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How to Search Like a Pro
What is the Difference Between a Search and a Directory?

- According to Yahoo! Help
- Additional clarification provided by DirectoryOne.com
  - Some search engines and directories include both types of indexes, and are known as "hybrids".
  - Some examples of search engines are Google, Gigablast, and Alltheweb.
  - The best known directories are Yahoo, Business.com, Dmoz.org, and Looksmart.
  - Directories, unlike search engines, use a tree hierarchic structure to organize their database.
- Levitt and Davis provide additional information about portals and directories versus search engines as it relates to legal research
How Do Search Engines Really Work?

- Franklin provides a nice description of how Internet search engines work.
- Internet search engines are special sites on the Web that are designed to help people find information stored on other sites. There are differences in the ways various search engines work, but they all perform three basic tasks:
  - They search the Internet -- or select pieces of the Internet -- based on important words.
  - They keep an index of the words they find, and where they find them.
  - They allow users to look for words or combinations of words found in that index.
How Do Search Engines Really Work?

- Early search engines held an index of a few hundred thousand pages and documents, and received maybe one or two thousand inquiries each day.
- Today, a top search engine will index hundreds of millions of pages, and respond to tens of millions of queries per day.
- "Spiders" take a Web page's content and create key search words that enable online users to find pages they're looking for.
- When a spider is building its lists, the process is called Web crawling.
Web spider

Builds index based on its own system of weighting

Builds list of words and notes where they were found

Encodes the data to save space

Stores data for users to access
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Franklin describes the various options for creating search strategies using Boolean logic:

- Searching through an index involves a user building a **query** and submitting it through the search engine.
- The query can be quite simple, a single word at minimum.
- Building a more complex query requires the use of **Boolean operators** that allow you to refine and extend the terms of the search.
Learn Boolean Logic

The Boolean operators most often seen are:

- **AND** – All the terms joined by "AND" must appear in the pages or documents. Some search engines substitute the operator "+"] for the word AND.
- **OR** – At least one of the terms joined by "OR" must appear in the pages or documents.
- **NOT** – The term or terms following "NOT" must not appear in the pages or documents. Some search engines substitute the operator "−" for the word NOT.
- **FOLLOWED BY** – One of the terms must be directly followed by the other.
- **NEAR** – One of the terms must be within a specified number of words of the other.
- **Quotation Marks** – The words between the quotation marks are treated as a phrase, and that phrase must be found within the document or file.
Learn Boolean Logic

- Some databases and search engines may substitute symbols and numbers for words:
  - Proximity connectors
  - Wildcards can be indicated by a question mark (?) to replace one character before, within or after a search term and the asterisk symbol (*) to replace one or more characters before, within or after a search term.
  - Parentheses should be used when creating complex searches.
  - Many databases and search engines will use field code or tags that let you restrict your search to just author, title, etc.
- Whatever search engine or database you are using, you will want to become familiar with the particular words, abbreviations and symbols it uses so that you can effectively increase the relevance of your search retrieval.
**Boolean Operator OR**

- Used to retrieve a set in which each citation contains *at least one* of the search terms.
- Use OR when you want to pull together articles on similar topics.
- **Example:** *football OR hockey OR soccer*
**Boolean Operator AND**

- Used to retrieve a set in which each citation contains *all* search terms.
- **Example:** *salmonella AND hamburger*
Boolean Operator NOT

- Retrieves a set from which citations to articles containing specified search terms following the NOT operator are eliminated.
- **Example**: *arthritis NOT letter*
Gil provides an interesting article on titled The 10 Best Search Engines of 2014:

1. Dogpile
2. Ask (aka “Ask Jeeves”)
3. Duck Duck Go
4. Google
5. Bing
6. Yippy (formerly “Clusty”)
7. Webopedia
8. Yahoo!
9. The Internet Archive
10. Mahalo
Search Engines That Think: The Future of Searching

On the other hand, there are newer types of search strategies being developed to more accurately capture what the user is searching for.

Franklin reports on two opportunities that show promise in the future:
- Concept-based searching
- Natural-language queries.
Massive amounts of information are now being generated in digital form in a wide variety of formats and file sizes.

The era of “big data” is clearly upon us. And that is where we will turn to technology to help solve the problem.

Data mining, algorithms, tags, etc. are all being developed and tested, by entrepreneurs and vendors as well as by faculty researchers in my own school. (See Mathew Palakal, Ph.D., http://soic.iupui.edu/people/mathew-palakal/, accessed 11/13/14)

Some articles about big data in the context of law are listed in your seminar materials.
Research Interests

**Biomedical Text Mining:** The biomedical literature databases continue to grow rapidly with vital information that is important for conducting sound biomedical research. BioMap is an attempt to create a scalable knowledgebase of biological relationships extracted from vast amount of biomedical literature data. The development of BioMap system addresses several innovative research issues related to knowledge discovery from literature documents and real-time, interactive access of this knowledge. Specific problems that are being investigated are: discovering *explicit, implicit* and *directional* relationships among biological entities from abstracts and full text documents; discovering both explicit and implicit protein-protein interactions and computationally validating these interactions; and, obtaining novel pathways associated with specific diseases in question. Protein-protein, gene-protein, disease-drug interactions are examples of biological associations that are automatically discovered from large number of literature documents. BioMap can discover interactions in user specified biomedical problem domains such as inflammatory diseases, regenerative biology, cancer, etc., and provide a user-centric view of the knowledge that are discovered.

**Intelligent Information Management Systems:** There is a critical need for innovative information management and knowledge discovery tools to sift through vast volumes of heterogeneous data from various information sources. This project looks into developing Intelligent Software Systems that can integrate information resources and extract embedded knowledge from these information sources.

Related News

- October 8, 2013
  Dr. Davide Bolchini Receives Google Faculty Research Award
- June 13, 2013
The Power of the “Find” Function to Scan Web Pages Quickly

- The Find command [CTRL] + [F] can be a powerful tool because it enables you to search for information within a specific website.
- The process is very easy.
- Once you have located a website that you believe may have the information you want, simple use the pull-down menu under Edit and select Find on this page.
- You will be provided with a search box to type your keywords.
You can see that the word I searched for, “data,” is highlighted in yellow. This can be a quick way to scan large amounts of information. It is a great device for finding that “needle in a haystack”. Fortunately, most websites now provide their own search boxes (typically at the top right of the screen), which is even more convenient, and it will search the entire website, rather than just one page at a time.
If I search “forensics” on Kroll Ontrack, here is what I locate.
The equivalent of a Find command is also available in other software. Rather than print and review an entire PDF document, you can use the Find feature on the top left side of the screen. For example, if I have a question about whether a lawyer can benefit from a client’s literary rights, I will open the PDF version of the Indiana Rules of Professional Conduct. I merely use the pull-down menu under Edit, select Find and then fill out the text box at the top of the screen. I can then see all instances of the keyword “literary” within the document and move seamlessly to each of them by clicking on Next or Previous.
Indiana Rules of Court
Rules of Professional Conduct

Including Amendments made through January 1, 2013
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the advice of independent legal counsel on the transaction; and

(3) the client gives informed consent, in a writing signed by the client, to the essential terms of the transaction and the lawyer's role in the transaction, including whether the lawyer is representing the client in the transaction.

