



Can You Trust Your Legal Analytics?

Litigation Analytics has become a staple of the legal profession. More vendors are claiming to provide litigation analytics, but are you willing to stake your client's case and your career on that data? Join Karl Harris, CEO of Lex Machina, and Kelli Jones, Customer Success Manager at Lex Machina, for this on-demand webcast, where they discuss what it takes to create accurate litigation analytics and the risks of relying on incomplete data.

They covered:

- Docket challenges in Federal and State Court
- What it takes to create accurate and complete analytics
- The risks of relying on incomplete data

Speakers:



Karl Harris
CEO
Lex Machina



Kelli Jones
Customer Success Manager
Lex Machina

Kelli Jones ([00:00](#)):

Hello everyone. And thank you for joining today's 30 minute webcast entitled Can You Trust Your Litigation Analytics? My name is Kelli Jones and I'm a customer success manager here at Lex Machina. I'm joined today by Karl Harris, our CEO.

Kelli Jones ([00:15](#)):

Welcome, Karl.

Karl Harris ([00:16](#)):

Thanks, Kelli. I'm super excited about our webcast. I can see that we have a big audience today.

Kelli Jones ([00:21](#)):

That we do. So today, Karl and I will be talking about what it takes to create accurate analytics for courts, judges, counsel, and parties, along with the risks of relying on incomplete data. If you have questions, please submit them in the Q&A window at any time during this webcast, and we'll answer them at the end.

Kelli Jones ([00:42](#)):

Karl, could you start us off by giving our audience a little bit of background about Lex Machina, for those who may not be familiar with our company?

Karl Harris ([00:51](#)):

Absolutely, Kelli. And it's actually really simple: Lex Machina is legal analytics. So what that means to us is that Lex Machina provides legal analytics to companies and law firms, enabling them to craft successful strategies, win cases and close business. And if you don't really remember anything else about Lex Machina from this webcast, I really hope you remember this: Lex Machina is legal analytics, and legal analytics help you win. But to be just a little more specific, we enable you to make data-driven decisions to answer questions like:

Karl Harris ([01:23](#)):

How is a judge likely to behave in a certain scenario?

Karl Harris ([01:26](#)):

What is the best winning strategy for my particular case? Or how has opposing counsel behaved in cases like mine?

Karl Harris ([01:34](#)):

And how do I convince my client that I'm the best law firm to represent her in this case?

Karl Harris ([01:39](#)):

And we've been doing this for over 10 years. In fact, we just celebrated our 10-year anniversary as a business. And we actually created legal analytics. We actually even had a trademark on the phrase, "legal analytics." And we're very proud to continue to win awards like the 2021 Legal Technology

Trailblazers Award from the National Law Journal. These are all a great reflection of the value we provide to our customers through constant innovation. And those customers include hundreds of law firms and companies ranging from the biggest Fortune 500 companies and Amlaw 100 law firms, to smaller companies and boutique law firms.

Kelli Jones ([02:14](#)):

Thanks for that background. I'd like to follow up with a question that we don't often ask at the beginning of our webcasts: Why did we decide to focus on the topic of whether you can trust your litigation analytics?

Karl Harris ([02:27](#)):

So that's a great question, Kelli. And the reason we're having this conversation is that the legal analytics space is growing so fast, especially in these last few years. That's obviously a great development for Lex Machina, and it's also a great thing for our customers, as they have more and more ways to bring data-driven approaches to their legal practices.

Karl Harris ([02:47](#)):

Now one thing that might not be so obvious is that we also welcome all of the other solution providers that have entered our space, even those with whom we compete. Like they say, after all, it's no fun to be the only person at the party. And we were actually the only person at the legal analytics party for a long, long time. However, because legal analytics is so important to us, we want to make sure that customers have trust in not just Lex Machina, but in legal analytics in general.

