ACTIONABLE AI

presents

AI Playbook

for Florida Family Law Firms

A Practical Guide to Implementing AI Responsibly, Ethically, and Profitably

actionableai.net · Prepared by Greg Yates - Updated October 8, 2026

Important Notice

This playbook is educational and informational. It is not legal advice, ethics counsel, or a substitute for consultation with the Florida Bar or qualified legal ethics counsel. AI tools, Florida Bar rules, and federal court directives change frequently. Verify current authorities and guidance before relying on anything in this document for client matters.

Nothing in this playbook creates an attorney-client relationship. Actionable AI is a consulting firm, not a law firm.

All sample policies, disclosures, and templates are starting points. Have a Florida-licensed attorney review them before adoption.

A note on numbers. Every figure here falls into one of three buckets, and you can tell which from the sentence around it. Statutory amounts, deadlines, and case outcomes carry their own citation and can be checked at the source. Third-party statistics name the body that produced them. Anything else is an Actionable AI working assumption, offered to be stress-tested against your firm's own rates, volumes, and matter values rather than repeated as fact.

Contents

What Changed: October 2026 Update 5

The Problem With Generic AI Advice 6

- What This Playbook Does Differently 6
- The Actionable AI Philosophy 6

Why Florida Family Law Is Different 8

- High Emotion Creates High Risk 8
- The Data Is Uniquely Sensitive 8
- Florida’s Statutory Landscape Is a Minefield 8
- The 2023 Alimony Reform: A Case Study in AI Risk 9

The Florida Ethics Reality 11

- The Five Rules That Matter Most 11
- Florida Bar Ethics Opinion 24-1 12

The Emerging Issues Most Family Law Firms Are Missing 14

- Bucket One: Safety Versus Symmetry 14

Bucket Two: Parentage Beyond Marriage..... 15
Bucket Three: Proof Before Persuasion..... 16
Best Use Cases by Practice Area..... 18
Dissolution of Marriage..... 18
Child Custody and Timesharing..... 18
Alimony: Post-2023 Reform..... 19
Equitable Distribution..... 19
Domestic Violence Matters..... 20
Post-Judgment Modification Matters..... 20
Paternity Matters..... 20
Prompts Library..... 22
Research Prompts..... 22
Document Drafting Prompts..... 24
Client Communication Prompts..... 25
Discovery and Litigation Prompts..... 26
Case Strategy and Mediation Prompts..... 27
Specialized Matter Prompts..... 28
Ethics Risks & Governance Framework..... 33
High-Risk Failure Modes..... 33
Vendor Due Diligence Checklist..... 34
Data Classification Framework..... 34
Approved Tool List..... 35
Staff Training Requirements..... 36
Appendix A: Sample AI Governance Policy..... 37
1. Purpose..... 37
2. General Principles..... 37
3. Definitions..... 37

4. Permitted Uses....38
5. Prohibited Uses....38
6. Confidentiality and Data Handling....38
7. Court and Tribunal Filings....38
8. Family Law Practice Addendum....39
9. Incident Response....39
10. Acknowledgment....39
Appendix B: Client AI Disclosure Statement....40
Implementation Notes....40
Appendix C: Court AI Disclosure & Certification....41
Implementation Notes....41
Appendix D: Letter to AI Vendors....43
Appendix E: 90-Day Implementation Roadmap....44
Days 1–30: Foundation....44
Days 31–60: Build Proficiency....44
Days 61–90: Optimize and Expand....45
Appendix F: Authorities....46
Appendix G: Interim AI Use Policy and Checklist....47
About Actionable AI....49
What We Do....49
Who This Playbook Is For....49

What Changed: October 2026 Update

If you read one page, read this one. Here is what moved since the last edition, and what to do about it.

When	What changed	What to do
Oct. 1, 2026	SC2026-1262: every family law form is now a "Florida Supreme Court Approved Family Law Form." The Court can change forms by order, outside normal rulemaking. Comments due Nov. 24, 2026.	Pull forms from flcourts.gov every time. Never let AI rebuild a form from memory.
June 15, 2026	SC2026-0673 amends Rule 2.515(d)(2): every signer represents that cited authorities "exist and are accurately cited."	Citation checking is now a signature-level duty in state court.
May 28, 2026	AOSC26-12 bars circuit-level AI disclosure and certification orders.	Stop tracking local state-court AI orders. Keep checking federal standing orders.
Aug. 21, 2026	*Capital Standard* (2d DCA): 46 fabricated or unsupported citations. Briefs struck, $1,500 fine, fees, Bar referral.	Verify every citation against a primary source. Every one.
Dec. 30, 2025	*Brito v. Salas*: § 742.14 donor relinquishment is not automatic for at-home insemination.	Ask how the child was conceived at intake.
Jan. 1, 2027	California SB 574 takes effect for California lawyers.	Not Florida law. Read it as a preview.

Also new in this edition: a sample Approved Tool List naming five tools, a workable Tier 4 rule, working-assumption time numbers for each practice area, corrected court-disclosure defaults, and Appendix G, a two-page interim policy your team can sign this week.

What did not change: the alimony statute (§ 61.08) and the child support guidelines (§ 61.30) have not been amended since 2023. The 2023 rewrites are still the main trap.

The Problem With Generic AI Advice

Here is what most AI consultants will not tell you: the generic AI advice flooding your inbox right now was written for tech companies. Not law firms. Not Florida law firms. And definitely not Florida family law firms representing people in the worst weeks of their lives.

It does not know that you practice under the Rules Regulating The Florida Bar. It does not know that your client told you about the affair in confidence. It does not know that the judge on your next contested hearing is the one in your circuit who hates technology. It does not know that the 2023 alimony reform changed the math on every modification case you have.

Generic AI advice produces generic results. In a Florida family law practice, that means wrong results at the worst possible time: in an emergency hearing, in a contested timesharing trial, in front of a client whose life is already in pieces.

What This Playbook Does Differently

This playbook was built specifically for small Florida family law firms, solos and firms running dissolution, custody, support, paternity, post-judgment modification, and the occasional collaborative matter. It assumes you are a practicing attorney, not a technology enthusiast. It assumes your clients are in crisis, not choosing between vendors.

It answers three questions that matter:

1. What specific tasks should you use AI for, and which ones are career-ending traps?
2. What are the real ethics and confidentiality risks, and how do you build guardrails that hold?
3. How do you implement this without blowing up your practice or your bar license?

That is it. No technology evangelism. No breathless predictions about how AI will transform the legal profession by 2030. Just what works, what does not, and how to get started without getting disbarred.

The Actionable AI Philosophy

Tools serve lawyers. Not the other way around.

The family law firm that will benefit most from AI is not the one that adopts it fastest. It is the one that adopts it most deliberately. That means knowing exactly what you are asking a tool to do, why you are asking it, and what the failure modes look like before they show up in a client's case.

Family law is not a commodity practice. Your clients hire you for judgment under pressure, your ability to read a courtroom, and your knowledge of the specific judge and the local custody evaluator. AI does not give you any of that. What AI can do is take the repetitive, time-intensive work off your plate so you can spend more of your day doing the work only a lawyer can do.

THE ACTIONABLE AI TEST

Before implementing any AI tool in your practice, ask these four questions:

1. Does this tool have a Data Processing Agreement (DPA) or equivalent available for your account level?
2. Where does client data go, and who can access it?
3. Can you verify the output before it reaches a client, a court, or opposing counsel?
4. Would you be comfortable if the Florida Bar knew you were using this tool for this purpose?

If you cannot answer all four questions confidently, you are not ready to use that tool for client matters.

Why Florida Family Law Is Different

Every practice area has its own relationship with AI. Trust and estates lawyers worry about defective instruments. Tax lawyers worry about hallucinated authorities. Criminal defense lawyers worry about deadlines and machine-made evidence. Family lawyers worry about all of that, plus a client population in crisis and a body of Florida statute that just got rewritten.

High Emotion Creates High Risk

Family law clients are not in a good place. They are going through divorce, custody fights, domestic violence proceedings, or the financial fallout of a marriage that failed. Their emotional state affects how they perceive your work, your fees, and your communication. It also affects how they will react if they find out, or worse, if opposing counsel tells the judge, that AI played a role in their case without their knowledge.

This is not hypothetical. Client trust is foundational in family law in a way it is not in, say, commercial litigation. A business client does not particularly care if you used AI to draft their licensing agreement. A divorcing parent reading their parenting plan cares very much that a human lawyer they trusted thought through every word. The client disclosure template in Appendix B handles this correctly.

The Data Is Uniquely Sensitive

Look at what sits in a typical family law file: Social Security numbers, bank account records, credit card statements, tax returns, mental health evaluations, substance abuse histories, domestic violence narratives, children's school records, immigration status, medical conditions. Sometimes all in the same matter.

That file is one careless AI prompt away from a confidentiality violation under Rule 4-1.6 if you are not paying attention. The question, the critical question most AI guidance skips, is not whether to use AI. It is which tool, with what data, under what agreement, and who is allowed to touch it.

Florida's Statutory Landscape Is a Minefield

Florida family law statutes require analysis that trips up experienced practitioners, let alone AI models trained on pre-2023 data. The 2023 alimony reform under SB 1416 (effective July 1, 2023) is the headline example, but it is not the only place where statute, case law, and local practice diverge from what a general-purpose model will produce on first ask.

Critical Florida statutes your AI tools need to handle correctly:

Statute	Subject and Complexity Note
F.S. § 61.08	Alimony, completely restructured in 2023. Models trained before mid-2023 may apply pre-reform rules. Verify all output against current statute.
F.S. § 61.13	Timesharing and parental responsibility. Twenty best-interest factors. AI is useful for factor analysis; judgment calls require a lawyer.

