



ISaidUSaid™

Your truth, Authenticated™

Powered by ISaidUSaid

Court Communication Report

Generated by ISaidUSaid.com

1. This report was autonomously generated on 08 January 2026, for matter FCC/123 listed in the Family and Federal Circuit Court of Brisbane, QLD, AUS, by an Artificial Intelligence ("AI") Large Language Model ("LLM") trained by experienced human domestic violence social workers employing Human-In-The_Loop ("HITL") training paradigm. This training is fully compliant with EU AI Act, GDPR and Australian AI Ethics Principles.
2. The following digital interactions were analysed between Mr Joe Blogs and Jill Blogs from 09 April 2024 to 31 December 2025:
 - a. 44 email messages.
 - b. 26 video/audio recordings.
 - c. 0 instant messages (e.g. WhatsApp, iMessage)
 - d. 0 messages sent via parenting applications (e.g. Our Family Wizard, Talking Parents, CoParent Coordinator, AppClose)
3. Communication was analysed for the following negative interaction styles:
 - a. Profanity: Highlights messages that contain swearing, cursing, or other vulgar wording.
 - b. Threats: Surfaces statements that threaten to hurt someone or imply looming physical harm.
 - c. Toxic language: Calls out language that is broadly hostile, abusive, or needlessly cruel.
 - d. Very toxic language: Flags messages that are extremely hostile or abusive even by toxic standards.
 - e. Insults: Identifies direct name-calling or belittling remarks aimed at the other person.

The report was generated by Artificial Intelligence, for more information, please go to www.isaidusaid.com

- f. Identity attacks: Detects insults that target race, gender, sexuality, or other identity traits.
- g. Court Order breach: Alerts you when a message appears to violate an uploaded court order.
- h. Admission of guilt: Finds apologies or statements admitting responsibility for past abuse.
- i. Coercive control: Looks for descriptions of someone tightly controlling another person's life.
- j. Financial abuse: Points out language about restricting money, access to funds, or financial freedom.
- k. Parental criticism: Highlights attacks on the other person's parenting skills or decisions.
- l. Body shaming: Surfaces remarks that mock or demean someone's body or appearance.
- m. Bullying: Flags attempts to intimidate, coerce, or dominate through aggressive language.
- n. Unfounded abuse allegations: Identifies accusations of abuse or crimes that lack evidence or findings.
- o. Sexual harassment: Calls out unwanted sexual advances, requests, or explicit remarks.
- p. Legal threats: Spots threats to involve lawyers, courts, or police as leverage.
- q. Coerce self-harm: Highlights statements encouraging, pressuring, or suggesting self-harm.
- r. Stalking: Flags admissions of secretly following, monitoring, or tracking someone's movements.
- s. Official mediation refusal: Notes explicit refusals to participate in mediation or facilitated dialogue.
- t. Blackmail: Detects conditional threats that demand compliance or concessions.
- u. Shame Induction: Flags language meant to humiliate or make the other person feel unworthy.
- v. Righteous Cruelty: Identifies punishment or cruelty that is framed as morally deserved.
- w. Moral Superiority: Highlights messages asserting ethical high ground to belittle someone.
- x. Scorekeeping: Spots references to past wrongs used to control or demand repayment.

- y. Devaluation: Detects sudden disparagement aimed at tearing down the other person's worth.
- z. Vengeful Intent: Flags expressions of wanting payback, retaliation, or revenge.
- aa. Exploitation of Vulnerability: Identifies manipulation that weaponizes someone's secrets or wounds.
- ab. Feigning Victimhood: Calls out false claims of being the victim to avoid responsibility.
- ac. Guilt-Tripping: Highlights attempts to control through guilt or emotional debt.
- ad. Responsibility Shifting: Identifies blame-shifting statements that dodge accountability.
- ae. Trust-Breaking Behavior: Flags admissions of betrayal, secrecy, or unreliability.
- af. Performative Forgiveness: Detects forgiving language used as a tactic to shame or control.
- ag. Performative Apology: Spots hollow apologies offered to manage optics rather than repair harm.
- ah. Self-Righteousness: Highlights messages dripping with moral superiority or judgment.
- ai. Resentment Expression: Flags lingering bitterness that is used to punish or shame.
- aj. Judgmental Framing: Identifies sweeping moral condemnations of the other person's character.
- ak. Ultimatum: Flags conditional demands where cooperation is made contingent on compliance.
- al. Emotional Invalidation: Highlights statements that dismiss, minimize, or mock the recipient's feelings.
- am. Weaponised Mental Health Attribution: Flags statements that attribute mental illness or psychological instability to undermine the recipient's credibility or dismiss their concerns.
- an. Gas-lighting: Detects attempts to make someone doubt their memory, perception, or sanity.
- ao. Emotional Indebtedness: Flags pressure based on implied emotional debt such as 'after all I've done for you'.
- ap. Withdrawal Punishment: Flags threats to cut off communication or cooperation to pressure the recipient.
- aq. Criticism (Gottman Institute): Summarizes moments where the person attacks character instead of behavior.

