



DIAGNOSTIC REPORT · LVR-2026-002

date of review: July 17, 2026

prepared for: design-partner submission · client identity withheld

subject: administrative-law excerpt · 1 authority · 1 proposition

Submitted text: "Congress has not spoken to the precise question at issue. Chevron USA, Inc. v. Natural Resources Defense Council, 468 U.S. 837 (1984)."

VERDICT: FAIL

Do not file as written. The citation is defective and the authority it invokes has been overruled; see corrective actions. A corrected, reframed passage is eligible for re-verification.

authorities checked:

1

defective citation:

1

authority no longer

good law: 1

fabricated: 0 ·

quotation defects: 0

Findings

**Chevron USA, Inc. v. Natural
Resources Defense Council, 468
U.S. 837 (1984)**

⚠ F-1 · REAL CASE, DEFECTIVE CITATION — WRONG VOLUME

Chevron U.S.A., Inc. v. Natural Resources Defense Council, Inc. is reported at **467 U.S. 837 (1984)** — not 468. Whatever occupies 468 U.S. 837 is a different decision.

Why this error survives eyeball review: volume 468 of U.S. Reports is also a 1984 volume, so the citation is chronologically self-consistent and looks perfect on its face. Only resolution against the reporter itself exposes it — precisely the class of error that passes a busy reader and fails in front of a clerk who pulls the cite.

× citation — volume 468 does not resolve to Chevron; correct volume is 467

✓ existence — the intended authority is real: 467 U.S. 837, decided June 25, 1984

✓ substance — the submitted sentence paraphrases Chevron step one ("whether Congress has directly spoken to the precise question at issue"); the step-one discussion appears at 467 U.S. at 842-43. No quotation marks are used, so no quotation defect arises (contrast LVR-2026-001, F-4)

Read the real opinion: [Justia — Chevron U.S.A., Inc. v. NRDC, 467 U.S. 837 \(full text\)](#)

Chevron deference framework (step one), invoked by the submitted sentence **× F-2 · AUTHORITY NO LONGER GOOD LAW — FLAGGED FOR COUNSEL REVIEW**

Even fully corrected, the citation invokes a framework the Supreme Court has overruled. ***Loper Bright Enterprises v. Raimondo*, 603 U.S. 369 (June 28, 2024)**, ended *Chevron* deference: courts, not agencies, now resolve statutory ambiguity, with agency views weighing at most under *Skidmore*. A 2026 filing that frames its argument on Chevron step one without addressing *Loper Bright* invites an immediate credibility strike even though every word of the (corrected) citation is real.

Scope note: Lavir flags superseded or overruled authority; it does not determine whether Chevron-era framing remains proper for a particular matter (e.g., retroactivity, reliance interests, *Brand X*-related questions). That judgment belongs to counsel.

- × good-law status — expressly overruled, 6-2/6-3, June 28, 2024
- ✓ verification basis — Supreme Court slip opinion and Congressional Research Service analysis, linked below

Sources: supremecourt.gov — [Loper Bright slip opinion, No. 22-451 \(PDF\)](#) · [Congressional Research Service — Loper Bright and agency interpretations](#) · [background: Wikipedia](#)

Corrective actions

#	ACTION
1	Correct the citation to: Chevron U.S.A., Inc. v. Natural Resources Defense Council, Inc., 467 U.S. 837, 842–43 (1984) (F-1).
2	Address <i>Loper Bright Enterprises v. Raimondo</i> , 603 U.S. 369 (2024), or reframe the argument under the post-Chevron standard; whether and how is counsel's judgment (F-2).
3	Resubmit the revised passage for re-verification; a passing revision receives a dated Lavir Verified record for the matter file.

Appendix — source index (where each authority was verified)

AUTHORITY	PRIMARY SOURCE CONSULTED
Chevron U.S.A., Inc. v. NRDC, 467 U.S. 837 (1984)	https://supreme.justia.com/cases/federal/us/467/837/
Loper Bright Enterprises v. Raimondo, 603 U.S. 369 (2024)	https://www.supremecourt.gov/opinions/23pdf/22-451_7m58.pdf · https://www.congress.gov/crs-product/R48320
"468 U.S. 837" as cited	Does not resolve to Chevron — that mismatch is finding F-1. Volume/page verified against the U.S. Reports via the sources above.

All links are to free public sources — no subscription is required to re-verify any finding in this report.

Scope & method. Lavir verifies existence, citation accuracy (reporter, volume, page, year, court), quotation fidelity, and good-law status signals against primary public sources. Whether a genuine authority supports the proposition it is cited for, and how superseded authority should be handled in a particular matter, is flagged for counsel's review and never auto-determined. The check pipeline contains no generative AI: citations are extracted deterministically, existence is resolved by lookup against public records, and quotations are matched textually. This engagement was performed under Lavir's v0 protocol: engine extraction and screening with analyst-performed source resolution. A source that cannot be retrieved is reported as "needs review" — never as verified, and never as fabricated.

Confidentiality. This submission was reviewed under Lavir's confidentiality commitments (lavr.org/confidentiality): used solely for this check, never used to train any AI system, deleted on request. This report is the client's property.