LAWMA: THE POWER OF SPECIALIZATION FOR LEGAL TASKS

Anonymous authors

Paper under double-blind review

Abstract

Annotation and classification of legal text are central components of empirical legal research. Traditionally, these tasks are often delegated to trained research assistants. Motivated by the advances in language modeling, empirical legal scholars are increasingly turning to commercial models, hoping that it will alleviate the significant cost of human annotation. In this work, we present a comprehensive analysis of large language models' current abilities to perform legal annotation tasks. To do so, we construct CaselawQA, a benchmark comprising 260 legal text classification tasks, nearly all new to the machine learning community. Starting from GPT-4 as a baseline, we show that it has non-trivial but highly varied accuracy, often exhibiting performance that may be insufficient for legal work. We then demonstrate that a lightly fine-tuned Llama 3 8B model vastly outperforms GPT-4 on almost all tasks, typically by double-digit percentage points. A few tens to hundreds of examples suffice to achieve high classification accuracy. Our work points to a viable alternative to the predominant practice of prompting commercial models. For concrete legal tasks with some available labeled data, researchers are better off using a specialized open-source model.

025 026 027

028

029

004

010 011

012

013

014

015

016

017

018

019

021

023

1 INTRODUCTION

The legal system generates a staggering volume of complex documents. United States federal courts alone process hundreds of thousands of cases a year, each having substantial case files. Much empirical legal research involves the systematic collection and analysis of such data in order to understand how laws function in practice and what impact they have on society. What limits researchers across the board is the cost of annotating and classifying legal documents. Legal classification tasks vary in complexity, but often require substantial expertise and effort. Employing trained research assistants stretches to a few thousand documents at a time, but is no match for the sheer scale of legal data.

There has long been an interest by empirical legal scholars in NLP tools for feature extraction (i.e., annotation) in lieu of human annotators (Livermore & Rockmore, 2019). Starting from sentiment analysis and topic models, to now large language models. The costs and error of existing methods is the single most important bottleneck in the empirical legal studies pipeline. Yet, the use of large language models to annotate legal text remains a critically understudied area.

Nonetheless, motivated by the rapid advances in language models, law scholars increasingly try out commercial models, such as GPT-4, on a variety of legal tasks, hoping to boost the efficiency of legal research. The underlying assumption is that large models such as GPT-4 provide the best solution to the problem that is currently available. In this work, we critically examine this assumption.

046 047

048

1.1 OUR CONTRIBUTIONS

We introduce and study a collection of 260 legal classification tasks, nearly all new to the ma chine learning community. The tasks we introduce are actual legal annotation tasks based on
 the U.S. Supreme Court (Spaeth et al., 2023) and Court of Appeals (Songer) databases. These
 databases offer rich annotations for court cases, which we utilize as labels to create challenging
 multi-class classification tasks. We aggregate these tasks into an easy-to-use benchmark, which we
 caselawQA. We detail in Section 2 the process used to construct this benchmark.



Figure 1: The cost of generality: Difference in accuracy between Lawma 8B and GPT4. Each vertical bar represents the accuracy difference on one task, sorted in ascending order.

We then evaluate in Section 3 the zero-shot performance of 28 language models, including GPT-4. We find that only a handful of them—notably Llama 3 70B Instruct and GPT-4—perform significantly better than a constant classifier that outputs the majority class. Of these models, GPT-4 delivers the strongest performance. Still, its average performance is poor (**62.0**% accuracy), and there are dozens of tasks where it performs worse than random guessing. Evaluating GPT-4 fewshot does not improve performance. Based on our comprehensive evaluations, we conclude that that the performance of current LLMs is far from sufficient for actual legal annotation work.

Next, we leverage our large corpus of legal classification tasks to fine-tune a single Llama 3 8B
Instruct (MetaAI, 2024) model, which we call *Lawma 8B* (Section 4). We show that Lawma 8B
achieves vastly superior performance to GPT-4¹ (Figure 1). Specifically, Lawma 8B outperforms
GPT-4 by 20.0 accuracy points, attaining in absolute terms 81.9% accuracy. Although it is expected
that fine-tuning improves performance, the strong superiority of fine-tuning an open-weights model
at much smaller scale is highly surprising. Our results demonstrate that, for legal classification tasks,
researchers are better off using small specialized models rather than large general-purpose LLMs.

Finally, we conduct several additional large-scale fine-tuning experiments that further demonstrate the benefits and practicality of specializing models:

083 084

085

090

092

093

063

064

065 066

- Larger models respond better to fine-tuning. Across nine different base models, accuracy increases steadily with pretraining compute (Section 4.2, Figure 7). We fine-tune a single Llama 3 70B Instruct model, which we call Lawma 70B, which attains **83.3**% accuracy.
 - Fine-tuning is data efficient. A few hundred examples typically suffice to achieve high classification accuracy (Section 4.3, Figure 8). This is crucial, since labeling a few hundred data points is often financially feasible for many legal scholars.
 - Fine-tuning generalizes to unseen tasks. Fine-tuning only on Court of Appeals tasks improves its accuracy on Supreme Court tasks by 18.8 accuracy points (Section 4.4, Figure 9).
 - We can simultaneously fine-tune on all 260 tasks. There is not a large loss compared with fine-tuning on a single specific task (Appendix D, Figure 11). This is desirable in practice, as it obviates the need to train and maintain a separate model for each task.

094 095

Our results speak to the power of specialization for legal classification tasks. The methods described in our paper can radically expand the capacity of legal scholars to engage in quantitative work, empowering legal scholars to apply the "law as data" paradigm to a host of novel research questions. Annotations of existing datasets can become much more fine-grained. Entire jurisdictions that have hitherto escaped academic attention, such as the many courts of U.S. States, may finally be analyzed.

From a benchmarking perspective, the tasks presented in this work are of independent interest. They are challenging multi-class classification problems that require some amount of legal expertise. The best models achieve non-trivial, but modest zero-shot performance. And even fine-tuned models don't reach intercoder agreement rates (Section C). Our empirical findings suggest that these legal classification tasks are diverse, non-trivial evaluation tasks for future model advances.

¹We evaluate gpt-4-0613, which is what at the time of writing gpt-4 points to in the API. The recently released GPT-40 and 01 models are currently not available for our region via the Azure OpenAI Service.

Finally, our work challenges the prevailing narrative about the suitability of "generalist" models.
In commercial APIs, users are generally limited to prompting generalist models, as fine-tuning is costly for the model provider. But as we show, generalist models are neither sufficiently good nor best possible for many practical tasks. Specializing models to concrete tasks of interests, even using relatively few labeled examples, can provide a simple, practical, and far more accurate solution.

114 1.2 RELATED WORK

116 **Benchmarks for legal tasks.** LegalBench (Guha et al., 2023) is a recent multi-task benchmark for natural language understanding in legal domains. As of writing, LegalBench consists of 162 tasks 117 gathered from 40 contributors. LegalBench draws on numerous earlier benchmarking efforts in dif-118 ferent legal domains, specifically, inference on contracts (Koreeda & Manning, 2021; Hendrycks 119 et al., 2021), merger agreement understanding (Wang et al., 2023), identifying the legal holding 120 of a case (Zheng et al., 2021), statutory reasoning (Holzenberger & Van Durme, 2021), privacy 121 compliance and policy (Wilson et al., 2016; Zimmeck et al., 2019; Ravichander et al., 2019), and 122 identifying unfair clauses in terms of service (Lippi et al., 2019). Bhambhoria et al. (2024) evaluate 123 the performance of general-purpose models on legal question-answering tasks and advocate for the 124 development of open-source models tailored to the legal domain. We extend and strengthen these 125 valuable efforts to benchmark large language models in legal settings. We focus on core legal classi-126 fication tasks based on the U.S. Supreme Court Database (Spaeth et al., 2023) and the U.S. Courts of Appeals database (Songer). Our evaluation suite measures the performance of models in annotating 127 court opinions, focusing on tasks that are of interest to the field of empirical legal studies. The tasks 128 we study are complementary to those in LegalBench. We do not evaluate our model on LegalBench, 129 since our model is specialized to the Supreme Court and Appeals Court data. 130

130

113

115

Large language models for the legal domain. General-purpose language models are likely to be 132 trained on a substantial amount of legal data because much of this data is publicly available on the 133 internet. For example, the FreeLaw dataset includes a large collection of court opinions (Gao et al., 134 2021). Legal-BERT (Chalkidis et al., 2020) is a BERT-like transformer model that was pretrained 135 on a few hundred thousand legal documents. The more recent SaulLM models (Colombo et al., 136 2024b;a) adapt the open-weights Mistral (Jiang et al., 2023; 2024) models to the legal domain both 137 by continual pretraining and instruction-tuning on legal text. In contrast to Lawma, we consider 138 SaulLM to be a general-purpose model for the legal domain, not tailored to any specific legal task. Our approach differs significantly; we focus on developing models specialized for annotation tasks 139 of practical interest to empirical legal studies. We demonstrate that specialization is highly effective, 140 with our Lawma models significantly outperforming all other evaluated LLMs. For a discussion on 141 the adoption of large language models in the legal community, refer to Appendix A. 142

143

Data annotation and labeling. Hall & Wright (2008) provide an overview of the use of human 144 annotators in empirical legal studies. Student coders have been deployed to extract a wide variety 145 of features from legal data. Although student researchers are much less expensive than private 146 attorneys, the costs can quickly become prohibitive. Depending on the size of the document and the 147 complexity of the task, research assistants can label roughly dozens of examples per hour. Projects 148 involving the labeling of hundreds of documents are financially feasible for many legal scholars, but 149 projects involving many thousands of documents are largely impractical. In an example of a larger 150 annotation effort, Frankenreiter et al. (2021) employed human coders to annotate several thousands of corporate charters. Using ChatGPT for a similar task, Frankenreiter & Talley (2024) estimated 151 that employing human coders would have been approximately ten times more costly. 152

Data annotation and labeling also play a major role in machine learning benchmarks and applications, see, e.g., Aroyo & Welty (2015); Gray & Suri (2019); Hardt & Recht (2022) for background.
Dorner & Hardt (2024) give an extended discussion about label quality and annotator disagreement in the context of machine learning benchmarks.

157 158

1.3 LIMITATIONS

159

Fine-tuning increases accuracy to about 80% in our evaluation suite compared with around 60% for non-specialized models. While we are rather certain that 60% accuracy is insufficient for consequential legal work, we emphasize that 80% is still far from perfect. In addition, the variance

162 What follows is an opinion from the Supreme Court of the United States. Your task is to identify whether the opinion effectively says that the 163 decision in this case "overruled" one or more of the Court\'s own 164 precedents. Alteration also extends to language in the majority opinion 165 that states that a precedent of the Supreme Court has been "disapproved," 166 or is "no longer good law". Note, however, that alteration does not 167 apply to cases in which the Court "distinguishes" a precedent. 168 [COURT OPINION] 170 Question: Did the the decision of the court overrule one or more of the 171 Court's own precedents? 172 A. Yes B. No 173 Answer: 174 175 Figure 2: Example task corresponding to the Supreme Court "precedent alteration" variable.

176 177

178 in accuracy across tasks remains high. Although our work meets the ethical and technical recom-179 mendations by Kapoor et al. (2024) for "developers of legal AI", we maintain caution about the use 180 of large language models for consequential legal tasks. To which extent these models are suitable for use in specific applications requires additional substantive investigation. We add that the legal 181 documents we consider are exclusively from either the U.S. Supreme Court or appellate courts in 182 the United States. We cannot speak to how these results may change for tasks in other legal domains 183 within the United States or legal systems in other countries. 184

185

2 CASELAWQA

186 187

188 In this work, we focus on legal classification tasks. Legal classification tasks range in complexity, from extremely simple tasks that require little specialized knowledge, to highly sophisticated tasks 189 that involve specific legal knowledge, familiarity with legal principles or discourse, and the ability to 190 engage in nuanced analogical or conceptual reasoning. For example, labeling the ideological valence 191 of a decision requires the annotator to understand how specific legal issues map onto contemporary 192 political debates. Labeling the standard of review applied by an appellate court requires detailed 193 knowledge of these standards as well as the ability to parse procedural history. Many legal doctrines 194 are quite complicated, involving multipart tests, nuanced exceptions, and balancing inquiries. 195

Our reasons to study legal classification tasks are both technical and substantive. From a technical 196 machine learning perspective, these tasks provide highly non-trivial classification problems where 197 even the best models leave much room for improvement. From a substantive legal perspective, effi-198 cient solutions to such classification problems have rich and important applications in legal research, 199 see Appendix A.1 for a detailed discussion. 200

201 2.1 DATA SOURCES 202

203 Central to our study are the U.S. Supreme Court Database (Spaeth et al., 2023) (SCDB) and the 204 U.S. Courts of Appeals database (Songer) (USCAD). The SCDB compiles comprehensive infor-205 mation on U.S. Supreme Court decisions from 1946 onward, and includes variables such as case 206 outcomes, issue areas, legal provisions, and vote counts. The USCAD contains detailed information about decisions made by the U.S. Courts of Appeals from 1925 to 1988. It includes data on judi-207 cial decisions, panel compositions, and case characteristics. Both databases provide essential tools 208 for scholars conducting quantitative analyses of the judicial system, decision-making, ideological 209 trends, and the impact of various factors on case outcomes. 210

211 The SCDB and USCAD have been instrumental in advancing research on judicial decision making 212 within the fields of political science and empirical legal studies (Epstein et al., 2013; Segal & Spaeth, 213 2002; Martin & Quinn, 2002). These datasets have been used to drive a substantial research program by allowing scholars to systematically analyze large numbers of court cases, uncovering patterns, 214 trends, and factors influencing judicial outcomes. By providing detailed information on case char-215 acteristics, judge attributes, and decision outcomes, these databases have enabled researchers to test 216 Number of opinions 1000 60 tasks of tasks 20 217 40 218 of 1 500 Number 10 219 Number 20 220 0 0 101 10² 10³ 104 105 100 101 10³ 10¹ 10² 10^{4} 10^{2} 10³ 222 Number of tokens in the opinion (GPT-4) Number of classes in the task Number of examples in the task

Figure 3: General statistics of the court opinions and legal classification tasks considered.

theories of judicial behavior, examine the impact of ideology on court decisions, and explore the dynamics of judicial decision-making at different levels of the court system. The insights gained from research using these databases have had significant implications for legal practitioners, policymakers, and the broader legal community, contributing to a better understanding of how courts operate and how legal outcomes are shaped.

2.2 CONSTRUCTION OF THE CLASSIFICATION TASKS

We use the variables of the USDB and the USCAD to construct a set of classification tasks. We construct a total of 260 distinct classification tasks, 38 of them corresponding to the Supreme Court database and 232 to the U.S. Court of Appeals. The annotations in the USDB and USCAD serve as labels for these classification tasks. For each task, we additionally construct a prompt template consisting of a general description of the task, followed by a multiple choice question containing each of the possible variable codes. We formulate the task description, question, and answer choices by closely following the databases' variable descriptions. See Figure 2 for an example task.

For every case contained in the USDB and the USCAD, we use the provided case citations to search for its corresponding majority opinion of the court on the Caselaw Access Project, a database of digitized court opinions. We match a total of 24,916 court cases, which we divide into a 70%/10%/20% train/validation/test split. That is, models may not train on any of the court cases used for evaluation.

Since many of the classification tasks contain heavily imbalanced classes, we subsample the majority class such that there are at most as many task examples in the majority class as task examples in all other classes combined. As a result, a constant classifier that outputs the majority class label will never achieve more than 50% accuracy on any individual task. This results in a more honest measure of model performance, as models cannot attain high accuracy simply because a task is heavily imbalanced. We report in Appendix E results without subsampling of the majority class.

We plot some statistics of the tasks in Figure 3. First, court opinions tend to be long, with 12% having above 8,000 tokens, the typical maximum context size for current state-of-the-art models, such as Llama 3. Second, some tasks have a large number of classes, with 28% of tasks having more than 10 classes. Third, there is a large variability in terms of the number of task examples, ranging from a couple dozen to 18500 task examples. Our final dataset comprises 718,971 task examples.

257 To reduce the compute required for evaluating the benchmark, we select at random 5,000 examples 258 from the Supreme Court tasks and 5,000 examples from the Court of Appeals tasks. We include only 259 court cases where the court opinion, including the head matter, contains at least 2,000 characters, ensuring the opinion is at least a few sentences long. These 10,000 task examples comprise the test 260 set of CaselawQA. We nonetheless make available all 143,635 task examples corresponding to the 261 test court cases, which we call the extended test set. Evaluating on the extended test set is 14x as 262 expensive, but provides much more fine-grained information on models' performance across all 260 263 legal classification tasks, rather than simply an aggregate measure of model performance. In this 264 work, we report accuracy on the extended test set, unless otherwise stated. 265

266 267

268

228

229

230

231 232 233

- 2.3 EVALUATION METHODOLOGY
- We evaluate models using a prompt template identical to the one for the MMLU benchmark (Hendrycks et al., 2020). Since many popular benchmarks are phrased as multiple-choice



Figure 4: Accuracy of publicly-available LLMs on the extended test set of CaselawQA.

questions, recent models tend to do well for them (Dominguez-Olmedo et al., 2024). Due to diverse set of models and large number of tasks under consideration, we perform no prompt tuning.²

We use accuracy as the evaluation metric. Given that the tasks we consider involve vastly differing
numbers of answer choices, accuracy provides an interpretable measure of performance. Additionally, accuracy is the standard metric used in knowledge-testing LLM benchmarks. For completeness,
we also report balanced accuracy and macro-averaged F1 scores in Appendix E.

When reporting aggregate performance across multiple tasks (e.g., all Supreme Court tasks), we compute the average accuracy across all task examples. Intuitively, we can visualize the Supreme Court database as a large table with dimensions corresponding to the number of court cases (rows) and the number of tasks (columns). The aggregate accuracy, in this case, represents the fraction of entries in this table that the model correctly predicts. For completeness, we also report mean task accuracy (i.e., macro-averaging rather than micro-averaging across tasks) in Appendix E.

296 297

270

271

272

273

274

275

276

278

279 280

281

283

284

285

3 EVALUATION BASELINES

298 299

300 We start by evaluating the performance of different language models on the extended test set of 301 CaselawQA. We choose language models that are of particular relevance to the legal domain: LegalBert (Chalkidis et al., 2020), as well as SaulLM 7B (Colombo et al., 2024b), its base model 302 Mistral 7B Instruct (Jiang et al., 2023), and its Mixture-of-Experts variant Mixtral 8x7B (Jiang et al., 303 2024). We additionally evaluate GPT-4 (Achiam et al., 2023) due to its prevalent use among legal 304 scholars, and the Llama 3 Instruct (MetaAI, 2024) models, which are arguably the best performing 305 open-weights models at present time. We report the evalution results in Figure 4. We include as 306 baseline the majority classifier which simply outputs the majority class of each classification tasks. 307

Despite the popularity of LegalBERT, we observe that it performs worse than the majority classifier baseline. This is unsurprising, as by current standards it has both a small size (110M parameters) and a small context window (256 tokens). SaulLM 7B, the other legal-domain model, similarly fails to beat the majority classifier baseline. In fact, SaulLM 7B underperforms compared to its base model Mistral 7B Instruct both across all tasks and Court of Appeals tasks. This indicates that broadly adapting models to the legal domain may not prove beneficial for annotation work. Overall, we find that existing LLMs tailored for the legal domain obtain trivial performance in our annotation tasks.

In fact, we observe that only the two largest models tested, Llama 3 70B Instruct and GPT-4, perform substantially better than the majority classifier baseline. Still, their performance is modest (< 65% accuracy), and there are dozens of tasks where both models perform worse than random guessing, see Figure 16 in Appendix E. Our evaluations therefore indicate that, for most tasks, the performance of general-purpose LLMs is clearly insufficient for consequential legal annotation work.

 ²Note that more involved prompting strategies –e.g., chain-of-thought (Wei et al., 2022)– can yield better task performance but are substantially more expensive. For legal tasks specifically, the choice of prompt can have a significant effect in performance (Li et al., 2024). However, prompt tuning requires task-specific domain knowledge and can be reasonably time consuming.



Figure 5: Accuracy of the Lawma models on the extended test set of CaselawQA.

Few-shot evaluation We also consider whether evaluating GPT-4 few-shot leads to any improvements. Whereas the default context window for GPT-4 is 8,000 tokens, a version with 32,000 tokens is available at twice the cost. We evaluated the 32k version with 3-shot prompting, since it is often unfeasible to fit more than 3 task examples within the 32k context window. Labeling each example 3-shot is $3 \times 2 = 6$ times more expensive compared to the zero-shot GPT-4 evaluation. To compensate for the increase in cost, we evaluate the model 3-shot on roughly 5% of the test examples compared those used to evaluate GPT-4. Our evaluation shows that GPT-4's performance with 3-shot prompting does not improve over zero-shot prompting, as detailed in Table 1. This is likely because most legal classification tasks involve more than three classes, meaning that three in-context examples do not cover all possible answer choices. Consequently, the model often responds with one of the three presented examples, leading to a significant drop in performance. Few-shot prompting is therefore not a fruitful strategy to adapt the model to the legal classification tasks at hand.

Table 1: Zero-shot and few-shot accuracy of GPT-4.

Model	All tasks	Supreme Court	Court of Appeals
GPT-4 zero-shot GPT-4 32k 3-shot	$\begin{array}{c} 62.0 \pm 0.4 \\ 60.4 \pm 1.9 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 59.2 \pm 0.8 \\ 50.5 \pm 4.3 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 62.7 \pm 0.5 \\ 62.9 \pm 2.1 \end{array}$

4 FINE-TUNING AND THE POWER OF SPECIALIZATION

In this section, we present a detailed analysis of how models can be specialized for legal classification tasks. We start by fine-tuning Llama 3 8B Inst and Llama 3 70B Inst on all 260 tasks simultaneously, resulting in our Lawma 8B and Lawma 70B models. We then perform additional fine-tuning experiments highlighting different aspects, including the scaling behaviour of fine-tuning, its sample efficiency, and its generalization to unseen tasks and Courts.