- ar. Defensiveness (Gottman Institute): Marks responses that deflect blame, make excuses, or counterattack.
- as. Contempt (Gottman Institute): Flags communication steeped in mockery, disdain, or disrespect.
- at. Stonewalling (Gottman Institute): Identifies withdrawal tactics like silence, short answers, or leaving.
- au. Striking: Flags clips where someone slaps, punches, or kicks another person.
- av. Restraining: Highlights footage showing one person grabbing, holding, or dragging another.
- aw. Choking: Identifies scenes where someone restricts another person's neck or airflow.
- ax. Abusive Gesturing: Calls out threatening hand gestures meant to intimidate or humiliate.
- ay. Obstructing: Spots attempts to block someone's path or keep them from leaving.
- az. Biting, Scratching or Spitting: Detects aggressive biting, scratching, or spitting toward another person.
- ba. Pushing, Shoving, Tripping or Similar: Flags motions that shove, trip, or otherwise knock someone off balance.
- bb. Throwing Items: Highlights objects being hurled at or near someone to scare or harm.
- bc. Threatening with Weapon (guns, knives, etc.): Identifies moments where a weapon is brandished toward another person.
- bd. Other Physical Altercations: Covers any other physical struggle that causes obvious discomfort or pain.

4. Communication was also analysed for the following positive interaction styles:

- a. Proactive co-parenting: Recognizes collaborative suggestions that keep co-parenting on track.
- b. Requests for mediation: Identifies polite invitations to resolve disputes through mediation.
- c. Deescalation: Highlights efforts to calm a conflict, apologize, or lower the temperature.
- d. Declarations of Love & Devotion: Surfaces romantic professions of love, devotion, or adoration.
- e. Remorse: Calls attention to heartfelt expressions of regret for causing harm.

- f. Seeking Forgiveness: Notes vulnerable requests to be forgiven or welcomed back.
- g. Granting Forgiveness: Shows when someone clearly extends forgiveness to the other party.
- h. Validation: Marks statements that affirm another person's feelings or lived experience.
- i. Empathy: Identifies language that resonates with another person's feelings or pain.
- j. Bridge Building: Highlights invitations to compromise, collaborate, or meet in the middle.
- k. Vulnerability: Surfaces honest disclosures of fear, hurt, or uncertainty shared to connect.
- l. Acceptance: Notes calm acknowledgements of difficult realities without retaliation.
- m. Trust-Building Behavior: Celebrates assurances that reinforce reliability, openness, or safety.
- n. Healthy Boundary Setting: Recognizes calm statements that set limits without hostility.
- o. Repentance: Surfaces firm commitments to change harmful behavior going forward.
- p. Grace / Mercy: Highlights moments of kindness offered even when it is not required.

Analysis

5. The analysed interactions reflect a tumultuous communication dynamic between Jill and Joe, characterized by fluctuating tones ranging from playful banter to intense confrontations fueled by jealousy, distrust, and parenting disagreements. Initially, their exchanges exhibit a mix of humor and camaraderie, but critical trust issues often precipitate serious accusations, particularly from Jill, culminating in heightened emotional exchanges and occasional physical confrontations. Over time, both parties demonstrate a gradual shift toward more solution-oriented dialogue; Joe begins suggesting mediation and expressing a desire for collaborative co-parenting, while Jill, after periods of defensiveness, articulates her feelings of being overwhelmed and proposes practical solutions to their conflicts. This evolution suggests an emerging recognition of their shared responsibilities and the adverse impact of their disputes on their child, signaling a potential improvement in their communication and co-parenting relationship if they continue to progress beyond initial hostilities.

