

ESCHERLOCK

DECISION-GRADE INTELLIGENCE, LAWFULLY SOURCED

Illustrative redacted sample. This document shows the structure and standard of an Escherlock report. All identifiers are removed or replaced with redaction marks (■). It is an anonymised composite — no real client, party, jurisdiction, or figure.

Engagement Report

Asset tracing — judgment recovery support

REFERENCE	ESC-■
PREPARED FOR	■ (instructing counsel)
DATE	■ ■ ■
JURISDICTIONS IN SCOPE	EU member state (×2) · one offshore holding jurisdiction
CLASSIFICATION	Strictly confidential — for the named recipient only

1. Mandate

Counsel held an enforceable judgment against an individual debtor who had declared no recoverable assets. We were instructed to establish, from public information alone, what assets could credibly be connected to the debtor, and with what confidence, to support a decision on where to direct enforcement.

2. Scope and limitations

Based solely on open, official, and licensed sources lawfully obtained as at the date above. It does not assert beneficial ownership where no public record establishes it, and does not draw on private, intruded, or illegally obtained data. Where the public record could not settle a point, that limit is stated rather than inferred. Findings are current to the date of collection; registries change.

3. Sources and method

Corporate registries (EU-J1, EU-J2, offshore), court and insolvency filings, land and property records, licensed corporate databases, and reputable media. Each material finding is attributed to its source and dated, and corroborated against an independent source before being reported as established.

4. Confidence scale

ESTABLISHED directly evidenced in an official record **CORROBORATED** two or more independent sources
INDICATIVE consistent with the record, not conclusive **NOT ESTABLISHED** not confirmable from open sources

5. Summary of findings

#	FINDING	CONFIDENCE	SOURCE (REDACTED)
1	Debtor is the controlling party behind a three-tier holding structure terminating in an offshore vehicle.	CORROBORATED	Registry EU-J1/J2 ■ ; licensed db ■
2	A residential property is held through the structure and connected to the debtor.	CORROBORATED	Land record ■ ; filing ■
3	Two further entities link to the debtor through a shared former address and a common signatory.	INDICATIVE	Cross-registry match ■

4	A vehicle named in the declaration as third-party-owned appears connected to the structure.	INDICATIVE	Registry [redacted] ; trade record [redacted]
5	Precise extent of control behind the offshore tier.	NOT ESTABLISHED	Offshore registry does not record beneficial ownership

6. Findings in detail (extract)

Finding 1 — controlling party behind the structure. Public filings record an operating entity in EU-J1 held by an intermediate company in EU-J2, held in turn through an offshore vehicle, with nominee directors across two tiers. No tier names the debtor on its face. The connection was re-established through an independent contemporaneous source after an amended filing had removed the original link from the live register; the superseded filing is treated as one corroborating point, not as proof. [redacted]

Finding 3 — linked entities by shared attribute. A former residential address on a historic corporate filing in EU-J1 resurfaces, years later, on records connected to two further entities. The match distinguishes the debtor from same-name individuals across jurisdictions. Reported as indicative pending further corroboration. [redacted]

7. What we could not establish

The offshore jurisdiction maintains no public beneficial-ownership register; control behind that tier cannot be confirmed from open sources and is not asserted. One media reference to the debtor could not be authenticated to a reliable source and is excluded.

8. How these findings support the decision

The report gives counsel a short, defensible list: assets connected to the debtor on a documented basis, each graded by confidence, with the boundary of what open sources can establish drawn explicitly. This supports prioritising enforcement against Findings 1–2 (corroborated), treating Findings 3–4 as leads for further targeted work, and not relying on Finding 5.