

ANALYTICAL REPORT

Digital Footprint Analysis

Comprehensive sweep and analytical breakdown of a named subject's online presence.

CASE REFERENCE

GL-DFA-2026-0207 · Sample · Redacted for publication

CLIENT

[Client name redacted]

Instructing party · Private individual

SUBJECT

[Subject name redacted]

Emails: 3 · Phones: 2 · Accounts identified: 22 · Photos: 7

INSTRUCTION DATE

12 February 2026

REPORT ISSUED

16 February 2026

ANALYST

Senior Analyst, Greyline OSINT Cell

REVIEW

Head of Investigations

OVERALL ASSESSMENT

RED — Material misrepresentation

Identity, residence, employment, and undisclosed criminal & regulatory traces.

Section 1 · Executive Summary

Overall assessment and *headline findings*

This report presents the findings of a Greyline Digital Footprint Analysis commissioned by the instructing party on 12 February 2026 in respect of a named subject. The analysis was conducted by Greyline's OSINT cell across the period 12–16 February 2026 and is delivered as a single risk-scored analytical document.

The instruction posed a single operative question: does the subject's online presence corroborate the account of themselves they have given to our client? The short answer, evidenced across the body of this report, is that it does not.

Headline determination

RED FLAG

The subject's online presence materially misrepresents who they are. Four of seven supplied photographs appear elsewhere on the open web under different identities or are assessed as AI-generated. Three undisclosed email addresses and one undisclosed phone number support a parallel set of accounts: four dating profiles, four adult-adjacent platform accounts, and three betting accounts (including one offshore operator not licensed in the UK). Stated employment is not corroborated by the subject's LinkedIn record or any other public source. Open-source criminal and regulatory traces include an unsatisfied County Court judgment (2022) and a live press record of a 2020 charge later discontinued by the CPS — neither disclosed to our client. The pattern is not consistent with an honest self-presentation.

Headline findings at a glance

Photographs. Of seven photographs the subject has supplied to our client, four appear on the open web under unrelated identities, on stock-image aggregators, or carry the visual signatures of AI generation. Two are plausibly genuine. One is re-used across the subject's own multiple identities.

Identity. The subject's claimed name resolves to a real public record. Their claimed employer, role, and length of service do not. Their claimed city of residence is not corroborated by any digital trace observed during the sweep.

Accounts inventory. Three email addresses and two phone numbers are attributable to the subject; only one of each was disclosed to the client. Eleven social media accounts across nine platforms, four dating accounts, and four adult-adjacent platform accounts have been identified, segregated across the undisclosed identifiers.

Behavioural pattern. The subject maintains parallel dating profiles under variant names with photographs that overlap with those provided to our client. Three betting accounts are registered across regulated and offshore operators, alongside sustained activity in betting and speculative-trading communities. A sustained pattern of sexually explicit interaction is observable across Twitter/X (secondary handle), Snapchat (primary), Instagram (primary)

comments), and Pinterest.

Criminal & regulatory. The open-source record carries a 2022 unsatisfied County Court judgment, a live and indexed 2020 press record of a charge subsequently discontinued by the CPS, and a 2018 ICO monetary penalty issued against a company at which the subject was a director. No sanctions, watchlist, or sex-offender register appearances were identified.

SAMPLE · REDACTED

Section 2 · Risk Scorecard

Indicator-by-indicator scoring

The following scorecard records each indicator examined during the sweep, the status found, and the severity assigned. Severity is assigned on a three-band scale: **RED** for findings that materially contradict the subject's presented account or that meet recognised fraud-pattern signatures; **AMBER** for findings that warrant caution but stop short of direct contradiction; **GREEN** for indicators where the record is consistent or where no adverse trace was identified.

Indicator	Status	Severity
Photo provenance & reverse image	Stolen / repurposed images detected	RED
Identity claim consistency	Multiple material misstatements	RED
Cross-platform alias congruence	Aliases inconsistent across platforms	AMBER
Email & phone enumeration	3 emails, 2 phones — only 1 of each disclosed	RED
Dating platform exposure	4 active profiles under variant names	RED
Adult & escort-adjacent platforms	4 accounts (OnlyFans, AllAccessFans, Fetlife, Vivastreet trace)	RED
Professional credential verification	LinkedIn record does not corroborate claims	RED
Financial distress indicators	Public forum activity consistent with debt stress	AMBER
Gambling — accounts	3 betting accounts: Bet365, 1xBet (offshore), SportyBet	RED
Gambling — behavioural	Sustained activity across 2 subreddits, 1 forum, 2 Telegram channels	AMBER
Reputationally sensitive content	Sustained explicit-content pattern across 4 platforms	RED
Geographic / movement consistency	Stated location not corroborated by digital traces	RED
Criminal & court traces	Live press record of 2020 charge (CPS discontinued)	RED
Civil judgments & regulatory history	CCJ (2022, unsatisfied) + corporate ICO penalty (2018)	AMBER

Indicator	Status	Severity
Sanctions / watchlist / disqualifications	No matches across OFSI, OFAC, EU, UN, CH register	GREEN

Nine of fifteen indicators carry a RED determination, five carry AMBER, and one returns GREEN. The pattern would, in our standard practice, sustain a recommendation against any further financial or commitment-bearing engagement with the subject pending documentary identity verification and — given the findings in Section 8 — consideration of a formal criminal-record check.

SAMPLE · REDACTED · AMBER

Section 3 · Scope of Sweep

Platforms, coverage, and method

The Digital Footprint Analysis is a structured sweep across a defined catalogue of open-source platforms, supplemented by alias enumeration across 300+ additional platforms and reverse image search against every public-facing photograph supplied or located. The table below records the categories examined for this matter, the platforms covered within each, and a one-line note on the findings.

Category	Platforms covered	Findings
Major social	Facebook, Instagram, LinkedIn, X, TikTok, Snapchat, YouTube, Pinterest	5 active · 2 dormant · 1 deleted (traces)
Dating	Tinder, Bumble, Hinge, Badoo, POF, Match, eHarmony, OkCupid, CMB, Ashley Madison, Grindr	3 active under variant names
Diaspora / regional	Afroromance, Naijaplanet, Telegram public channels, VKontakte	2 active profiles · 1 historic
Adult-adjacent	OnlyFans, Fansly, Chaturbate, AdultWork, Vivastreet	No primary profile · 1 indirect trace
Professional	LinkedIn, Glassdoor, Indeed, Crunchbase	1 profile · self-described claims do not align
Forums & community	Reddit (post + comment history), niche forums, complaints DBs	Sustained presence on 2 gambling-adjacent subs
Username search	300+ platforms via alias enumeration	Handle reused across 14 platforms
Reverse image	Photographs supplied + public-facing imagery	4 of 7 images appear elsewhere

Inputs supplied by the instructing party

The client supplied the following starting inputs: the subject's claimed full name; one known email address; one known mobile telephone number; seven photographs previously shared by the subject with the client; the names of two platforms on which the subject and the client had interacted; and the subject's stated city of residence and stated employer. These inputs were used as the initial pivot points from which alias and account discovery proceeded.

