Investigative report

Civil litigation support | Premises liability | Final report

Assignment details	Case record
Case reference	SG-SAMPLE-043
Prepared for	Retaining counsel | Matter PL-260918
Claimant / premises	Claimant A. Morgan / Example Market, Tallahassee, Florida
Incident date	September 18, 2026
Investigation period	October 5-16, 2026
Report issued / prepared by	October 19, 2026 | John Doe, PI | License C012345678

Illustrative case; names, identifiers, evidence and findings are fictional.

01 / Assignment & scope

Counsel requested an independent reconstruction of a reported fall near a refrigerated display, identification of potential witnesses, and documentation of facts bearing on the origin, duration and notice of a reported floor hazard. The investigator was not retained to determine legal liability or medical causation.

02 / Executive summary

A store video export shows an apparent floor irregularity at 14:06:12 and the claimant falling at 14:24:38. A customer reports seeing liquid in the same area before the fall; an employee reports receiving a spill notification. A contemporaneous message record is consistent with that account. A later inspection entry conflicts with the available footage.

The evidence suggests a potentially material pre-incident notice issue, but does not independently establish the substance, its precise origin, the identity of every employee or the cause of the claimant’s injuries. Native records and custodian testimony remain important.

03 / Key result for counsel

Prioritize preservation of the original camera export, employee message and inspection audit trail; secure testimony from the two identified witnesses and the manager responsible for the floor inspection process.

Incident chronology

September 18, 2026 | All times Eastern Daylight Time (EDT)

The following chronology is derived from counsel-provided copies, witness accounts and a receipt. CCTV times below are as displayed on the export; the camera clock has not been independently synchronized. Cross-source timing is approximate.

Time / source	Event / observation
13:58:10 / E-01	A staff member moves a restocking cart through the aisle. No liquid discharge is visible.
14:06:12 / E-01	A small reflective area becomes discernible on the tile adjacent to the display. Image resolution prevents identification of the material.
Approx. 14:09 / E-02, E-04	W-01 reports seeing liquid and notifying a staff member; the customer receipt records a purchase at 14:11.
14:12 / E-03	Message attributed to W-02 reports a wet floor near the refrigerated display and requests cleanup. No read receipt is visible.
14:17:32 / E-01	An individual wearing a store uniform passes within several feet of the area; no inspection or cleanup is visible in the frame.
14:20 / E-05	Inspection log lists aisle as clear. The export does not show a corresponding inspection in its field of view.
14:24:38 / E-01	Claimant enters frame and falls near the reflective area. Foot contact is partially obscured by the display.
14:25:17 / E-01	A staff member approaches; another places a warning sign near the display at 14:27:04.
14:29:51 / E-01	Staff member uses a mop near the location; the reflective area is less apparent after this activity.
14:40 / E-06	Incident report records claimant’s account of slipping; report identifies no confirmed substance or source.

04 / Timing analysis

The displayed video interval between the first discernible floor irregularity and the fall is 18 minutes, 26 seconds. This is not a verified duration of a hazardous condition. The message time precedes the fall by approximately 12 minutes, subject to source-clock verification.

Witness development

Interviews and site documentation | Source reliability

05 / Witness W-01 — independent customer

Interview: October 7, 2026, 10:10 EDT | Telephone | Voluntary | E-02, E-04

W-01 described a clear, wet-looking area near the end of the refrigerated display and stated that a person wearing store apparel was notified before checkout. W-01 did not see the claimant fall and could not name the staff member. The receipt supports presence at the store around the relevant time, but does not prove the time of the reported notification.

Follow-up: Obtain a witness-reviewed statement and confirm the location against a floor plan. Ask counsel to consider deposition testimony if disputed.

06 / Witness W-02 — former store employee

Interview: October 8, 2026, 16:30 EDT | Telephone | Voluntary | E-03, E-07

W-02 stated that a customer reported a wet floor and that W-02 sent a message to the shift supervisor requesting cleanup. W-02 voluntarily supplied an image of the message from a personal device. W-02 did not personally inspect the area before sending it and could not confirm when the supervisor read the message. Employment ended before the interview; no reason for separation was investigated.

