

(12) **Patent Application Publication**
Sander et al.

(43) **Pub. Date:** **Aug. 14, 2025**

(51) **Int. Cl.**

G06F 16/25 (2019.01)

G06F 16/27 (2019.01)

G06Q 50/18 (2012.01)

(52) U.S. Cl.

CPC **G06F 16/25** (2019.01); **G06F 16/27**
(2019.01); **G06Q 50/18** (2013.01)

(57)

ABSTRACT

Example embodiments of present disclosure are directed to a system can acquire matter records from a private law firm database. Each record may contain a citation number, client name, billing data, attorney assignments, and any other metadata integral to the firm's internal processes. A specialized module, searches public or third-party databases for matching docket records. Once potential matches are identified, the system presents them alongside each matter, enabling either automated or manual pairing. This pairing process is logged, providing an evidentiary trail of which candidate docket was selected and when.

(71) Applicant: **LexPipe, Inc**, New York, NY (US)

(72) Inventors: **Michael E. Sander**, New York, NY (US); **Mikhail Fayer**, Berlin (DE)

(21) Appl. No.: 19/037,902

(22) Filed: **Jan. 27, 2025**

Related U.S. Application Data

(60) Provisional application No. 63/625,508, filed on Jan. 26, 2024.

LessPipe

Filters (0)

17 Rows

#	ID	Source	Target	Type	Class	Transfer Name	Transfer Name Filter	Transfer Properties
1	100-00000	100-00000	100-00000	100-00000	100-00000	100-00000	100-00000	100-00000
2	100-00001	100-00001	100-00001	100-00001	100-00001	100-00001	100-00001	100-00001
3	100-00002	100-00002	100-00002	100-00002	100-00002	100-00002	100-00002	100-00002
4	100-00003	100-00003	100-00003	100-00003	100-00003	100-00003	100-00003	100-00003
5	100-00004	100-00004	100-00004	100-00004	100-00004	100-00004	100-00004	100-00004
6	100-00005	100-00005	100-00005	100-00005	100-00005	100-00005	100-00005	100-00005
7	100-00006	100-00006	100-00006	100-00006	100-00006	100-00006	100-00006	100-00006
8	100-00007	100-00007	100-00007	100-00007	100-00007	100-00007	100-00007	100-00007
9	100-00008	100-00008	100-00008	100-00008	100-00008	100-00008	100-00008	100-00008
10	100-00009	100-00009	100-00009	100-00009	100-00009	100-00009	100-00009	100-00009
11	100-00010	100-00010	100-00010	100-00010	100-00010	100-00010	100-00010	100-00010
12	100-00011	100-00011	100-00011	100-00011	100-00011	100-00011	100-00011	100-00011
13	100-00012	100-00012	100-00012	100-00012	100-00012	100-00012	100-00012	100-00012
14	100-00013	100-00013	100-00013	100-00013	100-00013	100-00013	100-00013	100-00013
15	100-00014	100-00014	100-00014	100-00014	100-00014	100-00014	100-00014	100-00014
16	100-00015	100-00015	100-00015	100-00015	100-00015	100-00015	100-00015	100-00015
17	100-00016	100-00016	100-00016	100-00016	100-00016	100-00016	100-00016	100-00016

Transfer Name Filter

Transfer Properties

[illegible]


Claims

① A matter must include all claims

<input type="checkbox"/> ▼ Constitutional and Civil Rights Claims	8
<input type="checkbox"/> Anti-Discrimination Retaliation	3
<input type="checkbox"/> Race Discrimination	2
<input type="checkbox"/> Sex, Gender, and Pregnancy Discrimination	3
<input type="checkbox"/> > Criminal and Statutory Violation Claims	8
<input type="checkbox"/> > Employment Claims	22
<input type="checkbox"/> > Tort and Fiduciary Claims	11
<input type="checkbox"/> > Contract and Quasi-Contract Claims	15
<input type="checkbox"/> > Remedies and Procedural Claims	1
<input type="checkbox"/> ▼ Intellectual Property Claims	13
<input type="checkbox"/> Copyright Infringement	1
<input type="checkbox"/> Patent Infringement	2
<input type="checkbox"/> Trademark Infringement	1
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Unfair Competition Claims	14

Summary Judgment

<input type="checkbox"/> ▼ Defendant	4
<input type="checkbox"/> Filed	1
<input type="checkbox"/> Granted	1
<input type="checkbox"/> Denied	1
<input type="checkbox"/> PartiallyGranted	1
<input type="checkbox"/> ▼ Plaintiff	2
<input type="checkbox"/> Filed	1
<input type="checkbox"/> PartiallyGranted	1



