

---

Rayandre C Brooks and Brooks Inc.,

Court File No. 27-CV-24-11194

Plaintiffs,

vs.

Akshay (Roger) Patel, AAMCON Inc., Harsh  
Patel, Seema Hospitality LLC, Haresh Patel,  
and Oyo Hotel Pipestone aka Pipestone Inn,

Defendants.

---

**ORDER IMPOSING SANCTIONS FOR USE OF FAKE LEGAL AUTHORITY**

---

The above-entitled matter came duly before the Honorable Christian Sande, Judge of the above-named court, on Thursday, July 24, 2025 at the Hennepin County Government Center, Minneapolis, Minnesota.

Taweh Anderson, Attorney at Law, appeared on behalf of the plaintiffs;

David Lutz, Attorney at Law, appeared on behalf of the defendants.

Based upon all the files, records, and proceedings in this case, and the Court being fully advised in the premises,

**IT IS HEREBY ORDERED:**

1. As noted on the record during the hearing, the Court denied Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment due to Defense counsel's citation to nonexistent caselaw.
2. The Court Administrator is directed to **STRIKE** Defendants' Memorandum of Law in Support of Summary Judgment (Index No. 14) and Reply Memorandum in Support of Summary Judgment (Index No. 20) from the file on MNCIS in this case.

3. Pursuant to Rule 8.3 of the Minnesota Rules of Professional Conduct, Attorney David Lutz is **REFERRED** to the Minnesota Lawyer's Professional Responsibility Board. The Court will send (a) Defendants' brief in support of its motion for summary judgment; (b) Defendants' reply brief in support of its motion for summary judgment; (c) this Court's Order to Show Cause; (d) Attorney Lutz's correspondence to the Court; and (e) this Order.
4. Pursuant to Minn. R. Civ. P. 11.03 and Minn. Stat. § 549.211, subd. 5, Attorney David Lutz is **ORDERED** to pay a financial penalty of **\$5,000.00**. This penalty is imposed on Attorney Lutz and not his client. Payment must be made within 180 days of the date of this Order to the Fourth Judicial District Court Administrator, Hennepin County Government Center, Suite C-300, 300 South Sixth Street, Minneapolis, MN, 55487.
5. The attached Memorandum is incorporated by reference in this Order.
6. All prior and consistent orders remain in full force and effect.
7. Service of a copy of this order made upon self-represented parties by first class U.S. mail at their address(es) last known to the Court Administrator, or to attorneys by e-service, is due and proper service for all purposes.

**BY THE COURT:**

Dated: September 8, 2025

---

Christian Sande  
Judge of District Court

Jackson Tate, Esq. (612) 540-6764  
Law Clerk to The Honorable Christian Sande  
[4thJudgeSandeChambers@courts.state.mn.us](mailto:4thJudgeSandeChambers@courts.state.mn.us)

## MEMORANDUM

### I. Background

This case was filed in Hennepin County District Court on July 25, 2024. Plaintiff Rayandre Brooks argues that Defendant Akshay Patel agreed to sell him a gas station and convenience store business in Brooklyn Park, Minnesota and failed to transfer the business to Brooks in accordance with their alleged agreement.

On October 3, 2024 the Court issued a Scheduling Order with the deadline of April 25, 2025 for all dispositive motions to be filed and setting a trial date of August 18, 2025. On April 24, 2025, Defendants filed a Notice of Motion and Motion for Summary Judgment along with supporting papers. Plaintiffs filed a memorandum opposing summary judgment on May 8, 2025. Defendants filed a reply memorandum in support of their motion on May 15, 2025. The Court heard oral argument on May 22, 2025 and took the motion under advisement.

