



C O M P U T E R F O R E N S I C S L A B

London digital forensics & e-discovery · Established 2007

Legal Professional Privilege in Large Electronic Datasets

Finding, Protecting and Claiming Privilege at Scale Without Waiving It

Privilege doctrine was built for correspondence files; disclosure now runs on estates of millions of documents where the privileged material is scattered, quoted, forwarded, and embedded in threads with everything else. Legal advice privilege and litigation privilege still turn on the same questions: who is the client, what was the dominant purpose, has confidentiality survived: but answering them at scale is an engineering problem as much as a legal one: identifying candidate material across mailboxes and chat platforms, reviewing it consistently, drafting schedules that claim precisely, and running the quality control that keeps privileged documents out of productions. This guide covers both halves for UK lawyers: the doctrine as it applies to electronic material, the workflow that finds and protects it at scale, the waiver risks peculiar to modern estates, and the interaction with everything from threading to AI-assisted flagging. Guide 92 handles the aftermath when a privileged document has been disclosed.

⌚ Estimated reading time: 25 min read

§ ABOUT THE AUTHOR

PREPARED BY COMPUTER FORENSICS LAB E-DISCOVERY TEAM

Computer Forensics Lab is a London-based digital forensics and electronic disclosure practice established in 2007. Its eDiscovery arm, **e-discovery.uk**, runs privilege workflows on large-corpus matters: candidate identification across email and chat estates, review-stream design, schedule support and pre-production quality control: the engineering side of the doctrine this guide pairs with the law. Privilege determinations remain, on every matter, the instructing lawyers' own.

ESTABLISHED 2007 · LONDON

ISO 17025-ALIGNED PROCEDURES

PRIVILEGE WORKFLOW ENGINEERING

PRE-PRODUCTION QC

CPR PART 35 EXPERT REPORTS

FULL CHAIN-OF-CUSTODY DOCUMENTATION

§ CONTENTS

In this guide

- 01 Executive summary
- 02 The problem in plain English: doctrine meets a million documents
- 03 The two privileges in electronic form: LAP, litigation privilege and their edges
- 04 Where privileged material hides: threads, forwards, chat and copies
- 05 The workflow: identification, review streams and consistency
- 06 Claiming and protecting: schedules, redaction and pre-production QC
- 07 Waiver risks at scale: circulation, repetition and the modern estate
- 08 Source architecture: where else the evidence lives
- 09 Worked examples
- 10 Common mistakes and technical limitations
- 11 Questions to ask · Suggested wording
- 12 Checklist and red flags · When to involve a digital forensic expert
- 13 Frequently asked questions
- 14 Glossary · References · Disclaimer · How a specialist laboratory can assist

Executive summary

THE HEADLINE POINT: PRIVILEGE AT SCALE IS DOCTRINE PLUS ENGINEERING: IDENTIFY CANDIDATES SYSTEMATICALLY, DECIDE CONSISTENTLY, CLAIM PRECISELY, AND QC BEFORE ANYTHING LEAVES

The law is stable: **legal advice privilege** protects confidential lawyer-client communications for giving or obtaining legal advice, with the narrow English "client" (the individuals authorised to seek and receive advice, not the company at large) making internal circulation a live issue; **litigation privilege** protects confidential communications with third parties where adversarial proceedings are in reasonable contemplation and the dominant purpose is their conduct; both require confidentiality to survive, and in-house lawyers qualify for legal work but not commercial-hat work. The scale problem is that this doctrine must be applied across estates where advice is quoted in threads (guide 83's structures), forwarded beyond the client group, paraphrased in chat, and embedded in board packs: so the workflow carries the weight: **identification** (lawyer-identity and domain sweeps, prompted flagging per guide 90, thread-aware retrieval) building the candidate population; **review streams** staffed and guided for consistency, with borderline categories escalated; **claiming** via schedules that describe without revealing and redactions engineered irreversibly (guide 93); and **pre-production QC**: the last sweep of what is about to leave, catching the quoted advice inside the "commercial" thread: because guide 92's aftermath is cheaper to prevent than to litigate. Privilege calls are lawyer judgements throughout; the engineering exists so those judgements are made once, consistently, on everything that needed them.

