

18 September 2026

An impersonating online profile

Summary and scope

What the visible profile establishes, and what it cannot reveal.

A fictional example

Every person, organisation, event, and exhibit in this sample is invented. It demonstrates report structure and reasoning; it is not a client case, evidence, legal advice, or a promise of an outcome.

The question

A private client reports a public profile using their name and photograph to advertise paid consultations. Does the visible material support their account of impersonation, and can the operator be identified?

Summary of findings

The profile displayed the client's name, a matching photograph, and an invitation to book consultations at the time of review (E01). A client-supplied earlier publication contains the same image (E02). The client denies creating or authorising the profile (E03). No platform account records were available.

Assessment

The material **supports the client's account of impersonation**, with **moderate analytical confidence**. It does not establish who operates the account. Reused imagery and public profile details are insufficient to identify a particular person. No technical attribution or finding of criminal liability is made.

Agreed scope

Review the identified public profile, compare the supplied material, and record what was visible. No account access, covert engagement, device examination, contact with the operator, or enquiries into private communications were included.

Findings and reasoning

Distinguish public observations from a client's account and an identity claim.

Finding 1 · The profile presents a recognisable identity

Observation. The public profile displayed a name and photograph matching the supplied material, alongside a booking invitation. Reference: E01.

Limit. This records one point in time. It does not establish when the account was created, who controlled it, or whether anyone paid for a consultation.

Finding 2 · An earlier copy of the image is supplied

Document comparison. The same image appears in an earlier publication supplied by the client. Reference: E02.

Limit. The supplied copy does not independently prove its publication date or the direction in which the image was copied. Availability of a photograph does not establish authority to represent its subject.

Finding 3 · The client denies authorisation

Reported account. The client says neither they nor a representative created or approved the profile. Reference: E03.

Limit. This is the client's account. An authorised but forgotten arrangement or misunderstanding has not been independently excluded.

What the assessment means

The matching identity, commercial invitation, and denial of authorisation support an impersonation concern. Confidence remains moderate because account records and independent confirmation of authority are absent. The evidence cannot connect the operator to someone the client suspects. Any further work needs a separate agreed scope.

Evidence schedule and limitations

A record suitable for explaining the concern without overstating attribution.

E01 · Public profile capture

Invented capture record describing the displayed name, image, booking invitation, source, and observation time.

E02 · Earlier publication copy

Copy supplied by the fictional client; image comparison only, with its date unverified.

E03 · Client account note

Fictional enquiry note documenting the denial of authorisation and the questions asked.

What is not established

Account ownership, login locations, private messages, intent, financial loss, and a connection to any suspected person remain unestablished. Nothing in the report guarantees platform removal or identifies the applicable legal claim.

How a live case differs

A live report would reference retained captures, complete source addresses, observation times and time zones, and relevant handling records. No actual profiles or underlying exhibits exist here. Invented account handles, personal identifiers, and capture images are intentionally omitted.

Using and correcting a report

The client and their advisers decide whether and how to use the findings, including in a platform report. Urgent safety concerns should not wait for an investigation. Material corrections should identify the changed finding in a dated revision, retain the earlier version, and notify recipients.