(b) A lawyer shall not use information relating to representation of a client to the disadvantage of the client unless the client gives informed consent, except as permitted or required by these Rules.

(c) A lawyer shall not solicit any substantial gift from a client, including a testamentary gift, or prepare on behalf of a client an instrument giving the lawyer or a person related to the lawyer any substantial gift unless the lawyer or other recipient of the gift is related to the client. For purposes of this paragraph, related persons include a spouse, child, grandchild, parent, grandparent or other relative or individual with whom the lawyer or the client maintains a close, familial relationship.

(d) Prior to the conclusion of representation of a client, a lawyer shall not make or negotiate an agreement giving the lawyer literary or media rights to a portrayal or account based in substantial part on information relating to the representation.

(e) A lawyer shall not provide financial assistance to a client in connection with pending or contemplated litigation, except that:

1. a lawyer may advance court costs and expenses of litigation, the repayment of which may be contingent on the outcome of the matter; and

2. a lawyer representing an indigent client may pay court costs and expenses of litigation on behalf of the client.

(f) A lawyer shall not accept compensation for representing a client from one other than the client unless:

1. the client gives informed consent;

2. there is no interference with the lawyer's independence of professional judgment or with the client-lawyer relationship; and
Other versions of PDF readers may use a binoculars symbol on the left-hand side or the document or a pull-down menu at the top.
Managing Bookmarks

- There is no need to continually re-invent the wheel when conducting legal research or competitive intelligence on the Internet.
- One of the best tools available is the “bookmarks” or Favorites (Microsoft Explorer) feature of website browsers.
- If you find a website that is useful, simply add it to your list.
- You can organize bookmarks into a variety of categories or folders, which is particularly helpful when your list contains more websites than you can easily remember.
Managing Bookmarks

- As time goes on, you may notice that you have accumulated a long list of bookmarks or Favorites.
- It is useful to periodically weed through and delete bookmarks that you are no longer using.
- It is also a good idea to periodically go through your list and make sure all of the websites are still in operation.
- Delete those that are no longer active or update your list when the URLs change.
- Re–alphabetizing your list is also a good habit to get into.
- You can also place your most–used bookmarks onto a Favorites bar.
- Another strategy is to have two separate lists.
  - The top list can be for websites that you will use again and again.
  - The bottom list can be for websites that you are only using for a short–term project that can be deleted later.
- You can also organize your bookmarks into folders.
Managing Bookmarks

- To keep my list of Favorites at a manageable size, I try to find very comprehensive websites that are likely to have links to other sites I might be most interested in.
- For example, if I can get to chapters of an organization through its national headquarters website, I will add the national headquarters website to my Favorites.
Effectively Using RSS Feeds, Blogs and Podcasts

- Free RSS reader programs are available on the Internet.
- See the following websites for information, free RSS readers and reviews:
Some helpful RSS feeds covering legal topics include:

- Automobile recalls listed by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration from [http://auto-recalls.justia.com](http://auto-recalls.justia.com)
- U.S. government provides dozens of RSS feeds, arranged under categories such as defense and international relations, education and employment, environment, energy and agriculture, family, home and community, health, money, public safety and law, and science and technology – see [http://www.usa.gov/rss/index.shtml](http://www.usa.gov/rss/index.shtml), accessed 11/13/14.
  - Daily decisions: [http://www.law.cornell.edu/nyctap/rss/nyctap_today.rss](http://www.law.cornell.edu/nyctap/rss/nyctap_today.rss)
  - Recent decisions: [http://www.law.cornell.edu/nyctap/rss/nyctap_recent.rss](http://www.law.cornell.edu/nyctap/rss/nyctap_recent.rss)
- Legislative developments: [http://www.govtrack.us/](http://www.govtrack.us/)
There are a number of search engines for blogs. For example:

There are also blogs for law, sometimes referred to as blawgs.

- An index of blawgs is available through Justia’s BlawgSearch. ([http://blawgserach.justia.com](http://blawgserach.justia.com), accessed 11/13/14)
- In addition, you can try the following websites:
See also the ABA’s Blawg 100, the annual ranking of that year’s top legal blawgs:


The nominations for the 2014 ranking were due in August.

The 2014 Annual Blawg 100 was just published in the November 2014 ABA Journal.

One blawg that is always at the top of the list is myShingle.com, by Carolyn Elefant, who is also an excellent speaker. (http://myshingle.com/, accessed 11/13/14).
Podcasts

According to Wikipedia, ‘[a] podcast is a digital medium consisting of an episodic series of audio, video, radio, PDF, or ePub files subscribed to and downloaded through web syndication or streamed online to a computer or mobile device.” (Podcast, Wikipedia, http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Podcast, accessed 11/13/14)

Podcasting is very popular in educational settings, especially with the increased use of mobile devices.

I record and upload a weekly podcast for all of my courses at the School of Informatics and Computing, which students really enjoy and which is a nice complement to text-based information.
Law–Related Podcasts

- Allpodcasts.com:  [http://www.allpodcasts.com](http://www.allpodcasts.com)
- Podcasts from the American Bar Association through many of its sections, for example:  [http://www.americanbar.org/portals/solo_home/cle/podcasts.html](http://www.americanbar.org/portals/solo_home/cle/podcasts.html) (for solo practitioners)
- Government podcasts:  [http://freegovinfo.info/node/174](http://freegovinfo.info/node/174)
Other Information Sources

- Of course, there are additional opportunities to follow trends and capture up-to-the-minute information and events through Twitter and other social media sites.
- Also, many people may prefer to watch a video rather than read or listen to information.
  - Thus, YouTube can be an excellent source of information.
  - YouTube may be especially useful for training, for example, if you are trying to learn a new piece of software.
  - In one of my legal informatics courses, we teach SmartDraw software for use in courtroom presentations.
  - YouTube has many tutorials available on how to use this software.
Roper’s Classification of Search Engines