4.1 THE LAWMA MODELS

We first leverage our large corpus of legal classification tasks to fine-tune Llama 3 8B Instruct and
Llama 3 70B Instruct on *all tasks* simultaneously. We refer to these fine-tuned models as Lawma 8B
and Lawma 70B, respectively. We fine-tune on the 260 classification tasks described in Section 2.2.
The fine-tuning dataset contains a total of 503,698 task examples and 1.96B tokens. See Appendix F
for additional details regarding the model fine-tuning.

We compare in Figure 5 the task accuracies of Lawma 8B and Lawma 70B to that of their respective
base models Llama 3 8B Instruct and Llama 3 70B Instruct, as well as GPT-4. Fine-tuning leads
to remarkably large improvements in average task accuracy: Lawma 8B outperforms Llama 3 8B
Instruct by **37.2** accuracy points and Lawma 70B outperforms Llama 3 70B Instruct by **21.3** accuracy
points. Both Lawma 8B and Lawma 70B outperform GPT-4, Lawma 8B by **19.9** accuracy points and
Lawma 70B by **21.3** accuracy points. In fact, both Lawma 8B and Lawma 70B outperform GPT-4
in about 95% of all tasks, see Figure 1. Figure 6 further demonstrates the large effect of fine-tuning
by showing the histogram of task accuracies of Lawma in comparison with Llama 3 and GPT-4.

378

394

396

397

399

400

401 402

403

404

405

406

407

408 409

410



Figure 6: Distribution of task performance across all tasks for Llama 3, GPT4, and Lawma.



Figure 7: Performance after one epoch of fine-tuning increases monotonically in the amount of pretraining of the base model. Models left to right (blue dots): Pythia 70M, Pythia 160M, Pythia 410M, Pythia 1B, Pythia 2.8B, Pythia 6.9B, Llama 2 7B, Llama 3 8B Inst, Llama 3 70B Inst.

We find that Lawma 8B closely matches the performance of Lawma 70B. Specifically, Lawma 70B outperforms Lawma 8B by only 1.0 accuracy points for Supreme Court tasks and by 1.5 accuracy points for Appeals Court tasks (Figure 5). This suggests that, for our fine-tuning dataset, further scaling model size (e.g., fine-tuning GPT-4) is unlikely to yield major improvements. A more promising direction is to instead improve the diversity and quantity of the fine-tuning data. On the flip side, practitioners may choose to use Lawma 8B instead of the 70B model with little cost in performance.

4.2 PERFORMANCE AFTER FINE-TUNING SCALES WITH PRETRAINING COMPUTE

The performance of specialized models tends to scale with pretraining compute (Dominguez-Olmedo et al., 2024). We investigate how performance after fine-tuning scales with the pretraining compute of the base model. We fine-tune the following models for a single epoch: Pythia 70M, Pythia 160M, Pythia 410M, Pythia 1B, Pythia 2.8B, Pythia 6.9B (Biderman et al., 2023), Llama 2 7B (Touvron et al., 2023), Llama 3 8B Instruct and Llama 3 70B Instruct. We fine-tune on all 260 tasks simultaneously. We approximate pretraining compute in FLOPs as $C \approx 6 \cdot N \cdot D$ (Kaplan et al., 2020), where N is model size and D is the number of pretraining tokens.

418 We find that mean task accuracy after fine-tuning improves with pretraining compute (Figure 7). 419 However, we find signs of diminishing returns. For the Supreme Court tasks, performance increases 420 steadily from 10^{20} to 10^{24} FLOPs, but further scaling to 10^{25} FLOPs only improves performance by 421 an additional 4.0 accuracy points. For Appeals Court tasks, performance sharply increases from 10^{20} 422 to 10^{21} FLOPs (i.e., Pythia 1B – which interestingly already beats GPT-4 zero-shot), but stagnates 423 thereafter, only improving by an additional 8.5 accuracy points when scaling to 10^{25} FLOPs.

424 Our findings suggest that major improvements will likely not come from model scale alone. Rather,
 425 future work should focus on obtaining better scaling behavior. One promising direction is to improve
 426 the quality, quantity and diversity of the fine-tuning data.

- 427
- 428 4.3 SAMPLE EFFICIENCY 429
- We study how task accuracy scales as models fine-tune on more training examples. We consider
 the 10 tasks highlighted in Section B. We fine-tune Llama 3 8B Instruct on each task independently, rather than on all tasks simultaneously as in the previous experiments. For each task, we fine-tune

SC Issue Area SC Direction SC Disposition SC Case Source SC LC Disposition 0.95 0.75 0.8 0.8 Accuracy 0 75 0.90 0.50 0.50 0.85 0.25 0.6 0.6 0.25 Songer Gen. Issue Songer Direction Songer Treatment Songer Case Origin SC LC Direction 0.8 0.8 0.88 Accuracy 0.7 0.8 0.6 0.85 0.6 0.6 0.82 05 0.4 0.6 0.4 1000 1000 1000 1000 ,000 *,*00 20025050C 200 250 500 Ś 0 150,00 100 250 500 5 Train examples Train examples Train examples Train examples Train examples --- Model trained Llama 3 8B Instruct GPT-4 Lawma 8B

Figure 8: Sample efficiency of fine-tuning Llama 3 8B on a single task. Hundreds of task examples are typically enough to match or beat the zero-shot performance of GPT-4. Dashed blue line indicates the accuracy of Llama 3 8B fine-tuned on a single task as a function of the number of training examples. The shaded area indicates the 95% confidence interval over 5 random seeds.



Figure 9: Fine-tuning on the Court of Appeals tasks improves accuracy on Supreme Court tasks.

on 10, 50, 100, 250, 500, and 1000 task examples. We select task examples uniformly at random, and train 5 different models corresponding to different random seeds on the examples selected for training. We therefore fine-tune and evaluate a total of $10 \cdot 6 \cdot 5 = 300$ models. We fine-tune for a maximum of 20 epochs and early stop when validation loss increases for 3 consecutive epochs.

469 Figure 8 shows how accuracy improves with the number of training examples. Fifty training exam-470 ples are enough to match or beat the GPT-4 zero-shot baseline for 6 out of the 10 highlighted tasks, and 250 traning examples are enough to match or beat GPT-4 for 8 out of the 10 highlighted tasks. 472 This is crucial, since labeling a few hundred data points is often financially feasible for many legal 473 scholars (Hall & Wright, 2008). With relative few labelled task examples, fine-tuning reasonably 474 small publicly available models can be competitive with state-of-the-art closed models. Moreover, 475 accuracy continues to improve significantly with additional examples. With one thousand training 476 examples, fine-tuning Llama 3 8B Inst matches or beats the GPT-4 baseline for all highlighted tasks.

477 478

432

433

434

435

436 437

438

439

440

441

442 443

444

445 446

447

448

449

450 451 452

453

454

455

456 457

458

459 460

466

467

468

471

44

479 480

GENERALIZATION TO UNSEEN DATABASES

481 We now investigate whether fine-tuning only on the Songer Appeals Court database allows us to 482 generalize to the Supreme Court database. We fine-tune Llama 3 8B Inst for one epoch on all Songer tasks simultaneously. We plot in Figure 9 the mean accuracy for Court of Appeals tasks and 483 Supreme Court tasks at intermediate checkpoints. As expected, performance on Court of Appeals 484 tasks improves monotonically with the number of training examples seen. More interestingly, we 485 observe that mean task accuracy for the Supreme Court also improves substantially, by up to 18.8 accuracy points at 20% of the training steps³. Thereafter, performance degrades, seemingly plateauing at 11.3 accuracy points above the baseline non-finetuned performance of Llama 3 8B Inst.

Our findings indicate that, since there is some degree of overlap between Court of Appeal and Supreme Court tasks, fine-tuning on the former transfers to the latter. This suggests that Lawma might be of practical use beyond the Supreme Court and Court of Appeals tasks it was trained on.

Note, however, that fine-tuning only on the Court of Appeals database results in a mean case accuracy of 51.6%, compared to 82.4% for Lawma 8B. That is, not fine-tuning on Supreme Court cases results in a 30.9 accuracy points decrease in performance. These results again highlight the importance of fine-tuning precisely on the target tasks of interest.

496 497

498

5 DISCUSSION

We introduce and study a collection of 260 legal classification tasks, nearly all new to the machine learning community. CaselawQA, our introduced dataset, serves a double purpose: a benchmark to evaluate the ability of LLMs to perform legal annotation work of practical interest to legal scholars, and a fine-tuning dataset to specialize existing models to such legal classification tasks.

As we show, the performance of existing "generalist" LLMs is far from sufficient for consequential legal annotation work. In contrast, we demonstrate the power of specialization: we fine-tune and make available the Lawma 8B and Lawma 70B models, which strongly outperform all other models evaluated, including GPT-4 and two existing legal-domain LLMs.

The CaselawQA dataset, the Lawma models, and more broadly the specialization methodology 508 presented in this work, are all of practical interest to legal research. The cost of human annotators 509 represents a considerable bottleneck for the field of empirical legal studies. The advent of low-cost 510 and flexible tools for data extraction can lead to tremendous boosts in scholarly productivity and 511 knowledge production. For example, the falling cost of genetic sequencing led to a paradigm shift 512 across the biological sciences, as genetic data became increasingly available in fields as disparate as 513 public health and entomology (Köser et al., 2012; Ballare et al., 2019). A flexible automated feature 514 extraction tool for legal texts holds similar potential for empirical legal studies, as a large realm of 515 conceivable but impracticably expensive research projects becomes accessible. 516

The tasks we introduce are also interesting from a broader LLM benchmarking perspective. The accuracy numbers are neither too low nor too high. The best models achieve non-trivial, but modest zero-shot performance. And even fine-tuned models don't reach intercoder agreement rates. This situation suggests that these legal classification tasks may be good test cases for future model advances. As such, we hope to extend and strengthen existing evaluation efforts.

Lastly, our work challenges the prevailing narrative about the suitability of "generalist" models. The generalist abilities of large language models are vital for commercial APIs, where users are largely restricted to prompting. But as we show, generalist models may be neither sufficiently good nor the best possible solution for many practical tasks.

We show that this is certainly the case for annotation work that arises in empirical legal research.
Lightly fine-tuned special purpose models achieve significantly higher accuracy from relatively few
labeled examples. Labeling a few hundred cases is often financially feasible. This suggests a simple
and practical strategy for solving legal classification tasks: Obtain a few hundred labeled examples,
fine-tune an-open weights model, and use the fine-tuned model to annotate the remaining cases.

531 532

533 534

References

Josh Achiam, Steven Adler, Sandhini Agarwal, Lama Ahmad, Ilge Akkaya, Florencia Leoni Aleman, Diogo Almeida, Janko Altenschmidt, Sam Altman, Shyamal Anadkat, et al. Gpt-4 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.08774*, 2023.

 ³Note that 20% is the optimal amount of Songer data to train on if the goal is to generalize precisely to
 Supreme Court cases. If the goal is to generalize to some other dataset, then 20% need not be the optimal amount of Songer data to train on.

565

566

567

568

569

570

571

582

- 540 Lora Aroyo and Chris Welty. Truth is a lie: Crowd truth and the seven myths of human annotation. 541 AI Magazine, 36(1):15–24, 2015. 542
- Kimberly M Ballare, Nathaniel S Pope, Antonio R Castilla, Sarah Cusser, Richard P Metz, and 543 Shalene Jha. Utilizing field collected insects for next generation sequencing: Effects of sampling, 544 storage, and dna extraction methods. *Ecology and Evolution*, 9(24):13690–13705, 2019.
- 546 Rohan Bhambhoria, Samuel Dahan, Jonathan Li, and Xiaodan Zhu. Evaluating ai for law: Bridging 547 the gap with open-source solutions. arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.12349, 2024.
- Stella Biderman, Hailey Schoelkopf, Quentin Gregory Anthony, Herbie Bradley, Kyle O'Brien, Eric 549 Hallahan, Mohammad Aflah Khan, Shivanshu Purohit, USVSN Sai Prashanth, Edward Raff, et al. 550 Pythia: A suite for analyzing large language models across training and scaling. In International 551 Conference on Machine Learning, pp. 2397–2430. PMLR, 2023. 552
- Caselaw Access Project. Caselaw access project. URL: https://case.law/. 553
- 554 Ilias Chalkidis, Manos Fergadiotis, Prodromos Malakasiotis, Nikolaos Aletras, and Ion An-555 droutsopoulos. LEGAL-BERT: the muppets straight out of law school. arXiv preprint 556 arXiv:2010.02559, 2020.
- Jonathan H Choi. How to use large language models for empirical legal research. Journal of 558 Institutional and Theoretical Economics (Forthcoming), 2023. 559
- Jonathan H Choi and Daniel Schwarcz. AI assistance in legal analysis: An empirical study. Available 561 at SSRN 4539836, 2023. 562
- Jonathan H Choi, Kristin E Hickman, Amy B Monahan, and Daniel Schwarcz. ChatGPT goes to 563 law school. J. Legal Educ., 71:387, 2023. 564
 - Axolotl AI Cloud. Axolotl, 2024. URL https://github.com/axolotl-ai-cloud/ axolotl. Accessed: 2024-07-17.
 - Pierre Colombo, Telmo Pires, Malik Boudiaf, Rui Melo, Dominic Culver, Sofia Morgado, Etienne Malaboeuf, Gabriel Hautreux, Johanne Charpentier, and Michael Desa. Saullm-54b & saullm-141b: Scaling up domain adaptation for the legal domain. arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.19584, 2024a.
- Pierre Colombo, Telmo Pessoa Pires, Malik Boudiaf, Dominic Culver, Rui Melo, Caio Corro, An-572 dre FT Martins, Fabrizio Esposito, Vera Lúcia Raposo, Sofia Morgado, et al. Saullm-7b: A 573 pioneering large language model for law. arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.03883, 2024b. 574
- 575 Ricardo Dominguez-Olmedo, Florian E Dorner, and Moritz Hardt. Training on the test task con-576 founds evaluation and emergence. arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.07890, 2024. 577
- Florian E Dorner and Moritz Hardt. Don't label twice: Quantity beats quality when comparing 578 binary classifiers on a budget. In International Conference on Machine Learning, 2024. 579
- 580 Christoph Engel and Richard H Mcadams. Asking GPT for the ordinary meaning of statutory terms. 581 MPI Collective Goods Discussion Paper, (2024/5), 2024.
- Lee Epstein, William M Landes, and Richard A Posner. The behavior of federal judges: a theoretical and empirical study of rational choice. Harvard University Press, 2013. 584
- 585 Jens Frankenreiter and Eric L Talley. Sticky charters? the surprisingly tepid embrace of officer-586 protecting waivers in delaware. The Surprisingly Tepid Embrace of Officer-Protecting Waivers in Delaware (March 19, 2024). European Corporate Governance Institute-Law Working Paper, (762), 2024.588
- 589 Jens Frankenreiter, Cathy Hwang, Yaron Nili, and Eric Talley. Cleaning corporate governance. U. 590 Pa. L. Rev., 170:1, 2021. 591
- L Gao, S Biderman, S Black, L Golding, T Hoppe, C Foster, J Phang, H He, A Thite, N Nabeshima, 592 et al. The pile: an 800gb dataset of diverse text for language modeling 2020. arXiv preprint 593 arXiv:2101.00027, 2021.

- Mary L Gray and Siddharth Suri. *Ghost work: How to stop Silicon Valley from building a new global underclass.* Eamon Dolan Books, 2019.
- Morgan A Gray, Jaromir Savelka, Wesley M Oliver, and Kevin D Ashley. Empirical legal anal ysis simplified: reducing complexity through automatic identification and evaluation of legally
 relevant factors. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A*, 382(2270):20230155, 2024.
- 600 Neel Guha, Julian Nyarko, Daniel E. Ho, Christopher Ré, Adam Chilton, Aditya Narayana, Alex 601 Chohlas-Wood, Austin Peters, Brandon Waldon, Daniel N. Rockmore, Diego Zambrano, Dmitry 602 Talisman, Enam Hoque, Faiz Surani, Frank Fagan, Galit Sarfaty, Gregory M. Dickinson, Haggai 603 Porat, Jason Hegland, Jessica Wu, Joe Nudell, Joel Niklaus, John Nay, Jonathan H. Choi, Kevin Tobia, Margaret Hagan, Megan Ma, Michael Livermore, Nikon Rasumov-Rahe, Nils Holzen-604 berger, Noam Kolt, Peter Henderson, Sean Rehaag, Sharad Goel, Shang Gao, Spencer Williams, 605 Sunny Gandhi, Tom Zur, Varun Iyer, and Zehua Li. LegalBench: A collaboratively built bench-606 mark for measuring legal reasoning in large language models, 2023. 607
- Mark A Hall and Ronald F Wright. Systematic content analysis of judicial opinions. *Calif. L. Rev.*, 96:63, 2008.
- 611 Moritz Hardt and Benjamin Recht. *Patterns, predictions, and actions: Foundations of machine* 612 *learning.* Princeton University Press, 2022.
- Dan Hendrycks, Collin Burns, Steven Basart, Andy Zou, Mantas Mazeika, Dawn Song, and Jacob Steinhardt. Measuring massive multitask language understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2009.03300*, 2020.
- Dan Hendrycks, Collin Burns, Anya Chen, and Spencer Ball. Cuad: An expert-annotated nlp dataset
 for legal contract review. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2103.06268*, 2021.
- ⁶¹⁹ Nils Holzenberger and Benjamin Van Durme. Factoring statutory reasoning as language understanding challenges. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2105.07903*, 2021.
- Albert Q Jiang, Alexandre Sablayrolles, Arthur Mensch, Chris Bamford, Devendra Singh Chaplot,
 Diego de las Casas, Florian Bressand, Gianna Lengyel, Guillaume Lample, Lucile Saulnier, et al.
 Mistral 7b. arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.06825, 2023.
- Albert Q Jiang, Alexandre Sablayrolles, Antoine Roux, Arthur Mensch, Blanche Savary, Chris Bamford, Devendra Singh Chaplot, Diego de las Casas, Emma Bou Hanna, Florian Bressand, et al. Mixtral of experts. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.04088*, 2024.
- Jared Kaplan, Sam McCandlish, Tom Henighan, Tom B Brown, Benjamin Chess, Rewon Child,
 Scott Gray, Alec Radford, Jeffrey Wu, and Dario Amodei. Scaling laws for neural language
 models. arXiv preprint arXiv:2001.08361, 2020.
- Sayash Kapoor, Peter Henderson, and Arvind Narayanan. Promises and pitfalls of artificial intelligence for legal applications. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.01656*, 2024.
- Daniel Martin Katz, Michael James Bommarito, Shang Gao, and Pablo Arredondo. GPT-4 passes
 the Bar Exam. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A*, 382(2270):20230254, 2024.
- Yuta Koreeda and Christopher D Manning. ContractNLI: A dataset for document-level natural language inference for contracts. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.01799*, 2021.
- 640 Claudio U Köser, Matthew J Ellington, Edward JP Cartwright, Stephen H Gillespie, Nicholas M
 641 Brown, Mark Farrington, Matthew TG Holden, Gordon Dougan, Stephen D Bentley, Julian
 642 Parkhill, et al. Routine use of microbial whole genome sequencing in diagnostic and public
 643 health microbiology. 2012.
- LexisNexis. LexisNexis Launches Lexis+ AI, a Generative AI Solution with Linked Hallucination Free Legal Citations. News Release, Oct. 25 2023.
- 647 Zehua Li, Julian Nyarko, and Sarath Sanga. The terms of freedom: Black labor contracts in the reconstruction south. 2024.

648 649 650	Marco Lippi, Przemysław Pałka, Giuseppe Contissa, Francesca Lagioia, Hans-Wolfgang Micklitz, Giovanni Sartor, and Paolo Torroni. CLAUDETTE: an automated detector of potentially unfair clauses in online terms of service. <i>Artificial Intelligence and Law</i> , 27:117–139, 2019.
651 652 653	Michael A. Livermore and Daniel N. Rockmore (eds.). Law as Data: Computation, Text, & the Future of Legal Analysis. Santa Fe Institute Press, 2019.
654 655	Michael A Livermore, Felix Herron, and Daniel Rockmore. Language model interpretability and empirical legal studies. <i>Virginia Public Law and Legal Theory Research Paper</i> , (2023-69), 2023.
657 658	Andrew D Martin and Kevin M Quinn. Dynamic ideal point estimation via markov chain monte carlo for the us supreme court, 1953–1999. <i>Political analysis</i> , 10(2):134–153, 2002.
659 660 661	MetaAI. Llama 3: Advancing open foundation models, 2024. URL https://ai.meta.com/ blog/meta-llama-3/.
662 663 664 665	John J Nay, David Karamardian, Sarah B Lawsky, Wenting Tao, Meghana Bhat, Raghav Jain, Aaron Travis Lee, Jonathan H Choi, and Jungo Kasai. Large language models as tax attorneys: a case study in legal capabilities emergence. <i>Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A</i> , 382(2270):20230159, 2024.
666 667 668	Abhilasha Ravichander, Alan W Black, Shomir Wilson, Thomas Norton, and Norman Sadeh. Question answering for privacy policies: Combining computational and legal perspectives. <i>arXiv</i> preprint arXiv:1911.00841, 2019.
669 670 671	Jaromir Savelka and Kevin D Ashley. The unreasonable effectiveness of large language models in zero-shot semantic annotation of legal texts. <i>Frontiers in Artificial Intelligence</i> , 6, 2023.
672 673	Jeffrey A Segal and Harold J Spaeth. <i>The Supreme Court and the attitudinal model revisited</i> . Cambridge University Press, 2002.
675 676	Donald R. Songer. U.S. Courts of Appeals databases 1925–1996. URL http://www.songerproject.org/us-courts-of-appeals-databases.html.
677 678 679	Harold J. Spaeth, Lee Epstein, Andrew D. Martin, Jeffrey A. Segal, Theodore J. Ruger, and Sara C. Benesh. 2023 supreme court database, version 2023 release 01, 2023. URL http: //supremecourtdatabase.org.
681 682 683	Hugo Touvron, Louis Martin, Kevin Stone, Peter Albert, Amjad Almahairi, Yasmine Babaei, Niko- lay Bashlykov, Soumya Batra, Prajjwal Bhargava, Shruti Bhosale, et al. Llama 2: Open founda- tion and fine-tuned chat models. <i>arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.09288</i> , 2023.
684 685 686	Steven H Wang, Antoine Scardigli, Leonard Tang, Wei Chen, Dimitry Levkin, Anya Chen, Spencer Ball, Thomas Woodside, Oliver Zhang, and Dan Hendrycks. MAUD: An expert-annotated legal nlp dataset for merger agreement understanding. <i>arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.00876</i> , 2023.
687 688 689 690	Jason Wei, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Maarten Bosma, Fei Xia, Ed Chi, Quoc V Le, Denny Zhou, et al. Chain-of-thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models. <i>Advances in neural information processing systems</i> , 35:24824–24837, 2022.
691 692	Kyle Wiggers. Harvey, which uses AI to answer legal questions, lands cash from OpenAI. <i>TechCruch</i> , Nov. 23 2022.
693 694 695 696 697 698	Shomir Wilson, Florian Schaub, Aswarth Abhilash Dara, Frederick Liu, Sushain Cherivirala, Pedro Giovanni Leon, Mads Schaarup Andersen, Sebastian Zimmeck, Kanthashree Mysore Sathyendra, N Cameron Russell, et al. The creation and analysis of a website privacy policy corpus. In <i>Proceedings of the 54th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)</i> , pp. 1330–1340, 2016.
699 700 701	Lucia Zheng, Neel Guha, Brandon R Anderson, Peter Henderson, and Daniel E Ho. When does pretraining help? assessing self-supervised learning for law and the casehold dataset of 53,000+ legal holdings. In <i>Proceedings of the eighteenth international conference on artificial intelligence and law</i> , pp. 159–168, 2021.