F.S. § 61.075	Equitable distribution. Marital vs. non-marital classification. AI can frame the legal framework; valuations require experts.
F.S. § 61.30	Child support guidelines. The calculation is mechanical, AI can help. Deviation analysis requires more care.
F.S. § 61.13001	Relocation with a minor child. Notice and process rules are strict. AI for research; lawyer for filings.
F.S. §§ 61.55–61.58	Collaborative family law process. Use AI for document prep, not process advice.
F.S. § 741.28–32, § 741.30	Domestic violence. High-stakes. Lean hard toward no AI-generated content in actual pleadings without careful human review.
F.S. § 742	Paternity. Genetic testing, legitimacy, rights. AI useful for research; avoid AI-drafted pleadings without careful human review.
Art. X, § 4, Fla. Const.	Homestead. Appears frequently in equitable distribution. Constitutional analysis requires human judgment.

The 2023 Alimony Reform: A Case Study in AI Risk

On July 1, 2023, two separate bills rewrote Florida family law. SB 1416 (ch. 2023-315) restructured alimony: Florida courts may no longer award permanent alimony under current § 61.08, but existing permanent alimony awards may still require § 61.14 analysis. New caps were placed on durational alimony. CS/HB 1301 (ch. 2023-301) added a rebuttable presumption of equal time-sharing to F.S. § 61.13 and removed the 'unanticipated' requirement for modifying parenting plans and time-sharing schedules. Support and alimony modification rules were separately amended under § 61.14's changed-circumstances framework. [Source: 61.08; 61.13]

AI language models have training data cutoffs. Depending on when a model was trained and how its training data was selected, it may not correctly apply the post-2023 framework. This is not theoretical. It is the most predictable AI failure mode in current Florida family law practice. Every time you use AI for an alimony question, you are placing a bet on whether the model knows what year it is.

The rule: whenever you use AI for alimony analysis, explicitly tell the model to apply the current F.S. § 61.08 framework as amended effective July 1, 2023, and verify every output against the current statute and current case law. Do not assume. Verify.

IMPORTANT

Family law files sit at the top of the sensitivity scale, and the tool you may use depends entirely on what class of data the task touches. The firm runs one classification framework, set out in the Ethics Risks & Governance Framework chapter: Tier 1 public information, Tier 2 anonymized matter facts, Tier 3 client identifiers and matter facts, Tier 4 highly sensitive. Social Security numbers, children's full names and dates of birth, domestic violence narratives, mental health diagnoses, immigration status, and medical records are always Tier 4. Tier 4 data goes only into a named enterprise or legal-specific tool on the firm's Approved Tool List, and only after a responsible attorney signs off in writing. When in doubt, do not paste.

The Florida Ethics Reality

The Rules Regulating The Florida Bar were not written with AI in mind. They apply anyway. The good news is the framework is not new, the Rules already require competence, confidentiality, supervision, and candor. The bad news is the application is unsettled and the consequences for getting it wrong are not.

Florida Bar Ethics Opinion 24-1 addresses generative AI directly. It is required reading for any Florida family lawyer using these tools. The Florida Bar has also been active through its Professional Ethics Committee, Family Law Section publications, the Florida Supreme Court rules committee, and circuit administrative orders. Check floridabar.org for current opinions.

The Five Rules That Matter Most

RULE 4-1.1: COMPETENCE (AND TECHNOLOGICAL COMPETENCE)

The comment to Rule 4-1.1 requires keeping up with changes in the law and its practice, including the benefits and risks of relevant technology. This is your duty to understand what AI can and cannot do well enough to supervise its output intelligently.

In practice: you do not need to understand transformer architecture. You do need to know what data a tool sees, where that data goes, what the tool tends to get wrong, and what a competent attorney must do to verify output before it reaches a client or a court.

RULE 4-1.6: CONFIDENTIALITY OF INFORMATION

Family law files contain some of the most sensitive personal, financial, and family data that exists. Rule 4-1.6 prohibits revealing information relating to representation of a client without consent. When you paste a client's information into a public AI tool, even briefly, you are arguably making such a disclosure to the tool's provider.

The practical bright line: enterprise AI tools with appropriate contractual protections may be used for client-specific work, but only after vendor diligence on confidentiality, security, breach notice, and data retention. Florida Bar Ethics Opinion 24-1 also recommends informed client consent before using third-party generative AI that discloses confidential information. A DPA alone is not a substitute for that diligence and consent. Free consumer tiers are not, no matter how much faster they feel. Re-identification risk means even "anonymized" client data does not justify free-tool use on a real matter. One more confidentiality trap sits outside the tool stack: Florida is a two-party consent state under § 934.03. No AI notetaker or transcription assistant may join a call, meeting, or conversation with a client, opposing counsel, a guardian ad litem, or any third party without prior consent from everyone present. As a firm protocol, capture that consent on the record. Several video platforms now enable transcription by default, which makes this the easiest accidental violation in a small firm. [Sources: Opinion 24-1; 934.03]

RULE 4-5.3: RESPONSIBILITIES REGARDING NONLAWYER ASSISTANCE

Florida Bar guidance has applied the supervision principle to AI tools: you are responsible for AI output the same way you are responsible for a paralegal's work. Nonlawyer assistance, human or otherwise, must be supervised.

In a small family law firm, the volume pressure creates the specific risk here. It is tempting to process AI-drafted parenting plans, motions, and client letters in batch without the same line-by-line review a paralegal's draft would get. Resist. AI does not get tired of producing plausible-sounding wrong answers. You are the one who catches them.

RULE 4-3.3: CANDOR TOWARD THE TRIBUNAL

AI tools hallucinate case citations. This is not a bug that will eventually be fixed. It is an inherent feature of how language models predict plausible text. A plausible-sounding case is what they are built to produce, whether or not the case exists.

Florida has its own recent example. In Capital Standard, LLC v. U.S. Bank National Association, No. 2D2024-1392 (Fla. 2d DCA Aug. 21, 2026), the court struck both briefs, fined counsel $1,500, made him personally pay the opposing party's fees for answering the amended brief, and referred him to the Florida Bar after 46 fabricated or unsupported citations appeared across two briefs. Every AI-generated citation gets verified against a primary source before it enters any court filing. Not spot-checked. Verified. All of them. One fabricated citation is a Rule 4-3.3 problem and the kind of problem that reaches the local paper.

RULE 4-1.5: REASONABLE FEES

This rule creates a particular pressure in family law. If AI compresses a three-hour drafting task to twenty minutes, charging three hours at hourly rates raises a Rule 4-1.5 question. The fee must be reasonable, and the work must justify the charge.

Flat fees and value-based fees handle this cleanly, and most small family law firms already use flat fees for uncontested dissolutions, prenups, and routine post-judgment work. If you bill hourly on contested matters, document AI use in the file and bill what the work actually warrants.

Florida Bar Ethics Opinion 24-1

The Florida Bar Professional Ethics Committee issued Ethics Opinion 24-1 in January 2024, addressing generative AI directly. It covers confidentiality obligations under Rule 4-1.6, the duty of competence under Rule 4-1.1, supervision under Rule 4-5.3, and candor under Rule 4-3.3. Read it.

Beyond Opinion 24-1, the Florida Supreme Court has set a statewide standard: Rule of General Practice and Judicial Administration 2.515(d)(2), as amended by Opinion SC2026-0673 (effective June 15, 2026), backed by a companion administrative order (AOSC26-12) that preempts circuit-level AI disclosure and certification requirements. Do not rely on local Florida state-court AI orders; federal judges keep their own standing orders, which must be checked separately. Watch the Florida Bar Family Law Section and floridabar.org for developments. This area moves fast.

An outside reference point. California SB 574, signed September 30, 2026 and effective January 1, 2027, puts lawyer AI rules into statute for California practitioners: no delegating the practice of law to generative AI, no confidential information in tools that are not restricted to the lawyer and authorized persons, reasonable steps to verify output, and personal verification of every citation in a court filing. It does not govern Florida lawyers. It is where the rules are heading.

IMPORTANT

Any citation generated by AI, case, statute, regulation, Bar opinion, must be independently verified against a primary source before it appears in a research memo, a client letter, or a court filing.

Not the AI's secondary source. Not another AI tool. The primary source. Lexis, Westlaw, the Florida Statutes, the official court website.

Build this into your workflow as a non-negotiable verification step. It is the single best protection against the Capital Standard v. U.S. Bank outcome.

The same discipline applies to financial work. Spot-check standard: verify a 20 percent sample of the line items in an AI-assembled financial affidavit summary against the underlying statements.

Full-verification standard: 100 percent of income figures, asset values, and account balances on any contested equitable distribution or support matter, and on any case involving a business interest, a dependent adult child, or a durational alimony calculation.

Document the verification in the matter file: who checked, against what source, on what date.

The Emerging Issues Most Family Law Firms Are Missing

Here is the uncomfortable part. The statutes you trained on are not the statutes you practice under. Florida rewrote timesharing and alimony in 2023, the Supreme Court reopened parentage at the end of 2025, and the evidence in your next custody fight is sitting on a phone, not in a banker's box. The generic AI tools, and the generic AI advice that comes with them, have not caught up. Neither have most template packets.

> **THE OLD TEMPLATE PACKET**
>
> The old family-law template packet is not dead. It is worse. It is dangerous.
>
> A form that cites the pre-2023 alimony framework, ignores the equal-timesharing presumption, or treats a sperm donor's rights as settled does not save you time. It sets a trap with your name on it.

Three clusters of issues are moving fast enough that a small firm running last year's forms, or an AI model trained on last year's law, will get them wrong. Group them this way.

Bucket One: Safety Versus Symmetry

Since July 1, 2023, Florida law presumes that equal time-sharing of a minor child is in the best interest of the child. The presumption is rebuttable, but only by a preponderance of the evidence. F.S. § 61.13(2)(c)1, as amended by CS/HB 1301. That one sentence rewired custody litigation. In a contested case, equal time-sharing is presumed to be in the child's best interest, but the presumption is rebuttable; it does not automatically impose a 50/50 schedule. The court still weighs the § 61.13 best-interest factors and must make written findings when ordering another arrangement. Everything after that is the fight to rebut the presumption. [Source: 61.13]

The rebuttal battleground is safety. Domestic violence, coercive control, substance abuse, and child endangerment are where the presumption breaks. Greyson's Law (CS/CS/SB 130 (House companion HB 97), 2023) added a pattern of coercive and controlling behavior to the factors a court weighs in deciding whether a petitioner faces imminent danger under the domestic violence injunction statute, F.S. § 741.30, and it requires courts to weigh threats of domestic or sexual violence against a child or parent when deciding parental responsibility and timesharing, whether or not a separate case was ever filed. [Sources: SB130; 61.13; 741.30]

— AI helps: Building the rebuttal record, organizing incident chronologies, mapping each fact to the § 61.13 best-interest factors, and drafting the written findings a court must make when domestic-violence evidence is considered.