6. The following positive communication styles were identified:

Communication type	Mr Joe Blogs	Jill Blogs
Grace / Mercy	0	0
Deescalation	0	0
Empathy	0	0
Validation	0	0
Healthy Boundary Setting	0	0
Proactive co-parenting	0	0
Vulnerability	0	0
Requests for mediation	1	0
Remorse	0	0
Acceptance	0	0
Declarations of Love & Devotion	0	0
Trust-Building Behavior	0	0
Seeking Forgiveness	0	0
Bridge Building	0	0

The report was generated by Artificial Intelligence, for more information, please go to www.isaidusaid.com

Repentance	0	0
Granting Forgiveness	0	0

7. The following negative communication styles were identified:

Communication type	Mr Joe Blogs	Jill Blogs
Instigated the conflict	2	1
Stalking	0	0
Admission of guilt	0	0
Criticism (Gottman Institute)	0	0
Insults	2	2
Shame Induction	0	0
Stonewalling (Gottman Institute)	0	0
Emotional Indebtedness	0	0
Devaluation	0	1
Sexual harassment	0	0
Legal threats	0	0
Weaponised Mental Health Attribution	0	0
Threats	0	0
Bullying	2	0
Gas-lighting	0	0
Righteous Cruelty	0	0
Unfounded abuse allegations	0	0
Financial abuse	0	0
Resentment Expression	0	0
Vengeful Intent	0	0
Self-Righteousness	0	0
Judgmental Framing	0	0
Responsibility Shifting	0	0
Identity attacks	0	0
Moral Superiority	0	0
Feigning Victimhood	0	0
Withdrawal Punishment	0	0



The report was generated by Artificial Intelligence, for more information, please go to www.isaidusaid.com

Defensiveness (Gottman Institute)	0	0
Coercive control	1	0
Blackmail	0	2
Performative Apology	0	0
Contempt (Gottman Institute)	6	0
Court Order breach	0	0
Exploitation of Vulnerability	0	0
Emotional Invalidation	0	0
Official mediation refusal	0	1
Very toxic language	0	0
Performative Forgiveness	0	0
Parental criticism	0	0
Trust-Breaking Behavior	0	0
Ultimatum	0	1
Coerce self-harm	0	0
Scorekeeping	0	0
Guilt-Tripping	0	0
Profanity	1	1
Body shaming	1	1



8. The following negative actions were observed in video evidence:

Action type	Mr Joe Blogs	Jill Blogs
Biting, Scratching or Spitting	0	0
Abusive Gesturing	0	0
Threatening with Weapon (guns, knives, etc.)	0	0
Choking	1	0
Restraining	0	0
Striking	1	0
Obstructing	0	0
Throwing Items	0	0
Other Physical Altercations	0	0
Pushing, Shoving, Tripping or Similar	0	0

9. 31% of messages sent by Mr Joe Blogs contained some level of negative communication. 3% of messages sent by Mr Joe Blogs contained overtly positive communication.




10. 22% of messages received from Jill Blogs contained some level of negative communication. 0% of messages received from Jill Blogs contained overtly positive communication.



11. 67% of negative interactions were instigated by Mr Joe Blogs.
12. 33% of negative interactions were instigated by Jill Blogs.

Conflict instigated by...

By Mr Joe Blogs By Jill Blogs




Mr Joe Blogs: 67%

Jill Blogs: 33%

13. The tone of the sent messages evolves dramatically over time, starting with highly aggressive and abusive language towards the recipient, marked by personal attacks and threats regarding shared responsibilities, particularly concerning a child. Initially, the messages are filled with derogatory comments and expletives, indicating a very unhealthy communication style characterized by hostility and blame. However, as time progresses, there is a noticeable shift in tone towards a more conciliatory approach, where expressions of frustration are replaced with a desire for cooperation and mediation, suggesting a potential improvement in the overall dialogue. By the end of the correspondence, the messages reflect attempts at constructive communication, indicating a move towards healthier interactions.

Outgoing Message Sentiment (Monthly)


Sent messages over time



14. The received messages reflect a significant shift in tone over time, transitioning from aggressive and confrontational language to a more cooperative and respectful approach. Initially, the correspondence is marked by hostility, threats, and negative remarks, primarily directed at Joe, with statements conveying disdain and demands. However, as time progresses, there is a noticeable effort to engage in more constructive dialogue, with messages emphasizing understanding, respect, and a willingness to collaborate for the benefit of their child. This evolution suggests an improvement in the tone of communication, moving from hostility towards a more polite and solution-oriented interaction.