- **The client is narrow:** LAP's English client is the authorised group: circulation beyond it is the first waiver question, asked at review speed.
- **Dominant purpose does real work:** dual-purpose material (advice plus commerce, investigation plus litigation) is the hard category: guided, escalated, decided on the record.
- **Threads carry advice everywhere:** quoted and forwarded advice makes privilege a per-segment question: guide 83's treesap the boundary.
- **Schedules claim without revealing:** precise, category-consistent descriptions: the claim's credibility is drafted.
- **QC is the last line:** pre-production sweeps for lawyer identities, advice signatures and known-privileged content: run every production, every time.

The problem in plain English: doctrine meets a million documents

Privilege was litigated into shape in an era when the privileged material was a bundle of counsel's opinions and solicitors' letters in a marked file. The doctrine still pictures that file. The estate does not: the advice now arrives by email, is quoted in nineteen replies, forwarded to a project channel, paraphrased in a WhatsApp to the CFO, summarised in a board pack, and stored in four mailboxes, two chat exports and a DMS: guide 82's copies and guide 83's threads, carrying privilege with them: or shedding it, depending on who received what.

Two failure modes follow. **Under-claiming by leakage:** the privileged content nobody spotted: the advice quoted mid-thread in a document coded relevant by a reviewer reading fast: produced, and guide 92 begins. **Over-claiming by reflex:** everything touching a lawyer claimed wholesale: schedules that invite challenge, in-house commercial traffic claimed indefensibly, credibility spent that the genuine claims needed. Both are workflow failures more than doctrinal ones: the cure is the systematic middle of this guide: find the candidates comprehensively, decide them consistently under a written guide, claim them precisely, and sweep before production. The doctrine fits in a page; the discipline is the other sixteen.

The two privileges in electronic form: LAP, litigation privilege and their edges

- **Legal advice privilege:** confidential lawyer-client communications for giving or obtaining legal advice, including the continuum of correspondence that keeps both informed: with the English "client" confined to those authorised to instruct and receive: the Three Rivers legacy making "who was on this email" a doctrinal question, and lawyers' working papers protected while collected underlying documents are not.
- **Litigation privilege:** confidential communications between client or lawyer and third parties, when adversarial litigation is reasonably in contemplation and the communication's dominant purpose is conducting it: the investigation-report battleground: dual-purpose findings (regulatory, remedial, litigation) rising and falling on contemporaneous purpose evidence, which the estate itself supplies.
- **In-house counsel:** privileged for legal advice, not for commercial-hat work: the mixed-role inbox being the hardest single population in most corporate estates, decided message by message, not mailbox by mailbox.
- **Confidentiality as the substrate:** privilege presupposes confidence: material shared beyond the protected circle, posted to wide channels, or sent over counterparty systems raises survival questions before waiver doctrine even starts: §7's territory.
- **The edges flagged honestly:** common interest privilege, without prejudice protection, and the crime-fraud exception each modify the analysis where they arise: named in the review guide so reviewers escalate rather than improvise.

Where privileged material hides: threads, forwards, chat and copies

- **Quoted advice in threads:** the counsel's-view email quoted verbatim inside a later "commercial" reply: privilege attaching to the segment, the thread reviewed per guide 83's per-hop discipline: the single most common leak path.
- **Forwards beyond the client group:** advice forwarded to colleagues outside the authorised circle: simultaneously a hiding place (privileged content in unexpected mailboxes) and a confidentiality question (§7): both flagged when the forward is found.
- **Chat and messaging:** advice paraphrased, screenshotted or discussed on Teams, Slack and WhatsApp (guides 63-66): informal register defeating lawyer-name searches: the guide 84 §3 harvest applied to privilege vocabulary ("legal said", "per counsel", the GC's first name).
- **Attachments and packs:** opinions inside board packs, advice annexed to decision papers, markups embedding advice in drafts (guide 75's interiors): family-aware review so the privileged member is caught inside the disclosable family.
- **Copies across the estate:** the same advice in sender, recipients, DMS and archives: guide 82's suppression tables ensuring one privilege call propagates to every instance: consistency by engineering.

