	Court of Federal Claims, Tax Court, Court of International Trade, FISA Court	"U.S. Tax Court", "U.S. Court of Federal Claims"
<b>Administrative</b>	ALJ proceedings, agency boards (NLRB, EEOC, MSPB, BIA)	"National Labor Relations Board, Region 2"

## 9.2 State Court Hierarchy

State trial court naming varies significantly. Common patterns:

State Pattern	Trial Court Name	Example tribunalName Value
"Supreme Court" is trial level (NY)	Supreme Court	"Supreme Court of the State of New York, New York County"
"Circuit Court" (IL, VA, MD, WI)	Circuit Court	"Circuit Court of Cook County, Illinois"
"Superior Court" (CA, NJ, WA, GA)	Superior Court	"Superior Court of California, County of Los Angeles"
"District Court" (TX, CO, MN, KS)	District Court	"District Court, Harris County, Texas"
"Court of Common Pleas" (OH, PA)	Court of Common Pleas	"Court of Common Pleas, Licking County, Ohio"
"Chancery Court" (DE, TN)	Court of Chancery / Chancery Court	"Court of Chancery of the State of Delaware"

Applications SHOULD follow local naming conventions and include the county or equivalent unit in the court name for trial-level state courts.

### 9.3 Specialty Courts

Court Type	Example	Notes
US Bankruptcy Court	"U.S. Bankruptcy Court, District of Delaware"	Most used for Chapter 11 reorganizations.
US Tax Court	"U.S. Tax Court"	Hears disputes between taxpayers and the IRS.
Family / Probate Court	"Probate Court of Licking County, Ohio"	State court handling estates, guardianship, adoption.
Tribal Court	"Navajo Nation District Court"	Federal Indian law; tribal sovereignty.

## 10. Subdivision Profiles

### 10.1 When a Subdivision Profile Is Needed

The base US profile covers the common law tradition shared by 49 states and federal courts. A subdivision profile is warranted when a state's legal system has **structural differences** that cannot be captured by the US-level value sets alone.

### 10.2 Identified Subdivisions

Identifier	Full Name	Rationale
"us-la"	ADAC-Legal-US-LA	Louisiana operates under a civil law tradition derived from the Napoleonic Code. Distinct terminology: "parish" instead of "county", "successions" instead of "probate", "reconventional demand" instead of "counterclaim". Distinct document types: notarial acts, authentic acts, succession proceedings.
"us-pr"	ADAC-Legal-US-PR	Puerto Rico operates under a civil law tradition derived from the Spanish Civil Code. Bilingual (Spanish/English) legal system. Distinct terminology: <i>demanda</i> (complaint), <i>sentencia</i> (judgment), <i>escritura pública</i> (public deed). Distinct court structure: <i>Tribunal de Primera Instancia</i> organized into 13 judicial regions across 78 <i>municipios</i> .

## 10.3 Potential Future Subdivisions

Identifier	Rationale
"us-gu"	Guam — unique territorial court structure and Organic Act.
"us-vi"	U.S. Virgin Islands — territorial court system with distinct legal traditions.

## 10.4 Inheritance

A container with "jurisdictionProfile": "us-la" or "us-pr" inherits from all three levels:

1. **Base layer** — ADAC-Legal 0.9.0-draft.1 (all base values and schema)
2. **Country layer** — ADAC-Legal-US 0.9.0-draft.1 (this document — all US-specific values and guidance)
3. **Subdivision layer** — ADAC-Legal-US-LA 1.0 or ADAC-Legal-US-PR 1.0 (subdivision-specific additions)

An application that understands US but not US-LA can still process a Louisiana container — it recognizes all base and US-level values and treats Louisiana-specific values as unknown-but-preserved strings.

---

## 11. Complete US Container Example

The following shows a complete Signed Archival ADAC-Legal-US container for a document produced in federal civil discovery under FRCP Rule 34, with a privilege clawback scenario.