Incoming Message Sentiment (Monthly)


Received messages over time



15. The series of conflict instigations reveals a pattern of escalating negativity between the parties involved. Initially, the tone of the messages demonstrates clear hostility, with instances of personal attacks and explicit language, such as the phrases "Does it give you that much pleasure to humiliate me?" and "Go fuck yourself Joe," suggesting a deterioration in politeness over time. In terms of frequency and toxicity, one party appears to be the more aggressive instigator, initiating confrontations more frequently and employing increasingly abusive language. As the timeline progresses, the tone from both sides tends to become more aggressive, indicating that instigation is increasing rather than decreasing. Overall, the correspondence reflects a trend towards greater conflict, with both parties contributing to the negative dynamic, but one consistently maintaining a more confrontational stance.

Conflict Initiations (Monthly)


Conflict instigators over time



Volatility & Recovery

These charts visualise escalation intensity over time and how quickly the parties return to neutral tone after conflict spikes.

16. The volatility index tracks how sharply tone shifts between months. It is calculated by aggregating sentiment variance across all analysed messages for both parties and normalising to a 0–100 scale so that larger swings produce higher peaks.



Overview

Text (email, messaging, social).

17. **Sources.**
 - a. List of Email conversations with Jill Blogs
18. **The positive.** The analyzed interactions reveal a gradual shift from hostility to constructive communication between Joe and Jill. Both participants display an evolving willingness to address their co-parenting challenges by expressing their concerns and frustrations while also suggesting practical solutions. Joe begins to articulate his frustrations more constructively and proposes mediation, indicating a desire for collaborative resolution. Similarly, Jill, despite starting defensively, shows a commitment to problem-solving by acknowledging her feelings and suggesting adjustments for better co-parenting. Their dialogues reflect an understanding of the impact of their disputes on their child, highlighting a mutual interest in improving their communication and co-parenting arrangements.
19. **The negative.** The analysed interactions reveal several negative communication behaviors, primarily characterized by aggressive confrontations, personal attacks, and emotionally charged exchanges. Both participants, Joe and Jill, frequently resort to insults and threats, particularly during discussions about their co-parenting challenges, which highlights their inability to communicate effectively under stress. Jill's use of explicit language to express frustration further exemplifies the confrontational nature of their dialogue. Initially defensive, both individuals engage in hostile exchanges that escalate before attempting to shift towards more constructive communication, indicating a tumultuous dynamic marked by emotional strain and misunderstanding.
20. **General communication analysis.** The communication analyzed in the documents reveals a notable progression from aggressive confrontations to attempts at constructive dialogue between Joe and Jill regarding their co-parenting issues. Initially, their exchanges are filled with personal attacks and emotional intensity, characterized by defensiveness and hostility. Over time, both participants exhibit a shift towards a more solution-focused approach, suggesting practical strategies to improve their communication and co-parenting dynamic. Despite occasional

conflicts, the overall trend indicates an emerging willingness to collaborate and negotiate, suggesting a growing awareness of the impact of their disputes on their child. This evolution illustrates a balance between emotional expression and practical problem-solving in their interactions.

Interaction details

21. This interaction spans 09 Apr 2024 to 09 Oct 2024 and contains 3 conversations comprising 44 messages (0 positive, 13 negative). The data was sourced from Text (email, messaging, social) records and reflects communications between the parties as imported from the connected platform.
22. The interaction centers around ongoing conflict between Joe and Jill regarding their parenting of Johnny, highlighting their difficulties in co-parenting. Joe frequently expresses frustration about Johnny's behavior and critiques Jill's parenting, leading to harsh exchanges filled with personal attacks and threats. As the dialogue progresses, both parties show signs of escalation but eventually begin to focus on negotiating co-parenting arrangements. Jill expresses feelings of being overwhelmed and mentions the possibility of seeking legal advice if issues persist, while both participants acknowledge the negative impact of their disputes on Johnny. The overall communication evolves from hostility to a more constructive approach, suggesting an emerging willingness to collaborate on finding solutions.
23. The interaction demonstrates a progression from conflict to attempts at resolution between the participants. Initially, conversations are characterized by aggressive confrontations, with personal insults and heightened emotions evident from both participants, particularly Joe and Jill, as they discuss their co-parenting challenges regarding Johnny's behavior. Joe frequently initiates discussions by voicing concerns and suggesting solutions, while Jill initially responds defensively but slowly shifts towards more constructive communication. The presence of frustration is notable, especially in Jill's direct confrontational remarks, reflecting the emotional strain in their interactions. Over time, both participants express a desire for better communication and co-parenting strategies, indicating a willingness to negotiate despite their initial hostilities. This blend of emotional expression and practical dialogue highlights the complexities of their relationship and their parenting dynamics.