The workflow: identification, review streams and consistency

- **Candidate identification, layered:** lawyer identities and firm domains (maintained as a living list, secondees and former counsel included); privilege vocabulary from the §4 harvest; date-and-event windows around known advice; prompted flagging per guide 90 Example 3 as accelerant: layers combined so no single method's blindness governs.
- **The privilege review guide:** the doctrine of §3 operationalised: the client list by period, the dual-purpose rules, the escalation categories: written before coding starts, versioned as understanding sharpens: guide 89 §4's teaching discipline, applied to privilege.
- **Streams and specialists:** high-likelihood candidates to the specialist stream; the general review trained to flag, not decide; disagreements and borderline classes resolved by named senior lawyers on the record.
- **Consistency machinery:** propagation across duplicates and threads (guides 82-83's structures), overturn tracking, and periodic sampling of privilege calls in both directions: the same claim decided the same way in March and November.
- **The record:** who decided what under which guide version: the biography that answers challenges and instructs guide 92 if the day comes.

Claiming and protecting: schedules, redaction and pre-production QC

- **Withhold or redact, per document:** wholly privileged documents withheld and scheduled; mixed documents produced with privileged segments redacted under guide 93's irreversibility engineering: the thread with one privileged hop produced as the thread minus the hop, flagged as redacted.
- **Schedules that persuade:** descriptions precise enough to sustain the claim without revealing the content: date, participants by role, privilege basis, category consistency: PD 57AD's disclosure certificate and the schedule read together as the claim's public face.
- **Pre-production QC, always:** the outbound sweep: lawyer identities and domains against the production set, known-privileged hashes (guide 82 §7's sets, repurposed), advice-signature searches, sampling of the "not privileged" codes: the last, cheapest chance to prevent guide 92.
- **Clawback architecture in advance:** the protocol's inadvertent-disclosure terms (notice, return, non-use) agreed before productions flow: not a licence for carelessness, but the net under the wire: drafted now, per §11's wording.
- **Challenges handled on the record:** opponent challenges met from the §5 biography: the guide version, the decision, the reviser: and genuine over-claims conceded fast, because credibility is the schedule's real currency.

Waiver risks at scale: circulation, repetition and the modern estate

- **Circulation beyond the circle:** the §3 client boundary crossed by forwards, wide distribution lists and open channels: confidentiality's survival assessed per instance, with the estate's sharing artefacts (guides 51-58) supplying the facts.
- **Deployment and reliance:** advice quoted in open correspondence, summarised to regulators, or relied on in statements: express and implied waiver questions arising from use, with collateral-waiver reach ("cherry-picking") making partial deployment the dangerous kind.
- **Repetition in the informal register:** the chat paraphrase of counsel's view: whether privilege attaches to the repetition, and what its circulation did to confidence: the modern estate's contribution to the doctrine, reviewed with §4's methods.
- **Third-party platforms and counterparty systems:** advice discussed over the counterparty's Slack, personal accounts, or shared workspaces: confidentiality questions built into the infrastructure: mapped at collection (the guide 63-66 censuses) so the risk is known before the claim is made.
- **Inadvertent disclosure:** the production leak: prevention here (§6's QC), consequences and remedies in guide 92: the pair designed together.