### 11.1 Container Structure

```
smith-v-jones-rule34-production.adac
├─ manifest.json
├─ master/
│  ├─ master_0001.tif          (Page 1 - contract signature page, 600 DPI TIFF)
│  └─ master_0002.tif        (Page 2 - contract terms)
├─ metadata/
│  ├─ core.json
│  ├─ structure.json         (paged-document sequence)
│  └─ profiles/
│     └─ legal.json
├─ derivatives/
│  ├─ deriv_preview_001.jpg   (Web preview of page 1)
│  └─ deriv_redacted_001.pdf  (Redacted production PDF)
```

```

├─ regions/
│   └─ master-001.regions.json
├─ provenance/
│   ├── log.json (hash-chained events)
│   └─ checksums.json
└─ signatures/
    ├── index.json
    ├── container-ingest.p7s (Signed at receipt)
    └─ container-production-001.p7s (Signed at production)

```

## 11.2 Legal Profile (metadata/profiles/legal.json)

```

{
  "profileId": "urn:adac:profile:legal:v1",
  "profileType": "legal",
  "profileVersion": "1.0.0",
  "title": "ADAC Legal Profile - US",
  "data": {
    "jurisdictionProfile": "us",
    "matterReference": {
      "matterNumber": "1:26-cv-04521-LTS",
      "tribunalName": "U.S. District Court, Southern District of New York",
      "jurisdiction": {
        "country": "US",
        "subdivision": "New York",
        "localUnit": "New York"
      }
    },
    "matterType": "civillitigation",
    "matterCaption": "Smith v. Jones Corp.",
    "parties": [
      {
        "name": "John Smith",
        "role": "claimant",
        "legalRepresentative": "Smith & Associates LLP"
      },
      {
        "name": "Jones Corp.",
        "role": "defendant",
        "legalRepresentative": "Wilson & Wilson LLP"
      }
    ]
  },
  "classification": {
    "documentType": "requestForProduction",
    "filingDate": "2026-03-15T00:00:00Z",
    "confidentialityLevel": "aeoAttorneysEyesOnly",
    "sequentialNumberStart": "JONES000442",
  }
}

```

```
"sequentialNumberEnd": "JONES000443",
"retentionPolicy": {
  "period": "7 years after case closure",
  "disposition": "destroy",
  "holdActive": true
}
},
"custodyChain": [
  {
    "id": "custody-001",
    "action": "producedInDiscovery",
    "custodian": "Jones Corp. - Legal Department",
    "timestamp": "2026-04-01T09:00:00Z",
    "organization": "Jones Corp.",
    "notes": "Produced pursuant to Plaintiff's First Request for Production,
Request No. 14, FRCP Rule 34."
  },
  {
    "id": "custody-002",
    "action": "received",
    "custodian": "Jane Doe, Esq.",
    "timestamp": "2026-04-01T17:00:00Z",
    "organization": "Smith & Associates LLP",
    "signatureRef": "signatures/container-ingest.p7s",
    "notes": "Received via secure file transfer from opposing counsel (Wilson &
Wilson LLP).\"
  },
  {
    "id": "custody-003",
    "action": "scanned",
    "custodian": "Litigation Support",
    "timestamp": "2026-04-02T10:00:00Z",
    "organization": "Smith & Associates LLP",
    "notes": "Scanned from production set at 600 DPI, TIFF format.\"
  }
],
"holdNotices": [
  {
    "id": "hold-001",
    "holdType": "litigation",
    "matterReference": "Smith v. Jones Corp., 1:26-cv-04521-LTS",
    "issuedBy": "Jane Doe, Esq., Smith & Associates LLP",
    "issuedOn": "2026-01-15T00:00:00Z",
    "scope": "All documents relating to contract negotiations with Jones Corp.
from 2023-01-01 onward.",
    "releasedOn": null,
    "notes": "Hold issued upon filing of complaint. Duty to preserve per FRCP
Rule 37(e) and Zubulake.\"
  }
]
```

```

    ],
    "productions": [
      {
        "id": "prod-001",
        "productionSetId": "Smith v. Jones – Defendant's First Production",
        "producedOn": "2026-04-01T09:00:00Z",
        "producedBy": "Wilson & Wilson LLP",
        "producedTo": "Smith & Associates LLP",
        "sequentialNumberStart": "JONES000442",
        "sequentialNumberEnd": "JONES000443",
        "derivativeRef": "derivatives/deriv_redacted_001.pdf",
        "redactionsApplied": ["region-002"],
        "transmittalReference": "W&W Production Cover Letter, Matter No. WWL-2026-
04521, dated 2026-04-01"
      }
    ]
  }
}