Karl Harris ([03:13](#)):

You know, doing what we do is actually really hard. As I mentioned earlier, it took us 10 years to get where we were today. And I think it's actually really tempting for other folks that want to offer analytics to take shortcuts, and take what one prominent blogger in the legal industry called, "a quick and dirty approach to analytics." Now here at Lex Machina, we don't take a quick and dirty approach to anything. And that's because we believe that there are three core principles that are required to build analytics you trust: accurate, complete, and transparent. What that means is that, not surprisingly, analytics must be accurate, and they must be complete, and also there's got to be transparency to the end-user in how those analytics were created. And those three things build trust.

Kelli Jones ([03:56](#)):

You use the phrase, "quick and dirty." Why exactly is it risky to take a quick and dirty approach to analytics?

Karl Harris ([04:04](#)):

I'm glad you asked that, Kelli. So really fundamentally the problem is that PACER ... Which I'm sure all of you on the webcast know what it is. It's the filing system of record for the federal district courts. And the state court systems, they weren't built for analytics. They were built as filing systems of record for the courts, and they actually do a great job at that. Filing has been brought online for federal courts and for state courts, and that's great. However, because they weren't built with analytics in mind, it's very dangerous to blindly rely on the data from court systems to produce analytics. But rather than just tell you about it, let me show you some examples that we encounter on a daily basis when we're creating analytics data.

Karl Harris ([04:49](#)):

So the first problem is that law firms' names are very frequently misspelled, especially in PACER. And to give you an idea of what that means, what I've done here is I've created a few just screenshots from PACER in which the law firm Quinn Emanuel was involved in cases. So these five examples you see here, I took it directly from the PACER record and show you what it looks like. And what I want you to do here is zoom in on these red triangles here. These are all the different ways Quinn Emanuel was misspelled just in these five examples. One of my favorites is "Quinn Ed Manual." And you also might imagine the name Urquhart is misspelled in a lot of different ways.

Karl Harris ([05:27](#)):

But the point is Quinn Emanuel is very frequently misspelled in PACER. But why does that matter? The reason it matters is because if you just took a naive approach to analytics, which relies on the record from PACER, you'd actually roll this up as five different law firms. And then when you tried to do things like figure out what Quinn Emmanuel's track record was in litigation, or what cases they were involved in, or what findings they had, or what damages were awarded in those cases, in short, what their track record was, you'd be wrong because you'd be rolling it up five different ways. And this slide here shows five different examples. I actually have a screenshot here of all the different ways that we see Quinn Emanuel misspelled in PACER. We like to joke that Quinn Emanuel is the most misspelled law firm in America. There's literally hundreds of different ways Quinn Emanuel is misspelled. One of my favorites here is "I Quinn Emanuel."

Karl Harris ([06:21](#)):

But again, misspellings aside, the point here is if you are not taking a very sophisticated and proactive approach to normalizing these law firms and rolling this track record up under one entity called Quinn Emanuel, you're going to make mistakes when you make assessments about Quinn Emanuel's track record, how they might behave, or if you work Quinn Emanuel, showcasing your experience. And it's a real problem if you take a quick and dirty approach to analytics.

Karl Harris ([06:48](#)):

Another challenge that we see is that there are actually incorrect law firms in PACER. And just to give you an idea of what this means, I actually mean that PACER says that law firms are involved in cases that they're not actually involved in. And let me show you an example of how that might happen.

Karl Harris ([07:05](#)):

This right here is a screenshot, again, directly from PACER. It's from a patent case in the Western District of Texas. And you can see here, the plaintiff is Godo Kaisha IP Bridge. And in the record here, you can see the one that I've highlighted, PACER is very clear. It says that one of the attorneys representing the plaintiff is Alan Whitehurst from the law firm McKool Smith. You can even see his email address here, awhitehurst@mckoolsmith.com. If you're taking a look at PACER, again, like I said, it's very clear McKool Smith looks like it was involved in this case.