While reviewing Defendants' Memorandum in Support of Motion for Summary Judgment and Reply Memorandum in Support of Summary Judgment, the Court identified suspicious quotations and case citations in Defendants' summary judgment briefing.<sup>1</sup> The briefs signed by Attorney David Lutz (counsel for Defendants) cite twice to a purported 1996 decision of the Minnesota Court of Appeals listing the plaintiff as "Hallock" and the defendant as "Nelson". That

---

<sup>1</sup> See Defs. Mem. of Law in Supp. of its Mot. for Summ. J. at 13 (Apr. 24, 2025). The brief contains a wholly made-up case and states falsely, "The Minnesota Court of Appeals has emphasized that 'part performance of an oral contract must be unequivocally referable to the alleged agreement to remove the agreement from the statute of frauds,' *Hallock v. Nelson*, 545 N.W.2d 132, 134 (Minn. Ct. App. 1996). The court in *Hallock* further explained that 'performance which can be explained as readily on some other ground fails to provide the necessary clear inference of the existence of a contract.' *Id.* at 135.") and Defs. Reply Mem. of Law in Supp. of its Mot. for Summ. J. at 4 ("Performance which can be explained as readily on some other ground fails to provide the necessary clear inference of the existence of a contract." *Hallock v. Nelson*, 545 N.W.2d 132, 135 (Minn. Ct. App. 1996)."). These statements of law are completely fake.

case does not exist and there is no decision from the Minnesota Court of Appeals with that plaintiff and defendant.

The case citation in Defendants' briefing leads to a Nebraska Court of Appeals decision, *State v. Three Thousand Sixty Seven Dollars and Sixty-Five Cents (\$3,067.65) in U.S. Currency*, 545 N.W.2d 129 (Neb. Ct. App. 1996). The Nebraska case does not pertain to any of the subject matter of the above-captioned lawsuit and does not include the quotes that Attorney Lutz cites in his briefing. Notably, Plaintiff's counsel did not identify the fake law used by Defense counsel in their own briefing in opposition to summary judgment.

The Court, concerned that Defendants' counsel used artificial intelligence ("AI") or another unreliable source for legal briefing, issued an Order to Show Cause on July 18, 2025, scheduling a hearing at the same time of the previously scheduled pre-trial conference.

Attorney Lutz filed a letter in response to the Court's Show Cause Order.<sup>2</sup> Attorney Lutz confessed to using AI to prepare both the moving brief and the reply brief and failing to correct the two "hallucinated" case citations and misquotes.<sup>3</sup>

The Court held a combined Pretrial Conference and Show Cause Hearing on July 24, 2025. Attorney Lutz read a short statement, admitting to the use of AI and informing the Court that he was taking remedial measures to ensure that the situation would not occur again. Attorney Lutz characterized the use of the fake quotes as a mistake and averred that he never intended to mislead the Court with fake and nonexistent caselaw. The Court informed the parties that it was denying Defendants' motion for summary judgment due to the admittedly fake caselaw cited in

---

<sup>2</sup> Correspondence for Judicial Approval (Index No. 32) (July 18, 2025).

<sup>3</sup> Artificial intelligence models use data to create patterns and make predictions. However, if the training data is incomplete, biased, or otherwise erroneous, the AI can lead to inaccurate predictions or hallucinations. *See Wadsworth v. Walmart Inc.*, 348 F.R.D. 489, 493 (D. Wyo. 2025).

Defendants’ briefing. *See Delano Crossing 2016, LLC, v. County of Wright*, 2025 WL 1539250, at \*4 (Minn. Tax. Reg. Div., May 29, 2025) (When an attorney submits pleadings that are not based on valid law, the Court “generally will deny the motion without expending the time and resources necessary to analyze those arguments.”). The Court advised counsel that the Scheduling Order deadline for dispositive motions to be heard was long past, and the Court did not see good cause (*see* Minn. R. Civ. P. 16.02) to extend the motion deadline to allow re-briefing because of Defense counsel’s use of fake law.