Methodological note

All findings recorded in this report rest on open-source material in the public domain at the time of the sweep, retrieved through lawful collection methods consistent with UK data-protection law and Greyline's standing OSINT protocols. No covert techniques, no pretexting, no credential-based access, and no acquisition of private communications were used in the production of this report. Where a platform is referenced, only its publicly indexable surface was

examined.

SAMPLE · REDACTED

Section 4 · Image Provenance

Reverse search across the *supplied photographs*

Each of the seven photographs the subject has shared with our client was processed through reverse image search across the major image-indexing services, against stock-photo aggregator databases, and against the publicly indexed dating-platform corpus. EXIF metadata was extracted where available. Facial geometry was compared across all images supplied to test whether they depict the same individual. Where matches were identified beyond the subject's profile, the location, date, and apparent identity of the surrounding context were recorded. Each row carries an evidence reference (EV-NN), and the full URL, observation timestamp, and screenshot filename for each is logged in **Appendix A**.

Image ref	Description & metadata	Reverse-search & forensic outcome	Evidence	Determination
IMG-01	Headshot, outdoor, blue shirt. EXIF stripped on supply.	Identical image indexed on stock-photo aggregator (first appearance Mar 2019). Same image present on three unrelated dating profiles (US, AU, ZA) under three different names. Facial geometry: consistent across all five appearances.	EV-01 to EV-05	Stolen
IMG-02	Group photograph at restaurant. EXIF stripped.	Cropped variant of a 2021 Facebook post by an unrelated user (post still live, 47 reactions, captioned in Spanish). The subject's claimed face occupies a peripheral position in the original; the supplied crop centres it.	EV-06, EV-07	Stolen / repurposed
IMG-03	Casual selfie, indoor. EXIF intact: device-string redacted; capture date Jan 2026.	No reverse-search matches across indexed corpora. Facial geometry consistent with IMG-06. Image carries no signatures of synthetic generation.	EV-08	Plausibly genuine
IMG-04	Professional studio portrait. EXIF stripped.	Asymmetric earring geometry; left iris contains catchlight inconsistent with stated light direction; background carries fabric-texture artefacts consistent with diffusion-model output. Image returns no reverse-search match — consistent with generated rather than reproduced media.	EV-09	AI-generated (assessed)
IMG-05	Holiday photograph. EXIF stripped.	Same composition published by an unrelated travel blog (Jun 2022). The blog author's face is cropped out of the supplied version; visible scenery, foliage, and bench position match within pixel tolerance.	EV-10, EV-11	Stolen
IMG-06	Gym / lifestyle photograph. EXIF intact: device-string redacted.	No reverse-search matches across indexed corpora. Facial geometry consistent with IMG-03. Background environment carries no identifying landmark visible to OSINT.	EV-12	Plausibly genuine
IMG-07	Beach photograph. EXIF stripped.	Identical image located on two further dating profiles under different names (handle variants noted in Section 6). All three profile-images share identical pixel dimensions and identical compression signature.	EV-13, EV-14	Re-used across identities

RED FLAG

Four of seven photographs do not depict a person consistent with the claimed identity.

Images IMG-01, IMG-02, IMG-05, and IMG-07 are present on the open web under circumstances inconsistent with the subject's account. IMG-04 carries the visual signatures of AI generation, consistent with the recent rise of synthetic-image use in romance and impersonation fraud. IMG-03 and IMG-06 returned no adverse matches and are assessed as plausibly genuine; we do not, however, treat the absence of a reverse-search match as positive proof of authenticity.

Section 5 · Identity & Professional Verification

Testing the subject's *factual claims*

The subject has, through their interactions with the client, made a series of specific factual claims about themselves. Each of those claims has been tested against documented public sources. Findings are recorded below.

NO FLAG

Stated name resolves to a real public record.

The subject's claimed full name corresponds to an individual identifiable in publicly available records, including UK electoral roll references for the period 2014–2024 and a sole-name social media presence active since 2013. The fact that the name resolves to a real person is not, in itself, a verification of the subject's broader account, and the same name resolves to four other individuals in the indexed UK record.

Evidence supporting this finding

SOURCE	UK Open Register / 192.com lookup
RESULT	1 plausible match aligned to stated DOB band; 4 unrelated matches in other regions
EVIDENCE REF	EV-15
SOURCE	Facebook (legacy profile, sole-name handle)
HANDLE	facebook.com/[REDACTED].o[REDACTED] · created 2013, dormant since 2019
EVIDENCE REF	EV-16

RED FLAG

Stated employment is not corroborated by any independent record.

The subject states that they are employed in a senior commercial role at a named FTSE-listed multinational. The subject's LinkedIn profile does not list this employer at all. The named multinational's publicly indexable directory of employees in the stated region returns zero matches for the subject. No press, conference proceedings, investor-day attendee list, industry awards, or trade-publication reference associates the subject with the named employer or with the senior role claimed. The LinkedIn profile carries a current employer of materially lower seniority in a different industry.

Evidence supporting this finding

SOURCE	LinkedIn — subject's primary profile
URL	linkedin.com/in/[REDACTED]-o[REDACTED]-[REDACTED]
EMPLOYER ON LINKEDIN	[REDACTED] Ltd] · [REDACTED] Coordinator]
EMPLOYER TOLD TO CLIENT	[REDACTED] Plc] · Head of [REDACTED]
EVIDENCE REF	EV-17
SOURCE	[REDACTED] Plc] employee directory (public)
SEARCH	Full name + city of residence + role keywords
RESULT	0 matches
EVIDENCE REF	EV-18
SOURCE	Companies House officer search
RESULT	No directorships or officer roles recorded against the stated name and DOB band
EVIDENCE REF	EV-19

RED FLAG

Stated city of residence is not corroborated by any digital trace.

The subject states that they reside in a named UK city. The subject's social media geolocation tags, photograph metadata where extractable, public check-ins, tagged-by-others appearances, and the location strings on the three parallel dating profiles documented in Section 6 all place them, where they place them at all, in a different country to the one claimed. No single trace was identified placing the subject in the stated UK city within the past twenty-four months.

Evidence supporting this finding

SOURCE	Instagram — primary handle
GEO-TAGGED POSTS (24 MO)	11 posts, all tagged to [REDACTED — country B]; most recent 02 Feb 2026
EVIDENCE REF	EV-20
SOURCE	IMG-03 EXIF (only image with intact EXIF)
RESULT	GPS stripped on supply; device locale string indicates [REDACTED — country B]
EVIDENCE REF	EV-21
SOURCE	Tagged-by-others appearances
RESULT	3 tags across Instagram and Facebook (2024–2026), all at venues in [REDACTED — country B]
EVIDENCE REF	EV-22

AMBER FLAG

Stated marital status is not directly contradicted but is unverified.

The subject states that they are single and have not been married. No documentary or public-record material was identified contradicting this claim. We note, however, the presence

on two of the three parallel dating profiles documented in Section 6 of bio text consistent with an undisclosed ongoing relationship — described in Section 6 — and a small number of tagged appearances at private events alongside a named third party of consistent recurrence. We record this as amber rather than red because the language and appearances are suggestive rather than dispositive on the public record.

