

Blockchain Tracing Report

Sample report — fictional matter Sample-01 · Prepared to show report structure

THIS IS A FICTIONAL SAMPLE

Every name, wallet address, account number, amount and date in this document is invented for the purpose of showing what one of our reports looks like. No part of it describes a real person, a real matter or a real transaction. Wallet addresses are illustrative strings and are not intended to refer to any wallet that may exist on any blockchain. Receiving exchanges are shown as “Exchange A” and “Exchange B” because naming a real exchange in an invented fraud would be unfair to that exchange; in a real report they are named.

From	ComplyChain Solutions LLC info@complychainsolutions.com · complychainsolutions.com
To	Counsel for the complainant (sample)
Matter	Sample matter reference CC-0000-2026-00
Date	Sample
Platform	CoinForensics TRACE, with manual verification against public block explorers
Attachments	A. Wallet schedule · B. Transaction hash list (sortable workbook) · C. Full-resolution fund-flow graph. <i>Attachments are not included in this sample.</i>

1. Summary

Between February and May of the sample period, the complainant transferred **\$412,000** in USDT to wallet addresses supplied by people presenting themselves as an investment adviser and an account manager. We traced those funds from the complainant’s accounts at two retail exchanges and from their self-custody wallet, through three intermediary wallets, into a consolidation wallet, and on to deposit addresses at two international exchanges.

- 100 transaction hashes** are listed in Attachment B, grouped by wallet-to-wallet link. The key wallets are listed in Section 3.1; every address appears in Attachment A.
- Six deposit addresses** were identified at two exchanges, receiving **\$388,400** of the traced funds.
- \$23,600** remains in a wallet that has not moved since the sample period, shown in Section 3.
- Two pairs of accounts are linked: 3 and 4 by a shared name on record, and 5 and 6 by a shared source of first funding (Section 5).

Names are leads, not conclusions.

Accounts used to move misappropriated funds are often opened with stolen or borrowed identity documents, so a name on an account record may not show who controlled it. Regulated exchanges are generally required to verify customer identity at onboarding; their KYC files, including document images, are the most direct way to test whether an identity is genuine. We request them in Section 6.

Consolidation wallets often pool funds from more than one source. Where they do, a report must state how traced funds are allocated; in this sample no outside funds entered the path (Section 3).

2. Background

The complainant was approached through a messaging application by a person presenting as an investment adviser, who over several weeks supplied trading guidance and screenshots of apparent returns. A second person, presented as an account manager, directed the complainant to a web platform that displayed a rising balance. When the complainant attempted to withdraw, the platform required payment of a “settlement fee” and then a “compliance verification deposit.” No withdrawal was completed.

Transfers were made from the complainant’s accounts at two retail exchanges and from a self-custody wallet application. The platform domain was registered three months before the first contact and is no longer resolving.

3. How the Funds Moved

All activity in this sample is on Ethereum, and every amount traced is USDT (the ERC-20 token), counted at face value as US dollars. Network fees are paid in ETH and are excluded. During the period none of the intermediary wallets or the Consolidation Wallet received USDT from outside this trace, so no allocation method is needed and amounts balance exactly at each wallet. The complainant’s withdrawals left each retail exchange from that exchange’s own hot wallet, so the graph shows each retail exchange as a single starting point. Figures are from our tracing ledger. The figures in Section 4 are the totals of every transfer each deposit address received from the Consolidation Wallet; every one of those deposits is itemised in Attachment B.

In a real report the "Name on record" column carries the name the exchange holds for the account, in the script in which the exchange holds it, together with the country recorded. Those names are leads for counsel and law enforcement to test, not findings by us.

5. How the Accounts Connect

Two pairs of accounts are linked:

- Accounts 3 and 4 are held under the same name on the exchange’s records (Holder C).
- Before receiving traced funds, deposit addresses 5 and 6 were each first funded by the same wallet, which appears nowhere else in this trace.

Taken together these are grounds to ask the exchanges whether the accounts share login IP addresses, device identifiers or verification documents. We cannot see any of that from the blockchain; only the exchange can.

6. What We Ask the Exchanges For

This section is written so that counsel can lift it into a follow-up subpoena, court order or preservation letter to each exchange’s compliance or legal-process team. The first responses identified the accounts and confirmed the itemised deposits; these requests go to who actually controlled them.

1. **Preservation**, extended from the original requests to cover any account later linked to the six in Section 4.
2. **KYC file** for each account: identity documents, document images, verification imagery, date of onboarding and any failed verification attempts.
3. **Full deposit and withdrawal history** for each account, beyond the deposits already confirmed, with transaction hashes, for the sample period and six months after.
4. **Login records**: IP addresses, device identifiers and session times.
5. **Linked accounts**: any account the exchange associates with these by identity, device, IP or funding source.
6. **Current balance and status**, and whether any balance is already restrained.

Separately, because the unmoved balance is USDT, law enforcement may ask the token’s issuer to freeze that address, or counsel may seek a court order directing it to. Whether an issuer acts is its own decision; we make no representation about the outcome.

7. Limitations and Sources

- **Period covered.** Tracing covers the February–May activity described in Section 1. The Dormant Wallet’s balance and the first funding of deposit addresses 5 and 6 were checked separately, as of the retrieval date, as were the platform domain’s registration and current status; nothing else outside the period was reviewed.
- **What we screened.** Counterparties were screened against the sanctions data described below. A result of “no match found” means only that: it is not a clearance. In this sample, none of the counterparties screened matched.
- **Confidence levels.** In a full report every finding carries one of three labels: *Confirmed* = a transaction verified on-chain, an entry on an official government sanctions list, or a record produced by the exchange; *Inferred* = attribution or clustering by ComplyChain analysts using CoinForensics TRACE, not an official listing; *Unverified* = a reported lead not yet tested. They are omitted from this sample for length.
- **Names.** We do not conclude who controlled any wallet or account. Attribution is a matter for the exchange’s records and for the court.
- **Sources.** Public blockchain data retrieved from block explorers, with the date of retrieval recorded for each figure (omitted from this sample); domain registration (WHOIS) records for the platform domain; OFAC SDN data as published by the US Treasury; records the exchanges produced in response to legal process.
- **We do not recover funds** and we make no representation that any funds will be recovered. The fee for a report like this is fixed in writing before work begins and does not depend on the outcome.

8. Signature

A report is not final until a qualified analyst has reviewed every figure in it and signed below. Until then it is marked DRAFT and must not be relied on. This sample is unsigned.

Name and title of the signing analyst
Qualifications · Date

I have reviewed the transactions, figures and sources in this report. In a full report each finding carries a confidence level as described in Section 7.