The Court scheduled this case for trial during the September 3, 2025, trial block. On August 4, 2025, the parties filed a joint stipulation for dismissal because they had settled the case. The matter regarding the Court’s sanctions for use of nonexistent legal authority remained under advisement.<sup>4</sup>

## **II. Legal Authority for Court-Imposed Sanctions**

### **A. Minn. R. Civ. P. 11.02**

“[B]y presenting to the court ... a pleading, written motion, or other document,” an attorney certifies “to the best of [their] knowledge, information, and belief, formed after an inquiry reasonable under the circumstances” that “the claims, defenses, and other legal contentions there are warranted by existing law.” Minn. R. Civ. P. 11.02(b). “Thus, Rule 11 prescribes an ‘affirmative duty’ on counsel to ‘investigate the factual and legal underpinnings of a pleading.’” *In re Est. of Flatgard*, 14 N.W.3d 305, 313 (Minn. Ct. App. 2024) (quoting *Collins v. Waconia Dodge, Inc.*, 793 N.W.2d 142, 145 (Minn. Ct. App. 2011)). The Court may, on its own initiative, “enter an order describing the

---

<sup>4</sup> *See* Minn. Stat. § 549.211, subd. 5(b) (“Monetary sanctions may not be awarded on the court’s initiative unless the court issues its order to show cause before a voluntary dismissal or settlement of the claims made by or against the party which is, or whose attorneys are, to be sanctioned.”).

specific conduct that appears to violate Rule 11.02 and directing an attorney, law firm, or party to show cause why it has not violated Rule 11.02 with respect thereto.” Minn. R. Civ. P. 11.03(a)(2).

B. Minn. Stat. § 549.211

As an alternative to Rule 11, the Court may impose sanctions under Minn. Stat. § 549.211. Minn. Stat. § 549.211, subd. 6(b). By including the statutorily required acknowledgement on a pleading to the Court, an attorney agrees to the Court’s imposition of statutory sanctions. Minn. Stat. § 549.211, subd. 1.<sup>5</sup>

By presenting to the court, whether by signing, filing, submitting, or later advocating, a pleading, written motion, or other paper, an attorney or unrepresented party is certifying that to the best of the person's knowledge, information, and belief, formed after an inquiry reasonable under the circumstances:

\* \* \*

(2) the claims, defenses, and other legal contentions are warranted by existing law or by a nonfrivolous argument for the extension, modification, or reversal of existing law or the establishment of new law;

Minn. Stat. § 549.211, subd. 2.

The Court may, on its own initiative, enter an order describing the conduct that appears to violate § 549.211, subd. 2, and “direct[] an attorney, law firm, or party to show cause why it has not violated subdivision 2 with respect to that conduct.” Minn. Stat. § 549.211, subd. 4(b). “If, after notice and a reasonable opportunity to respond, the court determines that subdivision 2 has been violated, the court may, subject to the conditions in this section, impose an appropriate sanction upon the attorneys, law firms, or parties that have violated subdivision 2 or are responsible for the violation.”

Minn. Stat. § 549.211, subd. 3.

---

<sup>5</sup> Attorney Lutz included the acknowledgement and a citation to Minn. Stat. § 549.211 in both his initial memorandum and in his reply memorandum. *See* Defs. Mem. of Law in Supp. of its Mot. for Summ. J. at 29 (Apr. 24, 2025) and Defs. Reply Mem. of Law in Supp. of its Mot. for Summ. J. at 8 (May 15, 2025).

C. Sanctions

If a court determines Rule 11 or Minn. Stat. § 549.211 has been violated, “after notice and a reasonable opportunity to respond, . . . the court may, subject to [certain conditions], impose an appropriate sanction upon the attorney[ ], . . . for the violation.” Minn. R. Civ. P. 11.03; Minn. Stat. § 549.211, subd. 4(b). Sanctions “imposed for violation of this rule shall be limited to what is sufficient to deter repetition of such conduct[.]” Minn. R. Civ. P. 11.03(b); Minn. Stat. § 549.211, subd. 5(a). Courts are required to make factual findings as to improper conduct and explain the basis for any sanction. Minn. R. Civ. P. 11.03(c); *In re the Claims for No-Fault Benefits Against Progressive Ins. Co.*, 720 N.W.2d 865, 875 (Minn. Ct. App. 2006); *see also* Minn. Stat. § 549.211, subd. 5(c).