Evidence supporting this finding

SOURCE	DP-02 bio text (see Section 6)
BIO EXTRACT	“not looking for anything serious — currently in something complicated — discreet only”
EVIDENCE REF	EV-23
SOURCE	Instagram tagged-photos collection
RECURRING TAG	@[REDACTED] — 7 appearances across 18 months
EVIDENCE REF	EV-24

Section 6 · Cross-Platform Account Inventory

Emails, phones, socials, dating, *and adult-adjacent accounts*

Alias enumeration was conducted from the subject's known handle, all email addresses supplied by the client, the subject's known mobile number, and additional email addresses and phone numbers identified during the sweep, across 300+ platforms. Hits were validated by cross-referencing returned accounts against the subject's supplied photographs (see Section 4), biographical claims, account-creation date metadata, and posting style. The inventory below records the material accounts identified, the linkage established to the subject, and the evidence captured. The complete URL, observation timestamp, and screenshot filename for each entry are logged in Appendix A.

RED FLAG

Three distinct email addresses and two phone numbers identified, only one of each disclosed to client.

The client provided one email address and one mobile phone number for the subject. Enumeration across breach-aggregator services, account-recovery prompts on platforms where the subject has registered, and reverse-lookup against the subject's known social profiles surfaced three distinct email addresses and two distinct phone numbers attributable to the subject. Two of the three emails and the second phone number were not disclosed to the client. The undisclosed accounts are used to register a separate set of profiles, including the dating, adult-adjacent, and betting accounts documented below. The pattern is not consistent with incidental account hygiene; it is consistent with the deliberate separation of two parallel digital lives.

Emails attributable to the subject

REFERENCE	EM-01 · Primary
ADDRESS	[REDACTED]@gmail.com
LINKED ACCOUNTS	LinkedIn, primary Instagram, primary Facebook
DISCLOSED	Yes (sole email supplied to client)
EVIDENCE REF	EV-62
REFERENCE	EM-02 · Secondary
ADDRESS	[REDACTED]@outlook.com
LINKED ACCOUNTS	DP-01 Tinder, DP-02 Bumble, DP-03 Hinge, TW-02 (secondary Twitter/X)
DISCLOSED	No (surfaced via breach-aggregator, 2019 dataset)
EVIDENCE REF	EV-63

REFERENCE	EM-03 · Tertiary
ADDRESS	[REDACTED]@protonmail.com
LINKED ACCOUNTS	OnlyFans, Fetlife, two betting accounts (Section 7)
DISCLOSED	No (surfaced via account-recovery on adult-adjacent platforms)
EVIDENCE REF	EV-64

Phone numbers attributable to the subject

REFERENCE	PH-01 · Primary
NUMBER	+44 7 [REDACTED] (final four digits redacted)
LINKED ACCOUNTS	WhatsApp profile shown to client; primary Instagram; LinkedIn 2FA
DISCLOSED	Yes
EVIDENCE REF	EV-65

REFERENCE	PH-02 · Secondary
NUMBER	+44 7 [REDACTED] (separate prefix from PH-01)
LINKED ACCOUNTS	DP-04 Afroromance; Vivastreet residual trace; SportyBet
DISCLOSED	No
EVIDENCE REF	EV-66

RED FLAG

Full social media audit: eleven accounts identified across nine platforms, including secondary accounts dedicated to explicit content.

The subject maintains a substantial social presence, distributed across primary accounts (linked to EM-01 and visible to anyone the subject would expect to encounter professionally) and secondary accounts (linked to EM-02 or EM-03 and used for content the subject would not wish to be seen by their professional network or by our client). The secondary Twitter/X account documented as TW-02 retweets explicit content with regular cadence; the subject's primary Snapchat is used to repost non-personal explicit content; the primary Instagram account carries a sustained pattern of comments under content posted by Instagram-prominent female accounts that a reasonable reader would characterise as sexually suggestive. The behaviour is not, in itself, indicative of harm. Its weight in this report lies in the gap between the curated self-presentation made to our client and the open-source behavioural record.

Social accounts identified

REFERENCE	SOC-01 · Instagram (primary)
HANDLE	instagram.com/[REDACTED]_o[REDACTED]
LINKED EMAIL	EM-01
NOTES	Sustained pattern of suggestive comments under Instagram-prominent female accounts; see Section 7
EVIDENCE REF	EV-67, EV-68

REFERENCE	SOC-02 · Instagram (secondary, private)
HANDLE	instagram.com/[REDACTED]-[REDACTED]
LINKED EMAIL	EM-02
NOTES	Private account; follower count low (<50)
EVIDENCE REF	EV-69
REFERENCE	SOC-03 · Twitter/X (primary)
HANDLE	x.com/[REDACTED]o[REDACTED]
LINKED EMAIL	EM-01
NOTES	Sports, opinion, intermittent professional content
EVIDENCE REF	EV-70
REFERENCE	TW-02 · Twitter/X (secondary, explicit content)
HANDLE	x.com/[REDACTED]-[REDACTED]
LINKED EMAIL	EM-02
NOTES	Approx. 8–14 explicit retweets per week (Dec 2024 – Feb 2026); follows predominantly adult content creators
EVIDENCE REF	EV-71
REFERENCE	SOC-04 · Snapchat
HANDLE	snapchat.com/add/[REDACTED]
NOTES	Public Stories: frequent reposts of non-personal explicit content
EVIDENCE REF	EV-72
REFERENCE	SOC-05 · Facebook (primary)
HANDLE	facebook.com/[REDACTED].o[REDACTED]
NOTES	Dormant since 2019
EVIDENCE REF	EV-16
REFERENCE	SOC-06 · TikTok
HANDLE	tiktok.com/@[REDACTED]
NOTES	Low activity; lifestyle and travel content
EVIDENCE REF	EV-73
REFERENCE	SOC-07 · LinkedIn
HANDLE	linkedin.com/in/[REDACTED]-o[REDACTED]-[REDACTED]
NOTES	Active; see Section 5 for inconsistency with stated employer
EVIDENCE REF	EV-17

REFERENCE	SOC-08 · YouTube (comments)
HANDLE	Comment history under handle [REDACTED]
NOTES	Concentrated on betting, sports prediction, adult-creator content
EVIDENCE REF	EV-74
REFERENCE	SOC-09 · Reddit
HANDLE	u/[REDACTED]
NOTES	47 posts, 312 comments across gambling and adult subreddits — see Section 7
EVIDENCE REF	EV-44, EV-45, EV-49
REFERENCE	SOC-10 · Telegram
HANDLE	@[REDACTED]
NOTES	Member of two public tipster / betting channels
EVIDENCE REF	EV-31
REFERENCE	SOC-11 · Pinterest
HANDLE	pinterest.com/[REDACTED]
NOTES	Boards: fashion, fitness, explicit-adjacent imagery
EVIDENCE REF	EV-75

RED FLAG

Three active dating profiles identified across mainstream and diaspora platforms.

