**Labelling guidance**

*Introduction*

* This document is intended to guide the classification of court judgments sampled for human labelling into two categories: those which are substantially concerned with animal protection and those which are not substantially concerned with animal protection.

*Task*

* The judgment labeller should identify whether each (whole) judgment should be classified as substantially concerned with or not substantially concerned with animal law. This classification should be binary.
* If the judgment is substantially concerned with animal law, the labeller should write ‘1’ in the Classification’ column. If the labeller wishes to explain their reason (e.g., if classification was challenging or raised important issues) then they should do so in the ‘Explanation’ column.
* If the judgment is not predominantly concerned with animal law, the labeller should write ‘0’ in the ‘Classification’ column. If the labeller wishes to explain their reason (e.g., if classification was challenging or raised important issues) then they should do so in the ‘Explanation’ column.
* Where a binary classification cannot be applied to a judgment, the labeller should write “cannot classify” in the ‘Classification’ column and explain the reason why in the ‘Explanation’ column.

Binary classification should be determined as follows:

* A judgment should be labelled as classified as an animal protection law judgment if it substantially concerns, relates to, and/or affects the welfare and/or protection of one animal or multiple animals (following Overcash, 2012). Substantial in this context is taken to mean in a way that is meaningful and more than minimal.
* This guidance is exemplified using a small number of examples:
  + If a judgment centres on a public order offence charge where this charge was motivated by an intention to highlight the importance of animal welfare, then the judgment should not be classified as animal law.
  + If a judgment focuses on an assault carried out on someone because they were vegan, then the judgment should not be classified as animal protection law.
  + If a case concerns whether farm animals were caused unnecessary suffering by being subjected to poor conditions, then the judgment should be classified as animal protection law.
  + Should a judgment solely consider the rights of a consumer to be presented with vegan options at a school canteen/prison, then this should not be classified as animal protection law.
  + If a judgment focused on the receipt of adequate payment for a horse, then the case should not be classified as animal protection law. While the judgment in this instance might predominantly concern an animal, this concern does not substantially relate to the animal’s welfare and/or protection.

*Notes*

* The labelling guidance is intended to be comprehensible to any legal person. For the purposes of this document, a legal person is considered to be anyone with a) experience working in the UK as a lawyer or paralegal or b) degree-level knowledge of UK law.
* Additionally, this guidance has been created in a manner that should allow for consistent interpretation by different legal persons.
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