



## Tips & Tricks: Things You Can Only Do In Lex Machina

Want to learn how Lex Machina can answer your questions? In this recorded webcast you will learn 5 key things you can only get in Lex Machina that will help you achieve the litigation outcomes you want.

Lex Machina pioneered the concept of Legal Analytics over a decade ago. We are the leaders of this legal tech category and there are insights in Lex Machina that you just can't get anywhere else. Please join our VP of Sales & Customer Success, Todd Regenold, and our Legal Analytics expert, David Friedman, for this recorded 30-minute webcast to see what differentiates Lex Machina from all other tools and how this gives you a competitive advantage.

### Speakers:



Todd Regenold  
VP of Sales & Customer Success  
Lex Machina



David Friedman  
Customer Success Manager  
Lex Machina

Todd Regenold ([00:00](#)):

First off, we thank you so much for your time today. Thank you for joining today's webcast. We're here to serve you. What we're here to do today is share five critical things that you can only do in Lex Machina. Over a decade ago, Lex Machina invented legal analytics. We do it best. And there are certain critical insights, invaluable insights that you can only gain in Lex Machina. These logos represent just a small fraction of the corporations and law firms that are gaining tremendous value through the use of Lex Machina. You can see there, the logos of some of the world's most recognizable brands.

Todd Regenold ([00:55](#)):

Additionally, over three quarters of the Am Law 100 law firms are leveraging Lex Machina, those Am Law 100 firms, all the way down to just one- and two-person boutique firms, and all sizes of law firms in between. By way of introduction, my name is Todd Regenold, and I lead sales and customer success here at Lex Machina. I'm joined today by David Friedman. David is one of our customer success managers. Each and every one of our customers is assigned a customer success manager. These customer success managers, or CSMs, work very closely with our customers throughout the entire customer life cycle to make sure that everyone in their organization that they want trained and up to speed on the use of Lex Machina is trained. And they continue to work with each and every one of our customers, again, through that entire customer life cycle, to continue to drive value.

Todd Regenold ([02:04](#)):

In this webcast, you will learn five critical things that you can only do in Lex Machina. I'm going to go ahead now and turn it over to David Friedman. David's going to start by providing a high level overview of these five things, and then he'll just go ahead and jump into the first one. Thank you again for joining us. David Friedman, take it away.

David Friedman ([02:31](#)):

Great. Thank you, Todd. Appreciate the introduction. Happy to be here today and have the opportunity to talk about five things that only Lex Machina has. And those five things that we're going to discuss today, first are practice area specific filters. Second, practice area specific outcome analytics, which includes case resolutions, damages, remedies, and findings. Third, complete and accurate attorney data. Fourth, we have a courts and judges comparator. And fifth, curated document tagging. And so we're just going to toggle from the slideshow that we were looking at, from the slides that we were looking at, and we're going to take a live view in Lex Machina. I just want to make sure, are you able to see my screen? And we're seeing the welcome to Lex [crosstalk 00:03:16]-

Todd Regenold ([03:16](#)):

We've got it, David. All good.

David Friedman ([03:17](#)):

Okay, great. And so we're going to jump straight into the first example, which are practice area specific filters. So let's say that you're litigating in federal district court an employment case that has state employment claims. It's critical, in order to understand what to expect from such cases and to make data-driven decisions, that you're able to curate a case that has all of those cases and is not contaminated by any other cases that aren't relevant.

David Friedman ([03:43](#)):

And it's very easy to do this in Lex Machina. You click federal tab, and that's going to take us into federal district court cases within Lex Machina. And then on the left-hand side in the filter panel, and select case types, and so we see all the different practice areas and case types that are represented in Lex Machina. We see that there are over 300,000 employment cases in federal district court.

David Friedman ([04:07](#)):

So we're going to click the plus sign by that. But then again, what we're interested in, we are interested in those cases that have state employment claims, and we're not interested in the cases that do not. So there's an additional process, one more step. We go to case tags. Lex Machina has a robust selection of case tags. We have general case tags that would apply across the board, but we have these practice area specific case tags, and that's our focus right now.