— AI helps: Researching the current injunction standard under § 741.30 and the coercive-control and Greyson's Law amendments.

— AI does not: Conduct safety planning, weigh credibility, or decide whether the presumption is rebutted. That is judgment under pressure, and it is yours.

CHECK THE DATE ON YOUR FORMS

Any contested timesharing form, parenting plan, or AI prompt involving a minor child that does not start from the equal-timesharing presumption is working from repealed law.

Tell the model explicitly: apply F.S. § 61.13 as amended effective July 1, 2023, including the rebuttable presumption of equal time-sharing.

Forms update, October 1, 2026. In SC2026-1262, the Florida Supreme Court amended Rule 12.015 to unify family-law forms under the designation "Florida Supreme Court Approved Family Law Forms." The Court may now create, amend, or abrogate forms by order or opinion, outside the normal rulemaking process, so forms can change faster than your template folder. Comments on the amendments are open until November 24, 2026. Never let an AI tool reproduce a Supreme Court form from memory. An older title alone does not invalidate a form; the redesignation does not change other rulings on its validity or use. Check the current version on the Florida Courts Family Law Forms page before using a saved template or AI-assisted form. [Sources: SC2026-1262; Official forms]

Bucket Two: Parentage Beyond Marriage

Paternity, assisted reproduction, surrogacy, special-needs adult children, and nontraditional family structures used to be edge cases. They are Tuesday. And Florida's law here is unsettled in ways that punish anyone relying on a generic form.

In Brito v. Salas, Nos. SC2024-1184 & SC2024-1190 (Fla. Dec. 30, 2025), the Florida Supreme Court held, 4 to 3, that the donor-relinquishment rule in F.S. § 742.14 does not automatically apply when conception happens through at-home artificial insemination outside the statutory assisted-reproduction framework. The Court quashed the Second District's decision but did not declare the donor a legal parent or create a three-parent rule; it left his rights to other sources of paternity law. The takeaway for your practice: § 742.14 is no longer the clean, automatic answer practitioners assumed. [Source: Brito]

The statutory map matters, and AI models routinely blur it: F.S. § 742.11 (assisted conception and artificial insemination), § 742.13 (definitions, including gestational surrogacy), § 742.14 (donor relinquishment), and §§ 742.15–.16 (gestational surrogacy contracts). Add the F.S. § 742 paternity actions and the dependent-adult-child support framework in F.S. § 743.07(2) and § 61.1255, which allow support past 18 where the incapacity began before majority. Watch who may file: under § 61.1255 a parent or other person may bring the action on the dependent adult child's behalf, as may the adult child, or a chapter 393 guardian advocate or chapter 744 guardian if the right has been removed, and suit may be filed once the child reaches 17 years and 6 months. Two practical points the statute adds. Parents may fold dependent-adult support into an existing child-support case only if the written agreement reaches the court before the child turns 18; after that it takes a separate circuit-court proceeding. And the Department of Revenue may not file to establish, modify, or enforce support under this section, so the client cannot route it through DOR the way they might a standard support case. [Source: 61.1255]

- AI helps: Mapping which parentage statute governs a given conception path; drafting paternity petitions, ART and surrogacy intake checklists, and consent documents for attorney review; spotting the § 743.07(2) standing and timing issues before the child turns 18.

- AI does not: Resolve the open questions Brito created, predict how your circuit will apply it, or tell you whether the genetic-testing result will surface something the client is not ready for.

THE INTAKE QUESTION MOST FIRMS SKIP

Add three questions to intake: How was the child conceived? Is there a dependent adult child whose disability began before 18? Have more than two adults acted as this child's parents?

Each answer can change the statute that governs, and the form you should never have pulled off the shelf.

Bucket Three: Proof Before Persuasion

The persuasive brief is worthless if the proof underneath it is fabricated, inadmissible, or invented by a chatbot. In family law, the evidence has moved onto devices, and so has the malpractice.

Two things are now core litigation work. First, digital evidence: text messages, social media, screenshots, location data, and hidden cryptocurrency. Florida family courts generally analyze digital assets and cryptocurrency under the equitable-distribution framework in F.S. § 61.075; that statute is not crypto-specific. The assets may need to be disclosed, classified as marital or nonmarital, valued, and distributed. Concealment is a routine fight. IRS Form 1099-DA adds visibility into certain broker-handled activity. Brokers report gross proceeds for transactions effected on or after January 1, 2025; cost-basis reporting applies only to covered digital assets acquired on or after January 1, 2026 and held at the same broker. It does not capture every self-custody or noncustodial transfer. The form tells you what moved, not what it cost. Self-custody wallets, foreign platforms, and peer-to-peer transfers still take discovery, subpoenas, and forensic blockchain tracing to surface. Every screenshot still has to clear authentication under F.S. § 90.901. [Sources: 61.075; IRS 1099-DA]

Second, AI-generated citations. This is where careers end. In Capital Standard, LLC v. U.S. Bank National Association, No. 2D2024-1392 (Fla. 2d DCA Aug. 21, 2026), counsel's amended brief contained at least 31 fabricated or unsupported citations, and his reply brief added 15 more; the court struck both briefs and fined him $1,500. And effective June 15, 2026, Florida Supreme Court Opinion SC2026-0673 amends Rule of General Practice and Judicial Administration 2.515(d)(2) to require every signer, lawyer or self-represented, to represent that cited authorities "exist and are accurately cited." That rule governs Florida state courts. Federal courts run on their own judges' standing orders; check them before every filing. [Sources: Capital Standard; SC2026-0673]

— AI helps: Organizing and timelining digital evidence, drafting authentication foundations under § 90.901, building discovery requests for devices and crypto, and cite-checking, confirming every authority is real before it reaches a judge.

— AI does not: Authenticate evidence for you, value a volatile crypto holding, or stand behind a citation. "The AI made it up" is not a defense.

IMPORTANT

Under SC2026-0673 (eff. June 15, 2026, Florida state courts), your signature certifies that every cited authority exists and is accurately cited. Check federal judges' standing orders separately.

> No citation enters a filing, memo, or client letter until it is confirmed against Westlaw, Lexis, or the official court database.

None of this means slow down. It means start from current law, build the proof before you build the argument, and keep a human between the model and the courtroom. That is the whole job.

Best Use Cases by Practice Area

A small Florida family law practice runs roughly the same pipeline whether you are in Daytona, Tampa, Miami, or Jacksonville: dissolution (contested and uncontested), custody and timesharing, alimony, equitable distribution, domestic violence, paternity, and post-judgment modifications. Each one has its own AI fit and its own risk profile.

Dissolution of Marriage

Both contested and uncontested dissolution matters benefit from AI, but in different ways. Uncontested matters are highly systematizable. AI delivers fast value there. Contested matters require more careful integration, AI handles production well, judgment stays with the lawyer.

UNCONTESTED / SIMPLIFIED DISSOLUTION

- AI helps: Document automation for the Petition for Dissolution, Financial Affidavits, and Marital Settlement Agreement from a structured intake questionnaire. Client communication letters that walk clients through process and document gathering. Document checklists tailored to the specific circumstances (children, real property, retirement accounts, business interests). First-pass population of Florida Supreme Court Approved Family Law Forms, always starting from the current version on flcourts.gov.
- AI does not: Read whether this is actually "uncontested" or whether one spouse is signing under duress. Catch the buried business interest the client did not mention. Notice the family dynamic the intake form did not capture.

Working assumption: *a first-draft uncontested packet (petition, financial affidavit, MSA) from a structured intake drops from about 3 hours to about 1 hour, attorney review included. Stress-test it against your own time records.*

CONTESTED DISSOLUTION

- AI helps: First drafts of interrogatories, requests for production, and requests for admissions tailored to the financial complexity of the matter. Research on equitable distribution issues (business valuation, dissipation, commingling). Deposition outlines and potential questions for financial witnesses. Timeline reconstruction from financial records into a coherent narrative for mediation or trial. First-version trial briefs, proposed findings, and closing argument outlines.
- AI does not: Pick which case to cite in your jurisdiction. Read your judge's tolerance for any of it. Know which expert your circuit's bench actually respects.

Working assumption: *first-draft financial interrogatories and requests for production drop from about 2 hours to about 45 minutes before attorney edits.*

Child Custody and Timesharing

F.S. § 61.13 sets out twenty factors for determining a timesharing schedule that is in the best interest of the child. AI earns its keep on factor analysis, running through each statutory factor systematically against your client's facts and identifying which favor your position and which carry risk.

- AI helps: Factor analysis against the twenty best-interest factors. Detailed parenting plan drafting including holiday schedules, communication protocols, and decision-making frameworks. Relocation research under F.S. § 61.13001 and synthesis of how courts have weighed the factors in your jurisdiction. Guardian ad litem prep questions and issue lists. Parenting coordinator referral summaries.
- AI does not: Predict how a specific judge will rule. Pick up on the parental alienation pattern that does not show up in the documents. Know the local custody evaluator's preferences.

Working assumption: *a twenty-factor timesharing analysis memo drops from 2 to 3 hours to about 1 hour, verification included.*

> NOTE
>
> AI can analyze factors and identify patterns in case law.
>
> It cannot predict how a specific judge will rule. Your local knowledge matters.
>
> Never let AI factor analysis substitute for your judgment about the specific judge and jurisdiction in front of you. That is what you are paid for.