Sebastian Zimmeck, Peter Story, Daniel Smullen, Abhilasha Ravichander, Ziqi Wang, Joel R Reidenberg, N Cameron Russell, and Norman Sadeh. Maps: Scaling privacy compliance analysis to a million apps. *Proc. Priv. Enhancing Tech.*, 2019:66, 2019.

704 705 706

702

703

A ADOPTION OF LARGE LANGUAGE MODELS IN THE LEGAL COMMUNITY.

708 The legal community has moved relatively quickly in adopting GPT models. Several startups have 709 begun using incorporating large language models, including GPT, into legal products (Wiggers, 710 2022). Lexis Nexis, a major commercial provider of law-related services, has partnered with Open 711 AI and Anthropic to offer legal text generation (LexisNexis, 2023). Legal scholars have evaluated 712 GPT's performance on the bar exam (Katz et al., 2024) as well as law school exam (Choi et al., 713 2023). Choi & Schwarcz (2023) examined how GPT-4 can improve student performance on law 714 school exams. Nay et al. (2024) examined how LLMs perform on answering multiple choice ques-715 tions related to tax law. Gray et al. (2024) used GPT models to extract information from cases 716 concerning the factors that predict the constitutionality of police stops. Choi (2023) used GPT-4 to extract information concerning interpretative techniques from U.S. Supreme Court decisions. Liv-717 ermore et al. (2023) tested the performance of GPT models for categorizing cases by issue areas and 718 in recommending citations based on case similarity. Savelka & Ashley (2023) evaluate the zero-shot 719 performance of GPT-4 on a variety of semantic legal annotation tasks. Engel & Mcadams (2024) 720 ask GPT for the ordinary meaning of statutory terms. In the area of corporate law, Frankenreiter & 721 Talley (2024) use GPT-4 to extract information about the contents of corporate charters.

- 722 723 724
- A.1 POTENTIAL APPLICATIONS OF EFFICIENT SOLUTIONS TO LEGAL CLASSIFICATION TASKS

725 More efficient ways to solve legal classification tasks would be tremendously useful in practice. A 726 well functioning system to automatically extract relevant features from legal texts could, in particu-727 lar, facilitate empirical legal study across a wide range of domains. This research could include not only social scientific study of the causes or consequences of judicial decisions, but also more tradi-728 tional research modalities based on doctrinal interpretation (Livermore & Rockmore, 2019). There 729 is an almost unlimited variety of features that legal scholars could study, ranging from the factors 730 cited by judges when deciding the outcomes of property law disputes to the relationship between 731 the party affiliation of judges and their use of different interpretative styles. With the digitization of 732 legal texts at the U.S. state level and outside the U.S., low-cost and flexible featurization can also 733 boost efforts to show the geographic diffusion of legal concepts. 734

735 736

737

750

751

752

B HIGHLIGHTED TASKS

Throughout this paper, as in Figure 4, we provide detailed results for ten tasks. Six of these tasks are from the SCDB, and four are from the USCAD. We selected tasks that we believe are particularly relevant to the legal community and chose tasks with varying levels of complexity, ranging from relatively simple (e.g., determining the issue area) to more complex (e.g., determining the ideological 'direction' of the court decision).

Four tasks from the USCAD and all tasks from the SCDB were selected to form pairs, with each pair consisting of one task from the USCAD and one from the SCDB that capture similar concepts. It is important to note that, despite capturing broadly similar concepts, the precise formulation of the tasks might differ between the USCAD and the SCDB, making them less than perfectly comparable. In addition to the four pairs, we include two tasks from the SCDB that involve determining features of the decision reviewed by the Supreme Court on the basis of the Supreme Court opinion. The following is a description of the task pairs:

- SC Issue Area / Songer Gen Issue: These tasks capture the case's issue area, requiring a determination of whether the case belongs to one of several broadly defined categories, such as criminal cases or First Amendment cases. These tasks are expected to be of relatively low complexity.
- SC Case Source / Songer Case Origin: These tasks require identifying the court or adjudication body where the case was originally initiated before moving up the judicial hierarchy. Like the previous pair, these tasks are expected to be of relatively low complexity.

758

760

761

762

763

764

765

766

768

788 789

791

792

793 794

795

796

797

798

799

801

804

805

808

809

- SC Disposition / Songer Treatment: These tasks involve determining how the deciding court treated the lower court opinion it reviewed, such as whether it affirmed or reversed the opinion. We consider these tasks to be of relatively low complexity.
 - SC Direction / Songer Direction: These tasks involve determining the ideological 'direction' of the decision, specifically whether the decision supports a "conservative" or "liberal" outcome. We consider these tasks to be comparably complex.
 - SC LC Disposition / SC LC Direction: These tasks involve determining the disposition and ideological 'direction' of the decision reviewed by the Supreme Court. As these tasks require analyzing features of another decision based on the text of the Supreme Court decision, we consider these tasks to be comparably complex.

C INTERCODER AGREEMENT ANALYSIS

The Songer Appeals Court database provides intercoder agreement rates for a subset of the variables. These intercoder agreement rates provide valuable context for the performance of our model. Specifically, intercoder agreement gives us information about the inherent label noise in the annotation procedure. In particular, the intercoder agreement rate gives a natural upper bound on model performance, as we cannot expect the model to perform well when the label is uncertain or subject to interpretation.

However, we cannot directly compare intercoder agreement rates with the accuracy numbers we report. The reason is that in each task we subsampled the majority class to be no larger than the union of all other classes. This is a design choice we made to account for class imbalance. In this section, we map our model's accuracy to *adjusted* accuracy numbers that undo the subsampling step. This results in accuracy numbers that are commensurate with the intercoder agreement rate.

Name	IC Agreement	Adj accuracy	(unadjusted)	Keep
WEIGHTEV (songer_weightev)	76	78.7%	(77.2%)	28.72%
PROCEDUR (songer_procedur)	78	75.2%	(73.9%)	83.08%
ORIGIN (songer_origin)	83.2	80.1%	(77.7%)	53.13%
DIRECT2 (songer_direct2)	85.6	67.5%	(67.5%)	100.00%
DIRECT1 (songer_direct1)	94	80.5%	(80.5%)	100.00%
TREAT (songer_treat)	95.2	91.1%	(90.1%)	71.26%
GENISS (songer_geniss)	97.6	93.2%	(92.9%)	84.77%
CIRCUIT (songer_circuit)	100	93.2%	(93.2%)	100.00%
COMMENT (songer_comment)	100	100.0%	(91.7%)	0.13%

Table 2: Intercoder agreement rates, Lawma accuracies, and fraction of the majority class retained in our sample. Rows are sorted in increasing order of agreement rate.

Table 2 considers several tasks from the Appeals Court database, including the selected ones we highlighted in various figures. Each row corresponds to one task and provides the intercoder agreement rate, adjusted (and unadjusted) accuracy achieved by Lawma 8B, and the fraction of samples we retained in the majority class. A fraction of 100% means that we kept all samples. The smaller the fraction the larger the majority class is relative to the other classes.

800 The table contains several interesting insights:

- The adjusted accuracy of Lawma 8B is generally within single digit percentage points of the intercoder agreement rate for easy tasks such as general issue classification (GENISS).
- Lawma 8B is surprisingly close on the two tasks with the lowest intercoder reliability, i.e., WEIGHTEV and PROCEDUR. This shows that high intercoder reliability is no prerequesite for the model to perform well, i.e., close to the agreement rate.
- On harder tasks, like identifying the ideological valence of a decision (DIRECT1 and DI-RECT2), Lawma 8B is below the agreement rate by double digit percentage points.
- Tasks with very high agreement rate (e.g., CIRCUIT and COMMENT) are not all alike. Some of them (e.g., COMMENT) correspond to a task with extreme class imbalance. Here,



Figure 10: Lawma task accuracy against inter-coder agreement. Lawma

the model reaches the agreement rate. Other tasks (e.g., CIRCUIT) have perfect agreement rate, no class imbalance, and yet Lawma is far from the agreement rate.

These findings speak to the task heterogeneity and the non-trivial nature of the task suite as a classification benchmark.

D SPECIALIZING FOR SINGLE TASKS

We now study how much accuracy we stand to gain by fine-tuning on a *single* task. We specialize
models for each of the 10 tasks highlighted in Section B. We specialize the follow models: Llama 3
845 8B Inst, Llama 3 8B Inst fine-tuned for one epoch on all tasks, and Lawma 8B (i.e., Llama 3 8B Inst
fine-tuned for three epochs on all tasks). For each task, we fine-tune for a maximum of 20 epochs
and early stop when validation loss increases for 3 consecutive evaluation stpes, each corresponding
to one tenth of an epoch.

Figure 11 shows the results of specialization to single tasks. First, we observe that, for 7 out of tasks, Llama 3 8B Inst fine-tuned on all tasks for one epoch (yellow) outperforms Llama 3 8B Inst specialized for a single task (blue). That is, there is value to fine-tuning on our entire dataset rather than overspecializing for a single task. One explanation is that there is substantial cross-task overlap, and fine-tuning on the entire dataset amounts training on many more examples –even if on average these examples are less relevant.

Secondly, we observe that after fine-tuning on *all* 260 tasks for 1 epoch (yellow), further specializing
for a single task (green) improves performance on all cases. Importantly, the latter outperforms the
specialized Llama 3 8B Inst (blue) in all tasks. That is, a model that is fine-tuned on everything
provides a "better" foundation from which to then "overspecializing" for a single task.

Thirdly fine-tuning on everything for three epochs (i.e., Lawma 8B, in red) again improves over the specialized models (i.e., green). Lastly, "overspecializing" Lawma 8B for a single task results in small single digit improvements for 3 out of the 10 tasks. However, we observe no benefits from specializing Lawma 8B for most (7/10) of the tasks.⁴ These results show that we don't leave much accuracy on the table by fine-tuning a single model for all tasks. This is practically quite appealing, since it obviates the need to maintain a separate model for each task. A single model suffices. 864 0.9 866 Accuracy 867 0.8 868 0.7 870 songer songer. songer songer ςC ςC ςC ςC ςC ςC Case Source LC Disposition ISSUE Area Disposition Case Origin Direction LC Direction Treatment Direction Gen. Issue 871 872 873 Llama 3 8B Inst + specialized for a single task 874 Llama 3 8B Inst + 1 epoch on everything + specialized for a single task 875 Lawma 8B (3 epochs on everything) + specialized for a single task 876 877 Figure 11: Specializing Lawma 8B to individual tasks can yield small improvements in accuracy. 878 879 0.1.00 Mean 5.0 accuracy 0 .: All tasks Supreme Court tasks Court of Appeals tasks 880 882 883 884 885 886 SC Direction SC Disposition SC Case Source SC LC Disposition SC Issue Area 1.00 887 Balanced accuracy 0.20 0.25 888 889 890 0.00 Songer Direction Songer Treatment Songer Case Origin SC LC Direction Songer Gen. Issue 891 1.00 Balanced accuracy 0.20 0.25 892 893 894 0.00 895 Majority classifier Saul 7B Inst 🔲 Llama 3 70B Inst LegalBert Mixtral 8x7B Inst GPT4 896 Mistral 7B Inst Llama 3 8B Inst Lawma 8B 897 898 Figure 12: Evaluation results using balanced accuracy as the evaluation metric. 899

E ADDITIONAL PERFORMANCE RESULTS

E.1 BALANCED ACCURACY AND MACRO-F1

See Figure 12 and Figure 13 for evaluation results using mean balanced accuracy and mean macro-F1 as the evaluation metric, respectively.

E.2 RESULTS WITHOUT SUBSAMPLING THE MAJORITY CLASS

Figure 14 presents the evaluation results when not subsampling the majority class. Models achieve very hight accuracy on many tasks simply because they correctly identify the majority class.

E.3 AVERAGE TASK ACCURACY RESULTS

Figure 15 presents the results when using mean task accuracy across tasks as the evaluation metric.

915 916 917

900 901

902 903

904 905

906

907 908

909 910

911

912 913

⁴There is a small decrease in performance for SC Issue Area. This is because early stopping is performed with respect to loss on the validation set, but models are evaluated for accuracy on the test set.





Figure 15: Evaluation results when using mean task accuracy across tasks as the evaluation metric.

E.4 COMPARING LLAMA 70B INSTRUCT AND GPT-4 TO THE CONSTANT CLASSIFIER

Figure 16 illustrates the difference in performance across tasks between GPT-4 and Llama 3 70B Instruct, and the majority class classifier. GPT-4 and Llama 3 70B Instruct perform worse than the constant classifier for dozens of tasks.



Figure 16: Difference in zero-shot accuracy between GPT4, Llama 3 70B Instruct, and the majority classifier. Each vertical bar represents the accuracy difference on one task, sorted in ascending order.

1011 E.5 CHAIN OF THOUGHT EVALUATION 1012

1013 We follow the standard methodology of eliciting CoT by appending to the prompt "Let's think step 1014 by step." Since CoT requires two orders of magnitude more compute for evaluation than the standard 1015 QA approach, we only evaluate Llama 3 8B Instruct and Llama 3 70B Instruct. This required over 1016 500 H100 GPU hours. We observe that CoT leads to modest improvements of performance for both 1017 the 8B and 70B model, on average of 2 to 3 accuracy points, see Figure 17. Nonetheless, Lawma 8B still strongly outperforms Llama 3 70B, by over 20 accuracy points. 1018

1019 1020

981 982 983

984 985

986

987

988

991

992 993

994

996

998

1008 1009 1010

F FINE-TUNING DETAILS

1021 1022

1023 **Compute requirements.** We fine-tune on a cluster consisting of NVIDIA H100 GPUs. Finetuning on all tasks simultaneously required approximately 600 H100 hours for the 8B model and 1024 1600 GPU hours for the 70B model. In total, the experiments presented in the paper required 1025 approximately 8000 H100 GPU hours.

Impact of Chain of Thought (CoT) - Mean accuracy 1.0 0.855 0.8 0.640 0.623 Accuracy 9.0 70 0.529 0.503 0.2 0.0 Llama 3 8B Instruct + CoT Llama 3 70B Instruct Llama 3 70B Instruct + CoT Llama 3 8B Instruct Lawma 8B

Figure 17: Performance improvements using Chain of Thought (CoT).

1044 1045 F.1 Lawma

1046 We fine-tuning with a maximum sequence length of 8192 tokens. We use the AdamW optimizer 1047 with full precision, $\beta_1 = 0.9$, $\beta_2 = 0.95$, $\epsilon = 10^{-8}$. We use a peak learning rate of $2 \cdot 10^{-6}$. 1048 We use a cosine learning rate schedule, with 180 warm-up steps (approx. 4% of a full epoch) and 1049 decay to 10% of the peak learning rate. We use a weight decay of 0.1. We clip gradient to 1.0 max norm. We pack samples using the axolotl library (Cloud, 2024), which improves training efficiency 1050 by approximately 40%. For Lawma 8B, we fine-tune Llama 3 8B Instruct for 3 epochs. We train on 1051 a node of 7 H100s using DeepSpeed Zero 2, with a global batch size of 56. For Lawma 70B, we 1052 fine-tune Llama 3 70B Instruct for 1 epoch. We train on 8 nodes of 8 H100s each using DeepSpeed 1053 Zero 3, with a global batch size of 64. We find that additional epochs hurt average task performance, 1054 although performance continues to improve for some of the tasks. 1055

1055

1028

1030

1031

1032

1034

1035 1036

1042 1043

1057 F.2 ADDITIONAL FINE-TUNING EXPERIMENTS

1058 The hyperparameters are identical to those used for Lawma unless otherwise specified.

Scaling experiments. We fine-tune the Pythia and Llama 2 models with a peak learning rate of $2 \cdot 10^{-5}$, which we find to be result in higher performance than a peak learning rate of $2 \cdot 10^{-6}$. For the Llama 3 models, we use a learning rate of $2 \cdot 10^{-6}$, which we find to be perform better than $2 \cdot 10^{-5}$. We fine-tune for a single epoch. We use a batch size 64. We fine-tune models with their pretraining max sequence length, that is, 2k tokens for Pythia, 4k tokens for Llama 2, and 8k tokens for Llama 3. We use a warm up ratio of 0.03. Due to the costs associated with training the 70B model, we simply take Lawma 70B rather than re-training the model with these slightly different training hyperparameters.

1068

Sample efficiency and specialization We fine-tune for up to 20 epochs. We evaluate the loss on a separate validation set and early stop if the loss increases for 3 consecutive evaluation steps. For the sample efficiency experiments, we evaluate at the end of every epoch. For the specialization experiments, we evaluate every 0.1 epochs. We decay the learning rate to 10% of the peak learning rate over the 20 epochs. We fine-tune with a batch size of 64. For the specialization experiments, we train models both with and without learning rate warm up, and report the accuracy of the best model. We use the AdamW BitsAndBytes 8-bit optimizer, allowing us to fine-tune the models in a single H100 GPU.

1076

1077 Generalization We fine-tune only on the Songer Court of Appeals tasks. We fine-tune with batch
1078 size 64. We fine-tune for one epoch and we checkpoint models at 10, 30, 60, 100, 300, 600, 1000,
1079 2000, and 3000 training steps. A full epoch on the Songer Court of Appeal tasks corresponds to 3096 training steps.