Source architecture: where else the evidence lives

Per this series' source-architecture discipline: privilege questions are evidence questions, and the estate answers them. Whether a communication is privileged, and whether privilege survived, is established from: the communication's own record (participants, dates, content: the guide 87 fields dating the advice relationship); the circulation evidence (thread structures per guide 83, forward chains, sharing logs per guides 51-58: who actually received the advice, when: the client-boundary and confidentiality facts); the purpose evidence for litigation privilege (contemporaneous documents showing contemplation and dominant purpose: engagement letters, hold notices per guide 2's disciplines, board minutes: the estate proving or sinking the dual-purpose claim); the lawyer-relationship record (retainers, secondment terms, role descriptions: the in-house hat question answered from documents, not assertion); the platform layer (channel membership, access lists: confidentiality's technical substrate); and the review record itself (§5's biography: the claim's procedural defence). Privilege disputes are won by parties whose estates were mapped and read: the doctrine supplies the questions; the sources supply the answers.

QUESTION	THE COMMUNICATION ITSELF	CIRCULATION EVIDENCE	PURPOSE EVIDENCE	RELATIONSHIP RECORD	PLATFORM LAYER	REVIEW RECORD
Is it LAP?	Participants + content	Client-boundary facts	Advice continuum context	Y: who is "the client"	n/a	The decision's basis
Is it litigation privilege?	Content + date	Third-party recipients	Y: the dominant-purpose file	Engagement context	n/a	Y
Did confidentiality survive?	Markings, instructions	Y: the direct answer	n/a	n/a	Y: membership + access	Flags raised at review
Was it waived by use?	The deployment itself	Where it was deployed	Reliance context	n/a	n/a	Deployment decisions logged
Is the claim consistent?	n/a	Duplicate propagation	n/a	n/a	n/a	Y: guide versions + calls

Fallback strategy in one line: treat every contested claim as an evidence exercise across the estate: circulation, purpose, relationship, platform: the privilege file assembled from sources, not asserted from memory.

Worked examples

EXAMPLE 1 · THE ADVICE THAT TRAVELLED TO FORTY INBOXES

A company's GC emailed counsel's opinion on a disputed termination to the three-person deal team: the authorised client group. Within a week, the §8 circulation evidence showed, it had been forwarded to a twelve-person project distribution list, quoted in a programme-status pack, and summarised in a Teams channel with forty members including two contractors. The privilege review caught the spread through thread and forward analysis; the legal team's assessment split the population exactly as §7 requires: the original and client-group copies claimed; the wider circulations assessed for confidentiality survival instance by instance, with the contractor-accessible channel conceded as unprotectable and the pack redacted rather than claimed wholesale. The schedule's credibility held precisely because the claims tracked the circulation facts: and the concessions, made early, cost nothing the facts had not already spent.

EXAMPLE 2 · THE INVESTIGATION REPORT AND THE DOMINANT-PURPOSE FILE

After a warehouse incident, a company commissioned an investigation report, later claiming litigation privilege when the injured contractor's claim arrived. The challenge turned on dominant purpose at commissioning: and the estate decided it. The §8 purpose file, assembled at review, held: the instruction email citing "board safety review and insurer notification"; the engagement letter with no litigation reference; a hold notice issued only three weeks after commissioning; and a board minute recording the report's purpose as "operational learning". The claim was not pursued for the report itself; it held for the later annexes prepared after solicitors' engagement, where the contemporaneous record showed litigation as the driver. The lesson ran backwards through the client's playbook: purpose is evidenced when the work is commissioned, not argued when the claim is challenged: the file built on day one, per guide 2's disciplines, is the privilege.

EXAMPLE 3 · THE QC SWEEP THAT CAUGHT THE THREAD

A 60,000-document production was staged for exchange when the §6 pre-production sweep ran: lawyer identities, firm domains, known-privileged hashes, advice-signature terms: against the outbound set. It returned nineteen hits: eighteen false alarms and one thread coded "relevant, produce" by a reviewer months earlier: a commercial pricing chain whose fourth hop quoted, in full, the GC's advice on the very clause now in dispute. The thread was pulled, the quoted hop redacted under guide 93's engineering, the redacted thread produced, and the review record annotated with the correction. Total cost: ninety minutes. The counterfactual: the advice in the opponent's hands, guide 92's application, and the argument about whether a mistake was obvious: is the entire business case for running the sweep on every production, including the ones that feel safe.

