



Document discrepancies — 71 flags, 43 well founded

LINDBERGH FORMATION — 16 rue de Maillé, 91310 Montlhéry, France · Companies register (RCS) Evry 817 946 114

Document issued on 24/09/2026

12,000 files matched against their supporting documents · fictional document

Fictional document — demonstration example

This document is produced by the Blue Lemon Agent website to illustrate what an AI agent hands to its users. The companies, matters, amounts and people in it are invented. It has no legal, accounting or commercial value.

Fictional document, produced for the demonstration. **A flag is a discrepancy between two documents in the same file, never a judgement about a person. It enters no draft decision, appears on no note sent to the signature folder, and turns into nothing until a case officer has checked it with the applicant.**

What the matching flagged, and what the checking produced

Type of discrepancy	Flagged	Well founded after examination	Examined for nothing	Action taken by the office
Address on the proof of address differing from the one declared on the form	34	19	15	19 undeclared changes of address, regularised with no effect on the application

Type of discrepancy	Flagged	Well founded after examination	Examined for nothing	Action taken by the office
Date of birth differing between the passport and the translated civil status record	22	17	5	17 corrections, 14 of which concerned a keying error by the administration
Declared resources differing by more than 20 % from the attached payslips	15	7	8	7 files updated at the case officer's request
Total	71	43	28	—

The figure that does not flatter the agent: 28 files looked at for nothing out of 71. The gap comes from a single cause: in 21 of those 28, the address on the proof of address was the host's, properly established by a hosting statement attached to the same file — the comparison was between an address and a form, without reading the statement that explained them.

The tightened rule, re-run over the 12,000 files of the past year

	Rule in service	Tightened rule	Difference
Flags produced over 12 months	71	50	–21
Well-founded discrepancies found	43	43	0 lost
Pointless examinations	28	7	–21

	Rule in service	Tightened rule	Difference
What changes in the rule	Comparison of the address on the proof of address with the one on the form	Same comparison, preceded by reading the hosting statement where the file contains one	—

The tightened version is written and tested: it keeps the 43 well-founded discrepancies and spares 21 examinations. It comes into force only on approval by the head of the residence office — and that is what makes it defensible before an applicant who challenges its effect. **The writing and the measuring are done; the decision takes ten minutes.**

What a flag actually produces — the 17 well-founded civil status discrepancies

Origin of the discrepancy	Files	Effect for the applicant
Keying error in the administration's own application	14	Permit corrected before printing — instead of a correction requested by the applicant after issue
Translated record carrying a date in the original calendar, not converted	2	Conversion made and recorded in the file, with no step for the applicant
Genuine discrepancy between the two documents produced	1	Case officer notified, applicant invited to produce a compliant record
Total	17	16 applicants out of 17 had nothing to do

Across 71 flags, the most frequent outcome was not a check: it was the correction of data the administration itself held wrongly. That is what matching documents does when it looks at both directions of a discrepancy — and it also avoids fourteen permits issued with a wrong date, therefore fourteen corrections, fourteen appointments and fourteen reprints.

To be settled by the residence office

Entry into force of the tightened rule, approved by the head of office on: _____

Pre-filled correction form on civil status discrepancy — open / closed: _____

Scope of this document: the service operated by Blue Lemon Agent. For an agent deployed at your premises, the applicable location is that of the architecture set out in the quotation and verified before commissioning; local execution is announced only for the configuration explicitly described and accepted in the quotation; the applicable isolation depends on the deployment mode set out in the quotation, no dedicated isolation being presumed; the encryption mechanisms in transit and at rest, their components and key management are those documented for the architecture chosen; roles and permissions are configured and accepted for the identities and systems actually connected; the events logged, their content, their retention period and who may access them are defined for the deployment chosen.