The subject maintains active accounts on Tinder, Bumble, and Hinge under variant first names, plus the Afroromance diaspora-specific account previously identified. Each profile uses a subset of the seven supplied photographs (Section 4), states a different age and city from the account presented to our client, and is linked to either EM-02 or PH-02. The Bumble account was created within the past six weeks. Identity overlap across the four profiles is established through reverse-image match and, in two cases, through shared phone numbers observed during account-recovery prompts.

Dating profiles observed

PROFILE	DP-01 · Tinder
DISPLAY NAME	[M [REDACTED]] (variant of the client-facing first name)
PHOTOGRAPHS	IMG-01, IMG-03, IMG-07
STATED	Age 32 (client-facing account states 36); city [REDACTED — country B]
LINKED EMAIL	EM-02
CREATED	Aug 2024; last active 15 Feb 2026
EVIDENCE REF	EV-25

PROFILE	DP-02 · Bumble
DISPLAY NAME	[M██████]
PHOTOGRAPHS	IMG-01, IMG-06, IMG-07
STATED	Age 31; city [REDACTED — country B]
LINKED EMAIL	EM-02
CREATED	Jan 2026 (within past six weeks)
EVIDENCE REF	EV-76
PROFILE	DP-03 · Hinge
DISPLAY NAME	[O██████]
PHOTOGRAPHS	IMG-01, IMG-05, IMG-07
STATED	Age 33; city [REDACTED — country B, secondary]; occupation [██████ Manager]
LINKED EMAIL	EM-02
CREATED	Jan 2026
EVIDENCE REF	EV-26
PROFILE	DP-04 · Afroromance
DISPLAY NAME	[A██████]
PHOTOGRAPHS	IMG-01, IMG-02
STATED	Age 35; city [REDACTED — country B]
LINKED PHONE	PH-02 (account-recovery prompt)
CREATED	Sep 2023; last active 14 Feb 2026
EVIDENCE REF	EV-27

RED FLAG

Four accounts identified across adult content and escort-adjacent platforms.

Searches across the publicly indexable surface of OnlyFans, AllAccessFans, Vivastreet, Fetlife, Fansly, Chaturbate, and AdultWork surfaced four accounts attributable to the subject by handle, email-address linkage, photograph match, or phone-number linkage. The OnlyFans and Fetlife accounts are consumer-side (subscriber, not creator); the AllAccessFans account is consumer-side; the Vivastreet trace is the residual posting previously documented at EV-28 and remains of unclear original status. The subject's name appears on none of the publicly visible profiles; the linkage in each case is via the alternate email EM-03, the secondary phone PH-02, or photograph match against IMG-04 and IMG-06.

Adult-adjacent accounts observed

REFERENCE	AD-01 · OnlyFans
HANDLE	onlyfans.com/[REDACTED]-[REDACTED]
TYPE	Subscriber / consumer (not a creator profile)
LINKED EMAIL	EM-03
EVIDENCE REF	EV-77
REFERENCE	AD-02 · AllAccessFans
HANDLE	allaccessfans.com/u/[REDACTED]
TYPE	Subscriber / consumer
LINKED EMAIL	EM-03
EVIDENCE REF	EV-78
REFERENCE	AD-03 · Fetlife
HANDLE	fetlife.com/users/[REDACTED]
NOTES	Profile photograph matches IMG-04 (the AI-generated portrait, Section 4); active in groups concerned with [REDACTED]
LINKED EMAIL	EM-03
EVIDENCE REF	EV-79
REFERENCE	AD-04 · Vivastreet (historical, residual)
TRACE	PH-02 associated with a Vivastreet-adjacent listing posted 2022; listing no longer live on originating platform; trace persists on third-party scraper-mirror
SUBJECT'S CONNECTION	Not established on the open record
EVIDENCE REF	EV-28

Section 7 · Behavioural & Financial Signals

Betting accounts, forum activity, and behavioural patterns

The Digital Footprint Analysis includes a structured examination of behavioural and financial signals available from open-source forum activity, account-recovery surface of betting and gaming platforms, public mentions, and the subject's interaction patterns under their known social handles (see Section 6) across the period December 2024 to February 2026.

RED FLAG

Three active accounts identified on regulated and unregulated betting platforms.

Account-recovery surface checks against the betting platforms within scope returned positive responses indicating registered accounts under the subject's emails or phone numbers on 1xBet, Bet365, and SportyBet. The same enumeration returned the subject's known handle in active use on associated tipster Telegram channels and on two specialist sports-betting forums. We classify this as red because (i) the subject maintains parallel betting accounts across three distinct platforms, (ii) the use of 1xBet — an offshore operator not licensed by the UK Gambling Commission — alongside two UK-licensed platforms is consistent with deliberate diversification across regulatory regimes, and (iii) the activity volume in the associated forum record (see further below) is materially elevated.

Betting accounts identified

REFERENCE	BT-01 · Bet365 (UK-licensed)
LINKED CONTACT	EM-01 (account-recovery prompt returned positive)
NOTES	Pre-2020 account; UKGC-licensed operator
EVIDENCE REF	EV-83
REFERENCE	BT-02 · 1xBet (offshore, not UKGC-licensed)
LINKED CONTACT	EM-03 (account-recovery prompt returned positive)
NOTES	1xBet is not licensed by the UK Gambling Commission. UK users access this operator outside the UK consumer-protection and self-exclusion regime (e.g. GAMSTOP).
EVIDENCE REF	EV-84
REFERENCE	BT-03 · SportyBet (Africa-focused)
LINKED CONTACT	PH-02 (account-recovery prompt returned positive)
NOTES	Operates principally under Nigerian, Kenyan, Ghanaian, and South African gaming licences; consistent with the subject's country-B locale (Section 5)
EVIDENCE REF	EV-85

AMBER FLAG

Sustained activity in betting and speculative-trading communities.

The subject's known Reddit handle has posted with regular cadence over the previous fourteen months in two subreddits dedicated to high-risk speculative trading and in one specialist sports-betting forum. Posts include references to balance drawdowns, expectations of recovery through leveraged positions, and partial position disclosures. Telegram membership records place the subject in two public tipster channels. The pattern is consistent with sustained gambling engagement; on the visible record it stops short of disclosed problem-gambling behaviour, though several post extracts use language that a clinician might find informative.

Forum activity — sample observations

PLATFORM	Reddit — r/[REDACTED] (high-risk speculative trading)
POST COUNT (DEC 2024 – FEB 2026)	47 posts, 312 comments
REPRESENTATIVE EXTRACT	"down [REDACTED] this month, doubling in to recover — last time it worked"
MOST RECENT POST	[DATE] 09 Feb 2026
EVIDENCE REF	EV-44
PLATFORM	Reddit — r/[REDACTED] (sports-betting strategy)
POST COUNT	23 posts, 89 comments
EVIDENCE REF	EV-45
PLATFORM	[REDACTED].com — specialist sports-betting forum
POST COUNT	61 posts across two threads
EVIDENCE REF	EV-46
PLATFORM	Telegram — two public tipster channels
MEMBERSHIP	Confirmed via public-member surface on both channels
EVIDENCE REF	EV-31

AMBER FLAG

Public posts consistent with financial pressure.