Karl Harris ([07:38](#)):

Problem is they weren't. McKool Smith actually had nothing to do with this case. And how do I know that? If I go here ... So what I did is I went and I looked at the actual complaint, so the complaint that was filed in this case by the plaintiff, and I took a look at the attorney names who signed the complaint. There's a few here, but look down here at the one I've highlighted. There's Alan Whitehurst, the one

we're talking about. But this has him associated with Quinn Emanuel. And actually right here, there's his email address, alanwhitehurst@quinnemanuel.com.

Karl Harris ([08:09](#)):

But how can this be? Why is it that PACER is saying McKool Smith's involved, but the actual complaint when filed with the case says that it was Quinn Emanuel? The reason is that now, in current times, Alan Whitehurst does actually work for McKool Smith, but when he went and updated his information, his contact information in PACER, PACER retroactively associated all the cases he was involved with, with McKool Smith. And he's involved in dozens and dozens of cases. And what that means is now, looking back, there are dozens of cases in PACER that says that McKool Smith was involved when they weren't actually involved. And we correct that information. Again, other tools, that just take the PACER record as is, are going to make mistakes and associate firms with cases that they didn't actually have anything to do with.

Karl Harris ([08:58](#)):

Another problem that we have is ... We talked about misspelled law firms. We talked about ...

Karl Harris ([09:03](#)):

... because we talked about misspelled law firms. We talked about incorrect law firms. But a lot of times, the information's just missing. Law firms and attorneys can be missing from Pacer. Again, let me show you an example here. So here's a case. This one's actually from New Jersey. I chose another [inaudible 00:09:16] case here. You can see here's the plaintiff. It's Celgene. You can see who they were represented by. You can see, again, Quinn Emanuel. There's Saul Ewing in this case. Then here's the defendant, Dr. Reddy's Laboratories, represented by Rivkin Radler. Again, this looks pretty straightforward. This is a nice, clean docket sheet and Pacer. Tells you exactly who was involved in the case, except it doesn't actually tell you all the people that were involved in the case.

Karl Harris ([09:41](#)):

For this one, what I did, instead of looking at the complaint, I took a look at the answer that was filed in this case. So here's the actual screenshot from Pacer in the answer document, and I took a look at which attorneys were actually involved in this case. You can see that in the red highlight here. There is Greg Miller from Rivkin Radler, which you can see in the Pacer record, but there's also a few other attorneys from Rifkin Radler. Then, actually more shockingly, there's an entire law firm, Perkins Coie, that's running this case for the defendant that doesn't even appear in the Pacer record as is. That's a huge problem.

Karl Harris ([10:17](#)):

Just to fast-forward for a minute, let me show you what this case looks like in Lex Machina. We've actually added two entirely new law firms, Jones Day and Perkins Coie, that were involved in this case and 17 different attorneys that Pacer doesn't even tell you about. So, again, if you're just taking the Pacer record at face value, you get misspellings, you get things that are incorrect, and you get stuff that's just flat-out missing. If you were looking at the Pacer record in another tool, you'd have no idea Jones Day, Perkins Coie, big law firms involved in this case.

Karl Harris ([10:49](#)):

We spent a lot of time talking about Pacer in federal district court right now. State court's a whole different world. It's got all the problems I just talked about and more. There's missing attorneys. There's wrong law firms. There's missing parties. But in state court, sometimes there aren't even judges. Literally I'll show you an example here. This is from the Superior Court of California, County of Los Angeles. It's the biggest county court in the US by state filings, and there's a fair amount of information here. There's Merastar Insurance Company v. Electrolux. It's in the Compton courthouse. You can see a lot of information, like the parties. You actually do see an attorney for the defendant and the defendant. Same for the plaintiff here.