Transcription error						
Select All						
ID		Case No.	Name	Client	Attorney	Status
2	<input type="checkbox"/>	03-00-00549	Patent Portfolio Negotiations and Litigation	Microsoft Services Asia	Julene Taylor	Completed 11
4	<input type="checkbox"/>	180V00191	Kristine L. Taylor, as owner/litigator	FedEx Corporation	John Doe	Completed 10
6	<input type="checkbox"/>	2110-00-00732	Classical Multitasking	FedEx Corporation	John Doe	Completed 10
8	<input type="checkbox"/>	2018CV001376	Michael J. Schmit Litigation	FedEx Corporation	John Doe	Completed 10
1	<input type="checkbox"/>	1:19-cv-00587	Bacterial Diseases Patent Prosecution	Purdue University	Julene Taylor	Pending Review 10
3	<input type="checkbox"/>	8:16-cv-00116	Glennville Clapperton Litigation	FedEx Corporation	John Doe	Pending Review 10
5	<input type="checkbox"/>	1819CV00002	William Andrew Williams Litigation	FedEx Corporation	John Doe	Pending Review 10
7	<input type="checkbox"/>	20-141-00105	Dorothy B. Anderson Litigation	FedEx Corporation	John Doe	Pending Review 10
9	<input type="checkbox"/>	18CV18980	Michael Hesp Litigation	FedEx Corporation	John Doe	Pending Review 10
10	<input type="checkbox"/>	01840272015	Classical Multitasking	FedEx Corporation	John Doe	Pending Review 10

Legal Hold

PROTECTIVE

Legal Hold

Foundation Query

Search

Filter

Table 22

ID	Citation	Name	Client	Attorney	Status
2	605436-000420	Parent Portfolio Reignition and Litigation	Microsoft Services Asia	Jensen Taylor	Completed 11
4	1802950191	Kristina L. Taylor and out Litigation	Perich Corporation	John Doe	Completed 10
6	2118-cv-00702	Michael P. Litigation	Perich Corporation	John Doe	Completed 10
8	2018-02001376	Michael J. Schmitt Litigation	Perich Corporation	John Doe	Completed 10
1	1195-cv-00887	Seidenberg Detection Patent Prosecution	Purdue University	Jensen Taylor	Patent Prosecution
3	618401/2018	Seidenberg Detection Litigation	Perich Corporation	John Doe	Pending and pending
5	2018-02000022	Kristina P. Williams Litigation	Perich Corporation	John Doe	Patent Prosecution
7	2018-0200138	Dorothea D. Anderson Litigation	Perich Corporation	John Doe	Patent Prosecution
9	90714265	Michael P. Litigation	Perich Corporation	John Doe	Patent Prosecution
15	513402/2018	David Gordon Litigation	Perich Corporation	John Doe	Patent Prosecution











Case Files						
Last Page		199212100	New Search			
Foundation Query						
John Doe						
ID		Citation	Name	Client	Attorney	Status
2		0185-nc-00740	Patient Portfolio Negotiations and Litigation	Microsoft Services Asia	Johene Taylor	In Progress
4		18CJ950191	Kristina L. Taylor as co-defendant	FedEx Corporation	John Doe	In Progress
6		0118-cv-00732	Dietrich Publishing	FedEx Corporation	John Doe	In Progress
8		2018CV001776	Michael J. Schmidt Litigant	FedEx Corporation	John Doe	In Progress
1		1:19-cv-10587	Bacterial Dietetics Patent Prosecution	Fischer University	Johene Taylor	Pending Court Review
3		01690170318	Giancarlo DiGiuseppe Litigation	FedEx Corporation	John Doe	Pending Court Review
5		2018CV008022	Kristen Kremer Williams Litigation	FedEx Corporation	John Doe	Pending Court Review
7		2014F120585	Doretha S. Anderson Litigation	FedEx Corporation	John Doe	Pending Court Review
9		80C714985	Nicholas Hays Litigation	FedEx Corporation	John Doe	Pending Court Review
10		016400220119	Dani Gordon Litigation	FedEx Corporation	John Doe	Pending Court Review

Table 1					
Serial No.	Class	Name	Type	Status	Notes
1	650-000000	Method for determining a value	Method	Granted	
2	650-000000	Method for determining a value	Method	Granted	
3	650-000000	Method for determining a value	Method	Granted	
4	650-000000	Method for determining a value	Method	Granted	
5	650-000000	Method for determining a value	Method	Granted	
6	650-000000	Method for determining a value	Method	Granted	
7	650-000000	Method for determining a value	Method	Granted	
8	650-000000	Method for determining a value	Method	Granted	
9	650-000000	Method for determining a value	Method	Granted	
10	650-000000	Method for determining a value	Method	Granted	