Alimony: Post-2023 Reform

The 2023 alimony reform is the practice area where AI provides the most upside and carries the most risk of outdated analysis. The statutory framework changed fundamentally. Use AI here aggressively for analysis but always with a verification step.

- AI helps: Walking through the new statutory factors and framing the analysis under the reformed § 61.08 framework. Ability-to-pay and need analysis from financial disclosure. Drafting rehabilitation plans for bridge-the-gap or rehabilitative alimony. Researching the new substantial change of circumstances standard under the 2023 amendments. Present-value analysis of different alimony scenarios for settlement.
- AI does not: Know what your judge actually thinks of the durational caps. Read the opposing party's real ability to pay. Catch the discretionary deviation argument that wins this kind of case in your circuit.

Always include this language when prompting AI for alimony analysis: "Apply Florida's alimony statute as amended effective July 1, 2023 under SB 1416. Florida courts may no longer award permanent alimony under current § 61.08, but existing permanent alimony awards may still require § 61.14 analysis. Apply the new durational caps under § 61.08. (Note: the rebuttable presumption of equal timesharing is a § 61.13 issue; keep it in parenting/time-sharing prompts, not alimony analysis.)" [Source: 61.08]

Equitable Distribution

- AI helps: Organizing financial disclosures into a clean marital balance sheet. Researching marital vs. non-marital classification for specific asset types (inheritance, pre-marital property, commingled assets). Researching dissipation case law in Florida, meaning what courts have found constitutes dissipation and what they have not. Preparing questions for the business valuation expert and understanding valuation methodologies. QDRO drafting support (always have a QDRO specialist verify). Comparative analyses of distribution scenarios.

- AI does not: Value the business. Trace the commingled brokerage account. Catch the fraudulent transfer the forensic accountant will need to find.

Working assumption: *a marital balance sheet from produced financial disclosures drops from about 4 hours to about 1.5 hours, with 100 percent of figures verified against the statements.*

Domestic Violence Matters

This is the practice area requiring the most caution with AI. The stakes are immediate and physical. AI errors here can have consequences no malpractice insurance can fix.

- AI helps: Researching standards for injunctions under F.S. § 741.30 and related case law. Organizing a client's account of incidents into a chronological narrative for the petition, with mandatory human review. Compiling general safety planning resources (actual safety planning requires trained human professionals, not AI). Post-injunction research on contempt enforcement, modification standards, and geographic expansion.
- AI does not: Conduct safety planning. Draft an injunction petition without word-by-word attorney review. Substitute for human judgment in a case where physical safety is on the line.

> **CAREER-ENDING TRAP**
>
> Every word of every court filing in a domestic violence matter is reviewed by a licensed attorney before filing. No exceptions.
>
> The consequences of error in this context, for your client's physical safety, are too serious.

Post-Judgment Modification Matters

- AI helps: Researching what Florida courts have found constitutes a substantial and material change in circumstances for modification of support or alimony. Note: for time-sharing, the 'unanticipated' requirement was removed by the 2023 amendment; the standard is now substantial and material change of circumstances and best interests of the child. Drafting motions to modify with jurisdiction-specific formatting. Analyzing financial documents to document and quantify changed income for modification proceedings. Drafting motions for contempt for non-payment of support or violation of parenting plan. Drafting relocation petitions and supporting memoranda under F.S. § 61.13001.
- AI does not: Know which modification standard applies to your specific issue. Read whether the modification is going to feel retaliatory to the judge.

Working assumption: *a first-draft motion to modify drops from about 90 minutes to about 30 minutes before attorney review.*

Paternity Matters

- AI helps: Researching paternity establishment standards and rights under F.S. § 742. Drafting petitions to establish paternity and related motions. Summarizing differences in parental rights between married and unmarried parents under Florida law. Explaining the options and processes for legitimation.

- AI does not: Read whether genetic testing is going to surface something the client is not ready for. Manage the relationship dynamics that often drive these cases.

> **NOTE**
>
> AI-drafted family law documents are a starting point, not a finished product. Every parenting plan, MSA, motion, and pleading that will be filed or executed gets a line-by-line read by a Florida-licensed attorney against current Florida statute and case law.
>
> Florida-specific traps to verify on every draft: post-2023 alimony framework, equal-timesharing presumption under § 61.13, twenty best-interest factors, homestead under Art. X, § 4, equitable distribution classification under § 61.075, parenting plan minimum content, all-party consent under F.S. § 934.03 before recording protected communications.
>
> Document the review. The attorney-level read goes in the matter file.

Prompts Library

These prompts are starting points. Written for a small Florida family law practice handling dissolution, custody, support, paternity, and post-judgment modification work. Replace bracketed fields with matter-specific information before running. Strip client identifiers in non-approved tools.

IMPORTANT

Strip client identifiers before running any of these in a non-approved tool.

Verify every legal citation, statutory reference, and Bar opinion against a primary source before any output reaches a client, court, or opposing counsel.

Document the AI use in the matter file: tool, date, task, attorney.

Research Prompts

PROMPT 01: TIMESHARING FACTOR ANALYSIS · Custody: contested timesharing initial assessment

```
You are a Florida family law research assistant.
Analyze the following facts against Florida's twenty best-interest
factors under F.S. § 61.13(3)(a)–(t).
For each factor, state:
  (1) how the facts apply,
  (2) whether this factor favors Parent A, Parent B, or is neutral,
  (3) what additional information would strengthen the analysis.
Use Parent A / Parent B / Child A / Child B. No real names or SSNs.
Output: A factor-by-factor table followed by a one-paragraph summary.
```

PROMPT 02: POST-2023 ALIMONY ANALYSIS · Alimony: initial analysis under reformed statute

```
You are a Florida family law attorney analyzing an alimony claim.
Apply Florida's alimony statute as amended effective July 1, 2023
under SB 1416. Florida courts may no longer award permanent alimony under
current § 61.08, but existing permanent alimony awards may still require §
61.14 analysis.
The statute now provides for temporary, bridge-the-gap, rehabilitative,
and durational alimony with caps tied to marriage length.
Facts:
  - Marriage length: [X years]
  - Need vs. ability summary: [brief description]
  - Relevant § 61.08 factors: [list applicable factors]
Output: Issue, conclusion, analysis under the post-2023 framework,
authorities. Note any place where pre-reform precedent may not apply.
```

PROMPT 03: EQUITABLE DISTRIBUTION RESEARCH · Research: marital vs. non-marital asset classification

```
You are a Florida family law research assistant.
Research and summarize Florida law on the following equitable
distribution issue under F.S. § 61.075:
Issue: [Describe specific issue, e.g., classification of
inheritance received during marriage that was commingled.]
Constraints:
  - Cite Florida statutory and case authority.
  - Note any circuit splits in Florida.
  - Identify additional facts that would change the analysis.
Output: A research memo, no more than three pages, with sections
for issue, conclusion, analysis, and authorities.
```

PROMPT 04: DISSIPATION OF MARITAL ASSETS · Research: dissipation claim in contested dissolution

```
Research Florida law on dissipation of marital assets under
F.S. § 61.075. Address:
  1. The legal definition of dissipation.
  2. What constitutes and does not constitute dissipation.
  3. Timing: when in the marriage breakdown courts have found
     dissipation; when they have not.
  4. Remedies available in equitable distribution.
Output: A research memo with citations to Florida case law.
```

PROMPT 05: DOMESTIC VIOLENCE INJUNCTION STANDARDS · Research: injunction under F.S. § 741.30

```
Research Florida's standards for domestic violence injunctions
under F.S. § 741.30. Address:
  1. What constitutes domestic violence under Florida law.
  2. The legal standard for granting a temporary (ex parte)
     injunction vs. a final injunction.
  3. Burden of proof and evidentiary considerations.
  4. Duration, modification, and enforcement.
Use public primary sources only. Do not include client-specific facts in
this prompt.
Output: A research memo with primary-source citations.
```

Document Drafting Prompts

PROMPT 06: MSA: PROPERTY DIVISION CLAUSE · Drafting: specific clause for uncontested dissolution

```
Draft a marital settlement agreement clause addressing real
property disposition for a Florida dissolution of marriage.
Facts:
  - Property: [Description, e.g., marital home in Volusia County]
  - Resolution: [e.g., Wife retains property; Husband quitclaims]
  - Buyout terms (if any): [Amount; payment schedule]
  - Mortgage / refinance plan: [Describe]
Output: A draft clause for the MSA, plain English where possible,
with mandatory closing/refinance deadlines.
```

PROMPT 07: PARENTING PLAN · Drafting: detailed Florida parenting plan

```
Draft a complete Florida parenting plan consistent with
F.S. § 61.13 minimum content requirements.
Circumstances:
  - Children: [Ages, no names, use Child A, Child B]
  - Primary residence: [Parent A / Parent B / Equal]
  - Timesharing schedule: [e.g., alternating weeks]
  - Holiday schedule preferences: [list]
  - Decision-making (shared/sole, education/medical/religion)
  - Communication protocol between parents
Output: A draft parenting plan for attorney review.
```

PROMPT 08: CHILD SUPPORT DEVIATION ARGUMENT · Drafting: deviation from guideline child support

```
Draft a memorandum supporting deviation from Florida child support
guidelines under F.S. § 61.30(1)(a).
Facts:
  - Guideline amount: $[X]/month
  - Proposed deviation: $[Y]/month [above/below] guidelines
  - Reason for deviation: [Describe: extraordinary expenses,
    shared parenting time, etc.]
  - Supporting financial documentation: [Identify]
Output: A short memo with citations and a flagged section
identifying the weakest points so they can be addressed.
```

PROMPT 09: MOTION TO MODIFY TIMESHARING · Drafting: post-judgment modification motion

```
Draft a motion to modify timesharing under F.S. § 61.13 in a
```

```
Florida post-judgment matter.
Background:
  - Original order date and arrangement: [Describe]
  - Changed circumstances: [Describe what has changed and when]
  - Proposed modification: [Describe]
  - Best-interest factors implicated: [List]
Constraints: Front-load the substantial change argument.
Output: A draft motion for attorney review.
```