David Friedman ([04:33](#)):

And you'll see them for all the different practice areas, but we're going to zoom right in to employment, and we see state employment claim. So we're going to click the plus sign by that. We're going to click apply. And so now we see a curated set of cases. So we've went from over 300,000 employment cases to the 178,930 federal district court employment cases that have a state employment claim, and so we can be confident. This is the data set we're interested in, and it doesn't have cases that are not relevant to us. So that's the first example of something that only Lex Machina has, practice area specific filters.

Todd Regenold ([05:12](#)):

And David, that's absolutely fantastic. It's a great illustration. Before we move on to the next thing you can only do in Lex Machina, I just want to make sure that our audience has a real appreciation for what David just showed. And David, if you could go back to those case tags.

David Friedman ([05:28](#)):

Sure.

Todd Regenold ([05:29](#)):

For everyone on our webcast today, three million cases in the data set, analytics aren't particularly relevant. We care about employment cases. Now we've narrowed it down to just over 300,000 cases. But again, the analytics aren't particularly relevant until we get down to our very, very specific case set. And in this case, that is federal employment matters with a state employment claim. I want everyone to understand, not only are the analytics not particularly helpful until you can get down to your very specific case set, but they could very well actually be misleading.

Todd Regenold ([06:16](#)):

David used the word contaminated. You can imagine, if you have a discrimination matter employment matter, then you only want to look at that case set, those 92,000 cases. If you have an FLSA matter, you only want to look at those 51,000 cases. And if not, if you can't put these fine filters on, then your data is contaminated, and quite possibly it's misleading you as it relates to your case tactics and strategy. Back to you, David.

David Friedman ([06:48](#)):

Yeah, absolutely, Todd. That's right. And then also, it's important to remember in each of these examples that we're going to be looking at, you can also further refine the search by narrowing to a specific court or a specific judge. So we have the practice area specific filters, and then you can drill directly into the analytics for that court or judge that would be relevant for you.

David Friedman ([07:07](#)):

So the second thing that we're going to talk about that only Lex Machina has, now we have our curated set of cases, practice area specific. The next critical part of the picture is to look at the outcome analytics, to understand what has occurred previously in these types of cases so we can make the best data-driven decisions. In the first part of that process, we're going to look at case resolutions. Now, before you do that, if you have not already done so, it's important just to select terminated and click apply.

David Friedman ([07:34](#)):

You can always verify in the breadcrumb trail that you have that filter. Therefore, now when we're looking at outcome analytics, we're looking at cases that actually have an outcome that have terminated. So we'll go straight to case resolutions. And so there are four main categories that are listed here, and it's color coded so it's very easy to understand what you're looking at. When we see green, that means likely settlement. In this particular example, that reflects 77% of the cases. Yellow is a procedural resolution. In this example, that's 12-

David Friedman ([08:03](#)):

Yellow is a procedural resolution. In this example, that's 12%. blue represents the claim defendant winning, and that's 8% of these cases. And then red means that the claimant won. So this is critical information, to have to understand when you're going to litigate this kind of case. And again, you can always go into the specific court or judge and understand, what are the likely outcomes? What has happened in such cases previously? But this data rewards careful and more deep examination because, above and beyond those four general broad outcomes that I just described and that we looked at, in each category you can drill down more deeply. So for example, with claimant win and claim defendant win, we break it down. Default judgment, consent judgment in chronological order all the way through the proceedings, because there is a difference in time and in money expenditure between winning at default judgment versus winning at trial.

David Friedman ([08:55](#)):

So you want to understand not just how likely is it that one side or the other will prevail, but how long is it going to take, how much will it cost? And another critical part of this, we see that the claim defendant in this example wins four times as often as the claimant overall. That's in the big, bold numbers here. When we drill more deeply in, we see in this example the claim defendant is predominantly winning at summary judgment. But if that claimant survives summary judgment and makes it to trial, it's almost a 50/50 split when we're looking at the trial outcomes. Just a slight edge for the claim defendant. That's a critical insight that Lex Machina is providing. And then you have to make sure that when you're looking at this data, you're drilling into that and looking carefully at each step. And then you're going to be rewarded by having insights that are going to help you make good data-driven decisions to understand what is most likely to occur in these types of cases.

