

ISSUED U.S. PATENT

Evidence before authority

A trust and control layer for automated code remediation

US 12,670,085 B1 · issued June 30, 2026

Issued patent + tested reference implementation

Apurv Gaurav
Owner and inventor
apurvgaurav@gmail.com

The gap is not generation. It is authorization.

A proposed fix can look plausible and still lack the evidence required for higher authority.

GENERATION

Propose a change

AI agent · scanner · rule · developer

TRUST BOUNDARY

**What evidence
has the fix
earned?**

Replay · compare · evidence · gate

AUTHORITY

Permit a higher action

commit · merge · promotion
deployment · ledger update

ReplayGuard is positioned between a proposed remediation and the authority to let it move forward.

Five steps connect replay evidence to authority

Plain-language summary; issued claim language controls.



Strategic thesis

An automated remediation should not receive higher authority until the selected template has been applied in two runs, the processed outputs match byte-for-byte, and the claim-specified evidence has been created.

Where the asset can fit

Priority goes to products that generate, suggest, apply, or govern automated code remediation.

CORE CONTROL LAYER

Evidence-gated authorization

A control layer after fix generation and before higher-authority action.

- 01 **AI coding & repository platforms**
Govern generated fixes before repository authority
- 02 **AppSec remediation**
Verify scanner-, rule-, or agent-generated repairs
- 03 **DevSecOps / CI/CD**
Add evidence as a policy input before merge or promotion
- 04 **Agent & tool governance**
Require evidence before an automated tool action

Product adjacency only · no infringement opinion

Patent scope is not prototype evidence

ISSUED PATENT

What is legally claimed?

- Method, medium, and system claim forms
- Two-run remediation and byte-level comparison
- Matched-output approval + cryptographic / ledger evidence
- Issued claim language controls

REFERENCE IMPLEMENTATION

Can the workflow be inspected?

- FastAPI + React/Vite explanatory prototype
- ALLOW, BLOCK, and REVIEW decision paths
- Pinned build; automated verification and frontend build completed
- Not production deployment, formal proof, or live CI/CD enforcement

The implementation illustrates selected concepts. It does not define the patent's full legal scope.

Evidence supports focused diligence

Enough to begin a serious review—without presenting the prototype as a finished product.

20

claims

3 independent forms

PINNED

reference build

Automated verification completed

3

decision paths

ALLOW · BLOCK · REVIEW

RELATED CONTINUATION FILED | Family relationship and transaction scope available during qualified diligence.

HONEST LIMITS

No customer, revenue, pilot, or production-deployment claim. No complete SAST or taint analysis. No formal verification, semantic-equivalence proof, digital signatures, immutable ledger, or live CI/CD enforcement.

Flexible transaction structures.

Acquisition and licensing can be structured around strategic fit and diligence needs.

- 01 **Complete patent acquisition**
- 02 **Exclusive license**
- 03 **Non-exclusive license**
- 04 **Field-of-use license**
- 05 **Patent + source code + know-how**

Transaction terms available following qualified discussion

THE NEXT DECISION

**Does ReplayGuard justify
a focused strategic and
technical discussion?**

Strategic fit · product adjacency · diligence scope ·
transaction structure

Apurv Gaurav · apurvgaurav@gmail.com