G LIST OF ALL TASKS

1	081
1	082
1	083

sc_adminaction	-	Sample answer envices
	What is the agency involved in	Army and Air Force Exchange
	the administrative action?	vice, Atomic Energy Commiss
		Secretary or administrative unit or
		sonnel of the U.S. Air Force
sc_adminaction_is	Did administrative action occur	No, Yes
	in the context of the case?	
sc_adminactionstate	What is the state of the state	Alabama, Alaska, American Samo
	agency associated with the ad-	
	ministrative action?	
sc_authoritydecision	What is the basis of the Supreme	judicial review (national level),
	Court's decision?	dicial review (state level), Supre
		Court supervision of lower federa
		state courts or original jurisdiction
sc_casedisposition	What is the disposition of the	stay, petition, or motion granted,
•	case, that is, the treatment	firmed (includes modified), reverse
	the Supreme Court accorded	
	the court whose decision it re-	
	viewed?	
sc_caseorigin	What is the court in which the	U.S. Court of Customs and Pa
-	case originated?	Appeals, U.S. Court of Internation
		Trade, U.S. Court of Claims, Cour
		Federal Claims
sc_caseoriginstate	What is the state of the court in	Alabama, Alaska, American Samo
U U	which the case originated?	
sc_casesource	What is the court whose decision	U.S. Court of Customs and Pa
	the Supreme Court reviewed?	Appeals, U.S. Court of Internation
	-	Trade, U.S. Court of Claims, Cour
		Federal Claims
	What is the state of the court	
sc_casesourcestate	what is the state of the court	Alabama, Alaska, American Samo
sc_casesourcestate	whose decision the Supreme	Alabama, Alaska, American Samo
sc_casesourcestate	what is the state of the court whose decision the Supreme Court reviewed?	Alabama, Alaska, American Samo
sc_casesourcestate	what is the state of the court whose decision the Supreme Court reviewed? What reason, if any, does the	Alabama, Alaska, American Samo
sc_casesourcestate	what is the state of the court whose decision the Supreme Court reviewed? What reason, if any, does the court give for granting the peti-	Alabama, Alaska, American Samo case did not arise on cert or cert granted, federal court conflict, fed
sc_casesourcestate	what is the state of the court whose decision the Supreme Court reviewed? What reason, if any, does the court give for granting the peti- tion for certiorari?	Alabama, Alaska, American Samo case did not arise on cert or cert granted, federal court conflict, fed court conflict and to resolve impor
sc_casesourcestate	what is the state of the court whose decision the Supreme Court reviewed? What reason, if any, does the court give for granting the peti- tion for certiorari?	Alabama, Alaska, American Samo case did not arise on cert or cert granted, federal court conflict, fed court conflict and to resolve impor or significant question
sc_casesourcestate sc_certreason sc_decisiondirection	what is the state of the courtwhose decision the SupremeCourt reviewed?What reason, if any, does thecourt give for granting the peti-tion for certiorari?What is the ideological direction	Alabama, Alaska, American Samo case did not arise on cert or cert granted, federal court conflict, fed court conflict and to resolve impor or significant question Conservative, Liberal, Unspecifiab
sc_casesourcestate sc_certreason sc_decisiondirection	what is the state of the courtwhose decision the SupremeCourt reviewed?What reason, if any, does thecourt give for granting the peti-tion for certiorari?What is the ideological directionof the decision?	Alabama, Alaska, American Samor case did not arise on cert or cert granted, federal court conflict, fed court conflict and to resolve impor or significant question Conservative, Liberal, Unspecifiab
sc_casesourcestate sc_certreason sc_decisiondirection sc_decisiontype	What is the state of the courtwhose decision the SupremeCourt reviewed?What reason, if any, does thecourt give for granting the peti-tion for certiorari?What is the ideological directionof the decision?What type of decision did the	Alabama, Alaska, American Samo case did not arise on cert or cert granted, federal court conflict, fed court conflict and to resolve impor or significant question Conservative, Liberal, Unspecifiab opinion of the court (orally argu
sc_casesourcestate sc_certreason sc_decisiondirection sc_decisiontype	what is the state of the court whose decision the Supreme Court reviewed?What reason, if any, does the court give for granting the peti- tion for certiorari?What is the ideological direction of the decision?What type of decision did the court make?	Alabama, Alaska, American Samo case did not arise on cert or cert granted, federal court conflict, fed court conflict and to resolve impor or significant question Conservative, Liberal, Unspecifiab opinion of the court (orally argu per curiam (no oral argument), deci
sc_casesourcestate sc_certreason sc_decisiondirection sc_decisiontype sc_declarationuncon	 what is the state of the court whose decision the Supreme Court reviewed? What reason, if any, does the court give for granting the peti- tion for certiorari? What is the ideological direction of the decision? What type of decision did the court make? Did the Court declare unconsti- 	Alabama, Alaska, American Samo case did not arise on cert or cert granted, federal court conflict, fed court conflict and to resolve impor or significant question Conservative, Liberal, Unspecifiab opinion of the court (orally argu per curiam (no oral argument), deci No declaration of unconstitutiona
sc_casesourcestate sc_certreason sc_decisiondirection sc_decisiontype sc_declarationuncon	 what is the state of the court whose decision the Supreme Court reviewed? What reason, if any, does the court give for granting the peti- tion for certiorari? What is the ideological direction of the decision? What type of decision did the court make? Did the Court declare unconsti- tutional an act of Congress; a 	Alabama, Alaska, American Samo case did not arise on cert or cert granted, federal court conflict, fed court conflict and to resolve impor or significant question Conservative, Liberal, Unspecifiab opinion of the court (orally argu per curiam (no oral argument), dec No declaration of unconstitutiona Act of Congress declared unconst
sc_casesourcestate sc_certreason sc_decisiondirection sc_decisiontype sc_declarationuncon	 what is the state of the court whose decision the Supreme Court reviewed? What reason, if any, does the court give for granting the peti- tion for certiorari? What is the ideological direction of the decision? What type of decision did the court make? Did the Court declare unconsti- tutional an act of Congress; a state or territorial statute, regula- 	Alabama, Alaska, American Samo case did not arise on cert or cert granted, federal court conflict, fed court conflict and to resolve impor or significant question Conservative, Liberal, Unspecifiab opinion of the court (orally argu per curiam (no oral argument), dec No declaration of unconstitutiona Act of Congress declared unconst tional, State or territorial law, reg
sc_casesourcestate sc_certreason sc_decisiondirection sc_decisiontype sc_declarationuncon	 what is the state of the court whose decision the Supreme Court reviewed? What reason, if any, does the court give for granting the peti- tion for certiorari? What is the ideological direction of the decision? What type of decision did the court make? Did the Court declare unconsti- tutional an act of Congress; a state or territorial statute, regula- tion, or constitutional provision; 	Alabama, Alaska, American Samo case did not arise on cert or cert granted, federal court conflict, fed court conflict and to resolve impor or significant question Conservative, Liberal, Unspecifiab opinion of the court (orally argu per curiam (no oral argument), dec No declaration of unconstitutiona Act of Congress declared unconst tional, State or territorial law, reg tion, or constitutional provision unc
sc_casesourcestate sc_certreason sc_decisiondirection sc_decisiontype sc_declarationuncon	 what is the state of the court whose decision the Supreme Court reviewed? What reason, if any, does the court give for granting the petition for certiorari? What is the ideological direction of the decision? What type of decision did the court make? Did the Court declare unconstitutional an act of Congress; a state or territorial statute, regulation, or constitutional provision; or a municipal or other local or- 	Alabama, Alaska, American Samor case did not arise on cert or cert granted, federal court conflict, fed court conflict and to resolve impor or significant question Conservative, Liberal, Unspecifiab opinion of the court (orally argu per curiam (no oral argument), deci No declaration of unconstitutiona Act of Congress declared unconst tional, State or territorial law, reg tion, or constitutional provision unc
sc_casesourcestate sc_certreason sc_decisiondirection sc_decisiontype sc_declarationuncon	 what is the state of the court whose decision the Supreme Court reviewed? What reason, if any, does the court give for granting the peti- tion for certiorari? What is the ideological direction of the decision? What type of decision did the court make? Did the Court declare unconsti- tutional an act of Congress; a state or territorial statute, regula- tion, or constitutional provision; or a municipal or other local or- dinance? 	Alabama, Alaska, American Samo case did not arise on cert or cert granted, federal court conflict, fed court conflict and to resolve impor or significant question Conservative, Liberal, Unspecifiab opinion of the court (orally argu per curiam (no oral argument), deci No declaration of unconstitutiona Act of Congress declared unconst tional, State or territorial law, reg tion, or constitutional provision unc
sc_casesourcestate sc_certreason sc_decisiondirection sc_decisiontype sc_declarationuncon	 what is the state of the court whose decision the Supreme Court reviewed? What reason, if any, does the court give for granting the petition for certiorari? What is the ideological direction of the decision? What type of decision did the court make? Did the Court declare unconstitutional an act of Congress; a state or territorial statute, regulation, or constitutional provision; or a municipal or other local ordinance? What is the issue of the decision? 	Alabama, Alaska, American Samo case did not arise on cert or cert granted, federal court conflict, fed court conflict and to resolve impor or significant question Conservative, Liberal, Unspecifiab opinion of the court (orally argu per curiam (no oral argument), dec No declaration of unconstitutiona Act of Congress declared unconst tional, State or territorial law, reg tion, or constitutional provision unc stitutional
sc_casesourcestate sc_certreason sc_decisiondirection sc_decisiontype sc_declarationuncon	 what is the state of the court whose decision the Supreme Court reviewed? What reason, if any, does the court give for granting the petition for certiorari? What is the ideological direction of the decision? What type of decision did the court make? Did the Court declare unconstitutional an act of Congress; a state or territorial statute, regulation, or constitutional provision; or a municipal or other local ordinance? What is the issue of the decision? 	Alabama, Alaska, American Samo case did not arise on cert or cert granted, federal court conflict, fed court conflict and to resolve impor or significant question Conservative, Liberal, Unspecifiab opinion of the court (orally argu per curiam (no oral argument), decr No declaration of unconstitutiona Act of Congress declared unconst tional, State or territorial law, reg tion, or constitutional provision unc stitutional
sc_casesourcestate sc_certreason sc_decisiondirection sc_decisiontype sc_declarationuncon	 what is the state of the court whose decision the Supreme Court reviewed? What reason, if any, does the court give for granting the petition for certiorari? What is the ideological direction of the decision? What type of decision did the court make? Did the Court declare unconstitutional an act of Congress; a state or territorial statute, regulation, or constitutional provision; or a municipal or other local ordinance? What is the issue of the decision? 	Alabama, Alaska, American Samo case did not arise on cert or cert granted, federal court conflict, fed court conflict and to resolve impor or significant question Conservative, Liberal, Unspecifiab opinion of the court (orally argu per curiam (no oral argument), dec No declaration of unconstitutiona Act of Congress declared unconst tional, State or territorial law, reg tion, or constitutional provision und stitutional subconstitutional fair procedure: f tive from justice, self-incriminat immunity from prosecution, cruel
sc_casesourcestate sc_certreason sc_decisiondirection sc_decisiontype sc_declarationuncon	 what is the state of the court whose decision the Supreme Court reviewed? What reason, if any, does the court give for granting the petition for certiorari? What is the ideological direction of the decision? What type of decision did the court make? Did the Court declare unconstitutional an act of Congress; a state or territorial statute, regulation, or constitutional provision; or a municipal or other local ordinance? What is the issue of the decision? 	Alabama, Alaska, American Samo case did not arise on cert or cert granted, federal court conflict, fed court conflict and to resolve impor or significant question Conservative, Liberal, Unspecifiab opinion of the court (orally argu per curiam (no oral argument), dec No declaration of unconstitutiona Act of Congress declared unconst tional, State or territorial law, reg tion, or constitutional provision und stitutional subconstitutional fair procedure: f tive from justice, self-incriminat immunity from prosecution, cruel unusual punishment. death pen
sc_casesourcestate sc_certreason sc_decisiondirection sc_decisiontype sc_declarationuncon	 what is the state of the court whose decision the Supreme Court reviewed? What reason, if any, does the court give for granting the petition for certiorari? What is the ideological direction of the decision? What type of decision did the court make? Did the Court declare unconstitutional an act of Congress; a state or territorial statute, regulation, or constitutional provision; or a municipal or other local ordinance? What is the issue of the decision? 	Alabama, Alaska, American Samo case did not arise on cert or cert granted, federal court conflict, fed court conflict and to resolve impor or significant question Conservative, Liberal, Unspecifiab opinion of the court (orally argu per curiam (no oral argument), decr No declaration of unconstitutiona Act of Congress declared unconst tional, State or territorial law, reg tion, or constitutional provision unc stitutional subconstitutional fair procedure: fn tive from justice, self-incriminat immunity from prosecution, cruel unusual punishment, death pen (cf. extra legal iury influence de

1134			
1135	sc_issue_10	What is the issue of the decision?	federal pre-emption of state legislation
1136			or regulation. cf. state regulation of
1137			business. rarely involves union activ-
1138			ity. Does not involve constitutional
1139			does federal pre-emption of state leg-
1140			islation or regulation. cf. state regula-
1141			tion of business. rarely involves union
1142			activity. Does not involve constitu-
1143			tional interpretation unless the Court
1144			says it does., national supremacy: pub-
1145			regulation)
1146	sc_issue_11	What is the issue of the decision?	non-real property dispute between
11/7			states, non-real property dispute be-
11/10			tween states, boundary dispute be-
1140			tween states
1149	sc_issue_12	What is the issue of the decision?	federal taxation, typically under pro-
1150			visions of the Internal Revenue Code,
1151			visions of the Internal Revenue Code
1152			federal taxation of gifts, personal, busi-
1153			ness, or professional expenses
1154	sc_issue_2	What is the issue of the decision?	sex discrimination (excluding sex dis-
1155			crimination in employment), Voting
1156			Rights Act of 1965, plus amendments,
1157		What is the issue of the decision?	libel privacy: true and false light in
1158	sc_1ssue_5	what is the issue of the decision?	vasions of privacy parochiaid: govern-
1159			ment aid to religious schools, or reli-
1160			gious requirements in public schools,
1161			First Amendment, miscellaneous (cf.
1162	· · · ·		comity: First Amendment)
1163	sc_1ssue_4	What is the issue of the decision?	due process: takings clause, or other
1164			ing of property due process: miscel-
1165			laneous (cf. loyalty oath), the residual
1166			code, due process: miscellaneous (cf.
1167			loyalty oath), the residual code
1168	sc_issue_5	What is the issue of the decision?	Freedom of Information Act and re-
1169			lated federal or state statutes or regu-
1170			tives abortion: including contracep-
1171			tives
1172	sc_issue_6	What is the issue of the decision?	attorneys' and governmental employ-
1173			ees' or officials' fees or compensation
1174			or licenses, commercial speech, attor-
1175			neys (cf. commercial speech), attor-
1176			neys and governmental employees' or
1177			censes
1178	sc_issue_7	What is the issue of the decision?	labor-management disputes: right to
1170			organize, union-union member dis-
1120			pute (except as pertains to union or
1100			closed shop), labor-management dis-
1101		What is the issue of the desision?	putes: employee discharge
1102	sc_issue_o	what is the issue of the decision?	tection (cf. national supremacy: natu-
1103			ral resources, national supremacy: pol-
1104			lution), Employee Retirement Income
1185			Security Act (cf. union trust funds),
1186			election of remedies: legal remedies
1187			available to injured persons or things

188			
89 90 91 92	sc_issue_9	What is the issue of the decision?	standing to sue: private or implied cause of action, judicial administra- tion: review of non-final order, judicial administration: jurisdiction or author- ity of federal district courts or territo-
93 94	sc_issuearea	What is the issue area of the de-	rial courts Criminal Procedure, Civil Rights, First
195 196	sc_jurisdiction	What is the manner in which the Court took jurisdiction?	cert, appeal, bail
197 198 199	sc_lcdisagreement	Does the court opinion mention that one or more of the mem- bers of the court whose decision	Yes, No
200 201	se ledisposition	the Supreme Court reviewed dis- sented?	stay petition or motion granted af-
1202 1203 1204	se_teursposition	what treatment did the court whose decision the Supreme Court reviewed accorded the de- cision of the court it reviewed?	firmed, reversed
1205 1206 1207	sc_lcdispositiondirection	n What is the ideological direction of the decision reviewed by the Supreme Court?	Conservative, Liberal, Unspecifiable
1208 1209 1210 1211 1212	sc_partywinning	Consider that the petitioning party lost if the Supreme Court affirmed or dismissed the case, or denied the petition. Consider that the petitioning party won in part or in full if the Supreme Court	Yes, No
1213 1214 1215 1216 1217		reversed, reversed and remanded, vacated and remanded, affirmed and reversed in part, affirmed and reversed in part and remanded, or vacated the case. Did the peti- tioning win the case?	
1218 1219 1220 1221	sc_petitioner	Who is the petitioner of the case?	attorney general of the United States, or his office, specified state board or department of education, city, town, township, village, or borough govern- ment or governmental unit
1222 1223	sc_petitionerstate	What state is associated with the petitioner?	Alabama, Alaska, American Samoa
1224 1225	sc_precedentalteration	Did the the decision of the court overrule one or more of the Court's own precedents?	Yes, No
1226 1227 1228 1229	sc_respondent	Who is the respondent of the case?	attorney general of the United States, or his office, specified state board or department of education, city, town, township, village, or borough govern- ment or governmental unit
1230 1231	sc_respondentstate	What state is associated with the respondent?	Alabama, Alaska, American Samoa
1232 1233	sc_threejudgefdc	Was the case heard by a three- judge federal district court?	Yes, No
1234 1235 1236 1237	songer_abusedis	Did the court conclude that it should defer to agency discre- tion? For example, if the action was committed to agency discre- tion.	No, Yes, Mixed answer
1238 1239 1240	songer_adminrev	What federal agency's decision was reviewed by the court of appeals?	Benefits Review Board, Civil Aero- nautics Board, Civil Service Commis- sion

1242			
1243	songer_agen_acq	Did the court rule for the govern-	No, Yes, Mixed answer
1244		ment in an issue related to agency	
1245		acquisition of information (e.g.	
1246		subpoenas records etc.)?	
1247	songer ali	Did the court support the de-	No. Yes. Mixed answer
1248	songerianj	cision of an administrative law	
1249		judge?	
1250	songer_altdisp	Did the court's ruling on an is-	No, Yes, Mixed answer
1251		sue arising out of an alternative	
1252		settlement conference role of	
1253		mediator or arbitrator, etc.) favor	
1254		the appellant?	
1255	songer_amicus	Was there any amicus participa-	no amicus participation on either side,
1256		tion before the court of appeals?	1 separate amicus brief was filed, 2
1257			separate amicus briefs were filed
1258	songer_app_stic	state or local government agency	not, Alabama, Alaska
1259		that is an appellant?	
1260	songer_appbus	What is the total number of ap-	N/A
1261		pellants in the case that fall into	
1262		the category "private business	
1263		and its executives"? Answer with	
1264	songer appell 1.2	This question concerns the first	local neither local nor national na-
1265	songer_upperr_r_z	listed appellant. The nature of	tional or multi-national
1266		this litigant falls into the cate-	
1267		gory "private business (including	
1268		criminal enterprises)". What is	
1269	songer appell 1 3	This question concerns the first	agriculture mining construction
1270	songer_apperr_r_s	listed appellant. The nature of	agriculture, mining, construction
1271		this litigant falls into the cate-	
1272		gory "private business (including	
1273		criminal enterprises)". What cat-	
1274		egory of business best describes	
1275		which is involved in this case?	
1276	songer_appel1_1_4	This question concerns the first	single family farm, commercial farm,
1277		listed appellant. The nature of	agri-business, farm - other
1278		this litigant falls into the cate-	
1270		gory "private business (including	
1280		cally "agriculture". What subcat-	
1281		egory of business best describes	
1282		this litigant?	
1283	songer_appel1_2_2	This question concerns the first	business, trade, professional, or union
1284		listed appellant. The nature of this litigant falls into the act.	(BIPU), other
1285		gory "private organization or as-	
1286		sociation". What category of pri-	
1287		vate associations best describes	
1288		this litigant?	2
1289	songer_appel1_2_3	This question concerns the first	Business or trade association, utili-
1200		this litigant falls into the category	ues co-ops, Professional association -
1201		"private organization or asso-	other than law of methodicine
1202		ciation", specifically "business,	
1203		trade, professional, or union	
1204		(BTPU)". What subcategory of	
1205		private association best describes this litigant?	
	1		

1296			
1297	songer_appel1_3_2	This question concerns the first	cabinet level department, courts or leg-
1298		listed appellant. The nature of	islative, agency whose first word is
1299		this litigant falls into the category	federal
1300		DC)". Which category of federal	
1301		government agencies and activi-	
1302		ties best describes this litigant?	
1303	songer_appel1_3_3	This question concerns the first	Department of Agriculture, Depart-
1304		listed appellant. The nature of this litigant falls into the category	ment of Commerce, Department of Defense (includes War Department
1305		"federal government (including	and Navy Department)
1306		DC)", specifically "cabinet level	5 1 7
1307		department". Which specific fed-	
1308		eral government agency best de-	
1309	songer appell 4.2	This question concerns the first	legislative executive/administrative
1310	songer_upperr_1_2	listed appellant. The nature of	bureaucracy providing services
1311		this litigant falls into the cate-	
1312		gory "sub-state government (e.g.,	
1313		county, local, special district)".	
1314		ernment best describes this liti-	
1315		gant?	
1316	songer_appel1_4_3	This question concerns the first	City/county council, School Board,
1317		listed appellant. The nature	board of trustees for college or junior
1318		of this litigant falls into the category "sub-state government	college, Other legislative body
1319		(e.g., county, local, special dis-	
1320		trict)", specifically "legislative".	
1321		Which specific substate govern-	
1322		ment agency best describes this litigant?	
1323	songer appell 5.2	This question concerns the first	legislative executive/administrative
1024	songer-upperrie-	listed appellant. The nature of	bureaucracy providing services
1323		this litigant falls into the cate-	
1320		gory "state government (includes	
1222		territories & commonwealths)".	
1320		ment best describes this litigant?	
1330	songer_appel1_5_3	This question concerns the first	Legislature or separate house as an or-
1331		listed appellant. The nature of	ganization, Legislative Committee or
1332		this litigant falls into the cate-	Commission, Other Legislative Unit
1333		territories & commonwealths)".	
1334		specifically "legislative". Which	
1335		specific state government agency	
1336	11.7.0	best describes this litigant?	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
1337	songer_appen_/_2	inis question concerns the first listed appellant. The nature of	not ascertained, male - indication in opinion (e.g. use of masculine pro-
1338		this litigant falls into the cate-	noun), male - assumed because of
1339		gory "natural person (excludes	name
1340		persons named in their official	
1341		capacity or who appear because	
1342		tion)". What is the gender of this	
1343		litigant?Use names to classify the	
1344		party's sex only if there is little	
1345		ambiguity.	