Courts have broad latitude when issuing sanctions under Rule 11, albeit “limited to what is sufficient to deter repetition of such conduct or comparable conduct by others similarly situated.” Minn. R. Civ. P. 11.03(b); *see also* Minn. Stat. § 549.211, subd. 5(a). Sanctions may be appropriate to “deter repetition of such conduct.” Minn. R. Civ. P. 11.03(b); Minn. Stat. § 549.211, subd. 5(b). Under Minn. Stat. § 549.211, the sanction may consist of an order to pay a penalty into court. § 549.211, subd. 5(b).

“Competent representation requires the legal knowledge, skill, thoroughness, and preparation reasonably necessary for the representation.” Minn. R. Prof. Conduct 1.1. A lawyer “shall not knowingly . . . make a false statement of fact or law to a tribunal . . .”). Minn. R. Prof. Conduct 3.3(a)(1). When a judge has knowledge that “a lawyer has committed a violation of the Rules of Professional Conduct that raises a substantial question regarding the lawyer’s honesty, trustworthiness, or fitness as a lawyer in other respects [the judge] shall inform the appropriate authority.” Minn. Code of Jud. Conduct R. 2.15(B); *see also* *Bevins v. Colgate-Palmolive Co.*, No. 25-576, 2025 WL 1085695, at \*7

(E.D. Pa. Apr. 10, 2025) (ordering the clerk of court to send a copy to the state bar when sanctioned party filed pleadings with fake caselaw).

### III. Analysis

The Minnesota Tax Court has held that submitting a brief with hallucinated caselaw violates Rule 11.02: “[w]e conclude that the inclusion of citations to non-existing cases (or other legal authorities) is a violation of Rule 11.02(b), as fake citations cannot support *any* legal claims.” *Delano Crossing 2016, LLC*, 2025 WL 1539250, at \*3 (emphasis in original) (citing Minn. R. Civ. P. 11.02(b)). A similar analysis applies under Minn. Stat. § 549.211, subd. 2(2): a fake citation misleads the court in that it attempts to convey that “the claims, defenses, and other legal contentions are warranted by existing law”—which simply cannot be the case when the law cited *does not exist*.

Courts across the country have been grappling with the issue of attorneys’ use of AI and the resulting problems when counsel do not verify that AI-produced legal research can contain wholly made-up (i.e., hallucinated) legal authority. The problem has become so common that a website has been set up to catalogue the over 100 documented instances of attorneys (and now judges)<sup>6</sup> using AI to cite fake law and hallucinate quotes.<sup>7</sup> Courts nationwide have agreed on a common principle: hallucinated cases are problematic, and strike to the very core of our legal system.

“Many harms flow from the submission of fake opinions . . . Judicial resources are diverted from other pressing, legitimate work. And ‘[t]he client may be deprived of arguments based on authentic judicial precedents.’” *Garner v. Kadince*, No. 20250188-CA, 2025 WL 1481740, at \*2

---

<sup>6</sup> Mike Scarcella, *Two US Judges Withdraw Rulings After Attorneys Question Accuracy*, REUTERS (July 29, 2025, 1:00 p.m.), <https://www.reuters.com/legal/government/two-us-judges-withdraw-rulings-after-attorneys-question-accuracy-2025-07-29>.

<sup>7</sup> Damien Charlotin, *AI Hallucination Cases*, <https://www.damiencharlotin.com/hallucinations> (last visited Sept. 8, 2025).

(Utah Ct. App. May 22, 2025) (quoting *Mata v. Avianca, Inc.* 678 F.Supp.3d 443, 448 (S.D.N.Y. 2023) (footnote omitted)).