David Friedman ([09:48](#)):

The second part of the outcome analytics, we're going to move over to damages. Damages is presented in two ways. On the left hand side, this is the total. So if you want to know the total amount of damage awards in this subset of cases, we see that on the left hand side and then broken down by damage type. And these damage types can be opened up. These are dropdown menus. On the right-hand side we're seeing the year-by-year trends. This is also critically important. I want to know not just what has happened historically and the sum total, I want to see the year-by-year trends. And we see with this case type the year-by-year trend from 2016 to the present is the amount of damage awards, the number and amount. Those are tending to be declining. Now, if we open up one damage type, say employment damages back-pay. I'm hovering over that on the left-hand side. Note what happened on the right-hand side. Back-pay became an orange line, and we can see the year-by-year trends for that.

David Friedman ([10:44](#)):

So again, this data has a number of different layers to it, and you want to make sure that you're taking all of that in and making data-driven decisions accordingly, and only Lex Machina has this kind of data that's practice area-specific. And then the last thing I'll mention about damages before we move on to remedies, but this is an important point and it highlights would only Lex Machina it is doing with practice area-specific filtering. You'll recall that we selected federal district court employment cases with a state employment claim, but yet in damages we're seeing ERISA, consumer protection. We're seeing other practice areas. And you might be wondering, well what is that all about? What does that mean? Why is that in here? Lex Machina is giving you the complete picture. PACER has this inherent limitation of only one nature suit coat per case, but Lex Machina does not have that limitation.

David Friedman ([11:34](#)):

We're looking at each case and we're seeing there are employment cases with state employment claims not only where there was a consumer protection cause of action, but actually damages were awarded. Without this information, you don't have the complete picture of what has transpired in those cases. Now, you might say, if you're a practitioner who does not handle cases involving, say, contracts damages, you might say, "Well, that's great to have all this data but it's not relevant to me personally." That's okay. In Lex Machina, you can go on the left-hand side, you could click the minus sign by contracts or any of these other case types that are included in this total dataset, and you can remove them. You customize the data, but we're providing the complete picture so you're not missing anything. You have consonance. This is the whole picture, and then you decide which parts are relevant for you and make your decisions accordingly.

David Friedman ([12:25](#)):

So we'll move over to remedies. This is the third part of the outcome analytics. Remedies of course refers to injunctive relief. This is critical to understand what is likely to transpire in these cases. We see permanent injunction, preliminary injunction, temporary restraining order, and we see the grant denial rates for each of these. It's also important to note... This is the page that's giving you the data and the percentages to understand, how likely is it that any of these events will occur in this type of case? But any non-zero number on this page is a clickable link. So if you're wondering, well, on what basis is the court or the judge granting a consent judgment in these types of cases? That's when you can click on these numbers, and that's going to take you into the documents and the docket entries, something we're going to look at a little bit later in this webinar, and then you can see the underlying rationale, the reasoning behind why these remedies were granted or denied depending on which column you click on.

David Friedman ([13:25](#)):

And then the final piece of outcome analytics is findings. And again, all of these are critical. If you don't have these four, you don't have legal analytics. You have docket navigation, you have an incomplete picture. You can't make the best decisions of how to best advise your client. So with findings, this again, practice area-specific. For our example, we're going to go with employment. And before we dive deeply into this, I want to scroll down and make sure that everyone can see how many different findings Lex Machina has extracted from these cases. You won't find this anywhere else, only Lex Machina has this information. You're not going to find it in PACER, you're not going to find it in platforms that are just content to rely on the basic PACER data.

David Friedman ([14:10](#)):

We've seen the list here, so now let's dive into detail. How is this going to help you? If you're looking at federal district court employment cases with a state employment claim, you need to know, how often has there been a finding of Title VII discrimination based on race and color? And we see the answer right here in this row. But not only do we see the answer. If you look here, this is in chronological order. So this is letting us know at what stage of the proceedings this outcome occurred. So when we're looking at this data we're understanding, how likely are we to get here? How long is it going to take? How much is it going to potentially cost? And then similar to previous examples, the non-zero numbers on this page are clickable links.

David Friedman ([14:52](#)):

If I want to know why Title VII discrimination based on race and color was found 31 times at the default judgment level, I click on the 31, I pull up those documents, and now I understand the underlying rationale behind the data that we're looking at here. So this is the second example of what only Lex Machina has, practice area-specific outcome analytics, case resolutions, damages, remedies, and findings.