1951 songer.appell.7.3 This question concerns the first listed appellant. The nature of dis litigant falls into the cate- gory "natural person excludes persons named in their official capacity or who appear because of a role in a private organiza- tion)". What is the cate organiza- tion)". Which of these categories best describes the income of the litigant? not ascertained, poor + wards of state, persons named in their official capacity or who appear because of a role in a private organiza- tion)". Which of these categories best describes the litigant? not ascertained, not ascertained this litigant falls into the cat- gory "insicellaneous", specifi- cially "fiduciary, executor, or trustee, other, mature of the higgant? 1976 songer.appell.8.3 This question concerns the first listed appellant. The nature of this litigant falls into the cat- gory "insicellaneous", specifi- cially "fiduciary, executor, or estate - in- stitution fiduciary, executor, or trustee, other, nature of the higgant? 1986 </th <th>1350</th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th>	1350			
1352 listed appellant. The nature of this litigant falls into the cate- gory "natural person (excludes persons named in their official capacity or who appear because of a role in a private organiza- tion?". What is the race or ethnic identity of this litigant as identi- fied in the opinion? not ascertained, US citizen, alien 1359 songer.appell.7.4 This question concerns the first listed appellant. The nature of this litigant falls into the cate- gory "natural person excludes persons named in their official capacity or who appear because of a role in a private organiza- tion?". What is the citizenship of this litigant as indicated in the opinion? not ascertained, US citizen, alien 1360 songer.appell.7.5 This question concerns the first listed appellant. The nature of this litigant appellant. The nature of this litigant falls into the cate- gory "natural person (excludes persons named in their official capacity or who appear because of a role in a private organiza- tion)". Which of these categories best describes the income of the litigant? not ascertained, poor + wards of state, presumed poor 1371 songer.appell.8.2 This question concerns the first listed appellant. The nature of this litigant falls into the cat- gory "miscellaneous", Which of the following categories best de- scribes the litigant? fuduciary, executor, or trustee, other, nature of the litigant not ascertained 1384 songer.appell.8.3 This question concerns the first listed appellant. The nature of this litigant falls into the cat- gory "miscellaneous", Which of the following categories best de- scribes the litigant? fuduciary, executor, or trustee, other, nature of the litigant falls into the cat- gory "miscellaneous", specific ically "fiducia	1351	songer_appel1_7_3	This question concerns the first	not ascertained, caucasian - specific in-
1353 this infigant fails into the cate- gory "natural person (excludes persons named in their official capacity or who appear because of a role in a private organiza- tion)". What is the care or ethnic identity of this lingant as identi- fed in the opinion? not ascertained, US citizen, alien 1354 songer_appel1.7.4 This question concerns the first listed appellant. The nature of this lingant fails into the cate- gory "natural person (excludes persons named in their official capacity or who appear because of a role in a private organiza- tion)". What is the citizenship of this lingant a indicated in the opinion? not ascertained, US citizen, alien 1364 songer_appel1.7.5 This guestion concerns the first listed appellant. The nature of this lingant fails into the cate- gory "natural person (excludes persons named in their official capacity or who appear because of a role in a private organiza- tion)". Which of the cate- gory "matural person (excludes persons named in their official capacity or who appear because of a role in a private organiza- tion)". Which of the cate- gory "matural person (excludes persons named in their official capacity or who appear because of a role in a private organiza- tion)". Which of the cate- gory "matural person (excludes persons heat cate- in- songer appel1.8.2 fuducary, executor, or trustee, other, nature of the litigant role cate- gory "miscellaneous". Which of this litigant falls into the cate- gory "miscellaneous", which of the following categories best de- scribes the litigant? fuducary, executor, or trustee, other, nature of the sinded appellant. The nature of this litigant falls into the cat- gory "miscellaneous", which scutor a doministrator of estate - in- stitution 1380 songer.appel2.1.2	1352		listed appellant. The nature of	dication in opinion, black - specific in-
isonger.appell.7.5 This question concerns the first listed appellant. The nature of this lingant falls into the cate- gory "natural person (excludes persons named in their official capacity or who appear because of a role in a private organiza- tion)". What is the race or ethmic isted appellant. The nature of this lingant falls into the cate- gory "natural person (excludes persons named in their official capacity or who appear because of a role in a private organiza- tion)". What is the cate- gory "natural person (excludes persons named in their official capacity or who appear because of a role in a private organiza- tion)". What is the cate- gory "natural person (excludes persons named in their official capacity or who appear because of a role in a private organiza- tion)". Which of these categories not ascertained, poor + wards of state, presumed poor songer.appell.7.5 This question concerns the first listed appellant. The nature of this lingant falls into the cate- gory "miscellaneous". Which of the lingant? not ascertained, poor + wards of state, presumed poor songer.appell.8.2 This question concerns the first listed appellant. The nature of this lingant falls into the cate- gory "miscellaneous". Which of the following categories best de- scribes the lingant? fiduciary, executor, or trustee, other, nature of the lingant not ascertained songer.appell.8.3 This question concerns the first listed appellant. The nature of this lingant falls into the cat- gory "miscellaneous", specif- ically "fiduciary, executor, or trustate". Which of the following specific subatagories best de- scribes the lingant? local, neither local nor national, na- tional or multi-national songer.appel2.1.2 This question conc	1353		this litigant falls into the cate-	dication in opinion
1355 capacity or who appear because of a role in a private organiza- tion)". What is the race or ethnic identity of this litigant as identi- fied in the opinion? not ascertained, US citizen, alien 1360 songer.appell.7.4 This question concerns the first listed appellant. The nature of this litigant falls into the cate- gory "natural person (excludes persons named in their official capacity or who appear because of a role in a private organiza- tion)". What is the citizenship of this litigant falls into the cate- gory "natural person (excludes persons named in their official capacity or who appear because of a role in a private organiza- tion)". What is the citizenship of this litigant falls into the cate- gory "natural person (excludes persons named in their official capacity or who appear because of a role in a private organiza- tion)". Which of the cate- gory "natural person (excludes persons named in their official capacity or who appear because of a role in a private organiza- tion)". Which of the cate- gory "niscellaneous". Which of the following categories best de- scribes the litigant? not ascertained, poor + wards of state, presumed poor 1374 songer.appell.8.2 This question concerns the first listed appellant. The nature of this litigant falls into the cate- gory "miscellaneous". Which of the following categories best de- scribes the litigant? fucuiary, executor, or trustee, other, nature of the litigant or ascertained trustee in bankruptcy - institution, trustee on listed appellant. The nature of this litigant falls into the cat- gory "private business (including eriminal enterprises)". What is the scope of	1354		persons named in their official	
1356 of a role in a private organiza- tion)". What is the race or ethnic identity of this litigant as identi- fied in the opinion? not ascertained, US citizen, alien 1369 songer.appell.7.7.4 This question concerns the first listed appellant. The nature of this litigant falls into the cate- gory "natural person (excludes persons named in their official capacity or who appear because of a role in a private organiza- tion)". What is the citizenship of this litigant falls into the cate- gory "natural person (excludes persons named in their official capacity or who appear because of a role in a private organiza- tion)". What is the cate- gory "natural person (excludes persons named in their official capacity or who appear because of a role in a private organiza- tion)". Which of these categories best describes the cate- gory "natural person (excludes persons the first listed appellant. The nature of this litigant falls into the cate- gory "miscellaneous". Which of the following categories best de- scribes the litigant? fduciary, executor, or trustee, other, nature of the litigant not ascertained 1376 songer.appell.8.2 This question concerns the first listed appellant. The nature of this litigant falls into the cate- gory "miscellaneous", specif- ically "fiduciary, executor, or trustee, onduinistrator of estate - in- egory "miscellaneous", specif- ically "fiduciary, executor, or trustee". Which of the following specific subattgories best de- scribes the litigant? local, neither local nor national, na- tional or multi-national 1388 songer.appel2.1.3 This question concerns the sec- ond listed appellant. The nature of this litigant falls into the cat- gory "private business". What is the scope of this business? local, neither l	1355		capacity or who appear because	
1357 tion)". What is the race or ethnic identity of this lingtant as identified in the opinion? 1359 songer.appell.7.4 This question concerns the first lingtant falls into the category "natural person (excludes person named in their official capacity or who appear because of a role in a private organization)". What is the citizenship of this lingtant as indicated in the opinion? not ascertained, US citizen, alien 1360 songer.appell.7.5 This question concerns the first lingtant as indicated in the opinion? not ascertained, poor + wards of state, presumed poor 1370 songer.appell.7.5 This question concerns the first lingtant falls into the category "insteal regronization". What is the appellant. The nature of this lingtant falls into the category "insteal regronization". Which of these categories best describes the income of the lingtant? 1371 songer.appell.8.2 This question concerns the first lingtant falls into the category "inscellancous". Which of the scategories best describes the lingtan? fiduciary, executor, or trustee, other, nature of this lingtant falls into the category "inscellancous". Which of the following categories best describes the lingtan? trustee in bankruptcy - institution, trustee, which of the following specific subcategories best describes the lingtan? 1384 songer.appell.8.3 This question concerns the seconof this lingtant falls into the category "inscellancous", specific subcategories best describes the lingtan? fiduciary, executor, or trustee, on nature of this lingtant falls into the category "inscellancous". Which of the following specific subcategories	1356		of a role in a private organiza-	
1359 identity of this litigant as identi- fied in the opinion? 1360 songer_appel1.7.4 This question concerns the first listed appellant. The nature of this litigant falls into the cate- gory "natural person (excludes persons named in their official capacity or who appear because of a role in a private organiza- tion)". What is the citizenship of this litigant falls into the cate- gory "natural person (excludes persons named in their official capacity or who appear because of a role in a private organiza- tion)". What is the citizenship of this litigant falls into the cate- gory "natural person (excludes persons named in their official capacity or who appear because of a role in a private organiza- tion)". Which of these categories best describes the income of the litigant? not ascertained, poor + wards of state, presumed poor + wards of state, presumed poor + wards of state, presumed poor 1372 songer_appel1.8.2 This question concerns the first listed appellant. The nature of this litigant falls into the cate- gory "miscellaneous". Which of the following categories best de- scribes the litigant? fiduciary, executor, or trustee, other, nature of the litigant on ascertained this litigant falls into the cat- gory "miscellaneous", which of this litigant falls into the cat- gory "miscellaneous", specific subcategories best de- scribes the litigant? 1381 songer_appel1.8.3 This question concerns the first listed appellant. The nature of this litigant falls into the cat- gory "miscellaneous", specific subcategories best de- scribes the litigant? trustee in bankruptcy - institution, trustee in bankruptcy - individual, ex- ecutor or administrator of estate - in- stitution 1384 songer_appel2.1.2 </td <td>1357</td> <td></td> <td>tion)". What is the race or ethnic</td> <td></td>	1357		tion)". What is the race or ethnic	
1359 net in the opnion? 1360 songer.appell.7.4 This question concerns the first listed appellant. The nature of this litigant falls into the category "natural person (sceludes persons named in their official capacity or who appear because of a role in a private organization)". What is the citizenship of this litigant falls into the category "natural person (sceludes persons named in their official capacity or who appear because of a role in a private organization)". Which of these categories best describes the income of the litigant? not ascertained, poor + wards of state, presumed poor 1370 songer.appell.7.5 This question concerns the first litigant falls into the category "matural person (sceludes persons named in their official capacity or who appear because of a role in a private organization)". Which of these categories best describes the income of the litigant? fduciary, executor, or trustee, other, litigant falls into the category "miscellaneous". Which of the scategories best describes the litigant? 1377 songer.appel1.8.2 This question concerns the first litigant falls into the category "miscellaneous", specific subategories best describes the litigant? fduciary, executor, or trustee, other, listed appellant. The nature of this litigant falls into the category "miscellaneous", specific subategories best describes the lingant? 1384 songer.appel2.1.2 This question concerns the first litigant falls into the category "miscellaneous", specific and appellant. The nature of this litigant falls into the category "miscellaneous", specific and appellant. The nature of this litigant falls into the category "private business (including the specific subategories best describe	1358		identity of this litigant as identi-	
1360 Songer.appell.7.7.4 This question concerns the insue of this litigant falls into the cate-gory "natural person (excludes in the opinion?") not ascertained, 0.5 cluzch, aren in our ascertained, 0.5 cluzch, aren in our ascertained, 0.5 cluzch, aren in the ascertained in the opinion? 1361 songer.appell.7.5 This question concerns the first listed appellant. The nature of this litigant falls into the cate-gory "natural person (excludes persons named in their official capacity or who appear because of a role in a private organization)". Which of these categories best describes the income of the litigant? not ascertained, poor + wards of state, presumed poor 1371 songer.appell.8.2 This question concerns the first listed appellant. The nature of this litigant falls into the cate-gory "miscellaneous". Which of the following categories best describes the litigant? fiduciary, executor, or trustee, other, nature of the litigant falls into the cate-gory "miscellaneous". Which of the following categories best describes the litigant? 1381 songer.appell.8.3 This question concerns the first listed appellant. The nature of this litigant falls into the cate-gory "miscellaneous", specificially "fiduciary, executor, or trustee, other, nature of this litigant falls into the cate-gory "miscellaneous", specificially "fiduciary, executor, or trustee, other, other is litigant falls into the cate-gory "miscellaneous", specificially "fiduciary, executor, or endinistrator of estate - in-stitution, trustee". Which of the following categories best describes the litigant? 1384 songer.appel2.1.2 This question concerns the sec-on disted appellant. The nature of this litigant falls int	1359	songer appell 7 4	The first concerns the first	not accertained US citizen alien
 1361 this litigant falls into the category "natural person (excludes persons named in their official capacity or who appear because of a role in a private organization)". What is the citizenship of this litigant falls into the category "natural person (excludes persons named in their official capacity or who appear because of a role in a private organization)". What is the citizenship of this litigant falls into the category "natural person (excludes persons named in their official capacity or who appear because of a role in a private organization)". Which of these categories best describes the income of the litigant? songer.appell.8.2 songer.appell.8.3 songer.appell.8.3 songer.appell.8.3 songer.appell.8.4 songer.appell.2.1.2 This question concerns the first litigant falls into the category "miscellaneous". Which of the following categories best describes the litigant? songer.appell.8.3 songer.appell.8.4 songer.appell.8.5 songer.appell.8.5 songer.appell.8.7 This question concerns the first litigant falls into the category "miscellaneous". Which of the following specific subcategories best describes the litigant? songer.appell.8.4 songer.appell.8.5 songer.appell.8.5 songer.appell.2.1.2 This question concerns the second listed appellant. The nature of this litigant falls into the category "private business (including criminal enterprises)". What arise the second listed appellant. The nature of this litigant falls into the category "private business (including criminal enterprises)". What category of businesses (including criminal enterprises)". What category of businesses (including criminal enterprises). What category of businesses (including criminal enterprises). What category of businesses (including criminal enterprises). What category of businesses (in	1360	songer_appen_7_4	listed appellant The nature of	not ascertained, 05 citizen, anen
1362 gory "natural person (excludes persons named in their official capacity or who appear because of a role in a private organization)". What is the citizenship of this litigant as indicated in the opinion? not ascertained, poor + wards of state, presumed poor 1364 songer_appel1.7.5 This question concerns the first listed appellant. The nature of this litigant falls into the cate gory "natural person (excludes persons named in their official capacity or who appear because of a role in a private organization)". Which of these categories best describes the income of the litigant? not ascertained, poor + wards of state, presumed poor 1372 songer_appel1.8.2 This question concerns the first litigant falls into the cate gory "miscellaneous". Which of the following categories best describes the litigant? fiduciary, executor, or trustee, other, nature of this litigant falls into the cate gory "miscellaneous". Specific subcategories best describes the litigant? 1384 songer_appel1.8.3 This question concerns the first litigant falls into the cate gory "miscellaneous", specific subcategories best describes the litigant? trustee in bankruptcy - institution, truste in bankruptcy - institution, truste in bankruptcy - individual, executor or trustee". Which of the following specific subcategories best describes the litigant? 1384 songer_appel2.1.2 This question concerns the sec on disted appellant. The nature of this litigant falls into the cate gory "private business (including specific subcategories best describes the itigant? local, neither local nor national, national or multi-national 1384 songer_appel2	1361		this litigant falls into the cate-	
1363 persons named in their official capacity or who apper because of a role in a private organiza- tion)". What is the citizenship of this litigant as indicated in the opinion? not ascertained, poor + wards of state, presumed poor 1366 songer.appel1.7.5 This question concerns the first listed appellant. The nature of this litigant falls into the cate- gory "natural person (excludes persons named in their official capacity or who appear because of a role in a private organiza- tion)". Which of these categories best describes the income of the litigant? not ascertained, poor + wards of state, presumed poor 1372 songer.appel1.8.2 This question concerns the first listed appellant. The nature of this litigant falls into the cate- gory "miscellaneous". Which of the following categories best de- scribes the litigan? future, in bankruptey - institution, trustee in bankruptey - institution, trustee in bankruptey - institution, trustee". Which of the following specific subcategories best de- gory "miscellaneous", specif- ically "fudurary, executor, or trustee". Which of the following specific subcategories best de- gory "miscellaneous", specif- ically "fudurary, executor, or trustee". Which of the following specific subcategories best de- gory "private business (includ- ing or imia elterprises)". What is the scope of this business? local, neither local nor national, na- don listed appellant. The nature of this litigant falls into the cat- gory "private business (includ- ing or iminal enterprises)". What is the scope of this business? 1384 songer.appel2.1.2 This question concerns the sec- ond listed appellant. The nature of this litigant falls into the cat- gory "private business (includ- ing or iminal enterprises)". What cat- g	1362		gory "natural person (excludes	
1364 of a role in a private organiza- tion)". What is the citizenship of this litigant as indicated in the opinion? not accertained, poor + wards of state, presumed poor 1368 songer_appel1.7.5 This question concerns the first listed appellant. The nature of this litigant falls into the cate- gory "natural person (excludes persons named in their official capacity or who appear because of a role in a private organiza- tion)". Which of these categories best describes the income of the litigant? not accertained, poor + wards of state, presumed poor 1372 songer_appel1.8.2 This question concerns the first listed appellant. The nature of this litigant falls into the cat- gory "miscellaneous". Which of the following categories best de- scribes the litigant? fiduciary, executor, or trustee, other, nature of the litigant not ascertained 1381 songer_appel1.8.3 This question concerns the first listed appellant. The nature of this litigant falls into the cat- gory "miscellaneous", specif- ically "Iduciary, executor, or trustee". Which of the following specific subcategories best de- scribes the litigant? trustee in bankruptcy - institution, rustee". Which of the following specific subcategories best de- scribes the litigant? 1386 songer_appel2.1.2 This question concerns the sec- ond listed appellant. The nature of this litigant falls into the cate- gory "private business? local, neither local nor national, na- tional or multi-national 1390 songer_appel2.1.3 This question concerns the sec- ond listed appellant. The nature of this litigant falls into the cate- gory "private business?	1363		persons named in their official	
1365 of a rote in a private organiza- tion)". What is the citizenship of this litigant as indicated in the opinion? not ascertained, poor + wards of state, presumed poor 1366 songer_appell.7.5 This question concerns the first listed appellant. The nature of this litigant falls into the cate- gory "natural person (excludes persons named in their official capacity or who appear because of a role in a private organiza- tion)". Which of these categories best describes the income of the litigant? not ascertained, poor + wards of state, presumed poor 1376 songer_appell.8.2 This question concerns the first listed appellant. The nature of this litigant falls into the cate- gory "miscellaneous". Which of the following categories best de- scribes the litigant? fduciary, executor, or trustee, other, nature of the litigant on ascertained 1380 songer_appell.8.3 This question concerns the first listed appellant. The nature of this litigant falls into the cat- gory "miscellaneous", specif- ically "fduciary, executor, or trustee". Which of the following specific subcategories best de- scribes the litigant? trustee in bankruptcy - institution, trustee in bankruptcy - individual, ex- ecutor or administrator of estate - in- stitution 1386 songer_appel2.1.2 This question concerns the sec- ond listed appellant. The nature of this litigant falls into the cat- gory "private business? local, neither local nor national, na- tonal or multi-national 1381 songer_appel2.1.3 This question concerns the sec- ond listed appellant. The nature of this litigant falls intot he cat- gory "private business (including	1364		capacity or who appear because	
1366 of this litigant as indicated in the opinion? 1366 songer_appel1.7.5 This question concerns the first listed appellant. The nature of this litigant person (excludes persons named in their official capacity or who appear because of a role in a private organization)". Which of these categories best describes the income of the litigant? not ascertained, poor + wards of state, presumed poor 1370 songer_appel1.8.2 This question concerns the first litigant falls into the category "miscellaneous". Which of the sectagories best describes the litigant? fiduciary, executor, or trustee, other, nature of the litigant not ascertained 1376 songer_appel1.8.2 This question concerns the first listed appellant. The nature of the following categories best describes best leigant? fiduciary, executor, or trustee, other, instructe of the following categories best describes best litigant? 1381 songer_appel1.8.3 This question concerns the first listed appellant. The nature of this litigant falls into the category "miscellaneous", specificially "fiduciary, executor, or trustee. Which of the following specific subcategories best describes the litigant? 1388 songer_appel2.1.2 This question concerns the second listed appellant. The nature of this litigant falls into the category "private business? local, neither local nor national, national of this litigant falls into the category "private business? 1389 songer_appel2.1.3 This question concerns the second listed appellant. The nature of this litigant falls into the category "private business?	1365		of a role in a private organiza- tion)" What is the citizenship	
1367 opinion? 1368 songer_appel1_7.5 This question concerns the first listed appellant. The nature of this litigant falls into the cate- gory "natural person (excludes persons named in their official capacity or who appear because of a role in a private organiza- tion)". Which of these categories best describes the income of the litigant? fiduciary, executor, or trustee, other, nature of the litigant rule to cat- gory "miscellaneous". Which of the following categories best de- scribes the litigant? 1376 songer_appel1_8_3 This question concerns the first listed appellant. The nature of this litigant falls into the cate- gory "miscellaneous". Which of the following categories best de- scribes the litigant? fiduciary, executor, or trustee, other, nature of the litigant not ascertained 1380 songer_appel1_8_3 This question concerns the first listed appellant. The nature of this litigant falls into the cate- gory "miscellaneous", specif- ically "fiduciary, executor, or trustee". Which of the following specific subcategories best de- scribes the litigant? trustee in bankruptcy - institution, trustee in bankruptcy - individual, ex- ecutor or administrator of estate - in- stitution 1384 songer_appel2_1_2 This question concerns the sec- ond listed appellant. The nature of this litigant falls into the cat- gory "private business?". What is the scope of this business? local, neither local nor national, na- tional or multi-national 1390 songer_appel2_1_3 This question concerns the sec- ond listed appellant. The nature of this litigant falls into the cate- gory "private business". What cat- egory "private business?". What cat- egory "private business (including eriminal enterpris	1366		of this litigant as indicated in the	
1366 songer_appel1.7.5 This question concerns the first listed appellant. The nature of arole in a private organiza- tion)". Which of these categories best describes the income of the litigant? not ascertained, poor + wards of state, presumed poor 1370 arole in a private organiza- tion)". Which of these categories best describes the income of the litigant? fiduciary, executor, or trustee, other, nature of the litigant not ascertained 1376 songer_appel1.8.2 This question concerns the first listed appellant. The nature of this litigant falls into the cate- gory "miscellaneous". Which of the following categories best de- scribes the litigant? fiduciary, executor, or trustee, other, nature of the litigant not ascertained 1381 songer_appel1.8.3 This question concerns the first listed appellant. The nature of this litigant falls into the cate- gory "miscellaneous", specif- ically "fiduciary, executor, or trustee". boakruptcy - individual, ex- edutise the litigant? 1386 songer_appel2.1.2 This question concerns the sec- ond listed appellant. The nature of this litigant falls into the cat- gory "private business?". What is the scope of this business? local, neither local nor national, na- tional or multi-national 1389 songer_appel2.1.3 This question concerns the sec- ond listed appellant. The nature of this litigant falls into the cate- gory "private business?". What is the scope of this business? local, neither local nor national, na- tional or multi-national 1390 songer_appel2.1.3 This question concerns the sec- ond listed	1367		opinion?	
1369listed appellant. The nature of this litigant falls into the cate- gory "natural person (excludes persons named in their official capacity or who appear because of a role in a private organiza- tion)". Which of these categories best describes the income of the litigant?presumed poor1374songer.appell.8.2This question concerns the first listed appellant. The nature of the following categories best de- scribes the litigant?fiduciary, executor, or trustee, other, nature of the litigant not ascertained1379songer.appell.8.3This question concerns the first listed appellant. The nature of the following categories best de- scribes the litigant?trustee in bankruptcy - institution, trustee in bankruptcy - institution, istud appellant. The nature of listed appellant. The nature of this litigant falls into the cat- <td>1368</td> <td>songer_appel1_7_5</td> <td>This question concerns the first</td> <td>not ascertained, poor + wards of state,</td>	1368	songer_appel1_7_5	This question concerns the first	not ascertained, poor + wards of state,
1370this litigant falls into the cate- gory "natural persons named in their official capacity or who appear because of a role in a private organiza- tion)". Which of these categories best describes the income of the litigant?1371songer_appell_8.2This question concerns the first listed appellant. The nature of this litigant falls into the cate- gory "miscellaneous". Which of the following categories best de- scribes the litigant?fiduciary, executor, or trustee, other, nature of the litigant not ascertained1376songer_appell_8.2This question concerns the first listed appellant. The nature of this litigant falls into the cate- gory "miscellaneous", specif- ically "fiduciary, executor, or trustee". Which of the following specific subcategories best de- scribes the litigant?trustee in bankruptcy - institution, trustee in bankruptcy - individual, ex- ecutor or administrator of estate - in- stitution1386songer_appel2_1.2This question concerns the sec- ord listed appellant. The nature of this litigant falls into the cat- egory "mixcellaneous", specifically "fiduciary, executor, or trustee". Which of the following specific subcategories best de- scribes the litigant?1386songer_appel2_1.2This question concerns the sec- ord listed appellant. The nature of this litigant falls into the cat- egory "private business (includ- ing criminal enterprises)". What is the scope of this business?1390songer_appel2_1.3This question concerns the sec- ord fisted appellant. The nature of this litigant falls into the cat- egory "private business (including criminal enterprises)". What is the scope of this business?1394songer_appel2_1.3Thi	1369		listed appellant. The nature of	presumed poor
13712019Tatula person (excludes persons named in their official capacity or who appear because of a role in a private organiza- tion)". Which of these categories best describes the income of the litigant?1374songer_appel1.8.2This question concerns the first listed appellant. The nature of this litigant falls into the cate- gory "miscellaneous". Which of the following categories best de- scribes the litigant?fiduciary, executor, or trustee, other, nature of the litigant not ascertained1376songer_appel1.8.3This question concerns the first listed appellant. The nature of this litigant falls into the cat- gory "miscellaneous". Specif- ically "fuciary, executor, or trustee". Which of the following specific subcategories best de- scribes the litigant?trustee in bankruptcy - institution, trustee in bankruptcy - individual, ex- etitution1382songer_appel2.1.2This question concerns the first ically "fuciary, executor, or trustee". Which of the following specific subcategories best de- scribes the litigant?local, neither local nor national, na- tional or multi-national1380songer_appel2.1.2This question concerns the sec- ond listed appellant. The nature of this litigant falls into the cat- egory "private business?local, neither local nor national, na- tional or multi-national1381songer_appel2.1.3This question concerns the sec- ond listed appellant. The nature of this litigant falls into the cat- egory of business best describes the area of activity of this litigant which is involved in this case?agriculture, mining, construction1384songer_appel2.1.3This question concerns the sec- ond listed a	1370		this litigant falls into the cate-	
1372 capacity or who appear because of a role in a private organiza- tion)". Which of these categories best describes the income of the litigant?fiduciary, executor, or trustee, other, nature of the litigant not ascertained1376 1376songer.appell.8.2This question concerns the first listed appellant. The nature of the following categories best de- scribes the litigant?fiduciary, executor, or trustee, other, nature of the litigant not ascertained1379 1380songer.appell.8.3This question concerns the first listed appellant. The nature of this litigant falls into the cat- egory "miscellaneous", specificially "fiduciary, executor, or trustee". Which of the following specific subcategories best de- scribes the litigant?trustee in bankruptcy - institution, trustee in bankruptcy - individual, ex- tecutor or administrator of estate - in- stitution1386 1386 1386songer.appel2.1.2This question concerns the sec- ond listed appellant. The nature of this litigant falls into the cat- egory "private business?local, neither local nor national, na- tional or multi-national1390 1391 1392songer.appel2.1.3This question concerns the sec- ond listed appellant. The nature of this litigant falls into the cat- egory "private business?". What cat- egory of business best describes the area of activity of this litigant which is involved in this case?agriculture, mining, construction1394 1395songer.appel2.1.3This question concerns the sec- ond listed appellant. The nature of this litigant falls into the cat- egory of business best describes the area of activity of this litigant which is involved in this case?	1371		persons named in their official	
1373 1374of a role in a private organiza- tion)". Which of these categories best describes the income of the litigant?1376 1377songer_appel1_8.2This question concerns the first listed appellant. The nature of the following categories best de- scribes the litigant?fiduciary, executor, or trustee, other, nature of the litigant not ascertained1379 1380songer_appel1_8.3This question concerns the first listed appellant. The nature of this litigant falls into the cat- egory "miscellaneous". Which of the following categories best de- scribes the litigant?trustee in bankruptcy - institution, trustee in bankruptcy - individual, ex- ecutor or administrator of estate - in- stitution1381 1382 1384 1384 1385songer_appel2.1.2This question concerns the sec- ond listed appellant. The nature of this litigant falls into the cat- egory "private business?local, neither local nor national, na- tional or multi-national1389 1390 1391songer_appel2.1.3This question concerns the sec- ond listed appellant. The nature of this litigant falls into the cat- egory "private business?)" What is the scope of this business?local, neither local nor national, na- tional or multi-national1394 1395songer_appel2.1.3This question concerns the sec- ond listed appellant. The nature of this litigant falls into the cat- egory of business best describes the area of activity of this litigant which is involved in this case?agriculture, mining, construction	1372		capacity or who appear because	
1374tion)". Which of these categories best describes the income of the litigant?1375songer_appell_8_2This question concerns the first listed appellant. The nature of this litigant falls into the cat- egory "miscellaneous". Which of the following categories best de- scribes the litigant?fiduciary, executor, or trustee, other, nature of the litigant not ascertained1380songer_appell_8_3This question concerns the first listed appellant. The nature of this litigant falls into the cat- egory "miscellaneous", specificially "fiduciary, executor, or trustee". Which of the following specific subcategories best de- scribes the litigant?trustee in bankruptcy - institution, trustee in bankruptcy - individual, ex- ecutor or administrator of estate - in- sitution1386songer_appel2_1_2This question concerns the sec- ond listed appellant. The nature of this litigant falls into the cat- egory "private business (includ- ing criminal enterprises)". What is the scope of this business?local, neither local nor national, na- tional or multi-national1390songer_appel2_1_3This question concerns the sec- ond listed appellant. The nature of this litigant falls into the cat- egory "private business (includi- ing criminal enterprises)". What cat- egory "private business (includi- gory "private business (includi- gory of business best describes the area of activity of this litigant which is involved in this case?agriculture, mining, construction1394which is involved in this case?which is involved in this case?agriculture, mining, construction	1373		of a role in a private organiza-	
1375best describes the income of the litigant?1376songer_appel1_8_2This question concerns the first listed appellant. The nature of this litigant falls into the cate- gory "miscellaneous". Which of the following categories best de- scribes the litigant?fiduciary, executor, or trustee, other, nature of the litigant not ascertained1380songer_appel1_8_3This question concerns the first listed appellant. The nature of this litigant falls into the cat- egory "miscellaneous", specificially "fiduciary, executor, or trustee". Which of the following specific subcategories best de- scribes the litigant?trustee in bankruptcy - institution, trustee in bankruptcy - individual, ex- ecutor or administrator of estate - in- stitution1386songer_appel2_1_2This question concerns the sec- ond listed appellant. The nature of this litigant falls into the cat- egory "private business (includ- ing criminal enterprises)". What is the scope of this business?local, neither local nor national, na- tional or multi-national1394songer_appel2_1_3This question concerns the sec- ond listed appellant. The nature of this litigant falls into the cat- egory "private business (includ- ing criminal enterprises)". What cat- egory "private business?agriculture, mining, construction1394songer_appel2_1_3This question concerns the sec- ond listed appellant. The nature of this litigant falls into the cat- egory "private business (including criminal enterprises)". What cat- egory of business best describes the area of activity of this litigant which is involved in this case?agriculture, mining, construction1394songer_appel2_1_3This question	1374		tion)". Which of these categories	
1376Inigan?1376songer_appel1_8_2This question concerns the first listed appellant. The nature of this litigant falls into the cate- gory "miscellaneous". Which of the following categories best de- scribes the litigant?fiduciary, executor, or trustee, other, nature of the litigant not ascertained1380songer_appel1_8_3This question concerns the first listed appellant. The nature of this litigant falls into the cat- egory "miscellaneous", specif- ically "fiduciary, executor, or trustee". Which of the following specific subcategories best de- scribes the litigant?trustee in bankruptcy - institution, trustee in bankruptcy - individual, ex- ecutor or administrator of estate - in- stitution1386songer_appel2_1_2This question concerns the sec- ond listed appellant. The nature of this litigant falls into the cat- egory "private business (includ- ing criminal enterprises)". What is the scope of this business?local, neither local nor national, na- tional or multi-national1391songer_appel2_1_3This question concerns the sec- ond listed appellant. The nature of this litigant falls into the cat- egory "private business (includ- ing criminal enterprises)". What cat- egory "private business (including criminal enterprises)". What cat- egory of business best describes the area of activity of this litigant which is involved in this case?agriculture, mining, construction1394is the area of activity of this litigant which is involved in this case?agriculture, mining, construction	1375		best describes the income of the	
 asinger_appel1.5.2 binger_appel1.5.2 binger_appel1.5.2 binger_appel1.5.2 binger_appel1.5.2 binger_appel1.5.2 binger_appel1.8.3 binger_appel2.1.2 binger_appel2.1.2 binger_appel2.1.2 binger_appel2.1.2 binger_appel2.1.3 binger_appel2.1.3	1376	songer appell 8 2	This question concerns the first	fiduciary executor or trustee other
1378this litigant falls into the category "miscellaneous". Which of the following categories best de- scribes the litigant?1380songer_appel1_8_3This question concerns the first listed appellant. The nature of this litigant falls into the cat- egory "miscellaneous", specif- ically "fiduciary, executor, or trustee". Which of the following specific subcategories best de- scribes the litigant?trustee in bankruptcy - institution, trustee in bankruptcy - individual, ex- ecutor or administrator of estate - in- stitution1386songer_appel2_1_2This question concerns the sec- ond listed appellant. The nature of this litigant falls into the cat- egory "private business (includ- ing criminal enterprises)". What is the scope of this business?local, neither local nor national, na- tional or multi-national1391songer_appel2_1_3This question concerns the sec- ond listed appellant. The nature of this litigant falls into the cat- egory "private business?agriculture, mining, construction1393songer_appel2_1_3This question concerns the sec- ond listed appellant. The nature of this litigant falls into the cat- egory "private business?agriculture, mining, construction1394is the scope of this business?agriculture, mining, construction1394of this litigant falls into this case?the area of activity of this litigant the area of activity of this litigant which is involved in this case?	1377	songer_appen_0_2	listed appellant. The nature of	nature of the litigant not ascertained
gory "miscellaneous". Which of the following categories best de- scribes the litigant?1380songer_appel1_8_3This question concerns the first listed appellant. The nature of this litigant falls into the cat- egory "miscellaneous", specif- ically "fiduciary, executor, or trustee". Which of the following specific subcategories best de- scribes the litigant?trustee in bankruptcy - individual, ex- ecutor or administrator of estate - in- stitution1384songer_appel2_1_2This question concerns the sec- ond listed appellant. The nature of this litigant falls into the cat- egory "private business (includ- ing criminal enterprises)". What is the scope of this business?local, neither local nor national, na- tional or multi-national1384songer_appel2_1_3This question concerns the sec- ond listed appellant. The nature of this litigant falls into the cat- egory "private business?local, neither local nor national, na- tional or multi-national1389songer_appel2_1_3This question concerns the sec- ond listed appellant. The nature of this litigant falls into the cat- egory "private business?" What is the scope of this business?agriculture, mining, construction1384songer_appel2_1_3This question concerns the sec- ond listed appellant. The nature of this litigant falls into the cat- egory "private business (including criminal enterprises)". What egory of business best describes the area of activity of this litigant which is involved in this case?agriculture, mining, construction1384139513961396139713991399	1378		this litigant falls into the cate-	C
1380the following categories best de- scribes the litigant?1381songer_appel1_8_3This question concerns the first listed appellant. The nature of this litigant falls into the cat- egory "miscellaneous", specif- ically "fiduciary, executor, or trustee". Which of the following specific subcategories best de- scribes the litigant?trustee in bankruptcy - individual, ex- ecutor or administrator of estate - in- stitution1384songer_appel2_1_2This question concerns the sec- ond listed appellant. The nature of this litigant falls into the cat- egory "private business (includ- ing criminal enterprises)". What is the scope of this business?local, neither local nor national, na- tional or multi-national1384songer_appel2_1_3This question concerns the sec- ond listed appellant. The nature of this litigant falls into the cat- egory "private business?"local, neither local nor national, na- tional or multi-national1389songer_appel2_1_3This question concerns the sec- ond listed appellant. The nature of this litigant falls into the cat- egory "private business (including criminal enterprises)". What is the area of activity of this litigant gory "private business (including criminal enterprises)". What cat- egory of business bet describes the area of activity of this litigant which is involved in this case?agriculture, mining, construction	1379		gory "miscellaneous". Which of	
scribes the inigant?138113821383songer_appell_8_3This question concerns the first listed appellant. The nature of this litigant falls into the cat- egory "miscellaneous", specif- ically "fiduciary, executor, or trustee". Which of the following specific subcategories best de- scribes the litigant?1386138713881389138913891380138013811382138313841384138513861387138813891389138013901391139213931394139413951395139613971398139913911392139313941394139513951396139713981398139913911392139313941394139513951396139713981398139913991391139213931394139413951395139613971398139913991399139113921393 <td>1380</td> <td></td> <td>the following categories best de-</td> <td></td>	1380		the following categories best de-	
 asing r_appel 1.5.5 asing r_appel 2.1.2 songer_appel 2.1.3 songer_appel 2.1.3 songer_appel 2.1.3 asing r_appel 2.1.4 asing r_appel 2.1.4 asing r_appel 2.1.5 asing r_appel 2.1.5 asing r_appel 2.1.4 asing r_appel 2.1.5 asing r_appel 2.1.4 asing r_appel 2.1.5 asing r_appel 2.1.5 asing r_appel 2.1.4 asing r_appel 2.1.5 asing r_ap	1381	songer appell 8 3	This question concerns the first	trustee in bankruptey - institution
 1383 1384 1384 1384 1385 1386 1386 1386 1386 1386 1387 1388 1388 1389 1389 1390 1391 1391 1392 1393 1394 1395 1396 1397 1398 1398 1399 1400 	1382	songer_appen_6_5	listed appellant. The nature of	trustee in bankruptcy - individual, ex-
1384 1385 1386 1386 1386 1386 1387egory "miscellaneous", specif- ically "fiduciary, executor, or trustee". Which of the following specific subcategories best de- scribes the litigant?stitution1388 1389 1390songer_appel2_1_2This question concerns the sec- ond listed appellant. The nature of this litigant falls into the cat- egory "private business (includ- ing criminal enterprises)". What is the scope of this business?local, neither local nor national, na- tional or multi-national1390 1391songer_appel2_1_3This question concerns the sec- ond listed appellant. The nature of this litigant falls into the cata- egory "private business?agriculture, mining, construction1394 1395 1396 1396songer_appel2_1_3This question concerns the sec- ond listed appellant. The nature of this litigant falls into the cata- egory of business (including criminal enterprises)". What cat- egory of business best describes the area of activity of this litigant which is involved in this case?agriculture, mining, construction	1383		this litigant falls into the cat-	ecutor or administrator of estate - in-
 ically "fiduciary, executor, or trustee". Which of the following specific subcategories best de- scribes the litigant? songer_appel2_1_2 This question concerns the sec- ond listed appellant. The nature of this litigant falls into the cat- egory "private business (includ- ing criminal enterprises)". What is the scope of this business? songer_appel2_1_3 Songer_appel2_1_3 Songer_appel2_1_3 This question concerns the sec- ond listed appellant. The nature of this litigant falls into the cate- gory "private business". What is the scope of this business? agriculture, mining, construction agriculture, mining, construction the area of activity of this litigant which is involved in this case? 	1384		egory "miscellaneous", specif-	stitution
1386 1387trustee". Which of the following specific subcategories best de- scribes the litigant?1388 1389songer_appel2_1_2This question concerns the sec- ond listed appellant. The nature of this litigant falls into the cat- egory "private business (includ- ing criminal enterprises)". What is the scope of this business?local, neither local nor national, na- tional or multi-national1390songer_appel2_1_3This question concerns the sec- ond listed appellant. The nature of this litigant falls into the cate- gory "private business (including criminal enterprises)". What is the scope of this business?agriculture, mining, construction1394of this litigant falls into the cate- gory "private business (including criminal enterprises)". What cat- egory of business best describes the area of activity of this litigant which is involved in this case?agriculture, mining, construction	1385		ically "fiduciary, executor, or	
1387specific subcategories best de- scribes the litigant?1388songer_appel2_1_2This question concerns the sec- ond listed appellant. The nature of this litigant falls into the cat- egory "private business (includ- ing criminal enterprises)". What is the scope of this business?local, neither local nor national, na- tional or multi-national1390songer_appel2_1_3This question concerns the sec- ond listed appellant. The nature of this litigant falls into the cate- gory "private business?agriculture, mining, construction1394ond listed appellant. The nature of this litigant falls into the cate- gory "private business (including criminal enterprises)". What cat- egory of business best describes the area of activity of this litigant tayed which is involved in this case?agriculture, mining, construction	1386		trustee". Which of the following	
songer_appel2_1_2This question concerns the sec- ond listed appellant. The nature of this litigant falls into the cat- egory "private business (includ- ing criminal enterprises)". What is the scope of this business?local, neither local nor national, na- tional or multi-national1390songer_appel2_1_3This question concerns the sec- ond listed appellant. The nature of this litigant falls into the cat- egory "private business?local, neither local nor national, na- tional or multi-national1391songer_appel2_1_3This question concerns the sec- ond listed appellant. The nature of this litigant falls into the cate- gory "private business (including criminal enterprises)". What cat- egory of business best describes the area of activity of this litigant which is involved in this case?agriculture, mining, construction	1387		specific subcategories best de- scribes the litigant?	
1389ond listed appellant. The nature of this litigant falls into the cat- egory "private business (includ- ing criminal enterprises)". What is the scope of this business?tional or multi-national1391ing criminal enterprises)". What is the scope of this business?agriculture, mining, construction1393songer_appel2_1_3This question concerns the sec- ond listed appellant. The nature of this litigant falls into the cat- gory "private business (including criminal enterprises)". What cat- egory of business best describes the area of activity of this litigant which is involved in this case?agriculture, mining, construction	1388	songer_appel2_1_2	This question concerns the sec-	local, neither local nor national, na-
of this litigant falls into the cat- egory "private business (includ- ing criminal enterprises)". What is the scope of this business?1393songer_appel2_1_31394This question concerns the sec- ond listed appellant. The nature of this litigant falls into the cat- gory "private business (including criminal enterprises)". What cat- egory of business best describes the area of activity of this litigant which is involved in this case?	1389		ond listed appellant. The nature	tional or multi-national
egory "private business (includ- ing criminal enterprises)". What is the scope of this business?1392songer_appel2_1_31393songer_appel2_1_31394This question concerns the sec- ond listed appellant. The nature of this litigant falls into the cate- gory "private business (including criminal enterprises)". What cat- egory of business best describes the area of activity of this litigant which is involved in this case?1400	1390		of this litigant falls into the cat-	
1392ing criminal enterprises) . what is the scope of this business?1393songer_appel2_1_31394This question concerns the sec- ond listed appellant. The nature of this litigant falls into the cate- gory "private business (including criminal enterprises)". What cat- egory of business best describes1396criminal enterprises)". What cat- egory of business best describes1398the area of activity of this litigant which is involved in this case?	1391		egory "private business (includ-	
1393 songer_appel2_1_3 This question concerns the sec- ond listed appellant. The nature of this litigant falls into the cate- gory "private business (including criminal enterprises)". What cat- egory of business best describes agriculture, mining, construction 1394 ond listed appellant. The nature of this litigant falls into the cate- gory "private business (including criminal enterprises)". What cat- egory of business best describes agriculture, mining, construction 1396 criminal enterprises)". What cat- egory of business best describes 1398 the area of activity of this litigant which is involved in this case? 1400	1392		is the scope of this business?	
1394ond listed appellant. The nature of this litigant falls into the cate- gory "private business (including criminal enterprises)". What cat- egory of business best describes1397egory of business best describes the area of activity of this litigant which is involved in this case?1400	1393	songer_appel2_1_3	This question concerns the sec-	agriculture, mining, construction
of this litigant falls into the cate- gory "private business (including criminal enterprises)". What cat- egory of business best describes1397egory of business best describes1398the area of activity of this litigant which is involved in this case?1400	1394	0 - TT	ond listed appellant. The nature	<i>c a</i> , <i>c</i>
gory "private business (including criminal enterprises)". What cat- egory of business best describes1397egory of business best describes1398the area of activity of this litigant which is involved in this case?1400	1305		of this litigant falls into the cate-	
1397 criminal enterprises)". What cat- 1397 egory of business best describes 1398 the area of activity of this litigant 1399 which is involved in this case?	1306		gory "private business (including	
1398 the area of activity of this litigant 1399 which is involved in this case?	1307		criminal enterprises)". What cat-	
1399 which is involved in this case?	1308		the area of activity of this litigant	
1400	1390		which is involved in this case?	
	1400	L	1	