Common mistakes and technical limitations

Common mistakes

- **Mailbox-level thinking:** the lawyer's inbox claimed wholesale, the in-house commercial traffic indefensibly inside: §3's per-message discipline skipped.
- **Thread-blind review:** the quoted advice produced inside "commercial" chains: Example 3's near-miss, without the sweep.
- **The client group unmapped:** nobody listing who was authorised, per period: the first waiver question unanswerable at review speed.
- **Purpose evidence unbuilt:** Example 2's failure mode: litigation privilege claimed on assertion, sunk by the estate's own record.
- **Over-claiming by reflex:** everything lawyer-adjacent scheduled: credibility spent, challenges invited, the genuine claims endangered.
- **No pre-production QC:** the sweep skipped on "routine" productions: guide 92 begun for the price of ninety minutes.
- **Clawback terms missing:** the protocol silent on inadvertent disclosure: the net absent when the wire fails.
- **Chat vocabulary unharvested:** "legal said" and the GC's first name unsearched: §4's informal register leaking unflagged.

Technical limitations

- **Identity lists decay:** lawyers join, leave, second and marry into new surnames: the living list maintained, or the sweep sweeps past them.
- **Paraphrase defeats search:** advice restated without markers is found by context and human review, not terms: stated in the methodology, staffed accordingly.
- **Flags are not determinations:** AI and term layers accelerate; lawyers decide: guide 90's line, load-bearing here.
- **Redaction is an engineering discipline:** reversible redactions waive in practice whatever the doctrine says: guide 93 governs the tooling.
- **Cross-border privilege varies:** other jurisdictions' rules (in-house status, discovery regimes) complicate multinational estates: flagged per matter, advised per forum.

§ 1 1 · INTERROGATORIES & DRAFTING AIDS

Questions to ask · Suggested wording

Ask your client

- Who, by name and period, was authorised to seek and receive legal advice on the relevant matters: the client list the review guide needs?
- Which lawyers, firms and secondees have touched the matters: for the living identity list, informal names included?
- Where did advice actually circulate: packs, channels, forwards: and are there known wide-circulation events to assess now rather than at review?

Ask your opponent

- Please provide a privilege schedule identifying each withheld or redacted document by date, participants (by role), and the basis of the claim, sufficient to permit assessment of the claim without disclosure of the protected content.
- In respect of [the investigation report / category], please identify the date proceedings were first in reasonable contemplation and the contemporaneous evidence relied on for the dominant purpose of the withheld material.
- Please confirm the methodology by which privileged material was identified and quality-controlled prior to production, including whether thread-level review was applied.

Ask your eDiscovery / forensic provider

- Are the identification layers all running: identities, domains, vocabulary, prompted flags: and what is each catching that the others miss?
- Is one privilege call propagating across every duplicate and thread instance: and is the sampling confirming it?
- Has the pre-production sweep run on this production: and what did it return?

SUGGESTED WORDING · PRIVILEGE AND CLAWBACK PARAGRAPH FOR THE PROTOCOL

"Privileged material shall be withheld or redacted, and identified in a schedule stating for each item the date, participants by role, and basis of privilege, in terms sufficient to support the claim without revealing the protected content. Where privilege attaches to part only of a document or thread, the document shall be produced with the privileged content redacted and the redaction indicated. If a party discloses privileged material inadvertently, it shall notify the receiving party promptly upon discovery; the receiving party shall not read, use or copy such material further, shall return or destroy all copies on request, and the inadvertent disclosure shall not of itself constitute a waiver of privilege in the material or its subject matter. Each party shall apply reasonable quality-control measures, including thread-aware review, before production."