Minnesota attorneys have been warned about using AI for legal research and the need to verify all AI-sourced legal authority. The risks are well known:

- In November 2024, the Minnesota Supreme Court denied a Petition for Further Review because it contained citations to fake law and noted, “We take this opportunity to remind members of the bar of the State of Minnesota that their ethical obligations, including the obligation to provide competent legal representation and candor toward the tribunal, apply to any use of artificial intelligence tools.”<sup>8</sup>
- In January 2025, the U.S. District Court for the District of Minnesota struck an expert declaration proffered by the Minnesota Attorney General because the declaration contained “fake, AI-generated sources,” which U.S. District Judge Laura Provinzino found “shattered [the expert’s] credibility with this Court.”<sup>9</sup>
- The March 2025 issue of the Minnesota State Bar Association’s BENCH AND BAR OF MINNESOTA was dedicated to the topic of attorneys using artificial intelligence in legal

---

<sup>8</sup> Order Denying Petition for Further Review at 2, *Harris v. Lindell*, No. A24-0055 (Minn., Nov. 27, 2024) (discussing the ABA Standing Committee on Ethics and Professional Responsibility’s Formal Opinion 512, entitled “Generative Artificial Intelligence Tools,” as providing helpful guidance to lawyers on how to ethically incorporate generative AI into their practice (citing Susan M. Humiston, *Ethics Guidance for Generative AI Use*, BENCH & BAR MINN., Sept. 2024, at 6–7)).

<sup>9</sup> *Kohls v. Ellison*, No. 24-cv-3754, 2025 WL 66514, at \*4 (D. Minn., Jan. 10, 2025). This decision was widely publicized. See David Thomas, *Judge Rebukes Minnesota over AI Errors in ‘Deepfakes’ Lawsuit*, REUTERS (January 13, 2025, 3:07 p.m.), <https://www.reuters.com/legal/government/judge-rebukes-minnesota-over-ai-errors-deepfakes-lawsuit-2025-01-13>.

practice.<sup>10</sup> In fact, the cover of that issue shows a red life-ring buoy and the title, “*HELP! A tech-reticent lawyer’s guide to getting started with AI.*”

- The Minnesota Attorney General’s Office offers a free CLE on the use of generative AI.<sup>11</sup>

Nationally, attorneys have been warned. The American Bar Association issued a formal opinion in July 2024 offering ethics guidance on the use of generative AI for lawyers. The fifteen-page opinion highlights the upsides of AI (such as efficiency) but cautions attorneys:

Because [generative artificial intelligence] tools are subject to mistakes, lawyers’ uncritical reliance on content created by a [generative artificial intelligence] tool can result in inaccurate legal advice to clients or **misleading representations to courts** and third parties. Therefore, a lawyer’s reliance on, or submission of, a [generative artificial intelligence] tool’s output—without an appropriate degree of independent verification or review of its output—could violate the duty to provide competent representation as required by Model Rule 1.1.<sup>12</sup>

AI, like the advent of word processors and the Internet, can be a powerful tool to aid attorneys in their legal work. But these technological improvements should not be accepted with blind, unyielding faith or used as a substitute for legal analysis and interpretation. Healthy skepticism and due diligence must be applied if attorneys choose to use AI. “While technology continues to evolve, one thing remains the same—**checking and verifying the source.**” *Wadsworth*, 348 F.R.D at 493 (emphasis added).

The risks cannot be overstated when attorneys rely on generative AI without properly vetting legal citations. The American legal system is built on *stare decisis*, which “directs us to adhere to our former decisions in order to promote the stability of the law and the integrity of the

---

<sup>10</sup> Kristi Paulson, *HELP! A Tech-Reticent Lawyer’s Guide to Getting Started with AI*, BENCH & BAR MINN. (Feb. 27, 2025), <https://mnbars.org/?pg=BenchBarofMinnesota&pubAction=viewIssue&pubIssueID=52616>.