- Individual search engines, such as Google
- Specialty search engines, such as FindLaw
- Metasearch engines, such as Metacrawler or Dogpile
- Subject directories, such as Yahoo
- Library gateways, such as Infomine (http://infomine.ucr.edu/, accessed 11/13/14) or the Internet Public Library (http://www.ipl.org/, accessed 11/13/14)
- Subject-specific databases, such as PubMed (http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed, accessed 11/13/14) or any of the databases offered through INSPIRE. (http://www.in.gov/library/inspire/faq.html, accessed 11/13/14).
Levitt and Davis

- Justia: http://www.justia.com
- FindLaw: www.findlaw.com
- HR.org (formerly Hieros Gamos) http://hg.org
- LLRX.com: http://www.llrx.com
- Nolo Press: http://www.nolo.com
- VISALAW.com: http://www.visalaw.com
**Additional Options**

- **One of my favorites is the Legal Information Institute:** [www.law.cornell.edu](http://www.law.cornell.edu)
- Washburn University’s WashLaw: [www.washlaw.edu](http://www.washlaw.edu)
- CataLaw: [www.catalaw.com](http://www.catalaw.com)
- Public Legal – Internet Legal Research Group: [www.ilrg.com](http://www.ilrg.com)
- WWW Virtual Library: [http://vlib.org/admin/AboutVL](http://vlib.org/admin/AboutVL)
- Virtual Chase: [http://www.virtualchase.com](http://www.virtualchase.com)
- All Law: [http://www.alllaw.com](http://www.alllaw.com)
- TheLaw.net: [http://www.thelaw.net](http://www.thelaw.net)
Electronic Discovery

- Many of my research projects for presentations and publications involve electronic discovery.
- Whenever I have a question regarding electronic discovery, the first place I start is a review of the Electronic Discovery Reference Model (EDRM) and the information provided on the EDRM website. (EDRM, http://www.edrm.net/, accessed 11/12/14)
- By visualizing the steps in handling a piece of electronically-stored information (ESI) from the left-hand side of the model (which starts with proper information governance) to the presentation of the ESI in court, the EDRM also reminds me of the potential for ethical breaches at each step.
Another excellent resource for cases, statutes, guidelines and other materials for electronic discovery is the K&L Gates Electronic Discovery Law website. ([http://www.ediscoverylaw.com/](http://www.ediscoverylaw.com/), accessed 11/12/14)

The website contains a very helpful database of over 2000 cases that is searchable by keyword as well as having a number of pre-determined case attributes. ([http://www.ediscoverylaw.com/e-discovery-case-database/](http://www.ediscoverylaw.com/e-discovery-case-database/), accessed 11/12/14)

Many of the cases have very short summaries that include the case citation, the nature of the case, the electronic data involved, the electronic discovery issue and searchable attributes.

A number of the cases have more robust summaries that also may have links to additional materials.
Court Declines to Preclude “Eyes On” Review for Privilege

By K&L Gates on November 29th, 2014
Posted in CASE SUMMARIES


In this case, the parties made an effort to “craft an agreement respecting the handling of attorney-client and work product information inadvertently disclosed,” but disagreed regarding the proper procedure for identifying privileged information. Defendants sought to “encourage the incorporation and employment of time-saving computer-assisted privilege review, while Plaintiffs propose[all] that the order limit privilege review to what a computer can accomplish, disallowing linear (aka ‘eyes on’) privilege review altogether.” The court agreed with the defendants and entered an order allowing both computer-assisted and linear review, but invited the plaintiffs to file a second motion should the defendants’ methodologies result in unacceptable delays.
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The 2014 ABA Journal Blawg 100: Vote for Your Favorites Now!

By K&L Gates on November 29th, 2014
E-DISCOVERY CASE DATABASE

Search more than 2000 cases collected from state and federal courts involving electronic discovery issues by keyword, or by any combination of 30 different case attributes, including on-site inspection, format of production, allegations of spoliation, or involving data that is "not reasonably accessible," etc.

CLICK HERE to access the database, free of charge.
Electronic Discovery Case Database

K&L Gates maintains and continually updates a database containing over 2,000 electronic discovery cases collected from state and federal jurisdictions around the United States. This database is searchable by keyword, as well as by any combination of 31 different case attributes, e.g., on-site inspection, allegations of spoliation, motion for a preservation order, etc. Each search will produce a list of relevant cases, including a brief description of the nature and disposition of each case, the electronic evidence involved and a link to a more detailed case summary if available. For an alphabetical list of all cases contained within the database, click the search button at the bottom of the page.

Please select one or more of the following case attributes and/or enter keyword search terms below:

E-Discovery Rules

- FRCP 26(b)(2)(B) "Not Reasonably Accessible"
- FRCP 37(e) Safe Harbor
- FRCP 34(b) Procedure or Format
- FRCP 26(b)(2)(C) Limitations
- FRCP 26(b)(5)(B) or PRE 502
- Local Court Rule, Form or Guideline

Context

- TRO or Preliminary Injunction
- Motion to Compel
- Motion for Sanctions

- Motion for Preservation Order
- Motion for Protective Order
- Early Conference or Discovery Plan
- Third-Party Discovery

Particular Issues

- Data Preservation
- Records Retention Policy
- Backup Media Recycling
- Backup Tapes
- Deleted Data Recovery
- Admissibility

- Mirror Images
- On-Site Inspection
- Keyword Searches
- Format of Production
- Metadata
- Adequacy of Search/Identification or Collection (added 03/13)

Enter keyword search terms:

Limit results to citations with case summaries only

Search  Reset
Electronic Discovery Case Database

K&L Gates maintains and continually updates a database containing over 2,000 electronic discovery cases collected from state and federal jurisdictions around the United States. This database is searchable by keyword, as well as by any combination of 31 different case attributes, e.g., on-site inspection, allegations of spoliation, motion for a preservation order, etc. Each search will produce a list of relevant cases, including a brief description of the nature and disposition of each case, the electronic evidence involved and a link to a more detailed case summary if available. For an alphabetical list of all cases contained within the database, click the search button at the bottom of the page.