<p>ABSTRACT</p> <p>Method for determining a value</p> <p>Type: Method</p> <p>Status: Granted</p>	
<p>CLAIMS</p> <p>1. A method for determining a value, comprising:</p> <p>a) receiving a first input;</p> <p>b) processing the first input to produce a second input;</p> <p>c) outputting the second input.</p>	
<p>DESCRIPTION</p> <p>The present invention relates to a method for determining a value. The method includes receiving a first input, processing the first input to produce a second input, and outputting the second input.</p>	
<p>REFERENCES</p> <p>U.S. Pat. No. 6,500,000 (2000)</p> <p>U.S. Pat. No. 6,500,001 (2000)</p> <p>U.S. Pat. No. 6,500,002 (2000)</p>	
<p>FIGURES</p> <p>FIG. 1 is a block diagram of a system for determining a value.</p> <p>FIG. 2 is a flowchart of a method for determining a value.</p>	

Patent Portfolio Negotiations and Litigation						
Patent Portfolio						
ID	Patent	Title	Class	Priority	Status	Notes
1	101000001	Method for data processing	Class 1	Priority 1	Granted	
2	101000002	System for data processing	Class 2	Priority 2	Granted	
3	101000003	Method for data processing	Class 3	Priority 3	Granted	
4	101000004	Method for data processing	Class 4	Priority 4	Granted	
5	101000005	Method for data processing	Class 5	Priority 5	Granted	
6	101000006	Method for data processing	Class 6	Priority 6	Granted	
7	101000007	Method for data processing	Class 7	Priority 7	Granted	
8	101000008	Method for data processing	Class 8	Priority 8	Granted	
9	101000009	Method for data processing	Class 9	Priority 9	Granted	
10	101000010	Method for data processing	Class 10	Priority 10	Granted	

Confirm	
Are you sure you want to delete this patent?	Yes No

Patent Portfolio Negotiations and Litigation	
Patent 101000001	Patent 101000002
Patent 101000003	Patent 101000004
Patent 101000005	Patent 101000006
Patent 101000007	Patent 101000008
Patent 101000009	Patent 101000010

Patent Portfolio Negotiations and Litigation	
Patent 101000001	Patent 101000002
Patent 101000003	Patent 101000004
Patent 101000005	Patent 101000006
Patent 101000007	Patent 101000008
Patent 101000009	Patent 101000010

Patent Portfolio Negotiations and Litigation	
Patent 101000001	Patent 101000002
Patent 101000003	Patent 101000004
Patent 101000005	Patent 101000006
Patent 101000007	Patent 101000008
Patent 101000009	Patent 101000010

Patent Portfolio						
2025-25						
ID	Owner	Title	Status	Applicant	Filed	Expiry
1	Microsoft	System and method for managing data	Granted	John Doe	2010-01-01	2030-01-01
2	Google	Method for processing data	Granted	John Doe	2010-01-01	2030-01-01
3	Apple	System and method for managing data	Granted	John Doe	2010-01-01	2030-01-01
4	Amazon	Method for processing data	Granted	John Doe	2010-01-01	2030-01-01
5	Facebook	System and method for managing data	Granted	John Doe	2010-01-01	2030-01-01
6	Twitter	Method for processing data	Granted	John Doe	2010-01-01	2030-01-01
7	LinkedIn	System and method for managing data	Granted	John Doe	2010-01-01	2030-01-01
8	YouTube	Method for processing data	Granted	John Doe	2010-01-01	2030-01-01
9	Instagram	System and method for managing data	Granted	John Doe	2010-01-01	2030-01-01
10	Snapchat	Method for processing data	Granted	John Doe	2010-01-01	2030-01-01
11	WhatsApp	System and method for managing data	Granted	John Doe	2010-01-01	2030-01-01
12	Telegram	Method for processing data	Granted	John Doe	2010-01-01	2030-01-01
13	Signal	System and method for managing data	Granted	John Doe	2010-01-01	2030-01-01
14	Skype	Method for processing data	Granted	John Doe	2010-01-01	2030-01-01
15	Zoom	System and method for managing data	Granted	John Doe	2010-01-01	2030-01-01
16	Webex	Method for processing data	Granted	John Doe	2010-01-01	2030-01-01
17	GoTo	System and method for managing data	Granted	John Doe	2010-01-01	2030-01-01
18	Blackboard	Method for processing data	Granted	John Doe	2010-01-01	2030-01-01
19	FutureLearn	System and method for managing data	Granted	John Doe	2010-01-01	2030-01-01
20	Canvas LMS	Method for processing data	Granted	John Doe	2010-01-01	2030-01-01