<sup>11</sup> Generative AI: Advanced Uses and Practical Applications, <https://www.ag.state.mn.us/Office/CLE/20231005>.

<sup>12</sup> ABA: ABA Comm. On Ethics & Pro. Resp., Formal Op. 512 at 3–4 (2024) (emphasis added).

judicial process.” *State v. Willis*, 898 N.W.2d 642, 647 n.7 (Minn. 2017) (citation omitted) (internal quotation marks omitted). Trust in this system relies on veracity and reliability from attorneys and the courts. When an attorney cites to fake law and proffers it to the court, “[i]t promotes cynicism about the legal profession and the American judicial system.” *Mata*, 678 F.Supp.3d at 448. Worse, “a future litigant may be tempted to defy a judicial ruling by disingenuously claiming doubt about its authenticity.” *Id.* at 448–49.

Faith in the judicial system has declined sharply in the last several years.<sup>13</sup> Hallucinated caselaw that is divorced from *stare decisis*, and worse from reality, will only exacerbate the declining public perception of the judiciary across the country. Citizens should be able to trust that judges are grounding their decisions in real, valid caselaw, not fake law. Attorneys who submit fake law in their briefs deceive the court, and by that measure, the greater public. Courts must react strongly to this type of conduct or risk the proliferation of further disbelief in the judicial system.

Attorney Lutz’s error is particularly troubling due to the ease with which he could have caught and avoided (twice) the fake citation. As the Court informed counsel and the parties during the hearing, the Court checked and re-checked (using several staff attorneys) the fake citations proffered by Defense counsel to assure itself that the citations were truly fake, lest the Court wrongly accuse an attorney of such a grave act as deliberately misleading the Court and violating ethical rules. It is notable here that Plaintiff’s counsel did not discover the fake case citations in

---

<sup>13</sup> See Benedict Vigers and Lydia Saad, *Americans Pass Judgment on Their Courts*, GALLUP (Dec. 17, 2024), <https://news.gallup.com/poll/653897/americans-pass-judgment-courts.aspx> (Gallup Poll showing that the U.S. has seen a 24 percentage point decline in confidence in courts since 2020); Shawn Patterson Jr. et al. *The Withering of Public Confidence in the Courts*, JUDICATURE, Vol. 108 No.1 (2024) (Report that highlights waning faith in the judiciary, exemplified by the percentage of Americans who express either “a great deal” or “a fair amount” of trust and confidence in the judicial branch falling from 75 percent in 2000 to under 50 percent in 2022).

their own briefing in opposition to summary judgment. **The Court was the only entity verifying the law in this case.**<sup>14</sup>

Attorney Lutz informed the Court at the show cause hearing that he had found more fake citations generated by the AI tool he used, and he had caught all but the one used in both his moving brief and reply brief. He admitted in written correspondence to the Court that he “failed to properly confirm the accuracy of the *Hallock* [sic] citation through VLex Fastcase,” which was the AI research tool he used in drafting his motion.<sup>15</sup>

Confirming the legitimacy of a case is simple: an attorney need only enter the citation into a legal database (or open the appropriate book) to verify the case’s existence and the legal proposition expounded. Even a Google® search of the citation here would have revealed that the case does not exist. This significant mistake could easily have been avoided.

To that end, because Defendants’ briefing contains fake law, the Court will direct the Court Administrator to strike Defendants’ summary judgment briefing so that the fake law cited in this case is no longer part of the briefing record. *See* Minn. R. Civ. P. 11.03(b).