Please select one or more of the following case attributes and/or enter keyword search terms below:

E-Discovery Rules
- FRCP 26(b)(2)(B) "Not Reasonably Accessible"
- FRCP 34(b) Procedure or Format
- FRCP 26(b)(3)(B) or FRER 502
- FRCP 26(b)(2)(C) Limitations
- Local Court Rule, Form or Guideline

Context
- TRO or Preliminary Injunction
- Motion to Compel
- Motion for Sanctions
- Motion for Preservation Order
- Motion for Protective Order
- Early Conference or Discovery Plan
- Third-Party Discovery

Particular Issues
- Data Preservation
- Records Retention Policy
- Backup Media Recycling
- Backup Tapes
- Deleted Data Recovery
- Admissibility
- Mirror Images
- On-Site Inspection
- Keyword Searches
- Format of Production
- Metadata
- Adequacy of Search/Identification or Collection (Added 03/13)
- Cost Shifting
- Spoliation
- Court-Appointed Expert
- Privilege or Work Product
- Lack of Cooperation or Inaccurate Representations
- Computer Assisted Review

Enter keyword search terms:
Facebook

Limit results to citations with case summaries only
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Electronic Discovery Case Database

K&L Gates maintains and continually updates a database containing over 2,000 electronic discovery cases collected from state and federal jurisdictions around the United States. This database is searchable by keyword, as well as by any combination of 31 different case attributes, e.g., on-site inspection, allegations of spoliation, motion for a preservation order, etc. Each search will produce a list of relevant cases, including a brief description of the nature and disposition of each case, the electronic evidence involved and a link to a more detailed case summary if available. For an alphabetical list of all cases contained within the database, click the search button at the bottom of the page.

| Case Citation: | Bass v. Miss Porter's School, 2009 WL 3724968 (D. Conn. Oct. 27, 2009) |
| Nature of Case: | Claims arising from alleged bullying and harassment of private school student |
| Electronic Data Involved: | Facebook |
| E-Discovery Issue: | Upon in camera review of all documents produced to plaintiff by Facebook pursuant to subpoena, and in response to plaintiff’s objection to producing all such documents on the grounds that many were irrelevant and immaterial, court found “no meaningful distinction” between the pages produced and the pages withheld and stated that “Facebook usage depicts a snapshot of the user’s relationship and state of mind at the time of the content’s posting” and that “relevance is more in the eye of the beholder” such that production should not be limited to plaintiff’s determination of what may be “reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence” and ordered the production of all documents produced by Facebook to defendants, rather than the smaller subset previously provided |
| Case Summary: | Not Available |
| Attributes: | Motion to Compel; Third Party Discovery |

| Case Citation: | Crippin v. Christian Audiger, Inc., 717 F.Supp.2d 965 (C.D. Cal. 2010) |
| Nature of Case: | Breach of contract, copyright infringement, breach of covenant of good faith and fair dealing |
| Electronic Data Involved: | Messages from social networking sites |
| E-Discovery Issue: | Upon holding that the social networking sites at issue (Facebook, MySpace, Media Temple) were subject to the Stored Communications Act, court quashed subpoenas seeking private messages but, as to subpoenas seeking messages posted to plaintiff's Facebook wall and MySpace comments, remanded for further investigation of plaintiff's privacy settings as to these messages because the Stored Communications Act is not applicable to information readily available to the general public |
| Case Summary: | Available |
| Attributes: | Third Party Discovery |

| Nature of Case: | Personal Injury |
| Electronic Data Involved: | Social network content (Facebook, MySpace, Friendster, Flickr, etc.) |
| E-Discovery Issue: | Court acknowledged the discoverability of social media content but reasoned that “[i]n order to obtain a closed or private social media account by a court order for the subscriber to execute an authorization for their release, the adversary must show with some credible facts that the adversary subscriber has posted information or
Pursuant to Stored Communications Act, Court Quashes Subpoena for Private Messages, Remands for Further Consideration of Facebook Wall and MySpace Comments

By K&L Gates on June 11th, 2010
Posted in CASE SUMMARIES


Defendant subpoenaed several social networking sites seeking disclosure of plaintiff’s subscriber information and communications relevant to the underlying dispute. Plaintiff sought to quash the subpoenas arguing that such disclosure would violate the Stored Communications Act ("SCA"). The magistrate judge denied plaintiff's motion to quash upon finding the SCA was inapplicable. Plaintiff moved for reconsideration of the order.

Granting reconsideration, the district court judge found the SCA was applicable to the social networking websites at issue (Facebook, MySpace, Media Temple) and quashed the subpoenas to the extent they sought private messages. However, the court recognized a distinction between strictly private messages and those posted more openly, such as on plaintiff’s Facebook wall or MySpace comments. Specifically, the court noted the inapplicability of the SCA to information that is readily available to the general public. Thus, a review of plaintiff’s privacy settings was necessary to determine the extent of access allowed to his Facebook wall and MySpace comments (although the court recognized that the court would have to conduct a review of plaintiff’s privacy settings before the reconsideration order took effect).
**Electronic Discovery Case Database**

K&L Gates maintains and continually updates a database containing over 2,000 electronic discovery cases collected from state and federal jurisdictions around the United States. This database is searchable by keyword, as well as by any combination of 31 different case attributes, e.g., on-site inspection, allegations of spoliation, motion for a preservation order, etc. Each search will produce a list of relevant cases, including a brief description of the nature and disposition of each case, the electronic evidence involved and a link to a more detailed case summary if available. For an alphabetical list of all cases contained within the database, click the search button at the bottom of the page.

*Please select one or more of the following case attributes and/or enter keyword search terms below:*

**E-Discovery Rules**
- FRCP 26(b)(2)(B) "Not Reasonably Accessible"
- FRCP 37(e) Safe Harbor
- FRCP 34(b) Procedure or Format
- FRCP 26(b)(2)(C) Limitations
- FRCP 26(b)(3)(B) or FRE 502
- Local Court Rule, Form or Guideline

**Context**
- TRO or Preliminary Injunction
- Motion to Compel
- Motion for Sanctions
- Motion for Preservation Order
- Motion for Protective Order
- Early Conference or Discovery Plan
- Third-Party Discovery

**Particular Issues**
- Data Preservation
- Records Retention Policy
- Backup Media Recycling
- Backup Tapes
- Deleted Data Recovery
- Admissibility
- Mirror Images
- On-Site Inspection
- Keyword Searches
- Format of Production
- Metadata
- Adequacy of Search/Identification or Collection (added 03/13)
- Cost Shifting
- Spoliation
- Court-Appointed Expert
- Privilege or Work Product
- Lack of Cooperation or Inaccurate Representations
- Computer Assisted Review

**Enter keyword search terms:**

2014

**Limit results to citations with case summaries only**

Search  Reset
Electronic Discovery Case Database

K&L Gates maintains and continually updates a database containing over 2,000 electronic discovery cases collected from state and federal jurisdictions around the United States. This database is searchable by keyword, as well as by any combination of 31 different case attributes, e.g., on-site inspection, allegations of spoliation, motion for a preservation order, etc. Each search will produce a list of relevant cases, including a brief description of the nature and disposition of each case, the electronic evidence involved and a link to a more detailed case summary if available. For an alphabetical list of all cases contained within the database, click the search button at the bottom of the page.