Karl Harris ([11:33](#)):

It looks pretty complete, except when you take a step back, there's no judge here in the record from the court. One of the core things about analytics is figuring out judge behavior, judge track record, judges' motion metrics practice, all those types of things. If you don't even have the judge in the case, you're not going to have analytics about those judges. You have to do what Lex Machina does, which is search in the actual documents in the deeper part of the court record to discover these judges. We know that there are other tools that just take the case docket information at face value. You don't even have judges in cases like this.

Kelli Jones ([12:11](#)):

Thanks, Karl. That's pretty eyeopening. There are some pretty big problems with the data, and let's go ahead and dig even further into the details on what Lex Machina does to ensure that our data lives up to those three pillars that you mentioned, being accurate, complete, and transparent. Starting with the first pillar, accuracy, I work with customers every day to help them pull and interpret litigation analytics to improve their case strategy and business development. I'll tell you from time to time, I've had customers ask me why the number of cases they pull for a law firm or an attorney in Pacer or that they pull through another vendor, why that number of cases differs from the number in Lex Machina. Sometimes they're trying to size up opposing counsel experience by pulling this data. Other times, they're trying to pull data on their competition or even their own firm to pitch for new business. Karl, can you explain why there would be a difference in these numbers depending on which system someone used to pull them?

Karl Harris ([13:18](#)):

Absolutely. I think some of the examples that we showed earlier help explain why. So for example, if you're a system that just pulls the record directly from Pacer or you take Pacer data at face value, you're going to get numbers that, like we said, they're inaccurate. They're incomplete. I mean, it just has missing information or incorrect information, and that's going to produce different numbers. But furthermore, if you take what we call our quick and dirty approach, where you fix some stuff and you take some stuff at face value and you kind of don't do everything, you're going to get different numbers as well. You're going to get different numbers from Pacer, and you're going to get different numbers from reality.

Karl Harris ([13:55](#)):

So what we do in Lex Machina in is like I showed earlier, and what we show now is we take a very sophisticated, a very rigorous approach to making sure that we get all of the information correct in the

litigation record. To do that, I want to revisit that Quinn Emanuel, the example from earlier to show you what that means and why that's so important.

Karl Harris ([14:15](#)):

So remember earlier, we jumped about how Quinn Emanuel is the most misspelled law firm in America. We showed you that you didn't have accurate analytics. The track record of Quinn Emanuel can be different. We show that case where Nicole Smith was mistakenly attached to Quinn Emanuel. So to set up this example, to show how this would apply in the real world, let's imagine that you are an attorney and you actually work with Quinn Emanuel. What you're doing is you're putting together a pitch to win the defense side of the business in a newly filed multi-million dollar patent litigation case. What you want to do is you want to add data to your pitch deck to showcase your firm's extensive experience in this area.

Karl Harris ([14:54](#)):

So what I'm going to do is we're going to take a look at Quinn Emanuel in Lex Machina. The way you do that is you quickly go to counsel, and remember I showed you, there's literally hundreds of different ways to spell Quinn Emanuel in Pacer? If we type in Quinn Emanuel in Lex Machina and search for it, you get one result right here, Quinn Emanuel, Urquhart Sullivan, 9,642 cases. Everything's rolled up under this one entity. So if I click on Quinn Emanuel, again, you get some overview of the firm, all of the different cases that they've handled. We're interested in patent cases. So if I want to dive right in here, I can click on the 1,464 patent cases that Quinn Emanuel handled, and now what you're seeing ... I'm not going to give you a whole tour of Lex Machina today, because we were talking about trust in data, but you're going to see a lot of data here in Lex Machina.

Karl Harris ([15:43](#)):

So, for example, on this Summary tab, you can see all the courts that Quinn Emanuel has experience with in patent cases, all the judges that Quinn Emanuel has experienced with in patent cases. Now imagine if you were using a different tool and some of these cases were mistakenly assigned to Nicole Smith. You wouldn't have an accurate overview of those courts and those judges that Quinn Emanuel has experience in front of, or imagine if your pitch in your pitch deck, you wanted to say, "Look, on average, it takes cases like this that Quinn Emanuel has handled 492 days to terminate. For the 113 that have reached trial, it takes 850 days to terminate."