24. joe@isaidusaid.com: Throughout the interaction, Joe demonstrates a communication style that evolves from frustration and confrontation to a more constructive engagement. Initially, he expresses concern over Johnny's behavior and critiques Jill's parenting in a direct and emotionally charged manner, which leads to hostile exchanges characterized by insults. As the interactions progress, however, there is a notable shift in his approach towards seeking resolutions. Joe begins to suggest mediation and acknowledges the complexities of their co-parenting situation, indicating a desire for improvement in their communication dynamics. His ability to articulate frustrations while also proposing solutions reflects an understanding of the impact their conflicts have on Johnny, ultimately revealing a gradual transition from aggression to a focus on collaboration and shared responsibilities.

25. jill@isaidusaid.com: Throughout the interaction, Jill's communication style is characterized by emotional intensity and a progression from defensiveness to a more solution-focused approach. Initially, she responds to Joe's accusations with defensiveness, often matching his confrontations with strong emotional reactions and even insults. However, over time, there is a noticeable shift where she begins to acknowledge the issues at hand and articulates her feelings of being overwhelmed. Jill expresses a desire to resolve their co-parenting challenges by suggesting practical solutions, such as creating a menu and discussing visitation adjustments. Despite moments of conflict and frustration, particularly when she directly insults Joe, she demonstrates a growing willingness to engage in constructive dialogue aimed at improving their co-parenting situation. This evolution reflects a balance between her emotional responses and a commitment to finding common ground for the benefit of their child.

26. Examples (Positive Communication)

a. Requests for mediation

joe@isaidusaid.com to jill@isaidusaid.com

Jill, I think it would be helpful for us to attend mediation sessions to resolve our differences. Joe

27. Examples (Negative Communication)

a. Devaluation

jill@isaidusaid.com to joe@isaidusaid.com

Joe, You're a worthless excuse for a parent, and Johnny would be better off without you. Jill VTxB

b. Insults

joe@isaidusaid.com to jill@isaidusaid.com

Jill, You're such a pathetic loser, no wonder Johnny doesn't want to spend time with you. Joe IB

jill@isaidusaid.com to joe@isaidusaid.com

Go fuck yourself Joe

c. Official mediation refusal

jill@isaidusaid.com to joe@isaidusaid.com

Joe, Oh, and I refuse to attend any mediation sessions, it's a waste of time. Jill OMRB

d. Body shaming

joe@isaidusaid.com to jill@isaidusaid.com

Jill, You're such a pathetic loser, no wonder Johnny doesn't want to spend time with you. Joe IB

jill@isaidusaid.com to joe@isaidusaid.com

Joe, You're so fat and lazy, no wonder Johnny doesn't respect you. Jill BSB

e. Contempt (Gottman Institute)

joe@isaidusaid.com to jill@isaidusaid.com

Jill, You're such a pathetic loser, no wonder Johnny doesn't want to spend time with you. Joe IB

f. Toxic language

jill@isaidusaid.com to joe@isaidusaid.com

Go fuck yourself Joe

joe@isaidusaid.com to jill@isaidusaid.com

Jill, Well, how about you come suck my dick for more time with Johnny? Joe SHB

g. Bullying

joe@isaidusaid.com to jill@isaidusaid.com

Jill, I'll make sure everyone knows what a terrible parent you are. Joe

h. Ultimatum

jill@isaidusaid.com to joe@isaidusaid.com

Joe, Fine, but If you don't agree to my terms, I'll make sure you regret it.

Jill TB

i. Blackmail

The report was generated by Artificial Intelligence, for more information, please go to www.isaidusaid.com

jill@isaidusaid.com to joe@isaidusaid.com

Joe, I'll tell everyone you've been abusing Johnny if you don't do what I want. Jill AAB

j. Profanity

jill@isaidusaid.com to joe@isaidusaid.com

Go fuck yourself Joe

joe@isaidusaid.com to jill@isaidusaid.com

Jill, Well, how about you come suck my dick for more time with Johnny?