Todd Regenold ([15:20](#)):

David, once again, that's a terrific illustration and I love the way that you're working with our first only in Lex Machina and which is the ability to provide these filters. Now, when we get down to the matters that are relevant to us, and those are employment matters with a state employment claim. I'm going to ask you to put on your attorney hat for a minute, David. Outcomes. At Lex Machina, we refer to outcomes as table stakes. Can you imagine if you were an attorney and you were working with one of your clients and talking about case tactics and overall strategy but you weren't able to share with them what the outcomes were? What the potential outcomes. If you weren't able to share whether or not money exchanged hands or how much...

Todd Regenold ([16:03](#)):

... to share whether or not money exchanged hands or how much money, what sort of a position would you be in then?

David Friedman ([16:07](#)):

I think that's a very tenuous position to be in. I think honestly, at this point, it verges on malpractice. Because as an attorney, you have a duty to zealously defend, or excuse me, to zealously represent your client and to do everything possible to be abreast of current technological developments, current information. If there's information that's available to me and I'm not taking advantage of that, I can't

look my client in the eye and say, "I've done everything possible to zealously represent your interests," because there were analytics, there was information out there that I did not utilize. And I think that's a very tenuous position to be in as an attorney.

David Friedman ([16:41](#)):

There's a sports example or analogy that I often use. Think about the Super Bowl. Nobody shows up, no team shows up the day of the Super Bowl with no scouting report and just says, "Well, we're here. Hope we do well. Hope everything turns out well." You can't show up in Federal District Court without these analytics, without looking at these prior to getting there, and you're kind of on game day, you're on Super Bowl day, you have no scouting report, and you're just hoping everything's going to turn out for the best. That is obviously a suboptimal way of proceeding. Whether you're a football team or whether you're an attorney in Federal District Court, you need the scouting report, you need the analytics, you need to make data-driven decisions.

Todd Regenold ([17:19](#)):

I love your sports analogies, David. Let's go ahead and jump to number three.

David Friedman ([17:23](#)):

Absolutely. So the third thing that only Lex Machina has is complete and accurate attorney data. And for that, we're going to go to the counsel tab. And so let's say one piece of this, when we're talking about practice area specific filters in cases, but a part of this also as well, you want to have a complete picture of the opposing law firm, or any law firm that we're interested in, and the attorneys that work for that law firm. So for example, let's just say we look for a law firm such as Thompson Hine. We run the search in the counsel tab. We go to that page, the overview page for that law firm. And when we're on that overview page, we're seeing a case list. How many federal district court cases they have, civil cases within our scope of coverage, estate court cases within our scope of coverage.

David Friedman ([18:07](#)):

It's critically important that these numbers are accurate. If these numbers aren't accurate, it would be a misrepresentation of that law firm's level of experience, the level of experience of their attorneys. It could also skew the outcome analytics. Lex Machina has proprietary technology. We have a signature block analyzer. This enables us to capture pro hac vice admissions. It enables us to make sure we have complete and accurate attorney data. That's fundamental. That's of critical importance. We have all the accurate attorney data, which then means we have the accurate law firm data, so these case lists are complete within the scope of coverage, 2009 to the present for federal district court. We have all of this information.

David Friedman ([18:50](#)):

The analytics are only going to be as good as the underlying data. If you're missing data about how often an attorney has practiced in a particular type of case, if you're missing the data, then that's also going to be missing data for the law firm as well. So again, this is critically important. This is part of the overall picture of obtaining the analytics that you need to be successful in federal district court, as well as in the state courts.

Todd Regenold ([19:16](#)):

David, I love that term that you used, "critically important." And I think we'll go back to our case tags, and the same thing that we called out there is that if you're looking at an incomplete set of data, if you don't have all of the data, then what you are looking at is quite possibly inaccurate. Is that fair to say, David?

David Friedman ([19:39](#)):

Yeah. Absolutely. And again, I think a lot of times sports analogies help clarify things and make things very obvious and very simple. So if we go to that Super Bowl analogy, let's say that you have a scouting report and your scouting report is missing the data on the two fastest wide receivers on the other team. So you only have partial data. So you look at that and say, "Hey, you know what? This team's not a passing threat. We can just concentrate on the run game." Then you show up on game day and you realize, "Oh, they have these two really fast wide receivers. That wasn't in our scouting report. Our whole scouting report was misleading and dangerous. Our game plan is now useless."