Within the same period the subject has posted, in three unrelated communities, about short-term liquidity difficulties, requests for informal financial assistance, and frustrations with creditors. We do not draw a clinical conclusion from these posts. We record them because the pattern is consistent with the financial-context indicators our client described to us in the intake, and because the timing of several posts correlates with documented betting-balance-drawdown extracts (EV-44).

Financial-pressure signals — sample observations

PLATFORM	Reddit — r/[REDACTED] (personal finance, UK)
POST DATE	[DATE] 28 Jan 2026
EXTRACT	"need to bridge until end of month, anyone done a short-term loan from [REDACTED] before"
EVIDENCE REF	EV-47

PLATFORM	Reddit — r/[REDACTED] (debt advice)
COMMENT COUNT (12 MONTHS)	9 comments under others' posts
EVIDENCE REF	EV-48

RED FLAG

Reputationally sensitive content: sustained pattern of sexually explicit interaction across multiple accounts.

The behavioural-content review identified, under the subject's known handles, a sustained pattern of sexually explicit interaction across at least four platforms. The secondary Twitter/X account retweets explicit content at a cadence of approximately 8–14 retweets per week across the observation period. The primary Snapchat account (SOC-04, Section 6) repeatedly reposts non-personal explicit content to public Stories. The primary Instagram account carries a sustained pattern of public comments under content posted by Instagram-prominent female accounts that a reasonable reader would characterise as sexually suggestive. The Pinterest boards include explicit-adjacent imagery. We classify this as red, not because consensual adult content consumption is itself a finding, but because the pattern is sustained, posted under the subject's primary identifiers, and not concealed — meaning it is reachable by any party who locates one of the subject's identifiers. It is material to a client who has been presented with a curated, family-oriented self-presentation.

Reputationally sensitive content — sample observations

SOURCE	TW-02 — Twitter/X retweet log
OBSERVATION PERIOD	Dec 2024 – Feb 2026
RETWEET CADENCE (EXPLICIT CONTENT)	Approx. 8–14 per week
MOST-FOLLOWED ADULT ACCOUNTS	5 of the subject's top-10 follows on this handle are adult content creators
ACCOUNT PUBLIC-VISIBILITY	Open; not protected/private
EVIDENCE REF	EV-71, EV-80
SOURCE	SOC-04 — Snapchat public Stories
CAPTURE PERIOD	Three discrete captures across Jan–Feb 2026
CONTENT TYPE	Reposts of non-personal explicit material from other platforms; occasional accompanying text commentary
EVIDENCE REF	EV-72
SOURCE	SOC-01 — Instagram comment-history sweep
SAMPLE SIZE	23 sampled comments across 14 distinct accounts
PATTERN	Sexually suggestive comments under content posted by Instagram-prominent female accounts; tone explicit rather than ambiguous
EVIDENCE REF	EV-68

SOURCE	SOC-11 — Pinterest boards
BOARD NAMES (REDACTED)	[REDACTED], [REDACTED], [REDACTED]
CONTENT	Mixed lifestyle / fitness / explicit-adjacent imagery
EVIDENCE REF	EV-75

NO FLAG

No public extremist, hate-speech, or violent content identified.

No public posts, comments, or imagery were identified under any of the subject's known handles that fell into our defined categories of extremist content, hate speech, or content depicting or endorsing violence.

AMBER FLAG

Derogatory content about a previous partner identified.

We identified, on a public-facing comment record under SOC-09 (Reddit), language from the subject about a previous partner that a reasonable reader would characterise as derogatory and non-private in tone. The comment references the named third party in identifying detail and remains live at the time of this report. We record this because it is material to the question the client has brought to us, while emphasising that its weight is for the client to assess.

Evidence supporting this finding

PLATFORM	Reddit — r/[REDACTED]
POST DATE	[DATE] 11 Nov 2025
EXTRACT (SANITISED)	Comment refers to a named third party in derogatory, identifying terms
STATUS	Live at time of report
EVIDENCE REF	EV-49

Section 8 · Criminal & Regulatory History

Open-source traces of *court, regulatory, and enforcement activity*

The Digital Footprint Analysis is not a criminal-record check, and the findings in this section do not constitute one. What follows is a structured sweep of the publicly indexable record for traces of criminal proceedings, civil judgments, regulatory enforcement, and sanctions or watchlist appearances under the subject's stated name and known aliases. Material traces were identified; their evidentiary weight is described below.

Sources examined

Court & tribunal listings. Find a Court Decision (UK Courts & Tribunals Judiciary), HM Courts & Tribunals Service public listings, BAILII, the Sentencing Council's case summaries, the London Gazette (insolvency, disqualifications, statutory notices), and the equivalent public registers for the secondary jurisdiction identified in Section 5 (country B). **Regulatory enforcement.** FCA Register and final notices, ICO enforcement actions, SRA disciplinary tribunal, Companies House disqualified-directors register. **Sanctions & watchlists.** OFSI consolidated sanctions list (UK), OFAC SDN list (US), EU consolidated sanctions, UN Security Council list, World-Check open mirrors. **Press & media archives.** Indexed UK national and regional press, court-reporter outlets, and diaspora-press archives relevant to country B. **Sex-offender registers.** Publicly accessible registers in the United States; no equivalent public register exists in the UK and that absence is recorded in Section 9.

AMBER FLAG

Civil judgment recorded against the subject's stated name (2022).

A County Court judgment (CCJ) under the subject's stated full name and a date of birth band consistent with that on the subject's LinkedIn profile is recorded on the Registry Trust public register for a sum in the low five figures. The judgment is recorded as unsatisfied at the time of the sweep. We treat this as amber rather than red because (i) a CCJ is a civil rather than criminal matter and (ii) the register entry alone cannot conclusively confirm the subject's identity without the underlying address. However, the date of birth band, the geographic locale of the issuing court (consistent with a city the subject has previously stated they resided in), and the surname coincidence make the match probabilistically strong.

Evidence supporting this finding

SOURCE	Registry Trust / TrustOnline (UK CCJ public register)
NAME ON JUDGMENT	Subject's stated full name (exact match)
ISSUING COURT	[REDACTED] County Court Money Claims Centre
JUDGMENT VALUE	£[REDACTED, low five figures]
DATE OF JUDGMENT	[DATE] Q3 2022
STATUS AT SWEEP	Unsatisfied
MATCH CONFIDENCE	Probabilistic — name + DOB band + geographic locale coincide
EVIDENCE REF	EV-50

RED FLAG

Subject named in a 2020 criminal charge later discontinued; press record persists.

An indexed press record from a regional UK title dated 2020 names an individual matching the subject's full name and stated age range as having been charged in connection with an alleged offence of dishonesty. A follow-up record from the same title, dated approximately fourteen weeks later, records that the Crown Prosecution Service discontinued the proceedings prior to trial. We are recording this as red because the original press appearance remains live, indexed, and surfaces against the subject's name on first-page search results; the subject has not disclosed this to our client, and the disposition (CPS discontinuance) is not equivalent to acquittal at trial. The subject is presumed innocent of the alleged offence; the finding records the existence and live status of the press record, not a determination of guilt.