Records 1 - 10 of 59

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Citation</th>
<th>Nature of Case</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Electronic Data Involved: Documents concerning plaintiffs’ liabilities and financial condition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Discovery Issue: Where there was no evidence that plaintiff ever instituted litigation hold, and documents were either discarded during plaintiff’s office move or lost due to server failure and/or corruption, court found that a fair reading of the record overall indicated that plaintiff’s failure to preserve was at most negligent and not in bad faith, and that no sanctions were warranted given that the alleged relevance of the missing documents appeared purely speculative and conclusory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Summary: Not Available</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attributes: Motion for Sanctions; Data Preservation; Records Retention Policy; Spoliation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Citation</th>
<th>Nature of Case</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Electronic Data Involved: Audio recordings of telephone calls and related data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Discovery Issue: Considering plaintiffs’ motion for class certification, court discussed Omni’s efforts to preserve call records and recordings and the apparently accidental loss of related call detail records and attendant search functionality; plaintiffs argued that any difficulties in identifying class members was due to Omni’s destruction of data that could have been used to search call recordings, and that it would unfair to allow such difficulties to prejudice class certification; court ultimately certified class and ruled that, to the extent Omni argued that “identifying class members” may be difficult, those concerns were more properly addressed after class certification</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Summary: Not Available</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attributes: Data Preservation; Records Retention Policy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Another Milestone Passes: Judicial Conference Approves Federal Civil Rules Amendments
By K&L Gates on September 17th, 2014
Posted in FEDERAL RULES AMENDMENTS, NEWS & UPDATES

As reported by the National Law Journal (subscription required), the Judicial Conference has approved proposed changes to the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. No revisions to the proposals were reported. The proposals will now go before the United States Supreme Court for review and, if approved, will take effect on December 1, 2015, absent any...

Continue Reading

Committee on Rules of Practice and Procedure ("Standing Committee") Approves Proposed Amendments to Federal Rules of Civil Procedure
By K&L Gates on June 5th, 2014
Posted in FEDERAL RULES AMENDMENTS, NEWS & UPDATES

Last week, the Committee on Rules of Practice and Procedure (the "Standing Committee") approved proposed amendments to the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, including the "Duke Rules Package," addressing Rules 1, 4, 16, 20, 30, 31, 33, and 34 and a rewritten version of Rule 37(e), addressing preservation. The revised procedures would...

Continue Reading

Proposed Rule 37(e) Draft Committee Note Now Available
By K&L Gates on May 12th, 2014
Posted in FEDERAL RULES AMENDMENTS, NEWS & UPDATES

As previously discussed on this blog, proposed amendments to the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure were recently approved by the Advisory Committee on Civil Rules for submission to the Committee on Rules of Practice and Procedure (the "Standing Committee"). At the time of approval, the Committee Note for Proposed Rule 37(e) remained "under construction." The...
Local Rules, Forms and Guidelines of United States District Courts Addressing E-Discovery Issues

Many United States District Courts now require compliance with special local rules, forms or guidelines addressing the discovery of electronically stored information. Below is a collection of those local rules, forms and guidelines, with links to the relevant materials. Please note also that many individual judges and magistrate judges have created their own forms or have crafted their own preferred protocols for e-discovery. These are generally available on the website of the individual judge or magistrate judge and care should be taken to ensure you are aware of any such forms or guidelines in any court you may appear in.

District of Alaska
Local Rules (Civil)
Local Form 28(f): Scheduling and Planning Conference Report
Local Rule 16.1 Pre-Trial Procedures (requiring use of Local Form 28(f) or one substantially similar)

Eastern and Western Districts of Arkansas

Northern District of California
Guidelines for the Discovery of Electronically Stored Information
ESI Checklist for use during the Rule 26(f) meet and confer process
Model Stipulated Order Re: the Discovery of Electronically Stored Information
Standing Order for All Judges of the Northern District of California
A second excellent resource for materials on electronic discovery is the Kroll Ontrack. ([http://www.krollontrack.com/](http://www.krollontrack.com/), accessed 11/12/14)

This website includes blogs on electronic discovery and data recovery, white papers, case studies and industry news.

It also offers a searchable database of electronic discovery cases that complements what is provided by K&L Gates and is searchable by keyword as well as by e-discovery-related topics and jurisdiction. ([http://www.ediscovery.com/pulse/case-law/](http://www.ediscovery.com/pulse/case-law/), accessed 11/12/14)

I find it comforting when both of these databases provide summaries of the same case, but also they may cover different cases, which broadens my collection of cases.
Critical ediscovery case law at your fingertips, in-hand, under your thumb.

Ediscovery case law summaries by topic, jurisdiction or keyword - you pick.

Stay on top of the latest ediscovery law developments with Kroll Ontrack’s ediscovery case law summaries.

The ediscovery law summaries are a collection of the most salient ediscovery orders and opinions issued in courts across the country. Each month, the most important points of ediscovery law are added to this database.

Select from a list  All Topics  All Jurisdictions

-- OR --

Search via keyword  Keyword  Search
Ediscovery case law summaries by topic, jurisdiction or keyword - you pick.

Stay on top of the latest ediscovery law developments with Kroll Ontrack’s ediscovery case law summaries.

The ediscovery law summaries are a collection of the most salient ediscovery orders and opinions issued in courts across the country. Each month, the most important points of ediscovery law are added to this database.

Defendant Entitled toAppointment of Special Master Even though Federal Court Erroneously Admitted “Russian Equivalent of Facebook” Into Evidence


Keywords: social media, Facebook

Defendant Ordered to Keep Discovery Promises despite Plaintiff’s Inability to do the Same
Ediscovery case law summaries by topic, jurisdiction or keyword - you pick.

Stay on top of the latest ediscovery law developments with Kroll Ontrack’s ediscovery case law summaries.

The ediscovery law summaries are a collection of the most salient ediscovery orders and opinions issued in courts across the country. Each month, the most important points of ediscovery law are added to this database.

- Select from a list: All Topics
- Search via keyword: social media

Defendant Entitled to New Trial After Admitted “Russian Equivalent of Facebook” into Evidence

United States v. Vayner, 2014 WL 4942227 (2d Cir.)

