

APPENDIX

Table 1: Examples of generated summaries

Reference	Generated Summary		
	BART_baseline	LED_baseline	LED_human_kw-mark
HOLDINGS: [1]-A valid 42 U.S.C.S. Â§ 1981 discrimination claim did not exist because plaintiff had already completed the transaction of purchasing and receiving his food without any interference from the restaurant or its employees; and the altercation between plaintiff and a cashier did not occur until after plaintiff attempted to leave the restaurant with his food order in hand and the transaction completed; [2]-Plaintiff was not entitled to a declaration that the discriminatory practices of the corporate defendants violated Title II of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and Â§ 1981, or an injunction against the corporate defendants as he did not allege any facts suggesting a likelihood that he would be discriminated against again in the future as he failed to identify a policy, practice, or pattern of discrimination by the corporate defendants or that he would return to the restaurant. Defendants’ motion granted.	HOLDINGS: [1]-Plaintiff placed an online food order through a mobile phone app, paid for his purchase, and left the restaurant with his pick-up order; plaintiff alleged that a Panera cashier physically prevented him from leaving the store because he was Black; [2]-The customer alleged that the following day, after returning to the store, a second employee demanded to see his receipt and ripped the bag of food off the table, causing plaintiff’s food to fall out of the bag and onto the floor, and the first employee did not apologize or show any remorse for his actions; [3]-Because there was no evidence that the second employee volunteered his assistance to plaintiff, it was presumed that he was not the intended victim of the discrimination or that he acted in self-defense; [4]-Plainly stated claims failed under 42 U.S.C.S Â§ 1981 and 42 U.S. Civ.R.A. Â§ 1964 as the actions of the prior employee were completely separate and distinct from the conduct alleged in the complaint. Motion to dismiss granted.	HOLDINGS: [1]-42 U.S.C.S. Â§ 1981 claims failed because no valid Â§ 1981 claim existed since the alleged facts unambiguously described a single purchase of a take-out order, that was completed without interference, and at the point of conflict, a contractual relationship no longer existed nor was one being pursued; [2]-Plaintiff’s 42 U.S.C.S. Â§ 1981 claim failed because the allegations all referred back to a specific incident that occurred in the restaurant, which was not a place of business. Motion to dismiss granted.	HOLDINGS: [1]-No valid 42 U.S.C.S. Â§ 1981 claim existed where plaintiff alleged a discrete transaction “the purchase and receipt of a food order” which was completed, as plaintiff pleaded, without any interference from the store or its employees. The altercation between plaintiff and the cashier did not occur until after plaintiff attempted to leave the restaurant with his food order in hand and the transaction completed; [2]-Plaintiff failed to establish that any of defendant’s alleged discriminatory conduct was motivated by race because in light of the facts, including the fact that plaintiff was a member of a racial minority, the alleged facts unambiguously described a single purchase of a take-out order, that was completed without interference. Motion to dismiss granted.

(To be continued)

Reference	Generated Summary		
	BART_baseline	LED_baseline	LED_human_kw-mark
HOLDINGS: [1]-Defendant in a patent infringement suit was not entitled to transfer venue under 28 U.S.C.S. Â§ 1404(a) because it failed to meet its significant burden to demonstrate that public and private factors showed that transfer to another district where the case could have been brought was clearly more convenient, including, inter alia, that there were three more related cases pending in the instant court involving the same three asserted patents that involved overlapping issues, and that the case would likely be resolved much quicker in the instant district. Motion to transfer venue denied.	HOLDINGS: [1]-Defendant's motion to transfer venue under 28 U.S.C.S Â§ 1404(a) to the Eastern District of Michigan pursuant to the regional circuit was denied because the appellate court found that the Western District of Texas was clearly more convenient and a transfer of the case would not be in the interest of justice. Among other factors, the cost of attendance at the hearing, the convenience of access to potentially relevant witnesses, the availability of compulsory testimony, and the willingness of the company's potential witnesses to testify, as required by Tex. Civ. Prac. & Rem. Code Ann. Â§ 16-4-104(b), outweighed any practical problems that might arise from transferring the case because the court saw no reason why the asserted patents would not have been infringed in either district; [2]-Because the security division's headquarters were in Michigan, the transfer was not warranted even if the alleged patent infringement actually occurred in Texas. Motion to transfer denied.	HOLDINGS: [1]-In this patent infringement action, transfer under 28 U.S.C.S. Â§ 1404(a) to the Eastern District of Michigan was not warranted because the Eastern District of Michigan was a clearly more convenient venue; [2]-This case was unique in that the majority of the potential witnesses and potentially willing non-party witnesses resided in the Eastern District of Michigan, with no relevant witnesses in the Western District of Texas, and the possibility that some of the potential witnesses might have been denied a venue to attend trial by association with defendant's facilities was not compelling; [3]-The convenience of witnesses weighed against transfer because court congestion was greater in the Eastern District of Michigan than in the Western District of Texas, and courts could not say that the EDMI would have significantly easier access to defendant's relevant documents. Motion to transfer denied.	HOLDINGS: [1]-Defendant in a patent infringement suit was not entitled to transfer venue under 28 U.S.C.S. Â§ 1404(a) because it failed to meet its significant burden to demonstrate that public and private factors showed that transfer to another district where the case could have been brought was clearly more convenient, including, inter alia, that there were three more related cases pending in the instant court involving the same three asserted patents that involved overlapping issues, and that the case would likely be resolved much quicker in the instant district. Motion to transfer venue denied.

(To be continued)

Reference	Generated Summary		
	BART_baseline	LED_baseline	LED_human_kw-mark
HOLDINGS: [1]-The trial court was not asked to deliver an advisory opinion and it had subject matter jurisdiction in this case because appellants had standing, the controversy was ripe for determination, and the trial court could resolve that controversy in a manner that would bind the parties. Judgment reversed and remanded.	HOLDINGS: [1]-Because the trial court had subject matter jurisdiction, it properly granted the property owner's plea to the jurisdiction and dismissed the suit for declaratory judgment that the owners' filed, because the owners lacked standing to assert the validity and enforceability of a restriction, they had failed to present a justiciable controversy, they were seeking an impermissible advisory opinion, and their declaratory judgment action was not ripe for action by the trial court. Reverse and remand.	HOLDINGS: [1]-Because the property owners had standing, and because the controversy was ripe for determination, and because the trial court could resolve that controversy in a manner that would bind the parties, the trial court was not asked to deliver an advisory opinion and that it had subject matter jurisdiction; [2]-The property owners may or might not be able to succeed in a determination on the merits of their case, but they were entitled to try. Judgment reversed and remanded.	HOLDINGS: [1]-The trial court was not asked to deliver an advisory opinion and it had subject matter jurisdiction in this case because appellants had standing, the controversy was ripe for determination, and the trial court could resolve that controversy in a manner that would be beneficial to the parties. Judgment reversed and remanded.