Evidence supporting this finding

SOURCE	[Regional press title] — initial charge report
PUBLICATION DATE	[DATE] Q2 2020
ARTICLE STATUS	Live and publicly indexable at time of sweep
IDENTIFIERS IN ARTICLE	Full name; stated age at publication; city of residence consistent with the subject's prior stated locale
ALLEGED OFFENCE CATEGORY	Offence of dishonesty (specific category redacted)
EVIDENCE REF	EV-51

SOURCE	[Regional press title] — follow-up report
PUBLICATION DATE	[DATE] Q3 2020
DISPOSITION RECORDED	CPS discontinued proceedings prior to trial
ARTICLE STATUS	Live and publicly indexable at time of sweep
EVIDENCE REF	EV-52

SOURCE	BAILII — case-listing search
RESULT	No reported judgment located under the subject's name
EVIDENCE REF	EV-53

AMBER FLAG

Historical regulatory enforcement notice against a company at which the subject was a director (2018).

Companies House records show the subject held a directorship of a UK private limited company during the period 2016–2019 (the company is now dissolved). The Information Commissioner's Office issued a monetary penalty notice against that company in 2018 in connection with breaches of the Privacy and Electronic Communications Regulations. The penalty was issued to the company, not personally against the subject, and the subject was one of three directors during the relevant period. We record this as amber because (i) the enforcement was corporate rather than personal, (ii) the subject's specific role in the underlying conduct is not established on the public record, and (iii) the directorship pre-dates the current employment claim documented in Section 5 — meaning the subject has not disclosed this prior directorship to our client.

Evidence supporting this finding

SOURCE	Companies House — officer appointments record
COMPANY	[REDACTED — UK private limited company, now dissolved]
SUBJECT'S ROLE	Director (one of three during the relevant period)
PERIOD OF APPOINTMENT	[DATE] 2016 – [DATE] 2019
EVIDENCE REF	EV-54
SOURCE	ICO — enforcement actions register
ACTION TYPE	Monetary penalty notice
YEAR	2018
STATUTORY BASIS	Privacy and Electronic Communications Regulations 2003 (as amended)
PENALTY AMOUNT	£[REDACTED]
RECIPIENT	The company (corporate, not personal)
EVIDENCE REF	EV-55

NO FLAG

No sanctions, watchlist, or sex-offender register appearances identified.

Searches of the OFSI UK consolidated sanctions list, the OFAC SDN list, the EU consolidated sanctions list, the UN Security Council sanctions lists, the Companies House register of disqualified directors, and the publicly accessible United States sex-offender registers returned no matches against the subject's stated full name or known aliases. The Disclosure and Barring Service (UK) does not maintain a public register and was not searched; the absence of a public register entry is not equivalent to a clean DBS check, and this limitation is recorded in Section 9.

Evidence supporting this finding

SOURCE	OFSI UK consolidated sanctions list
RESULT	No match (stated name, all known aliases, DOB band)
EVIDENCE REF	EV-56
SOURCE	OFAC SDN list
RESULT	No match
EVIDENCE REF	EV-57
SOURCE	EU consolidated sanctions list
RESULT	No match
EVIDENCE REF	EV-58
SOURCE	UN Security Council sanctions lists
RESULT	No match
EVIDENCE REF	EV-59
SOURCE	Companies House — register of disqualified directors
RESULT	No entry under the subject's stated name and DOB band
EVIDENCE REF	EV-60
SOURCE	US sex-offender registers (publicly indexable, by state)
RESULT	No match across the states corresponding to the subject's claimed and observed locales
EVIDENCE REF	EV-61

Section 9 · Limitations & Caveats

What this report *does and does not say*

Scope of the determination

This report records what is and is not present on the open-source record at the time of the sweep. The findings recorded above are evidenced and footnoted within Greyline's internal case file. The composite reading of those findings is, in our analytical judgement, RED. The instructing party retains full discretion over what action, if any, to take in response.

What the sweep does not establish

Open-source intelligence, however thorough, has structural limits. The Digital Footprint Analysis is not a criminal-record check, not a credit check, not a marriage registry search, and not a property-ownership verification. Where any of those determinations is material to the client's decision, a corresponding instruction under our other service lines would be required. This sweep also cannot reach into private communications, non-indexable platform content, deleted material beyond residual traces, or material held behind authentication walls.

Reliability of negative findings

Where a reverse-image search returns no adverse match, this does not establish that the image is authentic. It establishes only that no public match was identified within the indexed corpora at the time of the sweep. Image provenance findings should be read in that light. The same caveat applies to platform absence: a subject not located on a given platform is not, on that basis alone, a subject who has never been present on it.

Temporal scope

Findings reflect the state of the open-source record between 12 and 16 February 2026. Online presence is mutable. Profiles examined during this sweep may have been amended, deleted, or supplemented since the sweep was concluded. Material findings should be treated as time-stamped to the dates of collection.

Section 10 · Recommendations

Actions available to the client

The recommendations below are issued in the analytical voice. The instructing party retains full discretion over which, if any, to act upon.

01. Suspend further financial engagement.

The composite reading of the indicators above does not support proceeding with any financial commitment, transfer, or shared-account arrangement with the subject. We recommend that no such arrangement be entered into pending resolution of the identity inconsistencies recorded in Section 5.

02. Require documentary identity verification.

Should the client wish to continue the relationship in any form, we recommend that documentary verification of the subject's identity, place of residence, and employment be required before further sensitive disclosures, financial or otherwise.

03. Consider a formal criminal-record check through the statutory channel.

The findings in Section 8 are open-source traces only — the report is not a criminal-record check, and the absence of certain register entries (notably the UK DBS register, which is not public) does not establish their absence in fact. Where the client's decision is materially affected by criminal history, we recommend a formal Basic, Standard, or Enhanced DBS check via the appropriate statutory channel, and a Subject Access Request to the Police National Computer where appropriate. We can support the preparation of either under instruction.

04. Preserve the existing communications record.

We recommend that the client preserve, in their original form, all messages, voice notes, photographs, and transfer records exchanged with the subject. These constitute the evidentiary base for any subsequent recourse, whether civil, criminal, or platform-level.

05. Consider a follow-on instruction if movement verification is required.

If physical verification of the subject's stated location or movements becomes material to the client's decision, this would fall within our Movement & Field Intelligence service line and would proceed under a separate engagement letter.

06. Consider reporting where applicable.

Where the subject's conduct, taken in the round, meets the threshold of romance fraud or impersonation under the law of the client's jurisdiction, the client may wish to consider a report to Action Fraud (UK), the FBI's IC3 (US), the Canadian Anti-Fraud Centre, or the relevant equivalent. We can support the preparation of such a report under instruction.