Karl Harris ([16:20](#)):

What if instead some of these cases actually involved different law firms, or what if some of these cases were Nicole Smith cases instead of Quinn Emanuel cases? You couldn't rely on this data. You would be getting incorrect information when you're trying to showcase your experience, or imagine, for example, you wanted to take a look and dive into some of the \$6 billion in damages that have been awarded in these patent cases. What if Quinn Emanuel wasn't involved in these cases at all, or what if Nicole Smith was getting credit for these cases and Quinn Emanuel wasn't? Again, you wouldn't be able to rely on this information.

Karl Harris ([16:55](#)):

That's kind of the point I want to drive home here, Kelli, in this part, which is these misspellings, these little incorrect things that look small in one case, when they roll up over time, they make a huge difference. It can cause you to misrepresent the track record of a particular law firm, misrepresent

millions of dollars in damages. It's a big deal. If you don't do what Lex Machina does, you can't have trust that you're getting these things right.

Kelli Jones ([17:22](#)):

Thanks for showing an actual example in our system. I think that's really helpful. The two examples that you just focused on, correcting misspelled law firms, which, by the way, we call normalizing the data, and correcting the Pacer data when attorneys move between firms, those are two big factors in how Lex Machina works behind the scenes to increase the accuracy of our analytics. But we also do quite a bit of work in other ways, and just to give our audience a couple more examples of the types of unique steps that Lex Machina takes to correct the data so that our customers can trust it, sometimes the data we receive from a court, the wrong law firm is listed-

Kelli Jones ([18:03](#)):

... the data we received from a court. The wrong law firm is listed as representing a party. We fixed that. Other times, the court's data actually mixes up the parties. The plaintiffs should be listed as defendants and vice versa. Our data team fixes that as well. And then something that occurs quite often in federal district court cases is that the cases are classified with the wrong nature of suit or NOS code. And here's just one statistic that our data team pulled for us. 25% of Lex Machina's trademark cases were not even classified with the trademark NOS code in PACER, but those cases do show up in our collection of trademark cases because Lex Machina goes beyond NOS codes to make sure cases are classified in the correct subject matter category and even across multiple categories when applicable.

Kelli Jones ([18:54](#)):

So, hopefully we are giving everyone a better understanding of the amount of work it takes and the great attention to detail to make sure analytics are accurate. Moving on to our next pillar, it's not enough for data to be accurate. You also want to have access to all of the data that's relevant. In other words, a complete set of data. Karl, can you next elaborate on why it's important to have data that's complete and also the risks of relying on incomplete data.

Karl Harris ([19:27](#)):

Absolutely, Kelli. And to talk about this, I wanted to just remind everybody of what we covered a little bit earlier. So, remember when we showed the case in which Jones Day & Perkins' plea were completely missing, along with the 17 other attorneys? The risk here is that you're going to be having huge gaps in your data when you're trying to figure out who's involved in the case, what attorney, what law firm, what judge. What I want to do here is bring this to life in the Lex Machina product. And let's do this with an example from a different law firm, because there's so many that we can find. And for this example, let's use the law firm Hinshaw & Culbertson. So, again, let's set up a real-world use case so you can understand why this is so important.

Karl Harris ([20:10](#)):

So, let's say that you're an attorney and your client has been sued by Hinshaw in a consumer protection case. What you need to do is you want to prepare an initial case evaluation for your client, and you want to include an assessment of the plaintiff's firm, which in this case is Hinshaw, experience and track record in such cases. So, what I'm going to do now is I'm going to jump to Lex Machina and I'm going to go to the Hinshaw & Culbertson page in the product here. And actually I just made a mistake there. Let me go back. Taking a look at... One second there. I've got a special link pulled up here, so I don't want to

mess it up. So, what I'm showing here is a Hinshaw page, but this is a special page that only we can produce at Lex Machina.