Follow-up: Obtain the original conversation export and confirm participant identities, timestamps and any responses through lawful discovery. Determine whether counsel wishes to obtain sworn testimony.

07 / Site documentation — October 12, 2026

With management permission, the investigator documented the publicly accessible aisle, display position, adjacent flooring and camera sightline. The layout was consistent with the video export, but the inspection occurred 24 days after the incident. No conclusion is made that lighting, floor condition or fixtures were identical on both dates. See E-08.

08 / Contact and collection protocol

Witnesses were advised of the investigator’s identity and purpose; participation was voluntary. Interviews were documented in written notes rather than audio-recorded. No represented party was contacted directly; further contacts with current employees were deferred to counsel. No restricted areas, private accounts or nonpublic systems were accessed without authorization.

Findings & litigation leads

Fact assessment | Material gaps | Recommended next steps

Findings are limited to the reviewed material. Evidence supporting and weakening the reported account is included so counsel can assess both sides of the dispute.

Issue	Assessment / supporting material	Limitation or contrary evidence
Pre-incident condition	E-01 shows a reflective area; W-01 reports liquid before the fall.	Glare or another material cannot be excluded from video alone.
Notice to staff	W-01 describes notification; E-03 contains a cleanup request consistent with W-02's account.	Recipient identity, receipt and response not independently authenticated.
Inspection record	E-05 records a clear aisle at 14:20; E-01 shows no corresponding inspection within frame.	Inspection may have occurred outside frame; entry time may differ from inspection time.
Fall mechanics	E-01 confirms a fall near the reported area; E-06 documents claimant's account.	Contact point partly obscured; no biomechanical or medical opinion offered.
Recurring hazard	No verified pattern of earlier leaks or spills established.	Maintenance history and prior incident records not produced.

09 / Recommended action for retaining counsel

Priority 1 — preserve: Native footage from all relevant cameras (13:30-15:00 EDT), export logs, recorder time settings, retention policy, message records, inspection-system audit trail and incident-report attachments.

Priority 2 — establish foundation: Identify the video custodian, shift supervisor, assigned floor inspector and cleanup staff; obtain authenticated records and testimony regarding their observations and procedures.

Priority 3 — develop alternative explanations: Obtain display maintenance and leak history, staffing records, cleanup supplies and any independent incident photographs. Consider qualified experts for floor condition and injury causation if needed.

Evidence & disposition

Exhibit register | Record handling | Outstanding production

ID / item	Source / received or created	Format / status
E-01 / CCTV export	Counsel / Oct 5	MP4 copy; native export pending
E-02 / W-01 interview	Investigator / Oct 7	Contemporaneous written notes
E-03 / Message image	W-02 / Oct 8	PNG copy; native thread pending
E-04 / Receipt	W-01 / Oct 7	JPEG copy; merchant record pending
E-05 / Inspection log	Counsel / Oct 5	PDF copy; audit trail pending
E-06 / Incident report	Counsel / Oct 5	PDF copy; author not interviewed
E-07 / W-02 interview	Investigator / Oct 8	Contemporaneous written notes
E-08 / Site photographs	Investigator / Oct 12	JPEG originals; site photo log

10 / Evidence handling & transfer

Items received from counsel or witnesses were designated as received copies, not presumed originals. Investigator-created notes and photographs were separately identified. Received files were retained unmodified; working copies were used for review. Source, date of acquisition and item identity were recorded in the case register.

Date	Custody event
Oct 5-12	John Doe received or created E-01 through E-08; recorded each acquisition and maintained restricted case storage.
Oct 16	John Doe completed review and reconciled exhibit references against the working file set.
Oct 19	Report prepared for retaining counsel. Exhibit transfer pending; obtain delivery acknowledgment and record any subsequent transfer.

11 / Disposition

Initial investigation complete. Native records and witness follow-up remain outstanding.
Preserve the case file and document supplemental findings as additional records are received.

Prepared by: John Doe | Private Investigator | C012345678
Report date: October 19, 2026