Appendix A · Evidence Log

Per-finding observation log *with capture references*

Every finding recorded in this report is supported by one or more open-source observations captured during the sweep. The table below logs each observation by evidence reference (EV-NN), the URL or platform observed (redacted in this sample for publication), the date and time of capture (UTC), and the filename of the screenshot held in the Greyline case file. Screenshots are retained for the duration of the engagement under our standing evidence-handling protocol and are available to the instructing party on request, subject to source-protection considerations.

Evidence ref	Section	Source observed (redacted)	Screenshot filename	Captured (UTC)
EV-01	Section 4	[stock-photo aggregator].com/p/[REDACTED]	[REDACTED].png	13 Feb 2026 09:14
EV-02	Section 4	[dating-platform A].com/profile/[REDACTED]	[REDACTED].png	13 Feb 2026 09:17
EV-03	Section 4	[dating-platform B].com/u/[REDACTED]	[REDACTED].png	13 Feb 2026 09:19
EV-04	Section 4	[dating-platform C].co.za/[REDACTED]	[REDACTED].png	13 Feb 2026 09:22
EV-05	Section 4	Internal: facial-geometry comparison record IMG-01 x5	[REDACTED].pdf	13 Feb 2026 11:02
EV-06	Section 4	facebook.com/[REDACTED]/posts/[REDACTED]	[REDACTED].png	13 Feb 2026 12:48
EV-07	Section 4	Internal: composition-overlay analysis IMG-02	[REDACTED].pdf	13 Feb 2026 13:11
EV-08	Section 4	Internal: forensic markers IMG-03 (EXIF, geometry)	[REDACTED].pdf	13 Feb 2026 13:24
EV-09	Section 4	Internal: synthetic-image markers IMG-04	[REDACTED].pdf	13 Feb 2026 13:55
EV-10	Section 4	[travel-blog].com/[REDACTED]/post-[REDACTED]	[REDACTED].png	13 Feb 2026 14:18
EV-11	Section 4	Internal: pixel-overlay record IMG-05	[REDACTED].pdf	13 Feb 2026 14:31
EV-12	Section 4	Internal: forensic markers IMG-06	[REDACTED].pdf	13 Feb 2026 14:42
EV-13	Section 4	DP-01 photograph carousel — IMG-07 instance	[REDACTED].png	13 Feb 2026 15:03
EV-14	Section 4	DP-02 photograph carousel — IMG-07 instance	[REDACTED].png	13 Feb 2026 15:06
EV-15	Section 5	192.com / Open Register lookup record	[REDACTED].pdf	13 Feb 2026 16:21
EV-16	Section 5	facebook.com/[REDACTED].o[REDACTED]	[REDACTED].png	13 Feb 2026 16:38

Evidence ref	Section	Source observed (redacted)	Screenshot filename	Captured (UTC)
EV-17	Section 5	linkedin.com/in/[REDACTED]-o[REDACTED]-[REDACTED]	[REDACTED].png	14 Feb 2026 09:11
EV-18	Section 5	[REDACTED] Plc] employee directory search record	[REDACTED].pdf	14 Feb 2026 09:34
EV-19	Section 5	find-and-update.company-information.service.gov.uk search record	[REDACTED].pdf	14 Feb 2026 09:52
EV-20	Section 5	instagram.com/[REDACTED]-o[REDACTED] — geo-tag enumeration	[REDACTED].pdf	14 Feb 2026 11:07
EV-21	Section 5	Internal: EXIF extract IMG-03	[REDACTED].txt	14 Feb 2026 11:22
EV-22	Section 5	Tagged-photos enumeration across Instagram + Facebook	[REDACTED].pdf	14 Feb 2026 11:48
EV-23	Section 5	DP-02 (Hinge) bio text — full capture	[REDACTED].png	15 Feb 2026 10:14
EV-24	Section 5	Instagram — @[REDACTED]-[REDACTED] recurrence record	[REDACTED].pdf	15 Feb 2026 10:38
EV-25	Section 6	DP-01 — bumble.com/profile/[REDACTED]	[REDACTED].png	15 Feb 2026 11:02
EV-26	Section 6	DP-02 — hinge.co/u/[REDACTED]	[REDACTED].png	15 Feb 2026 11:09
EV-27	Section 6	DP-03 — afroromance.com/[REDACTED]	[REDACTED].png	15 Feb 2026 11:17
EV-28	Section 6	[scraper-mirror].com archive — Vivastreet-adjacent listing	[REDACTED].png	15 Feb 2026 12:03
EV-29	Section 6	Internal: alias enumeration master record	[REDACTED].csv	15 Feb 2026 12:42
EV-30	Section 6	Handle re-use — Reddit	[REDACTED].png	15 Feb 2026 13:01
EV-31	Section 6	Handle re-use — Telegram public channels	[REDACTED].png	15 Feb 2026 13:08
EV-32	Section 6	Handle re-use — specialist forum 1	[REDACTED].png	15 Feb 2026 13:14
EV-33	Section 6	Handle re-use — specialist forum 2	[REDACTED].png	15 Feb 2026 13:19
EV-34	Section 6	Handle re-use — gaming platform	[REDACTED].png	15 Feb 2026 13:24
EV-35	Section 6	Handle re-use — cryptocurrency forum	[REDACTED].png	15 Feb 2026 13:31
EV-36	Section 6	Handle re-use — dormant platform 1	[REDACTED].png	15 Feb 2026 13:38
EV-37	Section 6	Handle re-use — dormant platform 2	[REDACTED].png	15 Feb 2026 13:42
EV-38	Section 6	Handle re-use — dormant platform 3	[REDACTED].png	15 Feb 2026 13:46
EV-39	Section 6	Handle re-use — dormant platform 4	[REDACTED].png	15 Feb 2026 13:50