Attorney Lutz violated Minn. R. Civ. P. 11.02(b) and Minnesota Statutes § 549.211, subd. 2(2), when he twice submitted a fake, hallucinated case with a fake quote in his briefing asking this Court to enter summary judgment in his client’s favor. He refers to his conduct as an “error [that] was entirely unintentional and in no way represents an attempt to mislead this Court.”<sup>16</sup> Proffering fake

---

<sup>14</sup> Other courts have been led astray by counsel’s haphazard use of unchecked fake law that the court, in turn, cited as legal authority in an order. *See Shahid v. Esaam*, No. A25A0196, 2025 WL 1792657, at \*5 (Ga. Ct. App. June 30, 2025) (Georgia Court of Appeals overturning trial court decision that relied on fictitious case law). The use of unchecked fake caselaw can create a cascade of errors, all of which are easily avoidable if attorneys and legal professionals simply verify citations.

<sup>15</sup> Correspondence for Judicial Approval (Index No. 32) (July 18, 2025).

<sup>16</sup> *Id.* at 1.

law to the Court without verifying the law's existence can be seen in no way other than an effort to mislead the Court, regardless of whether the party acted deliberately to mislead the Court or simply engaged in behavior with the same result. Sanctions are appropriate under Rule 11.02(b) and Minn. Stat. § 549.211, subd. 3.

Because the Court believes that submitting fake law raises questions as to an attorney's honesty, trustworthiness, and fitness as an attorney, the Court is obligated to inform the Minnesota Lawyer's Professional Responsibility Board. The Court will send the Board (1) Defendants' brief in support of its motion for summary judgment; (2) Defendants' reply brief in support of its motion for summary judgment; (3) the Court's Order to Show Cause; (4) Attorney Lutz's correspondence to the Court; and (5) this Order.

Courts have included financial sanctions in their orders in an effort to deter the submission of fake law. *See Mata*, 678 F.Supp.3d at 466 (fining attorneys who used fake caselaw \$5,000 jointly and severally); *Elizondo v. City of Laredo*, No. 5:25-CV-50 (S.D. Tex. July 23, 2025) (fining attorney who used fake caselaw \$2,500); *Mid Central Operating Engineers Health and Welfare Fund, Stephen Scott v. Hoosiervac LLC*, No. 2:24-CV-00326-JPH-MJD (S.D. Ind. May 28, 2025) (fining attorney \$6,000 for violating Fed. R. Civ. P. 11(c)(4)); *Lacey v. State Farm General Ins. Co.*, 2025 WL 1363069, at \*5 (C.D. Cal. May 5, 2025) (fining plaintiff's law firms that used fake caselaw \$31,100 jointly and severally); and *Wadsworth*, 348 F.R.D at 499 (fining pro hac vice attorney who used fake caselaw \$3,000, and local attorneys who sponsored pro hac vice attorney \$1,000 each).<sup>17</sup>

---

<sup>17</sup> In a recent order sanctioning attorneys who used fake law in briefing, the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Alabama disqualified three attorneys from further participation in a case and required them to "provide a copy of this order to their clients, opposing counsel, and presiding judge in every pending state or federal case in which they are counsel of record [and to] provide a copy of this order to every attorney in their law firm." *Johnson v. Dunn*, No. 2:21-cv-1701-AMM, 2025 WL 2086116, at \*21 (N.D. Alabama July 23, 2025).

Though attorneys have been cautioned extensively on the risks of using AI (and attorneys have been taught for generations to check the law), the submission of fake law shows no sign of abating. Since the Court issued its Order to Show Cause in this matter on July 18, 2025, to the date of the issuance of this order, a website has chronicled another 25 instances of hallucinated caselaw in the United States.<sup>18</sup> Because of the serious threat that fake law poses to our judicial system, the ease with which this violation could have been avoided, and as a further consequence and deterrent, the Court fines Attorney Lutz \$5,000.00 for the egregious violations of Minn. R. Civ. P. 11.02(b) and Minn. Stat. § 549.211, subd. 2(2).

CS

MINNESOTA  
JUDICIAL  
BRANCH

---

<sup>18</sup> Damien Charlotin, *AI Hallucination Cases*, <https://www.damiencharlotin.com/hallucinations> (last visited Sept. 8, 2025).