

## NOTICE REGARDING COURT IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS

### FOR SUBMISSION OF FABRICATED AUTHORITY PRODUCED BY AI

As the use of generative artificial intelligence (AI) has become more prevalent, the Oregon Court of Appeals has received an increasing number of filings containing fabricated authorities, meaning fake legal or factual content created by generative artificial intelligence programs. The fabricated authority includes citations that do not exist, quotations that do not appear in the cited authority, propositions of law attributed to citations but not reasonably related to the cite, or factual support that is made up and has no basis in the record. The inclusion of fabricated authorities in a court filing is grounds for striking the filing and the imposition of sanctions, including monetary sanctions payable to the court; attorney fees payable to the opposing party; and/or dismissal of the appeal. To avoid sanctions, any person using a generative artificial intelligence program to prepare content for a court filing must verify that (1) all cases cited exist; (2) all quotations attributed to existing cases are, in fact, contained in the cases cited; and (3) all paraphrased propositions of law attributed to existing cases are objectively reasonable in light of what the case actually says.

For more information, see [Ringo v. Colquhoun Design Studio, LLC, 345 Or App 301, 582 P3d 695 \(2025\)](#) (imposing sanctions on an attorney for citation of fabricated authority and describing the negative impact AI is having on the court system and the rule of law); [Powell v. Employment Department, 347 Or App 55, \\_\\_\\_ P3d \\_\\_\\_ \(2026\)](#) (imposing sanctions on a self-represented party for citation to fabricated authority that resulted from the party's reliance on online search engines and AI and describing the resulting prejudice to the opposing party and waste of judicial resources); [Williams v. Honl, 348 Or App 505, \\_\\_\\_ P3d \\_\\_\\_ \(2026\)](#) (requiring attorneys for the appellant to pay \$8,044.25 in attorney fees incurred by the respondent as a result of the appellant's inclusion of fabricated authority in the briefing); *id.* at 510 n2 (including a citation to *United States v. Farris*, \_\_\_ F4th \_\_\_, 2026 WL 915082, \*3 (6th Cir 2026), "so that Oregon lawyers are not misled into thinking that generative artificial intelligence products by established legal providers are necessarily incapable" of generating fabricated authority).