




CONVERSATION FORENSICS REPORT

Generated:	June 30, 2026
Case:	Alex Morgan
Tier:	Forensic
Messages Analyzed:	3,142
Date Range:	Jan 14, 2026 — Jun 30, 2026



Extreme toxicity — this relationship poses a serious risk

CONFIDENTIAL — For use by authorized legal professionals only. Not for distribution.

Generated by Verity Pro · [getverity.report](#)

Executive Summary

Overall Health Score **18/100**

Extreme toxicity — this relationship poses a serious risk

Key Findings

■	Gaslighting & Reality Distortion	47 instances detected
■	Coercive Control & Isolation	31 instances detected
■	DARVO — Deny, Attack, Reverse Victim and Offender	20 instances detected
■	Threats & Intimidation	14 instances detected

Warning patterns detected: 4

Positive patterns detected: 1

Date range: Jan 14, 2026 — Jun 30, 2026

Total messages analyzed: 3,142

Pattern Analysis

Gaslighting & Reality Distortion

CRITICAL

Persistent denial, minimization, or distortion of the other party's stated experiences. Classic pattern: "That never happened," "You're imagining things," "You're too sensitive."

Instances: 47

Example messages:

- "I never said that, you're making things up again"
- "You always do this — twist everything I say"
- "That's not what happened and you know it"

Ref: Stern, R. (2007). The Gaslight Effect. Morgan Road Books.

Ref: Bancroft, L. (2002). Why Does He Do That? Penguin Books.

Coercive Control & Isolation

CRITICAL

Systematic restriction of autonomy, monitoring of communications, and deliberate isolation from support networks.

Instances: 31

Example messages:

- "Who were you talking to? Show me your phone"
- "You don't need to see your friends — you have me"
- "I'll check your location later, don't even think about lying"

Ref: Stark, E. (2007). Coercive Control. Oxford University Press.

Ref: Johnson, M. P. (2008). A Typology of Domestic Violence. Northeastern University Press.

DARVO — Deny, Attack, Reverse Victim and Offender

HIGH

When confronted, subject consistently denies behavior, attacks the complainant's credibility, and reframes themselves as the victim.

Instances: 22

Example messages:

- "You're the abusive one here — I have screenshots too"
- "Everyone can see what you're doing to me"
- "I'm the one who should be filing a report"

Ref: Freyd, J. J. (1997). Violations of power, adaptive blindness, and betrayal trauma theory. Feminism & Psychology.

Ref: Harsey, S., & Freyd, J. (2020). Deny, Attack, and Reverse Victim and Offender. Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment & Trauma.

Threats & Intimidation

HIGH

Explicit or veiled threats of harm, legal consequences, or punitive action to control behavior.

Instances: 14

Example messages:

- "Keep pushing and see what happens"
- "I'll make sure you never see the kids again"
- "You have no idea what I'm capable of"

Ref: Walker, L. E. (1979). The Battered Woman. Harper & Row.

Ref: Dutton, D. G. (1995). The Batterer: A Psychological Profile. Basic Books.

Flagged Messages

Pattern Detected	Message Excerpt
Gaslighting & Reality Distortion	I never said that, you're making things up again
Gaslighting & Reality Distortion	You always do this — twist everything I say
Gaslighting & Reality Distortion	That's not what happened and you know it
Coercive Control & Isolation	Who were you talking to? Show me your phone
Coercive Control & Isolation	You don't need to see your friends — you have me
DARVO — Deny, Attack, Reverse Victim and Offender	You're the abusive one here — I have screenshots too
DARVO — Deny, Attack, Reverse Victim and Offender	Everyone can see what you're doing to me
Threats & Intimidation	Keep pushing and see what happens

Personality Assessment (AMPD)

DSM-5 Pathological Trait Domains

Antagonism		0.88
Disinhibition		0.62
Negative Affect		0.71
Detachment		0.44
Psychoticism		0.29

Detected profiles:

- Narcissistic
- Antisocial

Dark Triad Assessment

Narcissism		0.82
Machiavellianism		0.76
Psychopathy		0.54

Dominant trait: Narcissism

Attachment Style Analysis

Secure		0.09
Anxious		0.18
Avoidant		0.22
Disorganized		0.51

Dominant attachment style: Disorganized

Methodology & Citations

This report was generated using Verity's behavioral forensics engine, which applies pattern-matching algorithms informed by established psychological frameworks including the Gottman Four Horsemen model (criticism, contempt, defensiveness, stonewalling), Coercive Control theory (Stark, 2007), DARVO analysis (Freyd, 1997), and the DSM-5 Alternative Model of Personality Disorders (Section III).