Karl Harris ([21:00](#)):

And what is showing here is it's 293 federal district court cases in which only Lex Machina knows about for Hinshaw. It's the cases in which PACER would not have told you that Hinshaw was involved in the record, but that Lex Machina added to our system because of the things that we talked about. By going through and looking in the actual documents, like the complaints and the answers and the actual docket entries that are filed with the court. And so first of all, the thing to realize is that there's 293 cases that you wouldn't know about from Hinshaw if you were using a tool that just relied on the PACER record itself. That's a lot of cases. Remember our set up here, we're trying to see Hinshaw's experience in consumer protection cases. 125 of those cases are consumer protection cases. So, you're literally missing over 100 cases that are part of Hinshaw's track record if you're just relying on information from PACER.

Karl Harris ([21:56](#)):

Again, all of these different courts, all of these different judges that these cases were in front of. And you'd also be missing other types of information. For example, if you looked at what parties were involved in these cases. These are huge companies like Equifax and Baxter Healthcare, the Securities and Exchange Commission. You're missing Hinshaw's experience either representing or being opposed to some very large parties in litigation, which is a huge part of their track record. In terms of damages, you're missing out on \$214 million in damages that have changed hands in these cases. That's a lot. Again, it's hundreds of cases. It's really large companies that are involved in these cases. It's hundreds of millions of dollars in damages. And you're also missing findings.

Karl Harris ([22:46](#)):

So, again, you're interested in consumer protection here. If I take a look at consumer protection findings, which again is not a topic of this webcast, but it's only in Lex Machina you can find this type of thing, you'd be missing all of these different instances where a judge has ruled on a consumer protection finding in a case involving Hinshaw. And that's just a huge gap in the track record. And the last thing I want to close with in this section is we found some examples here. We saw Hinshaw. We saw Jones Day. We saw Perkins Coie. 293 cases for Hinshaw. This is incredibly widespread. We did some queries in our database and we figured out that Lex Machina has added attorneys to cases in over 1 million cases in PACER. And of those million cases in which attorneys have been added, there's been 2.5 million attorneys added to those cases by Lex Machina and a number of cases in which we've corrected an attorney.

Karl Harris ([23:46](#)):

Remember the example where Nicole Smith was actually not involved in the case? That's happened in over 700,000 cases. So, if you're not doing this, if you're not looking to make sure that your analytics are complete, you're literally going to make mistakes in millions and millions of cases. And we saw hundreds of cases for a particular law firm, hundreds of millions of dollars in damages, and all sorts of findings in other types of things. You're just going to have huge gaps in your data.

Kelli Jones ([24:13](#)):

It doesn't matter how many times I hear about those details. When I actually see examples in our system, it just amazes me the great lengths that our data team goes to when compiling our analytics so that our customers can have the most complete set of data possible. Going back to the beginning of our webcast for just a second, I want to mention again that it's not only attorneys and law firms that are missing from state court and federal court data. In the state courts, it's also judges. And in order to trust your litigation analytics, you have to have a complete picture of your judge's litigation experience and ruling tendencies. And one quick story I just want to share on that. A few weeks ago, I received a pretty panicked phone call from a partner who was working on a pitch and he needed to find out how long it took a particular judge in Orange County, California to get to trial. Because Lex Machina does provide analytics for state court judges, I was able to show him how to pull that timing information in just a few clicks.

Kelli Jones ([25:17](#)):

And of course he was extremely happy that Lex Machina could save the day and that he could quickly add that data point to his pitch deck. Okay, we are coming into the home stretch now. So far, we've learned that data needs to be accurate and complete in order for legal analytics to be reliable. But if you don't know where your data comes from or how it was compiled, how can you trust the analytics that are generated from that data? And even more to the point, how can you trust the conclusions that you draw from those analytics? I'd like everyone to think back for a moment to one of your grade school math classes when your teacher always asked you to show your work. Well, your analytics provider needs to do that as well. Karl, for our last section here, what does Lex Machina do that other vendors don't when it comes to showing our work and being transparent about our analytics?