David Friedman ([20:13](#)):

If you're looking up attorneys and you're looking up law firms and you're missing their pro hoc vice admissions, you're missing some of the cases that they've handled, you've got that incomplete picture. You don't really know what that law firm's experience is, what outcomes they've obtained, and then the whole game plan that you're coming up with based on that inaccurate data is not going to be very useful when the time comes to actually litigate, and it's going to be damaging to your client to be missing that data.

Todd Regenold ([20:39](#)):

That's really helpful. Thanks, David. Let's go ahead and jump to quick tools.

David Friedman ([20:43](#)):

Sure. So the fourth example of what only Lex Machina has is our courts and judges comparator. And that is one of our nine quick tools. I'm going to click the quick tools link. And just briefly to explain the overview, quick tools are nine navigation shortcuts, so I'll just scroll down so everyone can see there are nine of these shortcuts. We're just going to look at one of them today. These are shortcuts that we have built into the Lex Machina system to give you direct, immediate access to certain specific datasets. And the one that we're going to look at today is courts and judges comparator. So I'm going to click where it says, "Compare courts and judges."

David Friedman ([21:18](#)):

So why would we care about this? This is something that only Lex Machina has, but of what value is it? How am I going to utilize it? And I'll give two quick examples. If you're on the plaintiff's side and you have multiple courts where you could potentially file your cause of action, you are going to want to look up and compare the courts and the judges. Which ones are most plaintiff friendly? Which ones have the most experience? Which ones have the fastest docket? And then you're going to make your filing decisions accordingly. Conversely, if you're on the defense side and you're already in court, and you're contemplating a motion to transfer, you're going to want to make that same kind of comparison and understand, is it going to be to our client's advantage to move this action to a different court that is more defendant friendly, the timing is better, and so on? So from either side, whichever side of the aisle you're on, this information is going to be critically important.

David Friedman ([22:08](#)):

Now in the interest of time, within the quick tool, there is an example that's kind of pre-programmed in there, so we're just going to click that example. This is going to compare three judges from the Central District of California with that court overall in the contracts case type. And so when we click "compare courts and judges," that's going to take us directly to this comparison. So just to set where we are, we ran a comparison of three judges plus the court where they sit, and so we're seeing the biographical information for the judges, and then we see their open cases. So this lets us see, for example, Judge Selma, a much larger percentage of his current open case load is contracts cases compared to these other two judges, or that court overall. So that's an important data point that only Lex Machina is going to provide to you when you're trying to assess the experience level of these judges in this particular court. We see the same data set for terminated cases, so we have the complete picture. The open cases, the cases that are active now, as well as the terminated cases.

David Friedman ([23:09](#)):

Scrolling down, we see the case filings. Now, the lineup here in red, this is the Central District of California, so that entire court. That's why that number is so much higher. And then we see the individual judges, but we have the numbers underneath. So you can see the year by year trends for case filings in the contracts case type for these three judges, and this court. And the value of this, and why we have this separated out from the data that we looked at a moment ago, we're interested not just in the total number of cases that these judges have handled, but how recently have they handled a contracts case? How familiar are they with this recent developments in the law and so forth? So that's another critical part of the picture when you're evaluating the court and-or a judge?

David Friedman ([23:50](#)):

And so the timing analytics, again, this is also of vital importance. You want to understand how fast or how slow the docket is. We have several different timing events that we track, and what this is showing for each timing event is-

David Friedman ([24:03](#)):

... that we track. And what this is showing for each timing event is, from the date the case was filed till the date that event occurred, how long did it take? And it gives you the median, it shows you the fastest amount of time it took to get to that outcome on the left, and it shows you the one that took the longest on the right. So when you take in all of this data, then you are able to make good data-driven decisions about the timing outcomes for these judges and then the court. And so the timing events that we have in this example, time to permanent injunction, time to dismissal, time to summary judgment, time to trial, time determination, these are critical outcomes. You will want to know how long is it going to take if I'm litigating this kind of case in front of this judge, how long is it likely to take to get to this outcome?