Confidence levels reflect the ratio of flagged messages to total messages analyzed. This report is for informational and educational purposes only. All findings should be considered in context and reviewed by a qualified mental health or legal professional.

References:

- Stern, R. (2007). The Gaslight Effect. Morgan Road Books.
- Bancroft, L. (2002). Why Does He Do That? Penguin Books.
- Stark, E. (2007). Coercive Control. Oxford University Press.
- Johnson, M. P. (2008). A Typology of Domestic Violence. Northeastern University Press.
- Freyd, J. J. (1997). Violations of power, adaptive blindness, and betrayal trauma theory. *Feminism & Psychology*.
- Harsey, S., & Freyd, J. (2020). Deny, Attack, and Reverse Victim and Offender. *Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment & Trauma*.
- Walker, L. E. (1979). The Battered Woman. Harper & Row.
- Dutton, D. G. (1995). The Batterer: A Psychological Profile. Basic Books.

LEGAL USE STATEMENT: This forensic analysis report is intended for use by licensed legal professionals as supporting documentation in legal proceedings. Findings reflect statistical behavioral patterns and do not constitute clinical diagnosis. Expert testimony from a qualified professional is recommended.

APPENDIX A — Methodology & FRE 702 Disclosure

Prepared pursuant to Federal Rule of Evidence 702 and Daubert v. Merrell Dow Pharmaceuticals, 509 U.S. 579 (1993)

Method Overview

Verity employs lexical rule-based pattern matching applied exclusively to the subject's messages. Regular expressions derived from peer-reviewed behavioral research are tested against each message. Matching is deterministic: identical inputs produce identical outputs. All triggering phrases are preserved and disclosed in the Flagged Message Activity section.

Pattern Library

16 warning patterns and 7 positive communication patterns are evaluated. Each warning pattern is grounded in published psychological research (Gottman, 1994; Bancroft, 2002; Stark, 2007; Freyd, 1997; Stern, 2007; Walker, 1979). Pattern definitions and citations are published at getverity.report/methodology.

Confidence Scoring

Each detected pattern is assigned a confidence score (0.55–0.95) based on the ratio of flagged messages to total messages. Scores are reported per pattern. Example scores: "e5%" 0.85; "e2%" 0.75; "e1%" 0.65; "<1%" 0.55.

Health Score Formula

Score = clamp(100 - £deductions + £bonuses, 0, 100). Deductions: Critical severity weight 4.0 (max 18). Bonuses: positive patterns contribute up to 8 pts each. Formula is fully disclosed and reproducible.

Personality Frameworks

AMPD (DSM-5 Section III; APA, 2013): patterns mapped to 5 trait domains. Dark Triad (Paulhus & Williams, 2002): Machiavellianism, Narcissism, Psychopathy. Attachment Style (Ainsworth, 1978): Secure, Anxious, Avoidant, Disorganized. These are behavioral indicators, not clinical diagnoses.

SARA Risk Assessment

Spousal Assault Risk Assessment (Kropp et al., 1994): 10-factor structured professional judgment tool. Used in 40+ jurisdictions. Completed by the attorney based on case knowledge; scores reflect attorney-reported factors, not automated detection.

Testability

The engine is fully deterministic and auditable. Given identical input files, output is identical. Triggering phrases for each pattern flag are disclosed in the report body.

Known Limitations

Text-only analysis. False positives possible for colloquial usage. Export completeness not verified by engine. Subject identification relies on message-volume heuristics. No clinical diagnosis is expressed or implied.

FRE 702 Statement

This report is submitted as supporting forensic documentation, not as expert testimony. For maximum admissibility, the attorney is advised to supplement this report with testimony from a qualified forensic psychologist or licensed mental health professional who can opine on the behavioral significance of detected patterns in the context of this specific case.