PROMPT 10: CONTEMPT MOTION: SUPPORT NON-PAYMENT · Drafting: motion for contempt for non-payment

```
Draft a motion for civil contempt for failure to pay court-ordered
child support or alimony in Florida.
Facts:
  - Order requiring payment: [Date and description]
  - Amount owed per order: $[X]/month
  - Payments missed: [Number and dates]
  - Arrearage: $[Y]
  - Evidence of willfulness and ability to pay: [Describe]
Constraints: Include a purge provision. Address ability to pay.
Output: A draft motion for attorney review.
```

Client Communication Prompts

PROMPT 11: INITIAL CONSULTATION FOLLOW-UP LETTER · Client communication: post-consultation summary

```
Draft a follow-up letter to a new family law client after the
initial consultation. The letter should:
  1. Thank them for meeting.
  2. Summarize the legal issues discussed [list as bullets after].
  3. Outline the next steps and timeline.
  4. List documents the client needs to gather.
  5. Confirm fee arrangement and engagement letter.
Tone: warm, professional, plain English.
Length: under one page.
Output: A draft letter for attorney review.
```

PROMPT 12: CASE STATUS UPDATE · Client communication: routine status update

```
Draft a case status update letter for a family law client.
Current status: [Describe procedurally: discovery phase,
awaiting mediation, post-filing before first hearing, etc.]
```

```
Update items: [List specific updates]
Constraints:
  - Plain English. No legalese unless explained.
  - Specific dates for upcoming deadlines and hearings.
  - Under 400 words.
Output: A draft letter for attorney review.
```

PROMPT 13: SETTLEMENT RECOMMENDATION LETTER · Client communication: presenting a settlement offer

```
Draft a letter to a client presenting and analyzing a settlement
offer in a dissolution matter.
Offer details:
  - Property settlement: [Summary]
  - Support arrangement: [Summary]
  - Timesharing: [Summary]
Attorney assessment: [Your view: strengths, weaknesses,
alternatives, recommendation]
Constraints: Capture both the financial analysis and the
emotional weight of the decision. Plain English. Confirm in
writing that the client has received and understood the offer.
Output: A draft letter for attorney review.
```

Discovery and Litigation Prompts

PROMPT 14: INTERROGATORIES: FINANCIAL DISCOVERY · Discovery: interrogatories targeting financial issues

```
Draft a set of interrogatories for financial discovery in a
contested Florida dissolution.
Areas to address:
  1. Income sources (employment, self-employment, investments,
     deferred compensation, bonuses).
  2. Business ownership and valuation.
  3. Marital and non-marital asset identification.
  4. Recent transfers and account activity.
  5. Debts and liabilities.
Constraints: Stay within Florida limits on interrogatories.
Output: A numbered set of interrogatories for attorney review.
```

PROMPT 15: DEPOSITION OUTLINE: FINANCIAL WITNESS · Deposition prep: opposing party financial deposition

```
Create a deposition outline for the financial deposition of the
opposing party in a contested dissolution.
```

```
Matter background:
  - Key contested issues: [hidden income, business valuation,
    dissipation, non-marital claims, etc.]
  - Suspected discrepancies: [Describe]
  - Document set: [List categories produced in discovery]
Use roles (client / opposing party), not names.
Output: A topical deposition outline with proposed questions
and document references.
```

PROMPT 16: TRIAL BRIEF OUTLINE · Litigation: trial brief structure and argument framework

```
Create a trial brief outline for a contested Florida dissolution.
Issues for trial:
  - [Issue 1, e.g., equitable distribution of business interest]
  - [Issue 2, e.g., durational alimony]
  - [Issue 3, e.g., timesharing modification]
For each issue, outline: (1) the controlling Florida authority,
(2) the key facts supporting our position, (3) the anticipated
opposing argument, (4) the proposed finding for the court.
Output: A trial brief outline for attorney review and expansion.
```

Case Strategy and Mediation Prompts

PROMPT 17: PRE-MEDIATION STRATEGY MEMO · Strategy: mediation preparation

```
Draft a pre-mediation strategy memorandum for a Florida
dissolution mediation.
Matter summary:
  - Key issues in dispute: [List]
  - Client priorities: [List: what matters most]
  - Opposing party's likely priorities: [List]
  - BATNA (best alternative to negotiated agreement)
  - Opening position and movement strategy
Output: An internal strategy memo for attorney and client review.
```

PROMPT 18: QDRO COMPLIANCE REVIEW · Specialized: qualified domestic relations order review

```
Review the following QDRO draft for compliance with federal
ERISA requirements and Florida dissolution practice.
Plan type: [401(k) / defined benefit pension / 403(b) / other]
Plan administrator: [Name if available]
Award: [Describe the division: percentage or dollar amount,
```

```
gains/losses, segregated vs. separate interest, etc.]
Constraints: Always have a QDRO specialist verify; this prompt
helps you ask better questions of the specialist.
Output: A bullet list of concerns with the relevant authority.
```

PROMPT 19: EMERGENCY MOTION FOR TEMPORARY RELIEF · Drafting: motion for temporary injunction or immediate relief

```
Draft a motion for temporary relief in a Florida dissolution.
Relief sought: [e.g., temporary timesharing order; temporary
support; preservation of marital assets; exclusive use and
possession of marital home]
Basis for emergency: [Describe: irreparable harm, status quo,
safety concerns]
Supporting affidavits and exhibits available: [Identify]
Constraints: If the motion seeks a temporary injunction or emergency
injunctive relief, address the irreparable harm element directly. If the
motion seeks ordinary temporary relief (temporary support, suit money under
§ 61.071, exclusive use, or temporary parenting issues), address the
statutory basis and relevant factors. Irreparable harm is not the applicable
standard for non-injunctive temporary relief.
Output: A draft motion for attorney review.
```

PROMPT 20: BUSINESS VALUATION BRIEFING · Specialized: business valuation preparation

```
Help me prepare for the business valuation component of an
equitable distribution case.
Business type: [professional practice / retail / service /
real estate entity]
Approximate annual revenue: $[X]
Years in operation: [Y]
Key facts: [Owner involvement, key person dependence, prior
valuations, recent sale offers]
Constraints: Briefing document for the expert, not a valuation.
Address personal goodwill doctrine in Florida.
Output: A briefing memo with questions for the expert.
```

Specialized Matter Prompts

PROMPT 21: RELOCATION PETITION ANALYSIS · Research and Strategy: relocation under F.S. § 61.13001

```
Analyze the prospects for a petition for relocation with a minor
```

```
child under F.S. § 61.13001.
Facts:
  - Current location: [City/County in Florida]
  - Proposed relocation: [General location only]
  - Reason for relocation: [Describe]
  - Current timesharing arrangement: [Describe]
  - Proposed long-distance schedule: [Describe]
Constraints: Address the statutory notice requirement. Apply the
enumerated factors. Identify the weakest points.
Output: A strategy memo with citations.
```

PROMPT 22: PRENUPTIAL AGREEMENT REVIEW · Review: premarital agreement validity and enforceability

```
Review the following prenuptial agreement for validity and
enforceability under Florida's Uniform Premarital Agreement Act
(F.S. § 61.079).
Agreement provisions: [Summarize key terms; use Spouse A / B]
Circumstances of execution: [How and when signed, proximity to
wedding, disclosure of assets, independent counsel, etc.]
Constraints:
  - Flag provisions affecting child support, custody, parental
responsibility, or time-sharing; child support may not be adversely affected
under Florida’s premarital agreement statute, and custody/time-sharing
provisions require best-interests analysis.
  - Identify any procedural defects.
  - Identify any unconscionability issues.
Output: A short memo with citations.
```

PROMPT 23: CLIENT INTAKE QUESTIONNAIRE GENERATOR · Practice management: full intake questionnaire

```
Generate a complete client intake questionnaire for a new
family law client in Florida.
Matter type: [Dissolution / Paternity / Post-judgment
modification / Prenuptial agreement / DV injunction]
The questionnaire should:
  1. Gather all information needed to assess the matter.
  2. Include a domestic violence safety screener.
  3. Capture financial information at the right level of detail.
  4. Include a children/timesharing section where relevant.
  5. End with a document checklist.
Output: A draft intake questionnaire for adoption.
```

PROMPT 24: MEDIATION STATEMENT DRAFTING · Drafting: mediation statement for Florida family law mediation

```
Draft a mediation statement for a Florida dissolution mediation.
Matter summary:
  - Issues in mediation: [List]
  - Client position on each issue: [Summarize]
  - Supporting facts: [List]
  - Settlement parameters authorized by client: [Range]
Constraints:
  - Confidential mediator-only unless exchange is agreed.
  - Distinguish litigation position from settlement position.
  - Client reviews before submission.
Output: A draft mediation statement for attorney review.
```

PROMPT 25: ENGAGEMENT LETTER GENERATOR · Practice management: plain-language engagement letter

```
Draft a client engagement letter for a Florida family law matter.
Scope of representation: [Describe matter and inclusions/
exclusions]
Fee arrangement: [Hourly at $X/hr / Flat fee of $X / Retainer]
Constraints:
  - Plain language.
  - Include the AI-disclosure paragraph from Appendix B.
  - Include scope, fees, billing cadence, communication
    expectations, termination.
Output: A draft engagement letter for attorney review.
```

PROMPT 26: POST-JUDGMENT MODIFICATION ANALYSIS · Research and Strategy: substantial change of circumstances

```
Analyze whether the following facts establish a substantial and
material change in circumstances sufficient
to support modification of [timesharing / child support /
alimony] under Florida law.
Original order: [Date and brief description]
Changed circumstances: [Describe what has changed and when]
Supporting documentation: [Identify]
Constraints: For time-sharing, apply "substantial and material change"
standard ("unanticipated" was removed by the 2023 amendment). For support,
apply § 61.30. For alimony, apply § 61.14. Consider
whether informal modification has occurred.
Output: A short memo identifying strengths, weaknesses, and
next steps.
```