Checklist and red flags · When to involve a digital forensic expert

The privilege-at-scale checklist

- ☐ Client list mapped by name and period; review guide written first
- ☐ Living lawyer-identity and domain list maintained
- ☐ Privilege vocabulary harvested, informal register included
- ☐ Identification layers combined: identities, terms, prompts, threads
- ☐ Specialist stream staffed; escalation categories named
- ☐ Calls propagated across duplicates and threads; sampled both ways
- ☐ Purpose evidence assembled contemporaneously for litigation privilege
- ☐ Schedules precise, consistent, credibility-conscious
- ☐ Redactions engineered per guide 93; conversions flagged
- ☐ Pre-production sweep run on every production; clawback terms agreed

Red flags

- Advice circulating in wide channels and packs: Example 1's spread.
- Litigation privilege claims with no contemporaneous purpose file: Example 2's gap.
- "Commercial" threads quoting counsel mid-chain: Example 3's catch.
- Schedules claiming whole mailboxes or whole custodians.
- Opposing productions with implausibly few redactions for the lawyer traffic visible.
- In-house advice claims silent on the commercial-hat question.
- Protocols with no inadvertent-disclosure terms.

When to involve a digital forensic expert

At setup, where the identification layers, propagation machinery and review streams are engineered (§5's workflow); through review, where consistency sampling and the record run continuously; at production, where the §6 sweep is the standing gate (Example 3's ninety minutes); and at disputes, where circulation, purpose and confidentiality questions are answered from the §8 estate evidence and reported under CPR Part 35: with guide 92 on standby for the day prevention fails. Through **e-discovery.uk**, privilege workflows run with the engineering as standard and the determinations where they belong: with the instructing lawyers.

§ 13 · COMMON QUESTIONS

Frequently asked questions

Is everything involving our in-house lawyer privileged?

No: LAP covers the legal-adviser hat, not the commercial one, and mixed-role inboxes are decided message by message against that line: the wholesale claim is the classic over-reach that invites the challenge and endangers the genuine claims around it. The review guide's job is exactly this boundary, written down before coding starts.

The advice was forwarded around the company. Is privilege lost?

Not automatically: internal circulation raises the client-boundary and confidentiality questions rather than answering them: assessed per instance against who received it and on what terms, as Example 1's split shows. What is fatal is not the forward but the unexamined claim over it: map the circulation, assess it honestly, concede what the facts have already spent.

Our investigation report served several purposes. Can we claim litigation privilege?

Only if litigation's conduct was the dominant purpose when the work was done, and that is proved by the contemporaneous record: instructions, engagement terms, hold notices, minutes: Example 2's file, which either exists or does not. The practical rule: evidence purpose at commissioning; a claim built afterwards from recollection is a claim built for the challenge.

How do we stop privileged material slipping into a big production?

Layered identification at review (identities, vocabulary, threads, flags), propagation so one call covers every copy, and: non-negotiably: the pre-production sweep of §6 on every exchange: Example 3's ninety minutes against guide 92's alternative. Slips at scale are workflow failures, and the workflow is buildable.

Can AI decide privilege for us?

It can flag, prioritise and second-read: guide 90 Example 3's architecture: and the determination stays with a lawyer on a read document: the line every current authority draws, and the one economised at a claim's peril. Machine-accelerated privilege review is good practice; machine-adjudicated privilege is a waiver argument in waiting.

The other side's privilege schedule is vague. What can we do?

Press it with §11's requests: item-level dates, roles and bases sufficient to assess: and target categories where the estate's visible facts (lawyer traffic volumes, investigation chronologies) sit oddly with the claims: challenges built on specifics succeed where indignation does not. Courts police schedules that describe nothing: precision is demanded exactly because it is what a sound claim can always supply.

§ 1 4 · REFERENCE

Glossary

Client (LAP)

The individuals authorised to seek and receive the advice.

Clawback

Agreed terms for return and non-use of inadvertently disclosed material.