Keywords: social media, Facebook

Defendant Ordered to Keep Discovering Documents Despite Disability to do the Same
Ediscovery case law summaries by topic, jurisdiction or keyword - you pick.

Stay on top of the latest ediscovery law developments with Kroll Ontrack’s ediscovery case law summaries.

The ediscovery law summaries are a collection of the most salient ediscovery orders and opinions issued in courts across the country. Each month, the most important points of ediscovery law are added to this database.

Select from a list: All Topics ▼ All Jurisdictions ▼ Go

OR

Search via keyword: social media ▼ Search

Defendant Entitled to New Trial After Trial Court Erroneously Admitted “Russian Equivalent of Facebook” into Evidence


Keywords: social media, Facebook

Defendant Ordered to Keep Discovery Promises despite Plaintiff’s Inability to do the Same
Ediscovery case law summaries by topic, jurisdiction or keyword - you pick.

Stay on top of the latest ediscovery law developments with Kroll Ontrack’s ediscovery case law summaries. The ediscovery law summaries are a collection of the most salient ediscovery orders and opinions issued in courts across the country. Each month, the most important points of ediscovery law are added to this database.

Select from a list

- All Topics
- All Jurisdictions

Search via keyword

- social media

Detailed Summary  Short Summary

Court Rejects Privilege Request for Private Social Networking Site Communications


Keywords: Facebook, MySpace, social media, privilege

Court Finds Company Acted Appropriately in Blocking Facebook Following Employee Complaint
Case Law

Court Rejects Privilege Request for Private Social Networking Site Communications

Pennsylvania

McMillen v. Hummingbird Speedway, Inc., No. 113-2010 CD (C.P. Jefferson Sept. 9, 2010). In this personal injury litigation, the defendants sought production of the user names, log-in names and passwords granting access to the plaintiff’s Facebook and MySpace accounts. Having found comments on the public portions of the plaintiff’s social media sites indicated the plaintiff exaggerated his injuries, the defendants argued that private portions might similarly contain impeaching content. Objecting, the plaintiff contended that communications shared among private friends on social network sites are confidential and thus protected against disclosure. Equating the plaintiff’s argument with a request for a new “social network site privilege,” the court expressed concern that recognizing such a privilege would contravene the purpose and policy of Pennsylvania’s broad discovery rules. Thus, finding no reasonable expectation of confidentiality given the clear language contained on both sites regarding the possibility of disclosure, no subjective or objective relational need for privilege outside of attorney-client communications and a failure to outweigh the interests of justice, the court ordered the plaintiff to preserve existing information and provide his Facebook and MySpace user names and passwords to the defendants’ counsel.

Keywords: Facebook, MySpace, social media, privilege
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Another Excellent Resource

- Two of my favorite authors are Sharon Nelson and John Simek, who have been on the cutting edge of security, digital forensics, electronic discovery and legal technology for many years through their company, Sensei Enterprises.
- One suggestion is that all lawyers register for Sensei’s free article distribution service.
- A recent article by Nelson and Simek covers the preservation and harvesting of social media evidence as well as authentication, which is available from the Sensei Enterprises website.
- In this article, they discuss the benefits and risks of outsourcing the preservation process versus trying to handle it in–house, with special concerns raised about the danger of spoliation which often results in significant sanctions.
- They also provide practical suggestions for how to harvest the information without going through the social media vendor, who are only allowed to provide basic subscriber information, but not content, because of the Stored Communications Act.
ABOUT SENSEI

Sensei Enterprises, Inc. is a nationally-known digital forensics, information technology and information security woman-owned small business, founded in 1997 by Sharon Nelson, a practicing attorney and John Simek, vice president. Sensei provides information technology to hundreds of businesses locally in the DC Metro area. Sensei provides digital forensics and information security services nationwide.
SENSEI ENTERPRISES, INC.

Call Us (703) 359-0700 or Toll Free (877) 978-3440

ABOUT SENSEI

Sensei Enterprises, Inc. is a nationally-known digital forensics, information technology and information security woman-owned small business, founded in 1997 by Sharon Nelson, a practicing attorney and John Simek, vice president. Sensei provides information technology to hundreds of businesses locally in the DC Metro area. Sensei provides digital forensics and information security services nationwide.
15 TIPS FOR SAFE SHOPPING ONLINE

Excerpt: Did you know that cyberthieves also have Black Friday and Cyber Monday sales – of stolen credentials, including IDs, passwords, e-mails, credit card info, addresses, etc.? Your information IS their product so be wary of making it easy for them to engage in identity theft.

Read the entire article here.

November 30, 2014

ENCRIPTION: ITS TIME HAS COME

November 20, 2014
SENSEI’S 5 TIPS FOR SECURE ONLINE SHOPPING

November 28, 2014

With online shopping on the rise during the holiday season, here are some tips to keep your information safe:

1. Use Trusted, Secure Sites

2. Do Not Save Financial Information Online

3. Retain From Purchasing on Public Wi-Fi

4. Do Not Overshare on Social Media

5. Passwords, Passwords, Passwords

Happy Holidays from Sensei Enterprises, Inc!

www.sensei.com
Depending on the area of law you practice in – or have research questions about – there are excellent websites with free databases available.

For example, the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office provides a wonderful website with information about how to apply for patents and trademarks, manuals and guides, law and policy, and other helpful material, including information for the general public and for kids. (http://www.uspto.gov/, accessed 11/13/14).

From this website, you can also search the patent database) and the trademark database.

For copyright information, including the copyright database, forms and assistance for filing copyright applications and other documents, current and proposed legislation, fee schedules and other information, use the website for the U.S. Copyright Office. (http://www.copyright.gov/, accessed 11/17/14)
Welcome to the Trademark Electronic Search System (TESS). This search engine allows you to search the USPTO’s database of registered trademarks and prior pending applications to find marks that may prevent registration due to a likelihood of confusion refusal.

**WARNING:** Before conducting your search, you must understand the following: (1) what the database includes; (2) how to construct a complete search; and (3) how to interpret the search results. Click TESS TIPS for detailed information on these and other important search topics.

### Select A Search Option

**Basic Word Mark Search (New User)**
This option cannot be used to search design marks.

**Word and/or Design Mark Search (Structured)**
This option is used to search word and/or design marks. **NOTE:** You must first use the Design Search Code Manual to look up the relevant Design Codes.