PROMPT 27: COLLABORATIVE FAMILY LAW PROCESS OVERVIEW · Client education: collaborative law process explanation

```
Draft a plain-language explanation of the collaborative family
law process for a prospective client considering alternatives
to litigation for their dissolution.
Address:
  1. What collaborative law is and how it differs from litigation.
  2. The participation agreement and the withdrawal requirement.
  3. The team approach (neutrals, financial professionals,
     mental health professionals).
  4. Cost and timeline considerations.
  5. When collaborative is and is not a good fit.
Output: A handout-ready explainer, plain English.
```

PROMPT 28: RETAINER RENEWAL LETTER · Practice management: communicating retainer depletion

```
Draft a letter to a client advising that their retainer is
nearly depleted and requesting replenishment.
Current status:
  - Original retainer: $[X]
  - Remaining balance: $[Y]
  - Anticipated upcoming work: [Describe]
  - Replenishment amount requested: $[Z]
  - Payment method and deadline: [Specify]
Tone: professional, direct, no apology.
Output: A draft letter for attorney review.
```

PROMPT 29: FINANCIAL AFFIDAVIT REVIEW CHECKLIST · Practice management: reviewing client financial affidavit

```
Generate a review checklist for the Florida Family Law Financial
Affidavit a client has completed.
Affidavit type: [Short form (income under $50k) / Long form]
Sections completed by client: [List]
Constraints:
  - Do not paste the client's actual financial data into a
    non-approved tool.
  - Identify common error patterns to look for during review.
  - Address consistency with bank statements and tax returns.
Output: A reviewer checklist, not a substantive review.
```

PROMPT 30: SOCIAL MEDIA EVIDENCE ANALYSIS · Litigation support: social media for relevant evidence

```
Help me analyze social media evidence in a contested family law
matter.
Evidence type: [Facebook posts, Instagram images, text message
screenshots, dating app profiles, etc.]
Issues in dispute: [e.g., lifestyle inconsistent with claimed
income, parental fitness, dissipation]
Constraints:
  - Never instruct the client to delete social media content
    (spoliation).
  - Preservation method must be admissible.
  - Address authentication and hearsay considerations.
Output: A strategy memo on preservation, admissibility, and use.
```

Ethics Risks & Governance Framework

A governance policy without teeth is a document in a drawer. This section gives you the framework to make yours real: the failure modes to plan for, the data classification framework to use as a daily decision tool, the approved-tool list to control sprawl, and the training cadence to keep your staff out of trouble.

High-Risk Failure Modes

CONFIDENTIALITY BREACH THROUGH TOOL SELECTION

The most common failure mode. A staff member pastes client information into a free AI tool because it is faster. Disclosure to the tool provider, potential ingestion into training data, and a Rule 4-1.6 problem the firm has to manage in real time. The solution is not exhortation. It is an approved-tool list that names the alternative for every task, and a training program that makes the wrong tool slow and the right tool obvious.

UNCHECKED AI OUTPUT REACHING CLIENTS OR COURTS

AI output that goes from the model to a client or a court without meaningful attorney review is a Rule 4-5.3 supervision failure and a quality failure. AI makes mistakes, sometimes subtle, sometimes obvious. The risk in family law is that a subtle drafting error in a parenting plan or MSA does not surface until the post-judgment dispute three years later.

OUTDATED LEGAL ANALYSIS

The 2023 alimony reform is the headline example, but it is not the only one. AI models have training cutoffs. Florida case law moves. Always specify the current statutory framework in your prompts, and always verify output against current law. Treat any unprompted reference to pre-reform alimony rules, abolished standards, or repealed statutes as a model failure that requires re-prompting and verification.

CITATION HALLUCINATION IN FILINGS

The most publicly visible failure mode. The AI invents cases, statutes, or Bar opinions, or misstates holdings. Florida already has Capital Standard, LLC v. U.S. Bank National Association (2d DCA Aug. 2026) as a cautionary example. Every AI-generated citation gets verified against a primary source. Every one. The verification step lives in the workflow as a non-negotiable gate.

UNSUPERVISED STAFF USE

The most preventable failure mode. Paralegals and staff adopt unapproved tools because they are faster or more familiar. The fix is policy plus training plus a named supervisor, and an answer to the question, “What tool should I use for X?” that does not require the staff member to guess.

IMPORTANT

SAFE: Using AI to research general Florida family law standards, summarize a published case, or draft a generic intake template.

REQUIRES APPROVED TOOL: Drafting against client-specific facts, summarizing a client’s financial affidavit, drafting parenting plan language on a real matter.

> PROHIBITED: Pasting a client's intake form, financial statements, DV narrative, or children's identifying information into any non-approved AI tool, including "sanitized" or "anonymized" data, because re-identification risk is real.

Vendor Due Diligence Checklist

Before approving any AI tool for firm use, run through the questions below. Document the answers. Update the assessment annually or whenever the vendor changes terms.

Question	What to Look For
Does the vendor offer a Data Processing Agreement (DPA) or equivalent?	Yes, in writing, with specific protections. Generic terms of service are not sufficient.
Is client data used to train the AI model?	Enterprise tiers typically exclude data from training. Free/consumer tiers often do not.
Where is data stored geographically?	US-based storage is preferable for most firms. International storage may create additional compliance considerations.
Who has access to the data you input?	Vendor employees? Third-party contractors? For what purposes?
What happens to your data if you terminate the service?	Data deletion timelines and procedures should be specified in the agreement.
Has the vendor had any reported data breaches?	Review the vendor's security history and incident response record.
Does the tool have SOC 2 Type II certification or equivalent?	A useful diligence signal, not a standalone approval requirement. Ask for the report and review its scope and exceptions.
What are the terms for law enforcement requests for your data?	The agreement should specify notification procedures and legal process standards.

Data Classification Framework

Not all data in a family law file carries the same risk. A systematic classification framework makes confidentiality decisions consistent across the firm.

Class	What it contains	Tool tier required
Tier 1: Public information	Generic statutory research, hypothetical analysis, template drafting without client facts	Any approved AI tool.

Tier 2: Anonymized matter facts	General case strategy, legal research relevant to a client matter, internal analysis	Approved enterprise AI tools only, even when matter facts have been anonymized. No free consumer tools for matter-related facts.
Tier 3: Client identifiers and matter facts	Client names + case facts combined, financial summaries, specific property addresses, custody arrangements, settlement positions	Approved enterprise AI tools only with signed DPA. No free consumer tools.
Tier 4: Highly sensitive	SSNs, account numbers, children's full PII, DV details, mental health and medical records, immigration status	Named enterprise or legal-specific tools only (see Approved Tool List), with written attorney sign-off before each use, minimum necessary data, and a matter-file log entry. Never consumer tools.

Approved Tool List

Your governance policy is only as good as the list of tools it covers. Maintain a current approved-tool list that specifies which tools are approved for which data classes, and update it as vendors and offerings change.

Sample Approved Tool List. Nothing on this list is approved until the AI Policy Supervisor completes the vendor diligence below, confirms the plan's data terms in writing, and initials it. Approving a tool does not approve every plan, feature, plug-in, or integration. Confirm current product and plan names with the vendor before you sign.

Tool	Use it for	Data tiers and conditions
Lexis+ with Protégé	Florida legal research, citation checking, drafting from research results	Tiers 1 to 3 under a firm subscription with written confidentiality and no-training terms. Tier 4 only with written attorney sign-off.
Westlaw CoCounsel	Legal research, document review, deposition outlines, drafting from the record	Tiers 1 to 3 under a firm subscription with written confidentiality and no-training terms. Tier 4 only with written attorney sign-off.
Microsoft 365 Copilot	Drafting and summarizing inside Word, Outlook, and Teams on firm documents	Firm business license in the firm tenant only. Tier 4 only with sign-off. Teams transcription needs all-party consent under § 934.03.
ChatGPT Business	Client letters, chronologies, factor analysis, plain-English explanations	Business or Enterprise workspace only, never a personal or free account. Tier 4 only with sign-off.

Claude Team or Enterprise	Long-document analysis, financial organization, first drafts	Team or Enterprise plan only, never a personal or free account. Tier 4 only with sign-off.

When a new tool comes on the market and staff want to use it, the default answer is “not yet, pending the approval process.” The process should be fast, documented, and run by the AI Policy Supervisor.

Staff Training Requirements

A governance policy without training is a document in a drawer. Every staff member who touches AI on firm work needs to know:

- What tools are approved and for what tasks.
- How to classify data before deciding which tool to use.
- Why AI-generated citations and statutory references require independent verification.
- Why every pleading, parenting plan, MSA, and final judgment that will be filed or executed gets attorney-level review against Florida authority.
- What to do when they are unsure. Stop and escalate, not proceed and hope.
- What a confidentiality breach looks like and how to report it.

Minimum training cadence: initial onboarding before any AI use on client matters, annual refresh with case studies from the prior year, and tool-specific training before any new tool is approved for client use. Keep a training log.

Appendix A: Sample AI Governance Policy

[Firm Name]: Artificial Intelligence Use Policy

Version 1.0 | Effective Date: [Date] | Review Date: [Date + 1 Year]

1. Purpose

This Policy establishes [Firm Name]'s guidelines for the use of artificial intelligence tools in the practice of family law. The purpose of this Policy is to ensure that all AI tool use in the Firm complies with the Rules Regulating The Florida Bar, protects client confidentiality, and produces work product that meets the Firm's quality standards.

This Policy applies to all attorneys, paralegals, legal assistants, administrative staff, and contractors who handle client matters on behalf of the Firm.

2. General Principles

- AI tools are permitted to assist in the practice of law. They are not permitted to replace attorney judgment, supervision, or professional responsibility.
- All AI output communicated to a client or submitted to a court must be reviewed by a licensed attorney before transmission or filing.
- Client confidentiality obligations under Rule 4-1.6 apply in full to all AI tool use.
- The duty of competence under Rule 4-1.1 requires attorneys to understand the capabilities and limitations of AI tools sufficiently to supervise their output.
- All AI-generated citations must be verified against a primary legal source (Westlaw, Lexis, official court database) before inclusion in any court filing.