1404			
1405	songer_appel2_1_4	This question concerns the sec-	single family farm, commercial farm,
1406		ond listed appellant. The na-	agri-business, farm - other
1407		ture of this litigant falls into	
1408		(including criminal enterprises)"	
1409		specifically "agriculture". What	
1410		subcategory of business best de-	
1411	10.0.0	scribes this litigant?	
1412	songer_appel2_2_2	This question concerns the sec-	business, trade, professional, or union
1413		of this litigant falls into the cate-	(BIFO), other
1414		gory "private organization or as-	
1415		sociation". What category of pri-	
1416		vate associations best describes	
1417	songer appell? 2.3	this ittigant?	Rusiness or trade association utili
1418	songer_apper2_2_5	ond listed appellant The na-	ties co-ops Professional association -
1419		ture of this litigant falls into	other than law or medicine
1420		the category "private organiza-	
1421		tion or association", specifically	
1422		"business, trade, professional, or union (BTPID" What subcate	
1423		gory of private association best	
1424		describes this litigant?	
1425	songer_appel2_3_2	This question concerns the sec-	cabinet level department, courts or leg-
1426		ond listed appellant. The nature	islative, agency whose first word is
1427		of this litigant fails into the cat-	Tederal
1428		cluding DC)". Which category of	
1429		federal government agencies and	
1430		activities best describes this liti-	
1431	congor appol2 2 2	gant?	Department of Agriculture Depart
1432	soliger_apper2_5_5	ond listed appellant. The na-	ment of Commerce. Department of
1433		ture of this litigant falls into	Defense (includes War Department
1434		the category "federal govern-	and Navy Department)
1435		ment (including DC)", specifi-	
1436		which specific federal govern-	
1437		ment agency best describes this	
1438		litigant?	
1439	songer_appel2_4_2	This question concerns the sec-	legislative, executive/administrative,
1440		ond listed appellant. The nature	bureaucracy providing services
1441		of this hugant fails into the cate- gory "sub-state government (e.g.	
1442		county, local, special district)".	
1443		Which category of substate gov-	
1444		ernment best describes this liti-	
1445	congor appol2 4 2	gant?	City/acupty acupail Sahool Board
1447	songer_apper2_4_3	ond listed appellant. The na-	board of trustees for college or innior
1448		ture of this litigant falls into the	college, Other legislative body
1449		category "sub-state government	
1450		(e.g., county, local, special dis-	
1451		uncu)", specific substate govern	
1452		ment agency best describes this	
1453		litigant?	

