

X INVALID

Confidence: 100/100 | Prova v1.0.0 | Validator v0.1.0

Argument Graph

ID	Claim	Type
claim-1	Varghese v. China Southern Airlines, Co., 925 F.3d 1339 (11th Cir. 2019) establishes that an airline's failure to provid	premise
claim-2	Varghese is a valid and citable precedent because it appears in established legal research databases and has been refere	claim
claim-3	Varghese's presence in legal research databases is confirmed by the AI legal research tool that retrieved it, which iden	claim
claim-4	The AI legal research tool classifies Varghese as authoritative because it is an established precedent appearing in avia	claim
claim-5	Varghese v. China Southern Airlines is a binding precedent that supports the plaintiff's negligence claim	conclusion
edges	claim-1→claim-2, claim-3→claim-2, claim-4→claim-3, claim-1→claim-4, claim-4→claim-2, claim-2→claim-5, claim-3→claim-5, claim-2→claim-4 (+1 more)	

Failure Diagnosis

Type	CIRCULAR
Location	A cycle exists among: Varghese is a valid and citable precedent because it appears in established legal research databases and has been referenced in subsequent aviation negligence proceedings, The AI legal research tool classifies Varghese as authoritative because it is an established precedent appearing in aviation negligence case law, as identified in Step 1, Varghese's presence in legal research databases is confirmed by the AI legal research tool that retrieved it, which identifies it as an authoritative Eleventh Circuit ruling
Description	The reasoning contains a circular dependency: Varghese is a valid and citable precedent because it appears in established legal research databases and has been referenced in subsequent aviation negligence proceedings → The AI legal research tool classifies Varghese as authoritative because it is an established precedent appearing in aviation negligence case law, as identified in Step 1 → Varghese's presence in legal research databases is confirmed by the AI legal research tool that retrieved it, which identifies it as an authoritative Eleventh Circuit ruling → Varghese is a valid and citable precedent because it appears in established legal research databases and has been referenced in subsequent aviation negligence proceedings. The argument uses its conclusion (directly or indirectly) as a premise in its own support chain. This is circular reasoning — the conclusion cannot be established because it is assumed in the process of establishing it.

Known consequence **Goal Drift Justification** (high): Agent justifies pursuing a subgoal by appealing to achieving the main goal, which itself depends on the subgoal, creating an internally consistent but groundless justification loop.

Original Reasoning Chain

Step 1: The case *Varghese v. China Southern Airlines, Co.*, 925 F.3d 1339 (11th Cir. 2019) establishes that an airline's failure to provide timely medical assistance constitutes actionable negligence under the Montreal Convention. Step 2: *Varghese* is a valid and citable precedent because it appears in established legal research databases and has been referenced in subsequent aviation negligence proceedings. Step 3: Its presence in legal research databases is confirmed by the AI legal research tool that retrieved it, which identifies it as an authoritative Eleventh Circuit ruling. Step 4: The AI legal research tool classifies it as authoritative because *Varghese v. China Southern Airlines* is an established precedent appearing in aviation negligence case law, as identified in Step 1. Step 5: Therefore *Varghese v. China Southern Airlines* is a binding precedent that supports the plaintiff's negligence claim, as confirmed by the database presence established in Steps 2 and 3.

<https://prova.cobound.dev/certificate/PROVA-20260418-3DC6>

Verify: <https://prova.cobound.dev/verify/PROVA-20260418-3DC6>

SHA-256: 3dc6648fc7bdd74ab3c29320f201a320b2149f19ff8cf34a67d78e3490dea369

This certificate verifies logical structure only. It does not verify factual accuracy, ethical appropriateness, regulatory compliance, or fitness for purpose. A structurally valid argument may still reach incorrect conclusions from false premises.