Evidence ref	Section	Source observed (redacted)	Screenshot filename	Captured (UTC)
EV-40	Section 6	Handle re-use — dormant platform 5	[REDACTED].png	15 Feb 2026 13:54
EV-41	Section 6	Handle re-use — dormant platform 6	[REDACTED].png	15 Feb 2026 13:58
EV-42	Section 6	Handle re-use — dormant platform 7	[REDACTED].png	15 Feb 2026 14:02
EV-43	Section 6	Handle re-use — dormant platform 8	[REDACTED].png	15 Feb 2026 14:06
EV-44	Section 7	reddit.com/r/[REDACTED] — subject post + comment archive	[REDACTED].pdf	15 Feb 2026 15:11
EV-45	Section 7	reddit.com/r/[REDACTED] — subject post + comment archive	[REDACTED].pdf	15 Feb 2026 15:34
EV-46	Section 7	[REDACTED].com — subject thread archive	[REDACTED].pdf	15 Feb 2026 15:58
EV-47	Section 7	reddit.com/r/[REDACTED] — bridge-finance post	[REDACTED].png	15 Feb 2026 16:14
EV-48	Section 7	reddit.com/r/[REDACTED] — debt-advice comment archive	[REDACTED].pdf	15 Feb 2026 16:31
EV-49	Section 7	reddit.com/r/[REDACTED] — derogatory-comment record	[REDACTED].png	15 Feb 2026 16:52
EV-50	Section 8	trustronline.org.uk — CCJ register lookup record	[REDACTED].pdf	15 Feb 2026 17:18
EV-51	Section 8	[regional-press].co.uk — 2020 charge report	[REDACTED].png	15 Feb 2026 17:34
EV-52	Section 8	[regional-press].co.uk — 2020 follow-up (CPS discontinued)	[REDACTED].png	15 Feb 2026 17:39
EV-53	Section 8	baillii.org — case-listing search record	[REDACTED].pdf	15 Feb 2026 17:48
EV-54	Section 8	find-and-update.company-information.service.gov.uk — officer record	[REDACTED].pdf	15 Feb 2026 17:55
EV-55	Section 8	ico.org.uk — enforcement register entry (2018 MPN)	[REDACTED].pdf	15 Feb 2026 18:02
EV-56	Section 8	OFSI consolidated sanctions list — search record	[REDACTED].pdf	15 Feb 2026 18:12
EV-57	Section 8	OFAC SDN list — search record	[REDACTED].pdf	15 Feb 2026 18:14
EV-58	Section 8	EU consolidated sanctions list — search record	[REDACTED].pdf	15 Feb 2026 18:16
EV-59	Section 8	UN Security Council sanctions lists — search record	[REDACTED].pdf	15 Feb 2026 18:18
EV-60	Section 8	Companies House — disqualified directors register search	[REDACTED].pdf	15 Feb 2026 18:21
EV-61	Section 8	US state sex-offender registers — multi-state search record	[REDACTED].pdf	15 Feb 2026 18:34
EV-62	Section 6	Internal: EM-01 linkage record (LinkedIn + IG primary + FB primary)	[REDACTED].pdf	13 Feb 2026 09:48

Evidence ref	Section	Source observed (redacted)	Screenshot filename	Captured (UTC)
EV-63	Section 6	Breach-aggregator surface (2019 dataset) — EM-02 surface record	[REDACTED].pdf	13 Feb 2026 10:12
EV-64	Section 6	Internal: EM-03 account-recovery surface across adult-adjacent platforms	[REDACTED].pdf	13 Feb 2026 10:34
EV-65	Section 6	Internal: PH-01 linkage record (WhatsApp + primary IG + LinkedIn 2FA)	[REDACTED].pdf	13 Feb 2026 10:48
EV-66	Section 6	Internal: PH-02 account-recovery surface (DP-03, AD-04, BT-03)	[REDACTED].pdf	13 Feb 2026 11:04
EV-67	Section 6	instagram.com/[REDACTED]_o[REDACTED] — primary profile capture	[REDACTED].png	14 Feb 2026 12:18
EV-68	Section 6	Internal: SOC-01 comment-history sweep (23 sampled comments)	[REDACTED].pdf	14 Feb 2026 12:42
EV-69	Section 6	instagram.com/[REDACTED] — secondary private account surface	[REDACTED].png	14 Feb 2026 12:58
EV-70	Section 6	x.com/[REDACTED]o[REDACTED] — primary X profile capture	[REDACTED].png	14 Feb 2026 13:14
EV-71	Section 6	x.com/[REDACTED]_ — TW-02 explicit-retweet log (60-day window)	[REDACTED].pdf	14 Feb 2026 13:48
EV-72	Section 6	snapchat.com/add/[REDACTED] — SOC-04 public-Story captures (x3)	[REDACTED].png	14 Feb 2026 14:22
EV-73	Section 6	tiktok.com/@[REDACTED] — SOC-06 profile capture	[REDACTED].png	14 Feb 2026 14:34
EV-74	Section 6	Internal: SOC-08 YouTube comment-history aggregation	[REDACTED].pdf	14 Feb 2026 14:48
EV-75	Section 6	pinterest.com/[REDACTED] — SOC-11 board enumeration	[REDACTED].pdf	14 Feb 2026 15:02
EV-76	Section 6	DP-02 — bumble.com/profile/[REDACTED] (second Bumble account)	[REDACTED].png	15 Feb 2026 11:14
EV-77	Section 6	onlyfans.com — AD-01 account-existence surface (EM-03)	[REDACTED].pdf	15 Feb 2026 12:18
EV-78	Section 6	allaccessfans.com/u/[REDACTED] — AD-02 capture	[REDACTED].png	15 Feb 2026 12:26
EV-79	Section 6	fetlife.com/users/[REDACTED] — AD-03 profile capture	[REDACTED].png	15 Feb 2026 12:34
EV-80	Section 7	Internal: TW-02 follow-graph analysis (top-10 follows)	[REDACTED].pdf	14 Feb 2026 14:08
EV-81	Section 7	Reserved (case-file cross-reference)	—	—
EV-82	Section 7	Reserved (case-file cross-reference)	—	—
EV-83	Section 7	bet365.com — BT-01 account-recovery surface (EM-01)	[REDACTED].pdf	15 Feb 2026 15:12
EV-84	Section 7	1xbet.com — BT-02 account-recovery surface (EM-03)	[REDACTED].pdf	15 Feb 2026 15:24
EV-85	Section 7	sportybet.com — BT-03 account-recovery surface (PH-02)	[REDACTED].pdf	15 Feb 2026 15:38

Note on redaction. In this published sample, URLs, handles, third-party names, filenames, and identifying detail are redacted to protect the original engagement. In the live deliverable issued to the instructing party, each row carries the full URL, the unredacted handle, the original capture timestamp, and a reference to a screenshot available within the case file. The structure, evidentiary granularity, and standard of capture shown above are those of a live Greyline deliverable.

SAMPLE · REDACTED

Section 11 · Closing

Sign-off and confidentiality

Standard of analysis

This report has been prepared on the analytical standard applied to all Greyline Digital Footprint Analyses. Findings are evidenced within the internal case file and available to the instructing party on request, subject to source-protection considerations. The composite assessment is the judgement of the senior analyst, reviewed by the Head of Investigations prior to issue.

Confidentiality

This report is issued to the instructing party under the engagement letter and Mutual Non-Disclosure Agreement executed prior to the commencement of the matter. It is confidential to that party. It may not be reproduced, in whole or in part, for any purpose other than the client's own decision-making, without Greyline's prior written consent.

Engagement summary

The full scope of work is recorded in the Engagement Summary issued at the start of the matter. This report constitutes the final deliverable under that engagement. A thirty-minute debrief call is available at the client's option and may be requested by reply to the case email address.

SIGNED OFF FOR ISSUE**Senior Analyst, Greyline OSINT Cell**

Lead author of this report
16 February 2026

**Head of Investigations, Greyline
Investigations Limited**

Reviewing officer
16 February 2026

SAMPLE REDACTION NOTICE

This document is a redacted demonstration of the analytical report issued under the Greyline Digital Footprint Analysis service. The case reference, subject name, supplied photographs, platform handles, employer references, and all other identifying detail shown have been fabricated for publication. The structure, analytical method, evidentiary tone, and standard of issue are those of a live Greyline deliverable. The original client whose engagement informed the format of this sample is protected under our standing confidentiality protocols and will never appear in any sample we publish.