Joe SHB

Audio/Video

28. Sources.

List of Video recordings with Jill Blogs

a. **Mr. Joe Blogs is seen striking Jill Blogs. (frames 30-31)** uploaded 08 Jan 2026

by Mr Joe Blogs

b. **Mr. Joe Blogs is seen choking Jill Blogs. (frames 72-92)** uploaded 08 Jan 2026

by Mr Joe Blogs

Mr. Joe Blogs is seen striking Jill Blogs. (frames 30-31)

Mr. Joe Blogs is seen choking Jill Blogs. (frames 72-92)

29. **The positive.** The analysed interactions reveal several positive communication behaviours, particularly at the beginning of conversations where playful banter and light-hearted teasing created an engaging atmosphere. Participants exhibited humor and camaraderie, with Joe attempting to maintain a positive vibe by suggesting enjoyable activities, such as buying drinks. However, the interactions took a negative turn with increasing accusations and a lack of conflict resolution, leading to physical confrontations. Evidence of physical aggression includes instances of striking and choking. Overall, while initial communication included fun and lightness, it quickly deteriorated into hostility.

30. **The negative.** The analyzed interactions reveal significant negative communication behaviors characterized by escalation and aggression, primarily illustrated through Mr. Joe Blogs' accusatory and dominating style. His confrontational approach towards Jill Blogs includes both verbal accusations and physical aggression, as evidenced by instances of striking and choking during the exchanges. This hostile environment is marked by a lack of constructive dialogue, with Jill responding defensively under

emotional distress and both participants failing to navigate the conflict effectively, ultimately culminating in physical altercations.

31. **General communication analysis.** The communication across the interactions reveals a primarily accusatory and aggressive tone from Mr. Joe Blogs, contrasting with Jill Blogs' defensive and emotional responses. Initial exchanges sometimes exhibit a playful banter that quickly devolves into tension, especially when trust issues arise, emphasizing the volatility of their relationship dynamics. Notable shifts occur as conversations progress, particularly when accusations are made—Jill's defensiveness escalates with Joe's aggression leading to confrontational situations and eventual physical altercations. Indicators of physical aggression are present, including instances of striking and choking, underscoring the severe nature of the conflicts. Overall, the patterns illustrate a lack of constructive dialogue and a progression from mild disagreement to intense hostility and violence.

Interaction details — Mr. Joe Blogs is seen striking Jill Blogs. (frames 30-31) uploaded 08 Jan 2026 by Mr Joe Blogs; **Mr. Joe Blogs is seen choking Jill Blogs. (frames 72-92)** uploaded 08 Jan 2026 by Mr Joe Blogs

32. This interaction spans 31 Dec 2025 to 31 Dec 2025 and contains 1 conversations comprising 15 messages (0 positive, 3 negative). The data was sourced from Audio records and reflects communications between the parties as imported from the connected platform.

33. In the interaction, Mr. Joe Blogs confronts Jill Blogs with accusations of humiliation stemming from her engagement with another man. The conversation quickly escalates into heightened aggression, with Mr. Joe dominating the dialogue through accusatory statements. Jill responds defensively, expressing emotional distress while denying the claims. The intensity of the exchange eventually culminates in a physical altercation, highlighting the conflict's volatile nature and the contrasting emotional reactions of the participants.

34. The interaction displays a communication style that is predominantly accusatory, with Mr. Joe Blogs taking a commanding role in the conversation. He confronts Jill Blogs with accusations of humiliation stemming from her interaction with another man, leading to a rapid escalation in tension. Jill responds defensively and emotionally, denying the allegations and reacting to Joe's aggression. The dynamic indicates a

The report was generated by Artificial Intelligence, for more information, please go to www.isaidusaid.com

lack of constructive conflict resolution, as Mr. Joe Blogs' dominating approach contributes to the overall escalation, culminating in a physical confrontation, showcasing a pattern marked by aggression and defensiveness.

35. Jill Blogs: In the interaction, Jill Blogs displays a defensive and emotional communication style in response to accusations from Mr. Joe Blogs. She denies the claims of humiliation and interacts reactively to his aggression, indicating a struggle to maintain her composure under escalating conflict. The conversation rapidly shifts from dialogue to confrontation, with Jill's responses primarily focused on denial and self-defense. Her tone reflects an emotional investment in the interaction, striving to mitigate the impact of accusations while navigating a tense atmosphere marked by Mr. Joe Blogs's aggressive questioning. Overall, her communication is characterized by a need to assert her innocence amidst hostile exchanges.