**Word and/or Design Mark Search (Free Form)**
This option allows you to construct word and/or design searches using Boolean logic and multiple search fields. **NOTE:** You must first use the Design Search Code Manual to look up the relevant Design Codes.

### Additional Search Options

**Browse Dictionary (Browse Dictionary)**
This option browses all fields in the database unless you limit to a particular field. Results are returned in a dictionary-style (alphabetical) format.

**Search OG Publication Date or Registration Date (Search OG)**
This option searches the Official Gazette for marks published or registered on a particular date.
Trademark Electronic Search System (TESS)

TESS was last updated on Thu Dec 18 03:21:08 EST 2014

WARNING: AFTER SEARCHING THE USPTO DATABASE, EVEN IF YOU THINK THE RESULTS ARE "OK," DO NOT ASSUME THAT YOUR MARK CAN BE REGISTERED AT THE USPTO. AFTER YOU FILE AN APPLICATION, THE USPTO MUST DO ITS OWN SEARCH AND OTHER REVIEW, AND MIGHT REFUSE TO REGISTER YOUR MARK.

View Search History:
Records Returned: 100
Search Term: 
Search Term: 
Submit Query Clear Query

Plurals: Yes Quick File
Field: ALL
Field: ALL
Operator OR

Please logout when you are done to release system resources allocated for you.
USPTO Patent Full-Text and Image Database (PatFT)

Inventors are encouraged to search the USPTO’s patent database to see if a patent has already been filed or granted that is similar to your patent. Patents may be searched in the USPTO Patent Full-Text and Image Database (PatFT). The USPTO houses full text for patents issued from 1976 to the present and PDF images for all patents from 1790 to the present.

Searching Full Text Patents (Since 1976)

Customize a search on all or a selected group of elements (fields) of a patent.
- Quick Search
- Advanced Search
- Patent Number Search

Searching PDF Image Patents (Since 1790)

Searches are limited to patent numbers and/or classification codes for pre-1976 patents.
- View Patent Full-Page Images
- How to View Patent Images

Back to top

USPTO Patent Application Full-Text and Image Database (AppFT)

Search for Full-Text and Image versions of patent applications. Customize searches on all fields of a patent application in the AppFT for Full-Text searches.
- Quick Search
- Advanced Search
- Publication Number Search

Searches are limited to patent numbers and/or classification codes for Full-Page images.
- View Publication Full-Page Images

Back to top

Global Patent Search Network (GPSN)

Global Patent Search Network (GPSN) enables users to search the full text of multiple international patent collections. The initial collection available will be Chinese patent documentation from the State Intellectual Property Office (SIPO) of the People’s Republic of China. Users can search published applications, granted patents and utility models from 1985 to 2012. The data available includes full text Chinese patents, English machine translations and full document images. This collection will be periodically updated to include additional years of coverage.
- Search Global Patent Search Network (GPSN)

Additional Information
USPTO PATENT FULL-TEXT AND IMAGE DATABASE

Data current through December 16, 2014.

Query [Help]
Term 1: in Field 1: All Fields
Term 2: in Field 2: All Fields
Select years [Help]
1976 to present [full-text]

Patents from 1790 through 1975 are searchable only by Issue Date, Patent Number, and Current US Classification.
When searching for specific numbers in the Patent Number field, patent numbers must be seven characters in length, excluding commas, which are optional.
Copyright Office Announces Release of Compendium, Third Edition

The Register released a public draft of the "Compendium of U.S. Copyright Office Practices" on August 19, 2014.

Read More

HOW DO I...?

Register a Copyright  Record a Document  Search Records  Learn about Statutory Licensing

Tutorials
Electronic Copyright Office  Copyright Search

Other Services
Mandatory Deposit  Notice of First Record Copyright
Public Catalog
Copyright Catalog (1978 to present)

Basic Search

| Search for: | Title (exact initial article, A, An, The, El, La, Das etc.) |
| Search by: | Name (Chinlon Michel, Walt Disney Company) |
|            | Keyword |
|            | Registration Number (for V/Au 598-675 type vau000598675) |
|            | Document Number (for V/606 2P7 type v2606p067) |
|            | Command Keyword |

Search Hints

- Works registered prior to 1978 may be found only in the Copyright Public Records Reading Room.
- Can't find what you're looking for? Try our "Other Search Options".
- Search terms are not case sensitive.
- Search limits can be used with all "Search by:" options.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Search Type</th>
<th>Hint</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>- Omit initial articles (A, An, The, El, La, Das): King and I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Type the entire title, or the first few words of the title, starting with the first word</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>- For personal names, type last name first name: Hillerman Tony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- For corporate names, type in order: Sony Music Entertainment, Walt Disney Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>For Claimant names, go to Other Search Options and select &quot;Name: Claimant (KLCN)&quot; from the Search by box. For personal names, type first name last name: James Michener. For corporate names, type in order: Metro Goldwyn Mayer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>For Document names, go to Other Search Options and select either &quot;Docs: Party1 Statement (K291)&quot; or &quot;Docs: Party2 (K292)&quot;, or &quot;Docs: Party1/2 (KPTY)&quot; from the Search by box. For personal names, type first name last name: Stephen King. For corporate names, type in order: Warner Brothers Publisher</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Another outstanding source of information can also be found on the websites of professional organizations devoted to specific areas of the law.

- American Intellectual Property Law Association (AIPLA)
- International Legal Technology Association (ILTA)
- Organization of Legal Professionals (OLP)
Legal Dictionaries

- FindLaw Legal Dictionary: http://dictionary.lp.findlaw.com
- Black’s Law Dictionary: http://thelawdictionary.org/
In terms of legal dictionaries, there is probably an “app” for that so that content can be accessed on mobile devices. For example,


Finding and Using Free Full-Text Case Law Sites

- Google Scholar: http://scholar.google.com/
- FindLaw: www.findlaw.com
- The Public Library of Law: http://www.plol.org
- FindACase Network (free from VersusLaw): http://findacase.com
- Justia’s U.S. Supreme Court Center: http://supreme.justia.com
- Oyez (for free U.S. Supreme Court resources, including audio files): http://www.oyez.org
- Casetext (a “crowdsourced” case law database): https://casetext.com
- Supreme Court of the United States: http://www.supremecourt.gov
Other Websites

Other websites that are useful when doing legal research are:
- American Law Sources Online: [http://www.lawsourse.com/also](http://www.lawsourse.com/also)
- Legal Dockets On-line: [http://www.legaldockets.com](http://www.legaldockets.com)
- LLRX Court Rules, Forms and Dockets: [http://www.llrx.com/courtrules](http://www.llrx.com/courtrules)
- SunEthics.com: [http://sunethics.com](http://sunethics.com)
- Southern District of Indiana: [http://www.insd.uscourts.gov](http://www.insd.uscourts.gov)
- Indiana Courts: [http://www.in.gov/judiciary/](http://www.in.gov/judiciary/)
State Court Records – Indiana

- In terms of Indiana, more of the state court case records are available online, depending on when the county and its courts begin using the new electronic filing system called the Odyssey Case Management System. ([https://mycase.in.gov/default.aspx](https://mycase.in.gov/default.aspx), accessed 11/13/14)

- For a list of the courts that use Odyssey and how far back their records go, see [http://www.in.gov/judiciary/jtac/3147.htm](http://www.in.gov/judiciary/jtac/3147.htm)
State of Indiana Public Records Inquiry

This is the public access site for Odyssey Case Management System for Indiana Courts and Clerks.