David Friedman ([24:48](#)):

And then we talked about practice areas specific outcome analytics earlier. Now, we see the side-by-side comparison of these analytics with the judges in the court in the case resolutions. Does the claimant most often win? Does the claim defendant? How often are their settlements? And then the damage awards also. Again, it's not legal analytics if you don't have case resolutions, damages, remedies, and findings. We have all of that data here side-by-side for these judges and this court, and then I mentioned it before, but it does bear repeating, this is the page with the analytics. The non-zero numbers are clickable links. You can go into the documents and find out why did the claimant win? Why were

damages awarded in front of this judge? And that actually is going to dovetail perfectly into our final example, which is curated document tagging.

Todd Regenold ([25:41](#)):

I don't want to break your flow, David, but I'll pause you for one second. Can you go back to the Quick Tools main tab? I just want to ask a quick question.

David Friedman ([25:51](#)):

Sure, absolutely.

Todd Regenold ([25:51](#)):

Is it a fair characterization? I always think of this, David, when I think of Quick Tools, I think of the big green button or the easy button. In other words, you could compare the judges as you show it by navigating through Lex Machina, and it might take you five or 10 minutes to do that, but what we've essentially done here is we've picked some of the things that we know lawyers have to do most often, compare judges, do early case assessment, compare law firms if you're a corporate legal department, and we have essentially created these easy paths, Quick Tools, big green button to make it that much easier for our customers.

David Friedman ([26:25](#)):

Exactly. That's right, Todd. So these are navigation shortcuts for specific tasks. And like you said, it makes it easier. Instead of doing four judge searches or four court searches, do it all at once in Courts and Judges Comparator. And we definitely want to be respectful of everyone's time in the webcast so we'll go straight into our last example, which is curated document tagging. And it's actually going to take us full circle to the first examples. You'll recall, in the first example, we click the Federal tab and we went in the federal district court cases and we found the practice area specific analytics for federal district court cases, employment cases with the state employment claim. Now that we know those analytics, now we want to go into the documents. So we're going to make those same selections, Employment cases. We're going to go to case tags, Employment, State Employment Claim.

David Friedman ([27:13](#)):

But now we want to understand why did these outcomes occur? Only Lex Machina has this curated document tagging, so we're going to go to Orders. And so now this is a large data set, but these are all of the orders in this case type with this practice area specific case tag. Now that I see how large this data set is I can continue to refine it. I go back into the document tags and I say, "You know what? What I'm really interested in, those jury verdicts. Why are the jury's ruling in favor of the claimant or the claim defendant? And we just actually need to just slide this over to And, because just a little finesse, we just want to make sure that we have the jury verdict. Now, we've gone from millions of documents in seconds to a few dozen documents, and these are critical documents for me to understand these cases. Federal district court employment cases with the state employment claim case tag. These are the jury verdicts.

David Friedman ([28:07](#)):

I can now open up these documents and I can understand, why did the juries make the determinations that they did? And so that takes us full circle from the analytics, the practice area specific analytics that

we saw in our first example. Now, we can use Lex Machina's curated document tagging to see the underlying rationale behind those outcomes that we saw previously,

Todd Regenold ([28:30](#)):

That's terrific, David. You're bringing us home strong. And I always think of the underlying documents as showing our work so we provide those high level analytics that are of tremendous value. But what do attorneys always want to know? They always want to know why, and we provide that ability to drill all the way down to the docket level and get to these very important specifics. David, if you wouldn't mind, we're going to wrap up in the interest of time for our attendees and we'll go ahead and put up that last slide. In closing, and I'll say this to everyone who's joined, thank you so much for your time. We hope that you've found this to be of great value. What we would really love to do is engage further. If you're from a law firm, we would love to talk to you about the specific type of matters that you're involved in and how we can bring value to your firm.

Todd Regenold ([29:23](#)):

If you're a corporate legal department, we'd love to learn more about the types of matters that you're involved in. What's important to you? Do you handle matters in house or do you need to be focused on evaluating outside counsel and doing early case assessment? Whatever the case, we'd love to engage and we'd love to learn more about your needs and how we can bring value to your law firm or corporation. You can see our names, emails, phone numbers there. You're welcome to reach out to either David or myself. Additionally, you will be receiving an email within next couple of hours, and there will be a call to action there. If you'd like more information, again, we'd love to engage and talk specifically about your needs, your organization, and how we can bring value. Thanks again so much for joining us. David, awesome job. Thanks, everyone. Have a great day.

David Friedman ([30:13](#)):

Thank you.