

**CASE STUDY**

# Successful Pilot Project for Georgia-Based Commercial Litigation Firm

## Client Profile

**Type:** Commercial Litigation Law Firm

**Location:** Georgia, United States

**Focus:** High-stakes litigation, including motions practice

## Project Objective

To draft a persuasive Opposition to a Motion for Summary Judgment within a tight 48-hour deadline involving extensive factual and legal analysis.

## Challenges

- Compressed timeline of 48 hours
- Complex case materials (over 500 pages of PDFs including deposition transcripts, agreements, and exhibits)
- Need for accurate legal research aligned with Georgia state laws
- Extraction and synthesis of key evidence to support client's argument

## Our Approach

- **Project Planning:**  
Quick scoping call & allocation of a dedicated legal team with experience in U.S. commercial litigation
- **Legal Research:**  
Researched Georgia case law and statutes relevant to summary judgment standards and specific defenses
- **Document Review:**  
Systematic extraction of relevant facts and evidentiary references from voluminous documents
- **Drafting:**  
First draft prepared and internally reviewed within 36 hours; final delivery completed with time buffer
- **Extended Work Hours:**  
Team operated beyond standard hours to meet deadline without compromising quality

## Background Summary

**Plaintiff:** Mr. X – President and principal investor in Defendant Corporation MT. Invested \$1.25 million of personal funds to sustain Defendant MT. Engaged in discussions with Defendant NFI who made false representations to Plaintiff X. In 2020, negotiated asset sale with another entity Defendant FH.

## Promises Made by Defendant (Mr. NF)

- 01 Full reimbursement of \$1.25M investment
- 02 30% equity in new entity
- 03 15% equity in FH

## Precision Redlining

- ◆ Repeatedly confirmed orally and in writing
- ◆ Omitted from the APA and Employment Agreement due to assurances they would be formally documented later

## Breach and Termination

Despite leading MT post-acquisition and facilitating further deals, Plaintiff Mr. X:

- ✓ Received none of the promised compensation or equity
- ✓ Was abruptly terminated in July 2022 without severance or bonuses
- ✓ Was pressured to release legal claims in exchange for severance



## Legal Theory & Research Strategy

- 01 **Fraudulent Inducement Not Barred by Merger Clauses**  
Under Georgia law, merger clauses do not preclude claims of fraud in the inducement.  
  
Courts allow extrinsic evidence of misrepresentations made to secure execution of written agreements.
- 02 **Oral Contract Enforceability**  
Georgia recognizes oral agreements where: Written contracts are incomplete, and Conduct and intent of the parties reflect additional terms.
- 03 **Jury Must Decide Factual Disputes**  
Whether an oral agreement was formed or fraud occurred involves factual determinations, not suitable for summary judgment.

## Deliverable

Fully cited and formatted Opposition Brief, incorporating legal arguments, evidentiary citations, and factual narrative per local rules of court

## Result

- ✓ Delivered on time with high quality
- ✓ Client satisfaction achieved, leading to proposal for ongoing engagement
- ✓ Positive outcome: Client exploring a full-time resource model