Karl Harris ([26:15](#)):

Absolutely. Happy to talk about that, Kelli. And by the way, I love your story about rescuing your customer at the last minute. That's one of my favorite things to hear. It's why we get so excited about what we do here at Lex Machina. But to your point, transparency is super important in analytics because you want to have accurate and complete analytics, but also importantly, you want to trust that the analytics that you have are, in fact, accurate and complete. And the way that we do that, one of the things that's really important at Lex Machina, is they're very transparent in showing you exactly what it is that we're doing in our system and how we derive a particular analytics result. As Kelli said, it's all about showing your work. And again, rather than just talk about it, let me just show you an actual example in Lex Machina of what we mean when we say, "Show your work."

Karl Harris ([27:03](#)):

... In Lex Machina, of what we mean when we say show your work. So again, let's set up a use case. So let's say that you're working on a breach of contract case, and that's involving a partnership agreement. You are representing the partner that's being sued, and the complaint includes a particular cause of action for breach of fiduciary duty. What your client wants to know is how has the judge in your case ruled on this issue in the past. And for this example, let's say, you're in front of Judge Daniels from the Southern District of New York. So I'm going to hop into Lex Machina here. And again, remember we're in front of Judge Daniels.

Karl Harris ([27:34](#)):

So I'm going to click on courts and judges, and I'm going to type in George Daniels. And I'm going to go to this judge's page. And again, this is overview information, all the judges, current open cases, by case types, and biographical information and things like that. But again, remember, we're interested in contracts finding about fiduciary duty. So I'm going to click on federal district court cases, and I'm going to go over here. I'm going to click on finds. But before I do that, just as a reminder, what we're doing here, we want to look for how this judge has ruled a breach of fiduciary duty, but also we're wanting to show how Lex Machina shows our work.

Karl Harris ([28:13](#)):

So one thing you can see here is that every single data point in the product is clickable. You can always click in a Lex Machina data point to see the underlying cases, or the underlying data that produce a particular result. That's kind of like, at a basic level, that's what we mean by show your work.

Karl Harris ([28:31](#)):

So what I'm going to do for this example is I'm going to click on findings, and I'm going to look at contracts findings. And again, there's all sorts of different contracts findings. Just a reminder, this now on this webcast is about that Lex Machina has this type of information about what exactly the judge ruled on in different types of contracts findings, but we're interested in particular on breach of fiduciary duty. And because we've been sued in this case, what we really want to know is how do you get a finding of no breach of fiduciary duty, which is right here at the bottom. And you can see here, here are the seven times that no breach of fiduciary duty has been ruled on by Judge Daniels in these federal district court cases.

Karl Harris ([29:10](#)):

And what I can do here is I can click on this number seven, and what I see here is exactly those seven cases, when this has happened. So two things to keep in mind here. First of all, it's not just that we can give you the high level statistic of how many times this judge has found a breach of fiduciary duty in a case. You can start to do your research to see exactly which cases those are, and how that particular result was arrived at. But the second thing to keep in mind is, in the spirit of showing your work, these are those seven cases. And if I dive into one of them here, let's pick the top one, Johnson versus Nextel, you can see all the Lex Machina information, but I want to show you exactly where we derived this information.

Karl Harris ([29:56](#)):

This particular one was on an order regarding dismissal. So if I click apply here, this is the actual document. The docket entry that contains the document where this result was arrived at. And I know that if I click in here, then I can dive all the way down to page five of this particular document, and you can see that this is the section where the judge ruled on breach of fiduciary duty. And this is what I mean by show your work. Just as a reminder, we wanted to know what's going on in front with this judge in breach of fiduciary duty and contracts cases. I looked at the judge, I dove all the way down into just those findings that dealt with breach of fiduciary duty, and now I'm looking at an individual document with the actual language written by the judge, where that judge ruled on this particular issue in this particular case. This is what we mean by showing your work.