1458			
1459	songer_appel2_5_2	This question concerns the sec-	legislative, executive/administrative,
1460		ond listed appellant. The nature	bureaucracy providing services
1461		of this litigant falls into the cate-	
1462		territories & commonwealths)".	
1463		Which category of state govern-	
1464		ment best describes this litigant?	
1465	songer_appel2_5_3	This question concerns the sec-	Legislature or separate house as an or-
1466		of this litigant falls into the cate-	Commission, Other Legislative Unit
1467		gory "state government (includes	
1468		territories & commonwealths)",	
1469		specifically "legislative". Which	
1470		best describes this litigant?	
14/1	songer_appel2_7_2	This question concerns the sec-	not ascertained, male - indication in
1472	0 11	ond listed appellant. The nature	opinion (e.g., use of masculine pro-
1473		of this litigant falls into the cat-	noun), male - assumed because of
1474		persons named in their official	name
1476		capacity or who appear because	
1477		of a role in a private organiza-	
1478		tion)". What is the gender of this	
1479		nitigant? Use names to classify the party's sex only if there is little	
1480		ambiguity.	
1481	songer_appel2_7_3	This question concerns the sec-	not ascertained, caucasian - specific in-
1482		ond listed appellant. The nature	dication in opinion, black - specific in-
1483		of this litigant falls into the cat- egory "natural person (excludes	dication in opinion
1484		persons named in their official	
1485		capacity or who appear because	
1486		of a role in a private organiza-	
1487		identity of this litigant as identi-	
1488		fied in the opinion?	
1489	songer_appel2_7_4	This question concerns the sec-	not ascertained, US citizen, alien
1490		ond listed appellant. The nature	
1491		egory "natural person (excludes	
1492		persons named in their official	
1493		capacity or who appear because	
1494		of a role in a private organiza-	
1495		of this litigant as indicated in the	
1490		opinion?	
1498	songer_appel2_7_5	This question concerns the sec-	not ascertained, poor + wards of state,
1499		ond listed appellant. The nature	presumed poor
1500		egory "natural person (excludes	
1501		persons named in their official	
1502		capacity or who appear because	
1503		of a role in a private organiza-	
1504		best describes the income of the	
1505		litigant?	
1506	songer_appel2_8_2	This question concerns the sec-	fiduciary, executor, or trustee, other,
1507		ond listed appellant. The nature	nature of the litigant not ascertained
1508		or this inigant falls into the cate- gory "miscellaneous" Which of	
1509		the following categories best de-	
1510		scribes the litigant?	
1511			

1512			
1513	songer_appel2_8_3	This question concerns the sec-	trustee in bankruptcy - institution,
1514		ond listed appellant. The nature	trustee in bankruptcy - individual, ex-
1515		of this litigant falls into the cat-	ecutor or administrator of estate - in-
1516		egory "miscellaneous", specif-	stitution
1517		trustee" Which of the following	
1518		specific subcategories best de-	
1519		scribes the litigant?	
1520	songer_appfed	What is the total number of ap-	N/A
1521		pellants in the case that fall into	
1522		the category "the federal gov-	
1523		cialss"? Answer with a number	
1520	songer appfiduc	What is the total number of ap-	N/A
1505	songer_uppndue	pellants in the case that fall into	
1525		the category "fiduciaries"? An-	
1520		swer with a number.	
1527	songer_applfrom	What is the type of district court	Trial (either jury or bench trial), In-
1528		decision or judgment appealed	junction or denial of injunction or stay
1529		from (i.e., the nature of the deci-	of injunction, Summary judgment or
1530	songer appnator	What is the total number of ap-	N/A
1531	songer_appnatpi	pellants in the case that fall into	IVA
1532		the category "natural persons"?	
1533		Answer with a number.	
1534	songer_appnonp	What is the total number of ap-	N/A
1535		pellants in the case that fall into	
1536		the category "groups and associ-	
1537	songer annstate	What is the total number of ap-	N/A
1538	songer_appstate	pellants in the case that fall into	IVA
1539		the category "state governments,	
1540		their agencies, and officials"?	
1541		Answer with a number.	
1542	songer_appsubst	What is the total number of ap-	N/A
1543		pellants in the case that fall into	
1544		ments their agencies and offi-	
1545		cials"? Answer with a number.	
1546	songer_attyfee	Did the court's ruling on attor-	No, Yes, Mixed answer
1547		neys' fees favor the appellant?	
15/18	songer_bank_app1	Is the first listed appellant	Yes, No
1540		bankrupt?	X/ N
1545	songer_bank_app2	Is the second listed appellant	Yes, No
1000	songer bank r1	Is the first listed respondent	Ves No
1001	songer_bank_r	bankrupt?	103, 110
1552	songer_bank_r2	Is the second listed respondent	Yes, No
1003		bankrupt?	
1554	songer_capric	Did the courts's use or interpre-	No, Yes, Mixed answer
1555		tation of the arbitrary and capri-	
1556		cious standard support the gov-	
1557		courts to overturn agency actions	
1558		deemed to be arbitrary or capri-	
1559		cious, an abuse of discretion, or	
1560		otherwise not in accordance with	
1561		law. Overton Park emphasized	
1562		this is a narrow standard, and one	
1563		must prove that agency's action	
1564		also includes the "substantial ins-	
1565		tification" doctrine.	

1566 songer_casetyp1_1-2 What is the specific issue in the federal offense, state offense, not decase within the general category termined whether state or federal of-1568 of "issue"? fense songer_casetyp1_1-3-What is the specific issue in the murder, rape, arson 1570 case within the general category of "issue"? What is the specific issue in the 1572 songer_casetyp1_1-3murder, rape, arson 2 case within the general category of "issue"? 1574 songer_casetyp1_1-3-What is the specific issue in the murder, rape, arson 1575 3 case within the general category 1576 of "issue"? 1577 civil rights claims by prisoners and What is the specific issue in the songer_casetyp1_2-2 1578 case within the general category those accused of crimes, voting rights, of "issue"? race discrimination, sex discrimina-1579 tion, other civil rights 1580 songer_casetyp1_2-3-What is the specific issue in the suit for damages for false arrest or false case within the general category confinement, cruel and unusual pun-1582 of "issue"? ishment, due process rights in prison 1583 songer_casetyp1_2-3-What is the specific issue in the voting rights - reapportionment & dis-2 case within the general category tricting, participation rights - rights of of "issue"? candidates or groups to fully partici-1585 pate in the political process; access to ballot, voting rights - other (includes 1587 race discrimination in voting) songer_casetyp1_2-3-What is the specific issue in the alien petitions - (includes disputes over 1589 3 case within the general category attempts at deportation), indian rights of "issue"? and law, juveniles songer_casetyp1_3-2 What is the specific issue in the religion, press, commercial, speech 1591 case within the general category and other expression 1592 of "issue"? 1593 songer_casetyp1_3-3-What is the specific issue in the commercial speech, libel, slander, 1594 case within the general category defamation, free exercise of religion -1 of "issue"? 1595 songer_casetyp1_3-3-What is the specific issue in the obscenity, association, federal internal 1596 2 case within the general category security and communist control acts, 1597 of "issue"? loyalty oaths, security risks 1598 What is the specific issue in the songer_casetyp1_4-3 denial of fair hearing or notice - gov-1599 case within the general category ernment employees (includes claims of "issue"? of terminated government workers), denial of hearing or notice in nonemployment context, taking clause (i.e., denial of due process under the "taking" clause of the 5th or 14th 1604 Amendments) songer_casetyp1_5-3 What is the specific issue in the abortion rights, homosexual rights case within the general category where privacy claim raised, contracep-1606 of "issue"? tion and other privacy claims related to marital relations or sexual behavior (not in 501 or 502) songer_casetyp1_6-3 What is the specific issue in the union organizing, unfair labor praccase within the general category tices, Fair Labor Standards Act issues 1610 of "issue"? 1611 songer_casetyp1_7-2 What is the specific issue in the taxes, patents, copyright, torts, com-1612 case within the general category mercial disputes 1613 of "issue"? 1614 What is the specific issue in the state or local tax, federal taxation songer_casetyp1_7-3-1615 1 case within the general category individual income tax (includes taxes of "issue"? of individuals, fiduciaries, & estates), 1616 federal tax - business income tax (in-1617 cludes corporate and parnership) 1618

1620			
1621	songer_casetyp1_7-3-	What is the specific issue in the	motor vehicle, airplane, product liabil-
1622	2	case within the general category	ity
1623		of "issue"?	
1624	songer_casetyp1_7-3-	What is the specific issue in the	contract disputes-general (private par-
1625	3	case within the general category	ties) (includes breach of contract, dis-
1626		of issue ?	for specific performance disputes over
1627			whether contract fulfilled, claims that
1620			money owed on contract) (Note: this
1020			category is not used when the dispute
1629			fits one of the more specific categories
1630			below), disputes over government con-
1631	1.5.0		tracts, insurance disputes
1632	songer_casetyp1_7-3-	What is the specific issue in the	bankruptcy - private individual (e.g.,
1633	4	case within the general category	chapter /), bankruptcy - business re-
1634		of issue ?	bankruptev
1635	songer casetyp1 7-3-	What is the specific issue in the	social security benefits (including SS
1636	5	case within the general category	disability payments), other govern-
1637		of "issue"?	ment benefit programs (e.g., welfare,
1638			RR retirement, veterans benefits, war
1639			risk insurance, food stamps), state or
1640	. 172		local economic regulation
1641	songer_casetyp1_/-3-	what is the specific issue in the	and disputes over real property (private),
1642	0	of "issue"?	government over real property land-
16/2		01 15500 .	lord - tenant disputes
1643	songer_casetyp1_9-3	What is the specific issue in the	miscellaneous interstate conflict, other
1044	5 51	case within the general category	federalism issue (only code as issue if
1645		of "issue"?	opinion explicitly discusses federalism
1646			as an important issue - or if opinion ex-
1647			plicity discusses conflict of state power
1648			vs federal power), attorneys (disbar-
1649	songer casetyp? geniss	What is the second general issue	criminal civil rights First Amendment
1650	songer_easeryp2_gemss	in the case, other than mainissue?	erminal, ervir rights, i fist / inchement
1651	songer_circuit	What is the circuit of the court	First Circuit, Second Circuit, Third
1652	C	that decided the case?	Circuit
1653	songer_civproc1	What is the most frequently cited	N/A
1654		federal rule of civil procedure in	
1655		the headnotes to this case? An-	
1656		swer with a number.	NT/A
1657	songer_civproc2	what is the second most fre-	N/A
1658		procedure in the headnotes to this	
1650		case? Answer with a number.	
1660	songer_classact	Is the case described in the opin-	No, Yes
1000	C	ion as a class action suit?	
1001	songer_comment	Did the agency give proper op-	No, Yes, Mixed answer
1002		portunity to comment?	
1663	songer_concur	What is the number of judges	0, 1, 2
1664		who concurred in the result but	
1665	songer confess	Did the court conclude that a	No. Yes. Yes, but error was harmless
1666	songer_comess	confession or an incriminating	110, 103, 103, 000 01101 was harmiess
1667		statement was improperly admit-	
1668		ted? Consider only incriminat-	
1669		ing statements made by the de-	
1670		fendant.	
1671			

1674			
1675	songer_const1	What is the most frequently cited	N/A
1676		provision of the U.S. Constitu-	
1677		tion in the headnotes to this case?	
1678		If it is one of the original arti-	
1679		cles of the constitution, code the	
1680		humber of the article preceded by two zeros. If it is an amend-	
1691		ment to the constitution, code the	
1600		number of the amendment (zero	
1082		filled to two places) preceeded by	
1683		a "1". Examples: 001 = Article 1	
1684		of the original constitution, 101	
1685		= 1st Amendment, 114 $=$ 14th	
1686		Amendment.	
1687	songer_const2	What is the second most fre-	N/A
1688		quently cited provision of the	
1689		U.S. Constitution in the head-	
1690		the original articles of the consti-	
1691		tution, code the number of the ar-	
1602		ticle preceded by two zeros. If	
1602		it is an amendment to the con-	
1093		stitution, code the number of the	
1694		amendment (zero filled to two	
1695		places) preceeded by a "1". Ex-	
1696		amples: $001 = \text{Article 1 of the}$	
1697		original constitution, $101 = 1$ st	
1698		ment	
1699	songer constit	Did the court's conclusion about	Issue not discussed. The issue was dis-
1700	songer_constit	the constitutionality of a law or	cussed in the opinion and the reso-
1701		administrative action favor the	lution of the issue by the court fa-
1702		appellant?	vored the respondent, The issue was
1703			discussed in the opinion and the reso-
1704			lution of the issue by the court favored
1704			the appellant
1705	songer_counsel	Did the court rule that the defen-	No, Yes, Yes, but error was harmless
1706	11	dant had inadequate counsel?	
1707	songer_counsel1	for the appellant?	none (pro se), court appointed, legal
1708	songer counsel?	What is the nature of the counsel	none (pro se) court appointed legal
1709	songer_counser2	for the respondent?	aid or public defender
1710	songer_crmproc1	What is the most frequently cited	N/A
1711	8	federal rule of criminal proce-	
1712		dure in the headnotes to this	
1713		case? Answer with a number.	
1714	songer_crmproc2	What is the second most fre-	N/A
1715		quently cited federal rule of crim-	
1716		inal procedure in the headnotes to	
01/10		this case? Answer with a number.	No. Voc. Not account in 1
1/1/	songer_crossapp	the decision below to the court of	ino, ies, inoi ascertained
1718		appeals that were consolidated in	
1719		the present case?	
1720	songer_deathpen	Did the court conclude that the	No. Yes. Yes, but error was harmless
1721	songer-ucumpen	death penalty was improperly im-	, 100, 100, out offor was harmess
1722		posed? Consider only the valid-	
1723		ity of the sentence, rather than	
1724		whether or not the conviction was	
1725		proper.	

1	7	7	7
1	7	7	8
1	7	7	9

songer_decuncon	Did the court declare any statute or administrative action uncon- stitutional?	no declarations of unconstitutionality, act of Congress declared unconsti- tutional (facial invalidity), interpreta- tion/application of federal law invalid
songer_denovo	Did the court's use of the stan- dard of review, "de novo on facts" support the government? The courts generally recognize that de novo review is impracti- cal for the bulk of agency deci- sions so the substantial evidence standard helps provide a middle course. Consider the de novo re- view of administrative action, not de novo review of trial court by appeals court.	No, Yes, Mixed answer
songer_direct1	What is the ideological direction- ality of the court of appeals deci- sion?	conservative, liberal, mixed
songer_direct2	What is the ideological direction- ality of the court of appeals deci- sion?	conservative, liberal, mixed
songer_discover	Did the court's interpretation of rules relating to discovery or other issues related to obtaining evidence favor the appellant?	No, Yes, Mixed answer
songer_dissent	What is the number of judges who dissented from the majority?	0, 1, 2
songer_district	From which district in the state was this case appealed?	Not applicable, Eastern, Western
songer_diverse	Did the court conclude that the parties were truly diverse?	No, Yes, Mixed answer
songer_dueproc	Did the interpretation of the re- quirements of due process by the court favor the appellant?	No, Yes, Mixed answer
songer_entrap	Did the court rule that the defen- dant was the victim of illegal en- trapment?	No, Yes, Yes, but error was harmless
songer_erron	Did the court's use of the clearly erroneous standard support the government? That is, a some- what narrower standard than sub- stantial evidence, or ignoring usual agency standards.	No, Yes, Mixed answer
songer_execord	Did the interpretation of execu- tive order or administrative reg- ulation by the court favor the appellant? This does include whether or not an executive order was lawful.	No, Yes, Mixed answer
songer_exhaust	Did the court determine that it would not hear the appeal for one of the following reasons: a) administrative remedies had not been exhausted; or b) the issue was not ripe for judicial action?	No, Yes, Mixed answer
songer_fedlaw	Did the interpretation of federal statute by the court favor the appellant?	No, Yes, Mixed answer

1782			
1783	songer_fedvst	Did the court rule that federal law	No, Yes, Mixed answer
1784		should take precedence over state	
1785		or local laws in a case involving	
1786		laws or rules apply)?	
1787	songer_foreign	Did the court rule that domes-	No, Yes, Mixed answer
1788		tic law (federal, state or local)	
1789		should take precedence over for-	
1790		eign law in a case involving the	
1791		or rules apply- foreign country vs	
1792		federal, state, or local)?	
1793	songer_freeinfo	Did the court rule in favor of the	No, Yes, Mixed answer
1794		government when the adminis-	
1795		trative action in question related	
1796		to the agency's providing infor-	
1797		For example, Freedom of Infor-	
1798		mation, issues of governmental	
1799		confidentiality, or "government	
1800		in the sunshine".	
1801	songer_frivapp	Did the court conclude that it	No, Yes, Mixed answer
1802		case because the motion or an-	
1803		peal was frivolous or raised only	
1804		trivial issues and was therefore	
1805		not suitable for appellate review?	
1806	songer_frivol	Did the court conclude that either	No, Yes, Mixed answer
1807		or raised only trivial issues and	
1808		therefore was not suitable for ac-	
1809		tions on the merits?	
1810	songer_genapel1	What is the nature of the first	private business (including criminal
1811		listed appellant?	enterprises), private organization or as-
1812			ing DC)
1813	songer_genapel2	What is the nature of the sec-	private business (including criminal
1814		ond listed appellant whose de-	enterprises), private organization or as-
1815		tailed code is not identical to the	sociation, federal government (includ-
1816	concor conico	code for the first listed appellant?	ing DC)
1817	songer_gemss	case?	chiminal, civil rights, First Amendment
1818	songer_genresp1	What is the nature of the first	private business (including criminal
1819		listed respondent?	enterprises), private organization or as-
1820			sociation, federal government (includ-
1821			ing DC)
1822	songer_genresp2	listed respondent whose detailed	enterprises) private organization or as-
1823		code is not identical to the code	sociation. federal government (includ-
1824		for the first listed respondent?	ing DC)
1825	songer_genstand	Did the agency articulate the ap-	No, Yes, Mixed answer
1826		propriate general standard? This	
1827		question includes whether the	
1828		"correctly". The courts often re-	
1829		fer here to the rational basis test,	
1830		plain meaning, reasonable con-	
1831		struction of the statute, congres-	
1832		sional intent, etc. This issue	
1833		law applies or whether amended	
1834		law vs law before amendment ap-	
1835		plies.	

songer_habeas	Was the case an appeal of a de- cision by the district court on a	no, yes, state habeas corpus (criminal), yes, federal habeas corpus (criminal)
songer_immunity	Did the court refuse to reach the merits of the appeal because it concluded that the defendant had	No, Yes, Mixed answer
	immunity?	
songer_improper	Did the court conclude that there was improper influence on the jury? For example, include jury tampering or failure to shield jury	No, Yes, Yes, but error was harmless
	from prejudicial media accounts. Exclude prejudicial conduct by the prosecutor.	
songer_indict	Did the court rule that the indict- ment was defective?	No, Yes, Yes, but error was harmless
songer_indigent	Did the court rule that the defen- dant's rights as an indigent were violated?	No, Yes, Yes, but error was harmless
songer_initiate	What party initiated the appeal?	Original plaintiff, Original defendant, Federal agency representing plaintiff
songer_injunct	Did the court's ruling on the va- lidity of an injunction or the de- nial of an injunction or a stay of	No, Yes, Mixed answer
	injunction favor the appellant?	
songer_insane	Did the court below err in not permitting an insanity defense?	No, Yes, Yes, but error was harmless
songer_int_law	Did the court rule in favor of the appellant on an issue related to the interpretation of a treaty or in- ternational law?	No, Yes, Mixed answer
songer_interven	Did one or more individuals or groups seek to formally intervene in the appeals court consideration of the case?	no intervenor in case, intervenor = ap- pellant, intervenor = respondent
songer_judgdisc	Did the court's ruling on the abuse of discretion by the trial judge favor the appellant? This includes the issue of whether the judge actually had the authority for the action taken, but does not include questions of discretion of administrative law judges.	No, Yes, Mixed answer
songer_judrev	Did the court conclude the deci- sion was subject to judicial re- view? While questions of fact are subject to limited review, ques- tions of law are subject to full re- view. The problem becomes de- termining which are clear ques- tions of law or fact as they are of- ten "mixed".	No, Yes, Mixed answer
songer_jurisdiction	Did the court determine that it had jurisdiction to hear this case?	No, Yes, Mixed answer
songer_juryinst	Did the court conclude that the jury instructions were improper?	No, Yes, Yes, but error was harmless
songer_late	Did the court refuse to decide the appeal because the appellant failed to comply with some rule relating to timeliness of the ap- peal?	No, Yes, Mixed answer