3. Definitions

Term	Definition
AI Tool	Any software using artificial intelligence, machine learning, or large language model technology to produce, analyze, summarize, or otherwise process content.
Approved AI Tool	An AI tool reviewed and approved by the Firm's AI Policy Supervisor for specific use cases and data classes.
Client Data	Any information relating to client representation, including identifying information, case facts, financial data, family information, and work product.
AI Policy Supervisor	The attorney designated to oversee AI tool approvals, policy updates, training, and compliance documentation. In small firms, typically the Managing

	Partner.

4. Permitted Uses

- Internal administration and standard operating procedures.
- Intake summaries, document checklists, consultation prep, and plain-English client communications, after attorney review.
- First-draft assistance from attorney-supplied facts on pleadings, motions, MSAs, parenting plans, and correspondence.
- Reviewed marketing and educational content.
- Internal analysis: issue spotting, chronologies, financial organization, factor analysis under § 61.13, settlement scenario modeling.

5. Prohibited Uses

- Client identifiers in non-approved public AI tools.
- AI as sole legal research or sole source of legal authority.
- Unverified citations or statutory references in any filing, research memo, or client deliverable.
- AI as the last set of eyes on any Florida family law pleading, parenting plan, MSA, or final judgment that will be filed or executed.
- AI making substantive determinations on best-interest factors, alimony entitlement, equitable distribution classification, or domestic violence injunction merits.
- AI communicating with clients, opposing parties, or courts as a lawyer.

6. Confidentiality and Data Handling

No confidential information may be entered into any AI tool unless it is approved for that data class. Tier 4 data (Social Security and account numbers, children's full identifying information, domestic violence details, mental health and medical records, immigration status) may be entered only into a named enterprise or legal-specific tool on the Approved Tool List, after written sign-off from the responsible attorney for that specific use. Strip client identifiers and substitute role-based descriptors (Parent A/B, Child A/B) where possible. Document the AI use in the matter file: tool, date, task, attorney.

7. Court and Tribunal Filings

Before filing AI-assisted work, determine whether the court, judge, local rule, or standing order requires AI disclosure. In Florida state court, the default is the Rule 2.515(d)(2) representation that every cited authority exists and is accurately cited; AOSC26-12 bars circuit-level AI disclosure requirements, so do not volunteer certifications the rule does not require. In federal court, follow the assigned judge's standing order, and when in doubt there, disclose. Maintain a log of AI-assisted filings.

8. Family Law Practice Addendum

In addition to the general provisions of this Policy, the following rules apply specifically to Florida family law practice at [Firm Name]:

- AI may assist with first-draft assembly of family law pleadings, motions, parenting plans, and MSAs inside an approved drafting platform.
- AI may not be the last set of eyes on any document that will be filed or executed. Every filing and every executed agreement is read line by line against Florida statute and case law by a licensed Florida attorney before submission. No exceptions.
- AI may not determine best-interest factor weight, alimony entitlement under the post-2023 framework, equitable distribution classification, dissipation, or the merits of any domestic violence injunction.
- AI may not produce final research memos, settlement recommendation letters, or trial briefs without independent verification of every citation and statutory reference.

9. Incident Response

If a potential confidentiality breach through AI tool use occurs: stop using the tool immediately, document what information was input and into what tool, notify the AI Policy Supervisor within 24 hours, preserve all documentation, and do not attempt to remediate without guidance from ethics counsel. The Firm will determine, in consultation with ethics counsel, whether client notification is required and what remediation steps are appropriate. Separately, if the incident involves unauthorized access to personal information as defined by the Florida Information Protection Act (Fla. Stat. § 501.171) — including Social Security numbers, financial account numbers, or other statutorily covered data of Florida residents — the Firm has an independent statutory notice duty, not merely a contractual or ethical one. Under § 501.171, affected individuals generally must be notified within 30 days after the determination of a breach or reason to believe a breach occurred, subject to statutory delay and exception provisions. The Department of Legal Affairs must be notified when the statutory threshold and notice requirements are met. This duty exists regardless of what the AI vendor's own breach-notification commitment says. [Source: 501.171]

10. Acknowledgment

All attorneys and staff must sign the AI Policy Acknowledgment upon hire and upon any material revision to this Policy. The Firm maintains signed acknowledgments in each employee's personnel file.

Appendix B: Client AI Disclosure Statement

The following language is suitable for inclusion in a client engagement letter or as a standalone disclosure. Customize the bracketed fields.

DISCLOSURE: USE OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE TOOLS

[Firm Name] uses artificial intelligence (AI) tools in the course of representing clients. These tools assist with legal research, document drafting, document review, summarization of records, and administrative tasks.

The use of AI tools does not change our responsibilities to you under the Rules Regulating The Florida Bar. A licensed Florida attorney remains responsible for the work performed on your matter and reviews all AI-assisted work product before it is communicated to you or filed with any court.

We use only AI tools that meet our data security and confidentiality standards. We do not use free consumer AI tools for matter-related work, even when information has been anonymized. Where use of a third-party generative AI tool would disclose confidential information, we will obtain your informed consent before that use, consistent with Florida Bar Opinion 24-1. Your confidential information is protected by the same professional obligations that apply to all information in your file.

If you have questions about our use of AI tools, or if you would prefer that we not use AI tools in connection with your matter, please let us know. We will accommodate your preferences to the extent consistent with our professional obligations.

By signing this engagement letter, you acknowledge that you have read and understood this disclosure.

Implementation Notes

- Include this disclosure in your standard engagement letter, not as a separate document the client might not read.
- If a client asks you not to use AI on their matter, document that request in writing and honor it.
- Update this disclosure if your AI tool policies change in a material way.
- This disclosure does not need to list specific AI tools. Tools change; your practices matter more than the specific tool.

Appendix C: Court AI Disclosure & Certification

Florida state courts now run on a statewide standard, Rule 2.515(d)(2), as amended by SC2026-0673 (effective June 15, 2026), and a companion administrative order (AOSC26-12) makes circuit-level AI disclosure and certification requirements obsolete or inoperative. The template below is for use when a federal judge's standing order or other authority calls for an AI disclosure. Verify the controlling requirement, including the assigned federal judge's chambers, before filing. [Sources: SC2026-0673; AOSC26-12]

CERTIFICATION REGARDING USE OF GENERATIVE ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE

Use this template only to the extent required by the cited standing order, local rule, or other controlling authority. Do not certify more than that authority requires. Verify the controlling requirement before filing.

Pursuant to [the Standing Order of [Judge Name] dated [date]] [Local Rule [number]] [other authority], the undersigned counsel certifies as follows:

1. The undersigned has reviewed the requirements of [the applicable order or rule] regarding the use of generative artificial intelligence tools in connection with submissions to this Court.

2. In the preparation of the [pleading/motion/brief/other filing] to which this certification is attached, generative artificial intelligence tools [were] [were not] used.

3. If generative artificial intelligence tools were used, the undersigned represents that:

(a) The tool(s) used [is/are]: [identify each tool].

(b) The tool(s) [was/were] used for the following purpose(s): [identify the task].

(c) The undersigned has independently reviewed every legal citation, factual representation, and material assertion in the filing, and has verified each against primary sources or the underlying matter file.

(d) No portion of the filing has been delivered to the Court that the undersigned has not personally reviewed and adopted.

(e) The undersigned remains responsible for the contents of the filing and for the conduct of the matter.

4. The undersigned acknowledges that the use of generative artificial intelligence does not relieve the undersigned of any obligation under the Rules Regulating The Florida Bar, the rules of this Court, or any other applicable authority.

Implementation Notes

- Do not rely on local Florida state-court AI disclosure orders. AOSC26-12 makes them obsolete or inoperative. Check the assigned federal judge's standing order, which may still require an AI disclosure.
- Federal court: when the standing order is unclear, disclose. Judges respond better to voluntary transparency than to discovering undisclosed AI use. Florida state court: certify accuracy under Rule 2.515(d)(2) and stop there.

- Adapt the language to reflect what you actually did. Do not use boilerplate that does not accurately describe your process.
- Keep a log of which filings involved AI assistance and in what manner, in case questions arise later.

Appendix D: Letter to AI Vendors

Use this letter to put an AI vendor on notice that a Florida family law firm has specific data-handling obligations, and to get the answers in writing before you sign. Send it to the vendor's privacy or legal contact. Document the responses and keep them with your approved-tool records. Customize the bracketed fields.

[Date]

[Vendor Name and Address]

Re: Data-handling questions before approving [Tool Name] for use at [Firm Name]

To Whom It May Concern: [Firm Name] is a Florida family law firm evaluating [Tool Name] for use in our practice. Our files contain highly sensitive personal, financial, and family information, and our use of any tool is governed by the Rules Regulating The Florida Bar, including the duty of confidentiality under Rule 4-1.6. Before we can approve [Tool Name] for client matters, we need written answers to the following:

- 1. Does the vendor offer a Data Processing Agreement (DPA) or equivalent, in writing?
- 2. Is client data used to train the AI model? We require a contractual no-training commitment.
- 3. Where is our data stored geographically, and under whose jurisdiction?
- 4. Who at the vendor can access the data we input, and under what controls?
- 5. What happens to our data if we terminate the service, is it deleted, and on what timeline?
- 6. Has the vendor had any reported data breaches, and what is the breach-notification commitment?
- 7. Does the tool hold SOC 2 Type II certification or an equivalent independent audit?
- 8. What are the vendor's terms for responding to law-enforcement or third-party requests for our data?
- 9. How does the tool handle highly sensitive family law data, meaning Social Security numbers, children's PII, financial-account records, and domestic-violence safety details, and can such data be excluded or segregated?

Please respond in writing. We cannot approve any tool for client-matter use until these answers are on file and reviewed against our governance policy. Thank you.

[Firm Name] · [Authorized Signatory] · [Contact Information]

Appendix E: 90-Day Implementation Roadmap

The firms that fail with AI are the ones that try to implement everything at once. Start narrow. Get good at two or three things. Then expand. Here is a 90-day roadmap built for a small Florida family law firm.