Karl Harris ([30:46](#)):

You can go all the way down to the actual order, issued by the judge, to see where we're getting this information. And know, by the way, that also helps you in your legal practice, because now you know, when this judge rules on breaching fiduciary duty, what do they write about? What are they going to do? How can you win? How can you get that result for your client? And how can you trust that the way you're doing that is going to be accurate and complete, that's because Lex Machina data is transparent.

Kelli Jones ([31:12](#)):

Wow. You have shown us so much today in terms of what it takes to make litigation analytics accurate, complete, and transparent. And I want everyone to know that those are just a few examples of the many, many things that Lex Machina does to strengthen our data integrity. Given all the ground that we've covered, Karl, could you sum up what you'd like our audience to take away from this webcast?

Karl Harris ([31:36](#)):

Yeah. Absolutely. Thanks, Kelli. So first of all, one of the things that I like to say is, if you don't remember anything else from this entire webcast, just remember this, Lex Machina is legal analytics, and legal analytics helps you win. But with respect to this particular webcast, a key takeaway, a key conclusion is that, at Lex Machina, we're laser-focused on doing legal analytics right. And in order to do that, you've got a glimpse in what goes into the work behind the scenes here, but in order to do what we do, you have to be proactive. You have to be rigorous. You have to build specific technology, to make sure that your analytics are accurate and complete.

Karl Harris ([32:12](#)):

And one of the ways that we give you the ability to trust that our analytics are accurate and complete is that we're transparent in the way that we produce these results. And the last thing that I want you to remember is that analytics is all that we do. We are Lex Machina. We are legal analytics. We created the space. We've been doing it for 10 years. We take a tremendous amount of pride, not just Lex Machina's product, but in legal analytics generally. And that's why we're so focused on this. That's why our data is the most trusted data in the industry.

Kelli Jones ([32:41](#)):

Thanks so much. It has been invaluable to hear, directly from you as our CEO, what makes Lex Machina stand apart from the other analytics providers. And I know we're a few minutes over time, but I do want to at least address one question here. A good one came in, asking what other types of documentation do you provide to help users understand our systems analytics?

Karl Harris ([33:08](#)):

That's a great question. I'm glad that one came in. Because the reason is that it's also very much related to transparency. We have transparency, what I just showed, in terms of showing your work. But another way that Lex Machina has transparency is we have very complete rigorous documentation about what exactly we do and why we do it. And actually, just to show you that, I'm going to hop back into the product here.

Karl Harris ([33:33](#)):

So, if you're in Lex Machina homepage, and you go to the help center, and you click on documentation, learn about Lex Machina, you can see here a description of exactly what the analytics are that we produce, what the definitions are there. And it's very complete. We've actually won an award for the best documentation for any legal tech analytics company. And just to give you an example here, if you're looking at, let's just choose employment, and you wanted to know how does Lex Machina define an employment case. This is an exact description of how we define an employment case, with the exact NOS codes and things like that. And you can go through and you can get all sorts of information about exactly how Lex Machina produces analytics, how to interpret them, like timing events and things like that. And I think that's part and parcel with transparency, is explaining exactly what it is that we're doing and why.

Kelli Jones ([34:28](#)):

Thanks. We'll go ahead and end here. And I just want to give one final note that we've only covered a fraction of the ways that Lex Machina is used by our customers. There are so many different use cases for the different types of customers we have, both law firms and in-house counsel. If you'd like to see a demo of Lex Machina that's specifically tailored to your firm or company's litigation, we'll be sending an email out later today, just respond to that note and we'll get that set up for you. Again, I want to thank Karl for his insight today, and thank everyone for attending.