1890 1891 songer_majvotes What is the number of judges 0, 1, 2 who voted in favor of the dispo-1892 sition favored by the majority? 1893 songer_method What is the nature of the proceeddecided by panel for first time (no in-1894 ing in the court of appeals for this dication of re-hearing or remand), decase? cided by panel after re-hearing (second 1896 time this case has been heard by this same panel), decided by panel after remand from Supreme Court 1898 songer_mootness Did the court conclude that an is-No, Yes, Mixed answer sue was moot? 1900 Decisions that affect life, liberty, No, Yes, Mixed answer songer_notice 1901 or property must be preceded by adequate notice and an opportu-1902 nity for a fair hearing. Did the 1903 agency give proper notice? 1904 What is the total number of ap-N/A songer_numappel 1905 pellants in the case? Answer with 1906 a number. 1907 songer_numresp What is the total number of re-N/A spondents in the case? Answer with a number. 1909 songer_opinstat Is the opinion writer identified in Signed, with reasons, Per curiam, with 1910 the opinion, or was the opinion reasons, Not ascertained 1911 per curiam? 1912 songer_origin What type of court made the orig-Federal district court (single judge), 3 inal decision? 1913 judge district court, State court Did the court rule that some ev-No, Yes, Yes, but error was harmless songer_othadmis 1914 idence, other than a confession 1915 made by the defendant or ille-1916 gal search and seizure, was inad-1917 missibile (or did ruling on appropriateness of evidentary hearing 1918 benefit the defendant)? 1919 songer_othappth Did the court refuse to rule on No, Yes, Mixed answer 1920 the merits of the appeal because 1921 of some threshhold issue other 1922 than timeliness or frivolousness that was relevant on appeal but 1923 not at the original trial? 1924 songer_othcrim Did the court rule for the de-No, Yes, Yes, but error was harmless fendant on grounds other than procedural grounds? For exam-1927 ple, right to speedy trial, double jeopardy, confrontation, retroac-1928 tivity, self defense. This includes the question of whether the de-1930 fendant waived the right to raise 1931 some claim. 1932 Did the court conclude that the No, Yes, Yes, but error was harmless songer_othjury 1933 jury composition or selection was invalid or that the jury was biased 1934 or tampered with? 1935 songer_oththres Did the court refuse to rule on the No, Yes, Mixed answer 1936 merits of the appeal because of a 1937 threshhold issue other than lack 1938 of jurisdiction, standing, mootness, failure to state a claim, ex-1939 haustion, timeliness, immunity, 1940 frivolousness, or nonjusticiable 1941 political question? 1942

1944 Did the court rule for the de-No, Yes, Yes, but error was harmless 1945 songer_plea fendant on an issue related to 1946 plea bargaining? Plea bargain in-1947 cludes all challenges to plea. 1948 No, Yes, Mixed answer songer_polquest Did the court refuse to rule on the merits of the case because it was 1950 considered to be a nonjusticiable "political question"? 1951 songer_post_trl Did the court's ruling on some No, Yes, Mixed answer 1952 post-trial procedure or motion 1953 (e.g., allocating court costs or 1954 post award relief) favor the ap-1955 pellant? This doe not include attorneys' fees, but does include 1956 motions to set aside a jury ver-1957 dict. 1958 songer_prejud Was there prejudicial conduct by No, Yes, Yes, but error was harmless 1959 prosecution? 1960 Did the court's rulings on pre-No, Yes, Mixed answer songer_pretrial 1961 trial procedure favor the appellant? This includes whether or 1962 not there is a right to jury trial, 1963 whether the case should be certi-1964 fied as a class action, or whether 1965 a prospective party has a right to intervene in the case, but does not include rulings on motions 1967 for summary judgment. 1968 songer_procdis Did the court uphold the dis-No, Yes, Yes, but error was harmless 1969 missal by district court on proce-1970 dural grounds? 1971 Did the interpretation of federal No, Yes, Mixed answer songer_procedur rule of procedures, judicial doc-1972 trine, or case law by the court fa-1973 vor the appellant? 1974 N/A What is the total number of resonger_r_bus 1975 spondents in the case that fall 1976 into the category "private business and its executives"? Answer 1977 with a number. 1978 What is the total number of re-N/A songer_r_fed spondents in the case that fall into 1980 the category "the federal gov-1981 ernment, its agencies, and officialss"? Answer with a number. 1982 N/A songer_r_fiduc What is the total number of respondents in the case that fall into 1984 the category "fiduciaries"? An-1985 swer with a number. songer_r_natpr What is the total number of re-N/A spondents in the case that fall into 1987 the category "natural persons"? 1988 Answer with a number. What is the total number of re-N/A songer_r_nonp spondents in the case that fall into 1991 the category "groups and associ-1992 ations"? Answer with a number. What is the total number of re-N/A songer_r_state 1993 spondents in the case that fall 1994 into the category "state govern-1995 ments, their agencies, and offi-1996 cials"? Answer with a number.

1998 songer_r_stid What is the state of the first listed not, Alabama, Alaska state or local government agency 2000 that is a respondent? 2001 songer_r_subst What is the total number of re-N/A spondents in the case that fall into the category "sub-state govern-2004 ments, their agencies, and officials"? Answer with a number. songer_realapp Are the formally listed appellants both 1st and 2nd listed appellants are 2006 in the case the "real parties", that real parties (or only one appellant, and is, are they the parties whose that appellant is a real party), the 1st 2008 appellant is not a real party, the 2nd apreal interests are most directly at 2009 stake? pellant is not a real party songer_realresp Are the formally listed responboth 1st and 2nd listed respondents are 2010 dents in the case the "real parreal parties (or only one respondent, 2011 ties", that is, are they the parties and that respondent is a real party), the 2012 whose real interests are most di-1st respondent is not a real party, the 2013 rectly at stake? 2nd respondent is not a real party 2014 Did the agency fail to develop an No, Yes, Mixed answer songer_record 2015 adequate record? For example, if the court was unable to deter-2016 mine what doctrine was used for 2017 the decision or unable to deter-2018 mine the basis of the decision. 2019 local, neither local nor national, nasonger_respond1_1_2 This question concerns the first 2020 listed respondent. The nature of tional or multi-national this litigant falls into the cate-2021 gory "private business (including criminal enterprises)". What is the scope of this business? 2024 songer_respond1_1_3 This question concerns the first agriculture, mining, construction 2025 listed respondent. The nature of this litigant falls into the category "private business (including 2027 criminal enterprises)". What cat-2028 egory of business best describes 2029 the area of activity of this litigant 2030 which is involved in this case? songer_respond1_1_4 This question concerns the first single family farm, commercial farm, 2031 listed respondent. The nature of agri-business, farm - other 2032 this litigant falls into the cate-2033 gory "private business (including criminal enterprises)", specifi-2035 cally "agriculture". What subcategory of business best describes 2036 this litigant? songer_respond1_2_2 This question concerns the first business, trade, professional, or union 2038 listed respondent. The nature of (BTPU), other 2039 this litigant falls into the category "private organization or association". What category of pri-2041 vate associations best describes 2042 this litigant? 2043 songer_respond1_2_3 This question concerns the first Business or trade association, utili-2044 listed respondent. The naties co-ops, Professional association -2045 ture of this litigant falls into other than law or medicine 2046 the category "private organization or association", specifically 2047 "business, trade, professional, or 2048 union (BTPU)". What subcate-2049 gory of private association best 2050 describes this litigant? 2051

2052			
2053	songer_respond1_3_2	This question concerns the first	cabinet level department, courts or leg-
2054		listed respondent. The nature	islative, agency whose first word is
2055		of this litigant falls into the cat-	"federal"
2056		cluding DC)" Which category of	
2057		federal government agencies and	
2058		activities best describes this liti-	
2059		gant?	
2060	songer_respond1_3_3	This question concerns the first	Department of Agriculture, Depart-
2061		listed respondent. The nature of	ment of Commerce, Department of
2062		"federal government (including	and Navy Department)
2063		DC)", specifically "cabinet level	and wavy Department)
2064		department". Which specific fed-	
2065		eral government agency best de-	
2066	11.4.0	scribes this litigant?	
2067	songer_respond1_4_2	This question concerns the first	legislative, executive/administrative,
2068		this litigant falls into the cate-	bureaucracy providing services
2069		gory "sub-state government (e.g.,	
2070		county, local, special district)".	
2071		Which category of substate gov-	
2072		ernment best describes this liti-	
2072	songer respond 1 4 3	gant? This question concerns the first	City/county_council_School_Board
2074	songer_respondr_4_5	listed respondent. The nature	board of trustees for college or junior
2075		of this litigant falls into the	college, Other legislative body
2075		category "sub-state government	
2070		(e.g., county, local, special dis-	
2078		trict)", specifically "legislative".	
2070		ment agency best describes this	
2075		litigant?	
2000	songer_respond1_5_2	This question concerns the first	legislative, executive/administrative,
2001		listed respondent. The nature of	bureaucracy providing services
2002		this litigant falls into the cate-	
2003		gory "state government (includes	
2004		Which category of state govern-	
2000		ment best describes this litigant?	
2000	songer_respond1_5_3	This question concerns the first	Legislature or separate house as an or-
2007		listed respondent. The nature of	ganization, Legislative Committee or
2000		this litigant falls into the cate-	Commission, Other Legislative Unit
2003		territories & commonwealths)"	
2030		specifically "legislative". Which	
2091		specific state government agency	
2092		best describes this litigant?	
2093	songer_respond1_7_2	This question concerns the first	not ascertained, male - indication in
2094		instead respondent. The nature	opinion (e.g., use of masculine pro-
2095		egory "natural person (excludes	noun, mate - assumed because of
2096		persons named in their official	
2097		capacity or who appear because	
2098		of a role in a private organiza-	
2099		tion)". What is the gender of this	
2100		nugant Ose names to classify the	
2101		ambiguity.	
2102	L	<u> </u>	l

2106			
2107	songer_respond1_7_3	This question concerns the first	not ascertained, caucasian - specific in-
2108		listed respondent. The nature	dication in opinion, black - specific in-
2109		of this litigant falls into the cat-	dication in opinion
2110		egory "natural person (excludes	
2111		capacity or who appear because	
2112		of a role in a private organiza-	
2113		tion)". What is the race or ethnic	
2114		identity of this litigant as identi-	
2115	11.7.4	fied in the opinion?	
2116	songer_respond1_/_4	I his question concerns the first	not ascertained, US citizen, allen
2117		of this litigant falls into the cat-	
2118		egory "natural person (excludes	
2119		persons named in their official	
2120		capacity or who appear because	
2121		of a role in a private organiza-	
2122		of this litigant as indicated in the	
2123		opinion?	
2124	songer_respond1_7_5	This question concerns the first	not ascertained, poor + wards of state,
2125		listed respondent. The nature	presumed poor
2126		of this litigant falls into the cat-	
2127		persons named in their official	
2128		capacity or who appear because	
2129		of a role in a private organiza-	
2130		tion)". Which of these categories	
2131		best describes the income of the	
2132	songer respond 1 8 2	This question concerns the first	fiduciary executor or trustee other
2133	songer_respondr_o_2	listed respondent. The nature of	nature of the litigant not ascertained
2134		this litigant falls into the cate-	C
2135		gory "miscellaneous". Which of	
2136		the following categories best de-	
2137	songer respond 1 8 3	This question concerns the first	trustee in bankruptov - institution
2138	soliger_respondr_o_5	listed respondent. The nature	trustee in bankruptcy - institution,
2139		of this litigant falls into the cat-	ecutor or administrator of estate - in-
2140		egory "miscellaneous", specif-	stitution
2141		ically "fiduciary, executor, or	
2142		trustee". Which of the following	
2143		scribes the litigant?	
2144	songer_respond2_1_2	This question concerns the sec-	local, neither local nor national, na-
2145		ond listed respondent. The nature	tional or multi-national
2146		of this litigant falls into the cate-	
2147		gory private business (including criminal enterprises)" What is	
2148		the scope of this business?	
2149	songer_respond2_1_3	This question concerns the sec-	agriculture, mining, construction
2150		ond listed respondent. The nature	
2151		of this litigant falls into the cate-	
2152		gory "private business (including	
2153		every of business best describes	
2154		the area of activity of this litigant	
2155		which is involved in this case?	
2156			

2160			
2161	songer_respond2_1_4	This question concerns the sec-	single family farm, commercial farm,
2162		ond listed respondent. The na-	agri-business, farm - other
2163		ture of this litigant falls into	
2164		(including criminal enterprises)"	
2165		specifically "agriculture". What	
2166		subcategory of business best de-	
2167		scribes this litigant?	
2168	songer_respond2_2_2	This question concerns the sec-	business, trade, professional, or union
2169		ond listed respondent. The nature	(BTPU), other
2170		of this litigant falls into the cate-	
2171		sociation". What category of pri-	
2172		vate associations best describes	
2173		this litigant?	
2174	songer_respond2_2_3	This question concerns the sec-	Business or trade association, utili-
2175		ond listed respondent. The na-	ties co-ops, Professional association -
2176		ture of this litigant falls into	other than law or medicine
2177		tion or association". specifically	
2178		"business, trade, professional, or	
2170		union (BTPU)". What subcate-	
2179		gory of private association best	
2100	10.2.0	describes this litigant?	
2101	songer_respond2_3_2	ond listed respondent. The nature	cabinet level department, courts or leg-
2102		of this litigant falls into the cat-	"federal"
2183		egory "federal government (in-	
2184		cluding DC)". Which category of	
2185		federal government agencies and	
2186		activities best describes this liti-	
2187	songer respond? 3 3	gant? This question concerns the sec-	Department of Agriculture Depart
2188	songer_respond2_5_5	ond listed respondent. The na-	ment of Commerce. Department of
2189		ture of this litigant falls into	Defense (includes War Department
2190		the category "federal govern-	and Navy Department)
2191		ment (including DC)", specifi-	
2192		cally "cabinet level department".	
2193		ment agency best describes this	
2194		litigant?	
2195	songer_respond2_4_2	This question concerns the sec-	legislative, executive/administrative,
2196		ond listed respondent. The nature	bureaucracy providing services
2197		of this litigant falls into the cate-	
2198		gory "sub-state government (e.g.,	
2199		Which category of substate gov-	
2200		ernment best describes this liti-	
2201		gant?	
2202	songer_respond2_4_3	This question concerns the sec-	City/county council, School Board,
2203		ond listed respondent. The na-	board of trustees for college or junior
2204		category "sub-state government	conege, Other legislative body
2205		(e.g., county, local. special dis-	
2206		trict)", specifically "legislative".	
2207		Which specific substate govern-	
2208		ment agency best describes this	
2209		litigant?	
2210			

2214			
2215	songer_respond2_5_2	This question concerns the sec-	legislative, executive/administrative,
2216		ond listed respondent. The nature	bureaucracy providing services
2217		of this litigant falls into the cate-	
2218		territories & commonwealths)"	
2219		Which category of state govern-	
2220		ment best describes this litigant?	
2221	songer_respond2_5_3	This question concerns the sec-	Legislature or separate house as an or-
2222		ond listed respondent. The nature	ganization, Legislative Committee or
2223		of this hugant fails into the cale- gory "state government (includes	Commission, Other Legislative Unit
2224		territories & commonwealths)".	
2225		specifically "legislative". Which	
2226		specific state government agency	
2227	10.7.0	best describes this litigant?	
2228	songer_respond2_/_2	This question concerns the sec-	not ascertained, male - indication in
2229		of this litigant falls into the cat-	noun). male - assumed because of
2230		egory "natural person (excludes	name
2231		persons named in their official	
2232		capacity or who appear because	
2233		of a role in a private organiza- tion)" What is the gender of this	
2234		litigant?Use names to classify the	
2235		party's sex only if there is little	
2236		ambiguity.	
2237	songer_respond2_7_3	This question concerns the sec-	not ascertained, caucasian - specific in-
2238		of this litigant falls into the cat-	dication in opinion, black - specific in-
2239		egory "natural person (excludes	
2240		persons named in their official	
2241		capacity or who appear because	
2242		of a role in a private organiza-	
2243		identity of this litigant as identi-	
2244		fied in the opinion?	
2245	songer_respond2_7_4	This question concerns the sec-	not ascertained, US citizen, alien
2246		ond listed respondent. The nature	
2247		of this litigant falls into the cat-	
2248		persons named in their official	
2249		capacity or who appear because	
2250		of a role in a private organiza-	
2251		tion)". What is the citizenship	
2252		of this litigant as indicated in the	
2253	songer respond ₂ 7 5	This question concerns the sec-	not ascertained, poor + wards of state.
2254	songer_copond_it to	ond listed respondent. The nature	presumed poor
2255		of this litigant falls into the cat-	
2256		egory "natural person (excludes	
2257		persons named in their official	
2258		of a role in a private organiza-	
2259		tion)". Which of these categories	
2260		best describes the income of the	
2261	12.0.0	litigant?	
2262	songer_respond2_8_2	and listed respondent. The nature	nature of the litigant not ascertained
2263		of this litigant falls into the cate-	nature of the nugant not ascertained
2264		gory "miscellaneous". Which of	
2265		the following categories best de-	
2266		scribes the litigant?	

2268			
2269	songer_respond2_8_3	This question concerns the sec-	trustee in bankruptcy - institution,
2270		ond listed respondent. The nature	trustee in bankruptcy - individual, ex-
2271		of this litigant falls into the cat-	ecutor or administrator of estate - in-
2272		ically "fiduciary executor or	stitution
2273		trustee". Which of the following	
2274		specific subcategories best de-	
2275		scribes the litigant?	
2276	songer_rtcouns	Did the court rule that the defen-	No, Yes, Yes, but error was harmless
2277		dant's right to counsel was vio-	
2278		inadequate counsel)?	
2279	songer_search	Did the court below improperly	No, Yes, Yes, but error was harmless
2280	C	rule for the prosecution on an is-	
2281		sue related to an alleged illegal	
2282		search and seizure?	
2283	songer_sentence	Did the court conclude that some	No, Yes, Yes, but error was harmless
2284		penalty, excluding the death penalty, was improperly im-	
2285		posed?	
2286	songer_source	What forum heard this case im-	Federal district court (single judge), 3
2287		mediately before the case came	judge district court, State court
2288		to the court of appeals?	N X/ M' 1
2289	songer_st_v_st	appellant on the issue of a con-	No, Yes, Mixed answer
2290		flict of laws (which laws or rules	
2291		apply) other than federal v state	
2292		or foreign v domestic (e.g., one	
2293		state vs second state)?	
2294	songer_standing	Did the court determine that the	No, Yes, Mixed answer
2295	songer state	In what state or territory was the	not Alabama Alaska
2296	songer_state	case first heard?	not, i mounu, i moku
2297	songer_stateclaim	Did the court dismiss the case be-	No, Yes, Mixed answer
2298		cause of the failure of the plain-	
2299		tiff to state a claim upon which	
2300	songer stabicy	Did the interpretation of state or	No. Ves. Mixed answer
2301	songer_stponey	local law, executive order, ad-	ivo, ies, wixed answer
2302		ministrative regulation, doctrine,	
2303		or rule of procedure by the court	
2304	1 . 1	favor the appellant?	
2305	songer_subevia	the substantial evidence rule sup-	ino, ies, mixed answer
2306		port the government? For exam-	
2307		ple, "such evidence as a reason-	
2308		able mind might accept as ad-	
2309		equate to support a conclusion"	
2310		This issue is present only when	
2311		the court indicates that it is using	
2312		this doctrine, rather than when	
2313		the court is merely discussing the	
2314		evidence to determine whether	
2315		tion of the appellant or respon	
2316		dent.	
2317	songer_suffic	Did the court rule that there was	No, Yes, Yes, but error was harmless
2318	-	insufficient evidence for convic-	
2319		tion?	

No, Yes, Mixed answer 2323 songer_summary Did the court's ruling on the appropriateness of summary judg-2324 ment or the denial of summary 2325 judgment favor the appellant? 2326 No, Yes, Mixed answer songer_timely Did the court conclude that it 2327 could not reach the merits of the 2328 case because the litigants had not complied with some rule relating 2329 to timeliness, a filing fee, or be-2330 cause a statute of limitations had expired? 2332 songer_treat What is the disposition by the stay, petition, or motion granted, afcourt of appeals of the decision firmed; or affirmed and petition deof the court or agency below? nied, reversed (include reversed & va-2334 cated) No, Yes, Mixed answer songer_trialpro Did the court's ruling on pro-2336 cedure at trial favor the appel-2337 lant? This includes jury instruc-2338 tions and motions for directed verdicts made during trial. 2339 Are there two issues in the case? songer_two_issues no, yes 2340 What is the general category of criminal and prisoner petitions, civil songer_typeiss 2341 issues discussed in the opinion of government, diversity of citizenship 2342 the court? 2343 songer_usc1 What is the most frequently cited N/A 2344 title of the U.S. Code in the headnotes to this case? Answer with a 2345 number. 2346 songer_usc1sect What is the number of the sec-N/A 2347 tion from the title of the most 2348 frequently cited title of the U.S. 2349 Code in the headnotes to this case, that is, title usc1? Answer 2350 with a number. 2351 songer_usc2 The most frequently cited title of N/A 2352 the U.S. Code in the headnotes to 2353 this case is usc1. What is the sec-2354 ond most frequently cited title of this U.S. Code in the headnotes 2355 to this case? Answer with a num-2356 ber. 2357 songer_usc2sect What is the number of the sec-N/A 2358 tion from the title of the second 2359 most frequently cited title of the U.S. Code in the headnotes to 2360 this case, that is, title usc2? An-2361 swer with a number. 2362 Did the factual interpretation by No, Yes, Mixed answer songer_weightev 2363 the court or its conclusions (e.g., regarding the weight of evidence 2365 or the sufficiency of evidence) favor the appellant? 2366 No, Yes, Mixed answer songer_whlaws Did the court's discussion of 2367 which state's laws should control 2368 their ruling in the case support 2369 the position taken by the appellant? 2370 2371

2372 2373

2322

2374 2375