- Which courts use Odyssey and mycase.in.gov?
- Get information about bulk data requests
- On the search screen, you'll be asked to read and enter characters on a CAPTCHA image. If you have trouble reading it, click the speaker button to the right of the image to hear the code read aloud or click the refresh button to display a different image.
Which courts use Odyssey and mycase.in.gov?

Case information available at http://mycase.in.gov/ comes only from courts that use the state's Odyssey case management system. Following is a list of the courts/counties that use Odyssey and the dates they began using the system. Also included are courts scheduled to begin using Odyssey in the near future, abolished courts with archived cases still in Odyssey, and courts with renumbered identifiers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Court Identifier</th>
<th>Courts/County</th>
<th>Go Live Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>02C01</td>
<td>Allen Circuit Court</td>
<td>Scheduled for 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02D01</td>
<td>Allen Superior Court 1</td>
<td>9/7/2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02D02</td>
<td>Allen Superior Court 2</td>
<td>1/18/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02D03</td>
<td>Allen Superior Court 3</td>
<td>1/18/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02D04</td>
<td>Allen Superior Court 4</td>
<td>9/7/2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02D05</td>
<td>Allen Superior Court 5</td>
<td>9/7/2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02D06</td>
<td>Allen Superior Court 6</td>
<td>9/7/2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02D07</td>
<td>Allen Superior Court 7</td>
<td>11/26/2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02D08</td>
<td>Allen Superior Court 8</td>
<td>11/26/2012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Learn About the Free (Poor Man’s) “Shepard’s”

- Shepardizing is an important step in legal research.
- See the explanation from the LexisNexis website in your seminar manual.
- The importance of taking this step in legal research is explained on the website for the E.H Butler Library, Buffalo State University.
- However, Shepardizing requires either consulting bound volumes or an online service through LEXIS for a fee.
- It can be a tedious and expensive process.
- See also Westlaw’s KeyCite feature.
Definition of the Poor Man’s Shepard’s

Back in 2006, Hilyerd commented that “in some circles an even lower cost alternative is mentioned for checking to see if a particular opinion is still part of the law of a jurisdiction.

This method is known as the ‘poor man's Shepard's.’

It consists of using free case law databases such as LexisOne to determine if the courts in a jurisdiction are still relying on a particular opinion in their newer opinions.

This is done by using the name of the opinion the researcher wishes to check as a search term in the database and seeing if new opinions can be located.

While this method is available, it is very sloppy research and should only be used if no access is available to other methods.”
Rather than relying totally on a poor man’s approach, a hybrid strategy may be in order.

Use the Internet and free case law databases as a first step.

If more recent cases or materials are located, utilize the Shepard’s service, either online (through LexisNexis or using Westlaw’s KeyCite) or through the printed volumes.

This will save costs and time without sacrificing the unique information and peace of mind that Shepardizing or using Westlaw’s KeyCite feature can provide.

Levitt and Davis devote Chapter 18 to several free alternatives to using either LexisNexis or Westlaw.

Among these options are Google Scholar and FindLaw as well as a party name or case number as a keyword search.

In terms of my electronic discovery research, this is often the first thing I try after I have located a case summary through either the K&L Gates or Kroll Ontrack case database.
Members of the Indiana State Bar Association have free access to Casemaker. When the most recent contract for Casemaker was negotiated, the ISBA was able to add a number of premium features at no additional cost to members.

Per the Casemaker marketing flyer, these features include:

- **CaseCheck+:** a negative citator system that lets you know instantly if the case you are reading is still good law. CaseCheck+ returns treatments instantly as you search. It allows you to link to negative treatments and quickly review the citation history for both state and federal cases.

- **CiteCheck:** If you upload a brief or pleading, within 90 seconds Casemaker will provide a report stating whether your case citations continue to be good law.

- **Casemaker Digest:** A daily summary of appellate decisions for all state and all federal circuits, categorized by subject. Casemaker Digest will email or send you an RSS feed of the latest cases in your selected jurisdictions and subject areas of interest.

To learn more about Casemaker and the tools available to you as an ISBA member, you can call Customer Support at 877–659–0801.
CASEMAKER

CASEMAKER ONLINE LAW LIBRARY

Casemaker premium tools are available at no charge to members!

As a member of the Indiana State Bar Association, you can enjoy a savings of up to $450 in online legal research tools. The Association renegotiated its contract with Casemaker to bring you not only a new and improved basic product, but also all of its premium products at no additional cost (to include CaseCheck+, Casemaker Digest and CiteCheck). You have free access to Casemaker’s negative citator system, daily summaries of state and federal appellate cases specific to your area of interest, and a legal brief analyzer that will check your cites to make sure they are still good law.

Casemaker Login

Note: You must be logged in to view the links to Casemaker. To login use the Member Login on the right side of the page.

For questions about Casemaker please call the ISBA at (317) 639-5465.
MEMBER LOGIN

To sign in to the new website, you will simply use your ISBA membership number as your username and "inbar1896" as your password. Please note: The first time you sign in at www.inbar.org you will automatically be directed to a page titled "My Preferences," where you can manage notification settings and preferences for your member account. For now, you can simply click "Save My Settings."

Please enter your username and password.

Username
Password

Remember Me

SIGN IN

Forgot your password? Click here to reset your password.
Join Now!
Click here to Register

MY ISBA

Username
Password

Remember Me

SIGN IN

Forgot your password?
Join Now!

ISBA NEWS

10/15/2014
Jeff R. Hawkins assumes office as State Bar president

12/3/2014
Indiana State Bar Association welcomes 25th annual Leadership Development Workshop
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Any Questions?

Thank you for attending today’s seminar! Happy holidays!