Collateral waiver

Waiver's reach beyond the deployed material to its context.

Dominant purpose

Litigation privilege's threshold for the communication's driver.

LAP

Legal advice privilege: lawyer-client advice communications.

Litigation privilege

Third-party communications for contemplated proceedings.

Privilege schedule

The itemised public face of withheld and redacted claims.

Privilege vocabulary

The estate's own words for advice, harvested for identification.

Propagation

One privilege call applied across duplicates and thread instances.

Working papers

Lawyers' own preparatory material, protected as such.

Sources and authoritative references

The privilege-workflow disciplines in this guide draw on materials published by our laboratory and e-discovery practice, referenced here as sources:

- e-discovery.uk, EDRM Phase 05 · Review and Phase 06 · Production (privilege streams, propagation, schedules and pre-production QC as practised): e-discovery.uk/edrm/review · e-discovery.uk/edrm/production
- cflab.uk, digital forensics services (circulation and purpose evidence, thread analysis, CPR Part 35 reporting): cflab.uk/digital-forensics-services · guides library: cflab.uk/guides
- e-discovery.uk, practice method and Knowledge Centre: e-discovery.uk · e-discovery.uk/knowledge
- PD 57AD (privilege claims and the disclosure certificate): justice.gov.uk, [PD 57AD](https://justice.gov.uk/pd-57ad) · CPR Part 31 (including r.31.20 on inadvertent inspection): justice.gov.uk, [Part 31](https://justice.gov.uk/part-31)
- *Three Rivers District Council v Bank of England (No 5)* [2003] EWCA Civ 474 (the narrow client) and *SFO v ENRC* [2018] EWCA Civ 2006 (litigation privilege and dominant purpose): bailii.org, [SFO v ENRC](https://bailii.org/cases/ukewca/cv/2006/2006006.html)
- CPR Part 35: justice.gov.uk, [Part 35](https://justice.gov.uk/part-35) · ICO, UK GDPR guidance: ico.org.uk

DISCLAIMER

This publication provides general information about privilege in electronic datasets as at August 2026. Privilege law develops through case law and its application is intensely fact-specific; nothing here is a substitute for advice on a specific claim. The worked examples are fictional. This guide is not legal advice, does not create a professional relationship, and should not be relied upon in place of advice on the facts of a specific matter from a qualified lawyer or a suitably qualified forensic practitioner. Links were live at the date of publication.

§ HOW A SPECIALIST LABORATORY CAN ASSIST

Working with Computer Forensics Lab

Privilege engineering at **e-discovery.uk** supplies everything around the determination: layered identification with living identity lists and harvested vocabulary; specialist streams with escalation and the written guide; propagation and sampling so one call covers every copy consistently; schedule support; redactions engineered under guide 93; and the pre-production sweep as a standing gate on every exchange: Example 3's ninety minutes, institutionalised. The laboratory side assembles the evidence privilege disputes actually turn on: circulation maps, purpose files, confidentiality substrates per §8: and reports under CPR Part 35 where the facts are contested. Determinations remain the instructing lawyers' throughout; the engineering exists so they are made once, consistently, on everything that needed them. Conflicts checks, confidential scoping discussions and fixed-fee estimates are routine; and if a production is staged for exchange this month, the sweep is this week's gate: before it leaves, not after.



INSTRUCT THE LAB

Speak to a forensic examiner, not a salesperson.

Describe your matter in confidence and an examiner will respond the same working day. Conflicts checks and scoping calls with US counsel are routine.

NEW ENQUIRIES

+44 (0)20 7164 6971

EMAIL

info@cflab.uk

E-DISCOVERY

e-discovery.uk

Computer Forensics Lab Ltd · Euro House, 133 Ballards Lane, Finchley, London N3 1LJ, United Kingdom

cflab.uk · Customer service +44 (0)20 7164 6915 · ICO ZB395023 · NPCC · ISO 17025 aligned practice · UK Gov Digital Marketplace