```

### 11.3 Region Annotations (regions/master-001.regions.json)

```

{
  "mediaId": "master-001",
  "coordinateSystem": "pixel",
  "width": 4800,
  "height": 6400,
  "regions": [
    {
      "id": "region-001",
      "type": "boundingBox",
      "label": "Confidentiality stamp – AEO",
      "bounds": {
        "x": 1800.0,
        "y": 50.0,
        "width": 1200.0,
        "height": 100.0
      }
    },
    {
      "id": "region-002",
      "type": "boundingBox",
      "label": "Redacted – SSN",
      "bounds": {
        "x": 2400.0,
        "y": 2800.0,
        "width": 500.0,
        "height": 60.0
      }
    }
  ]
}

```

```

    },
    "linkedEntities": {
      "legal:redaction": {
        "reason": "personalData",
        "authority": "Protective Order dated 2026-02-10, ¶ 7(b); see also FRCP Rule
5.2(a)(1) (SSN truncation requirement)",
        "authorizedBy": "Jane Doe, Esq.",
        "appliedToDerivativeIds": ["deriv_redacted_001"],
        "redactedOn": "2026-04-01T08:30:00Z",
        "notes": "Social Security number of individual plaintiff - redacted to last
four digits per FRCP Rule 5.2(a)(1) and Protective Order ¶ 7(b).\"
      }
    }
  },
  {
    "id": "region-003",
    "type": "boundingBox",
    "label": "Bates stamp - JONES000442",
    "bounds": {
      "x": 4000.0,
      "y": 6200.0,
      "width": 700.0,
      "height": 80.0
    }
  }
]
}

```

## 12. Validation

### 12.1 Base and ADAC-Legal Validation

US containers are validated by the standard ADAC validator and all ADAC-Legal validation rules (LEG-001 through LEG-080). All base and ADAC-Legal validation rules apply without modification.

### 12.2 US-Specific Validation Rules

The following rules are specific to ADAC-Legal-US containers. All apply when `jurisdictionProfile` is "us" (or a US subdivision such as "us-la").

Rule	Severity	Description
LEGUS-001	Error	<code>jurisdiction.country</code> is populated but is not "US" in a container with <code>jurisdictionProfile: "us"</code> .
LEGUS-010	Warning	<code>matterReference.matterNumber</code> is populated but does not match a recognized PACER format (year-type-number or division:year-type-number-initials) for a federal matter.
LEGUS-011	Warning	<code>classification.confidentialityLevel</code> is "aeoAttorneysEyesOnly" or "aeoSourceCode" but no custody or classification notes reference a protective order.
LEGUS-012	Warning	A <code>foiaExemption*</code> redaction reason is used but the <code>authority</code> field does not reference a specific FOIA exemption number.
LEGUS-020	Warning	<code>retentionPolicy.holdActive</code> is true but a <code>custodyChain[]</code> entry has <code>action: "destroyed"</code> . Destruction is prohibited while a hold is active.
LEGUS-021	Warning	<code>privilegeLog[].claim</code> uses "legalProfessionalPrivilege" (base value) — consider using the more specific US values "attorneyClientPrivilege" or "workProductDoctrine".
LEGUS-030	Warning	A <code>custodyChain[]</code> entry has <code>action: "clawback"</code> but no <code>privilegeLog[]</code> entry references the recalled document, and no <code>legalPrivilegeDetermination</code> event appears in the provenance log.
LEGUS-040	Info	Container is not Signed Archival but is designated for US federal court production ( <code>productions[]</code> is non-empty). Signed Archival is RECOMMENDED for evidentiary use.
LEGUS-050	Info	<code>classification.documentType</code> is "rule30b6Deposition" but no <code>regions/</code> file is referenced. Consider annotating designated topic regions.