Days 1–30: Foundation

WEEK 1: POLICY AND TOOLING

- Designate an AI Policy Supervisor. In a small firm, this is usually the Managing Partner.
- Confirm Florida Bar technology CLE compliance. If short, register for an approved AI program now.
- Pull the malpractice policy and read the technology and cyber endorsements. Email the carrier with the AI coverage question if it is unclear.
- Audit current tool use: what AI tools are staff already using inside Westlaw, Lexis, the practice management platform, Microsoft 365, or otherwise? Document each.
- Select starting tools: one legal research AI and one general drafting platform with enterprise data handling. Obtain enterprise accounts with appropriate DPAs.

WEEK 2: TRAINING

- Conduct a 60-minute firm training on the AI Governance Policy, data classification framework, and approved tools.
- Walk through three live examples: one safe use, one use requiring caution, one prohibited use.
- Update the client engagement letter to include the AI disclosure from Appendix B.
- Post the approved tool list where staff can reference it.

WEEKS 3–4: PILOT

- Pick one high-volume, low-risk workflow to pilot: uncontested dissolution document assembly or routine client status update letters are natural starting points.
- Have one attorney run the pilot and document time savings, quality observations, and any near-misses.
- Adopt the sample governance policy in Appendix A. Customize for the firm. Have all staff sign the acknowledgment.

Days 31–60: Build Proficiency

DRAFTING WORKFLOWS

- Implement AI-assisted first drafts for the five most common document types: parenting plan, MSA, interrogatories, motion to modify, routine client update letter.
- Build the partner-review checklist into the drafting workflow: post-2023 alimony framework, twenty best-interest factors, equitable distribution classification, parenting plan minimum content, homestead.
- Build the firm prompt library using the prompts in this Playbook as starting points. Customize for the firm's voice and procedures.

RESEARCH WORKFLOWS

- Train attorneys and paralegals on effective use of legal research AI for the most common family law research questions in your practice.
- Implement the citation-verification step as a non-negotiable gate before any AI-generated citation enters a filing or memo.
- Test the alimony and timesharing research workflows specifically. They are the highest-complexity, highest-risk areas for outdated AI output.

CLIENT COMMUNICATION

- Deploy the routine client status update prompt across active matters.
- Deploy the post-consultation follow-up letter prompt for new clients.
- Track client satisfaction. Well-crafted, attorney-reviewed AI drafts often improve client experience.

Days 61–90: Optimize and Expand

MEASURE WHAT MATTERS

- Calculate time saved per matter type from AI assistance.
- Calculate cost per matter. Has AI reduced hours needed for routine tasks?
- Survey attorneys and staff on what is working and what is not.
- Review any quality issues or near-misses from the first 60 days.

EXPAND TO COMPLEX WORKFLOWS

- Move AI into discovery drafting, deposition prep, and trial brief first drafts.
- Pilot the financial-analysis prompts for equitable distribution matters.
- Integrate AI into mediation preparation using the prompts in this Playbook.
- If the practice has heavy QDRO or prenuptial agreement review volume, deploy a clause-level review tool with a specialist verification step.

POLICY MAINTENANCE

- Update the approved tool list if any tools have been added or removed.
- Update the AI Governance Policy if any procedures have changed.
- Schedule the first annual policy review (12 months from initial adoption).
- Check the Florida Bar website and Family Law Section publications, the statewide rule (2.515(d)(2)), and federal judges' standing orders for any new AI directives.

> **WHAT SUCCESS LOOKS LIKE AT DAY 90**
>
> Every attorney and staff member knows which AI tools are approved, for what tasks, and at what data classification level.
>
> Every parenting plan, MSA, motion, and final judgment that leaves the office has had attorney-level review against Florida authority. Every citation in every research memo has been verified against

primary sources.

The engagement letter discloses AI use. The compliance directory contains the governance policy, vendor DPAs, training records, and any incident files.

Three workflows are operating with AI assistance and measurable time savings. The firm is operating an AI program, not a stack of unused subscriptions.

Appendix F: Authorities

Primary authorities used for the material legal, ethics, court-procedure, data-breach, and tax propositions in this Playbook. Verify current versions before relying on any source for a client matter.

Florida alimony: 61.08

Florida parenting and time-sharing: 61.13

Florida equitable distribution: 61.075

Dependent-adult-child support: 61.1255

Domestic-violence injunctions: 741.30

Recording consent: 934.03

Florida breach notification: 501.171

Greyson's Law: SB130

Brito v. Salas: Brito

Florida Bar Ethics Opinion 24-1: Opinion 24-1

Rule 2.515 amendment: SC2026-0673

AOSC26-12: AOSC26-12

Capital Standard: Capital Standard

IRS Form 1099-DA: IRS 1099-DA

Family law forms unification: SC2026-1262

Equal time-sharing presumption: CS/HB 1301 (2023)

Alimony reform: SB 1416 (2023)

California SB 574 (2025–26): leginfo.legislature.ca.gov

Appendix G: Interim AI Use Policy and Checklist

Appendix A is the full policy. This is the version you adopt this week while you finish it. Review it, approve it, and have everyone sign.

Your 5-Minute AI Checklist

- ☐ Use only a firm-approved platform, plan, and model.
- ☐ Sign in to the firm business account with the required privacy, retention, and no-training settings. No personal or free accounts.
- ☐ No client-confidential, privileged, personal, financial, or health information unless this specific use is approved. Tier 4 needs written attorney sign-off.
- ☐ Use the minimum information necessary. Anonymize or redact where you can.
- ☐ Get client disclosure or consent where law, the ethics rules, the engagement terms, or firm policy require it.
- ☐ Independently verify facts, quotations, citations, calculations, legal authorities, and links.
- ☐ A responsible lawyer reviews substantive work before it is sent, filed, or relied on.
- ☐ Log the use in the AI Tracking Sheet: date, user, tool, plan, matter, purpose, data tier, reviewer.
- ☐ Escalate suspected breaches, fabricated authorities, bias, security incidents, or harmful conclusions.

Interim Policy

1. Scope. Covers every lawyer and employee and every AI tool or feature used for firm or client work, including AI built into ordinary software.

2. Approved tools only. Use only the tools, plans, and uses on the Approved Tool List. Approving a tool does not approve every plan, model, plug-in, or integration.

3. Confidentiality. Protect client information under Rule 4-1.6. Minimum necessary data. Tier 4 only in named tools with written attorney sign-off.

4. Verification. A person verifies all AI output before use, including every citation (Rules 4-1.1, 4-3.3; Rule 2.515(d)(2)).

5. Lawyer responsibility. AI output is a draft, never a final legal judgment. Lawyers supervise all AI-assisted work (Rules 4-5.1, 4-5.3).

6. Clients and fees. Disclose or obtain consent when required (Rules 4-1.4, 4-1.6). Bill only actual time and reasonable costs (Rule 4-1.5).

7. Tracking. Log every AI use for firm or client work in the AI Tracking Sheet, stored at [insert location].

8. Prohibited. Autonomous legal advice, unreviewed filings or client communications, unverified citations, circumventing security controls, unapproved tools for protected information.

9. Escalation. Stop, preserve the record, and notify the Initial AI Partner right away. Exceptions need advance written approval from the Initial AI Partner.

10. Enforcement. Violations may lead to suspension of AI access, corrective action, or other consequences consistent with firm policy and applicable law.

Initial AI Partner: [Name, Title] **Alternate:** [Name, Title, Email, Phone]

Acknowledgment

I have read this Interim AI Use Policy. I will use only approved AI tools and uses, log every use, independently verify all outputs, and report incidents or suspected violations promptly.

Printed name: _____ Role/title: _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____

Supervisor / approving partner (if required): _____

About Actionable AI

Actionable AI is a solo AI adoption consultancy for small law firms. Founded by Greg Yates, a former Big Law corporate equity partner at Steptoe (NYC Managing Partner) and Seyfarth Shaw, Actionable AI exists because the gap between how AI is marketed to lawyers and how lawyers actually need to use it is wide enough to fall through.

The firm works exclusively with small law firms in Florida. Not tech companies. Not wealth management. Not generic small business. Law firms. The specificity is the point.

What We Do

- AI readiness assessments: where your firm is, where the gaps are, what to fix first.
- Implementation support: selecting tools, negotiating enterprise agreements, building governance policies.
- Prompts and training: building the firm-specific prompt libraries and workflows that actually get used.
- Ongoing advisory: as the tools and Bar guidance evolve, your implementation needs to evolve with them.

Who This Playbook Is For

This playbook is written for the managing partner of a small Florida family law firm who knows AI is important, has probably experimented with it, and wants a framework for doing it right. It is not for the technology enthusiast who wants to talk about model architectures. It is for the lawyer who wants to compress drafting time, reduce errors, improve client experience, and not get disbarred in the process.

READY TO IMPLEMENT AI IN YOUR FAMILY LAW PRACTICE?

Book a free 15-minute assessment call to discuss (https://actionableai.s.gy/9Ei2uw):

- Which two or three workflows to start with for your case mix.
- How to build a governance policy your staff will actually follow.
- Florida-specific ethics guardrails for your circuit and your judges.
- How to keep your forms current after the October 1, 2026 forms unification and the 2023 timesharing and alimony rewrites.
- Whether your caseload includes parentage or digital-evidence issues most firms are missing.

No pitch. No deck. No obligation.

Greg Yates | Actionable AI
actionableai.net | gyates@actionableai.net

Actionable AI

Download the free Florida AI Starter Playbook.

Eight practical resources for managing partners and firm administrators: a readiness checklist, five pilot workflows, a tool-approval scorecard, a lawyer verification checklist, and a 90-day plan. It is free, and the button below downloads it directly.

Scan to download the Starter Playbook

Download the Starter Playbook (PDF)

Direct download: Florida AI Starter Playbook (PDF)

Want a second set of eyes on which workflow to pick?

I take 15-minute calls with managing partners and administrators. I will tell you whether there is a fit. No deck.

Book a 15-minute introductory call

Book a 15-minute introductory call