36. Mr Joe Blogs: Throughout the interaction, Mr. Joe Blogs exhibited a communication style characterized by aggression and accusation. He dominated the conversation right from the beginning, directing hostile questions toward Jill Blogs regarding her interactions with another man, which he perceived as humiliating. His tone escalated quickly, indicating a lack of restraint and leading towards an aggressive confrontation rather than seeking resolution or understanding. This approach resulted in a highly charged emotional exchange, with Mr. Joe Blogs firmly in control of the dialogue and showing little regard for the feelings or responses of his counterpart, ultimately culminating in a physical altercation. The interaction reflects a clear pattern of confrontational behavior and an unwillingness to engage in constructive dialogue.

37. Evidence

a. Mr Joe Blogs: Mr. Joe Blogs is seen striking Jill Blogs. (frames 30-31)



b. Mr Joe Blogs: Mr. Joe Blogs is seen choking Jill Blogs. (frames 72-92)











38. Examples (Negative Communication)

a. Striking

Mr Joe Blogs to Jill Blogs

Action:Mr Joe Blogs: Mr. Joe Blogs is seen striking Jill Blogs. (00:15)



b. Contempt (Gottman Institute)

Mr Joe Blogs to Jill Blogs

Does it give you that much pleasure to humiliate me?

c. Choking

Mr Joe Blogs to Jill Blogs

Action:Mr Joe Blogs: Mr. Joe Blogs is seen choking Jill Blogs. (00:36 - 00:46)



Interaction details

The report was generated by Artificial Intelligence, for more information, please go to www.isaidusaid.com

39. This interaction spans 01 Nov 2025 to 01 Nov 2025 and contains 1 conversations comprising 11 messages (0 positive, 2 negative). The data was sourced from Audio records and reflects communications between the parties as imported from the connected platform.

40. The interaction involves a conversation between Jill Blogs and Mr. Joe Blogs that begins with playful banter but quickly escalates into a serious confrontation. Initially, the two engage in light-hearted teasing regarding Joe's interactions with other girls at an event. However, the mood shifts dramatically when Jill sees another woman's name on Joe's phone, prompting her to demand honesty from him and express her distrust. The conversation ends with Jill insisting they need to resolve the issue after a physical confrontation, highlighting themes of jealousy and trust within their relationship. The exchange illustrates the balance between humor and tension, emphasizing how quickly a light discussion can turn into a conflict over personal insecurities.

41. The interaction showcases a dual communication style characterized by both humor and escalating tension. Initially, the participants engage in playful banter, with Jill and Joe joking about drinks and teasing each other, creating a lighthearted atmosphere. However, a sudden shift occurs when serious doubts about trust emerge, particularly from Jill, leading to a confrontational tone. Jill expresses suspicion regarding a woman's name on Joe's phone, demanding honesty and revealing deeper issues of distrust. This transition highlights the fragility of their interaction, where moments of camaraderie can swiftly evolve into serious allegations, illustrating the complex dynamics of their relationship.

42. Mr Joe Blogs: Throughout the interaction, Mr. Joe Blogs displays a communication style that begins with light-heartedness and humor, demonstrating a willingness to engage playfully with Jill. He responds jovially to her teasing and suggests positive actions, like buying drinks for others, aiming to maintain an upbeat atmosphere. However, this tone shifts significantly when trust issues arise, particularly when Jill confronts him about a woman's name on his phone. In response, Joe attempts to reassure her by explaining that the woman is merely an old friend, but he encounters increasing suspicion and anger from Jill. This dynamic showcases his struggle to balance humor with the seriousness of the accusations, revealing a communication pattern that fluctuates between amicability and tension as the conversation progresses.

43. Examples (Negative Communication)

The report was generated by AI. For more information, please go to www.isaidusaid.com

a. Coercive control

Jill Blogs to Mr Joe Blogs

Don't speak to her again... (door slams) Let me in. Open the (censored) door. Let's talk about this. Let me in.

b. Toxic language


Jill Blogs to Mr Joe Blogs

Don't be stupid. I knew it wasn't chicken... (laughs) Go get me a drink.
How many drinks do you need?

c. Insults

Jill Blogs to Mr Joe Blogs

Don't be stupid. I knew it wasn't chicken... (laughs) Go get me a drink.
How many drinks do you need?

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Cler Ribeiro", is written over a horizontal line. The signature is fluid and cursive, with a large, stylized 'C' and 'R'.

Cler Ribeiro
Chief Executive Officer
--End of Report--