## 13. References

### 13.1 Normative References

Reference	Description
<a href="#">ADAC 1.0 Format Specification</a>	The base container format.
<a href="#">ADAC-Legal 0.9.0-draft.1 Profile Specification</a>	The base legal profile this jurisdiction profile extends.
<a href="#">RFC 2119</a>	Key words for use in RFCs to Indicate Requirement Levels.
<a href="#">ISO 3166-1</a>	Country codes — "US" for United States.

Reference	Description
<a href="#">ISO 3166-2:US</a>	US state and territory subdivision codes.

## 13.2 Informative References

Reference	Description
<a href="#">Federal Rules of Civil Procedure</a>	Procedural rules governing civil litigation in US federal courts.
<a href="#">Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure</a>	Procedural rules governing criminal cases in US federal courts.
<a href="#">Federal Rules of Evidence</a>	Evidence rules, including Rule 502 (privilege waiver and clawback).
<a href="#">PACER</a>	Public Access to Court Electronic Records — US federal judiciary's electronic filing and case management system.
<a href="#">Freedom of Information Act (5 U.S.C. § 552)</a>	Federal law providing public access to government records.
<a href="#">28 U.S.C. § 1407</a>	Multidistrict litigation transfer statute.
<a href="#">False Claims Act (31 U.S.C. §§ 3729–3733)</a>	Statute authorizing qui tam actions.
<a href="#">Upjohn Co. v. United States, 449 U.S. 383 (1981)</a>	Landmark attorney-client privilege decision extending corporate privilege.
<a href="#">Hickman v. Taylor, 329 U.S. 495 (1947)</a>	Foundation of the work-product doctrine.
<a href="#">Zubulake v. UBS Warburg LLC, 220 F.R.D. 212 (S.D.N.Y. 2003)</a>	Landmark e-discovery decision establishing the duty to preserve electronic evidence.
<a href="#">EDRM (Electronic Discovery Reference Model)</a>	US industry framework for managing electronic discovery.
<a href="#">Sedona Principles (Third Edition)</a>	Best practices for electronic document production in US litigation.
<a href="#">NARA Records Schedules</a>	National Archives records retention schedules for federal agencies.
<a href="#">Executive Order 13556 — CUI</a>	Controlled Unclassified Information framework.
<a href="#">ADAC-Legal-US-LA 1.0 Profile Specification</a>	Louisiana subdivision profile — civil law tradition, parish jurisdiction, notarial acts.
<a href="#">ADAC-Legal-US-PR 1.0 Profile Specification</a>	Puerto Rico subdivision profile — Spanish civil law, bilingual system, <i>municipio</i> jurisdiction.

## About the Editor

ADAC is edited and maintained by **John Vaden**, a genealogist and technical workflow contributor with decades of experience in genealogical research and in shaping data practices and process standards across analyst and software development teams. His work on ADAC emphasizes clarity, interoperability, and practical implementation for genealogists, developers, and archival practitioners. InnoVadens, LLC serves as the legal steward of the ADAC Standard.

He is not a legal professional, and ADAC-Legal does not provide legal advice.

## Document History

- v1.0 — Initial release by Editor (John Vaden); AI-assisted drafting and refinement