Patent Portfolio Negotiations and Litigation

John Doe - 500-000000

Individual Property

Owner: John Doe
 Microsoft Corporation et al. Commonly owned with Microsoft Research Corporation
 Applicant: John Doe
 Title: 500-000000
 Filed: 2010-01-01
 Expiry: 2030-01-01
 Status: Granted

Giannario Cappiello Litigation					
Case No. - 010901/2019					
Litigation					
Case No.	Case Title	Case	Case	Case	Case
1	010901/2019	Case	Case	Case	Case
2	010901/2019	Case	Case	Case	Case
3	010901/2019	Case	Case	Case	Case
4	010901/2019	Case	Case	Case	Case
5	010901/2019	Case	Case	Case	Case
6	010901/2019	Case	Case	Case	Case
7	010901/2019	Case	Case	Case	Case
8	010901/2019	Case	Case	Case	Case
9	010901/2019	Case	Case	Case	Case
10	010901/2019	Case	Case	Case	Case
11	010901/2019	Case	Case	Case	Case
12	010901/2019	Case	Case	Case	Case
13	010901/2019	Case	Case	Case	Case
14	010901/2019	Case	Case	Case	Case
15	010901/2019	Case	Case	Case	Case
16	010901/2019	Case	Case	Case	Case
17	010901/2019	Case	Case	Case	Case
18	010901/2019	Case	Case	Case	Case
19	010901/2019	Case	Case	Case	Case
20	010901/2019	Case	Case	Case	Case


igation


Next sync: 9:51 PM

Sync Now

[Reset demo](#)

Field	Value
RecordType	Torts - Motor Vehicle
NormalizedJudge	no info
Status	Pre-RJl
Cause	no info
RecordType	Torts - Motor Vehicle
NormalizedJudge	no info
Status	Pre-RJl
Cause	no info
RecordType	Torts - Motor Vehicle
NormalizedJudge	no info
Status	Pre-RJl





Amount Billed by Phase


Amount Billed (USD)


Phase


Pleading


Discovery


PreTrial











METHOD AND SYSTEM FOR AI-ENHANCED LEGAL DATA INTEGRATION AND MANAGEMENT

BACKGROUND

[0001] The handling of law firm data is a complex process that involves the integration of varied document types and data from multiple sources, each with its own format, and security requirements. The traditional approach to managing this data is labor-intensive and prone to errors, often failing to capitalize on the potential for analytical insight. Outsourcing data management offers a partial solution but can lead to increased costs and operational inefficiencies.

[0002] This invention addresses these issues by introducing a method and system for AI-powered legal data integration and management. The solution is designed to automate the process of finding and matching law firm records to public records and synchronizing fields from the public record, back to private law firm databases. In this way, confidential law firm records will always be enriched with information from the public record, without any (or minimal) human interaction. Performing this seemingly simple task requires a number of existing and new technologies. Existing technologies that must be perfected include security, APIs, field-by-field data syncing, and security. Newer technologies, include suggesting and normalizing vendor-specific codes to standardized codes (including SALI or SOLI), using multiple sources to cross-references accurately, and mapping legal data to custom fields within law firm systems. The system streamlines the summarization and structuring of extensive legal documents, utilizing a tailored version of the Generative Pre-trained Transformer (GPT) model, improving data accessibility and management. Putting these components together and more, one can build a highly reliable legal data synchronization system.

[0003] As legal data continues to expand in volume and complexity, managing that data in real time and aligning it with a firm's internal practices and billing structures becomes increasingly critical. In addition to simply syncing docket entries, the invention addresses the growing need to connect each matter with cost and budget data, such that legal professionals can see both the substantive progression of a case and the accompanying financial implications.

SUMMARY

[0004] The invention is a data syncing and replication tool tailored for the legal industry. Its foundational principle is that all relevant legal data should be replicated precisely in the necessary location, in the correct format, and should be excluded where it is not needed. Achieving this objective requires addressing several intricate challenges specific to the legal domain.

[0005] To ensure accurate and seamless data replication, the system employs a multi-layered approach, including a robust machine learning framework that can interpret and categorize complex legal terminologies and identifiers into a universally recognized format. The system's architecture allows it to handle the nuances of legal data, such as the various ways case types, court names, and docket entries are recorded and utilized across different jurisdictions.

[0006] Furthermore, the system's AI-enhanced capabilities facilitate the automatic conversion of this diverse legal data into a standardized format that can be readily used by

various matter and practice management software. This not only simplifies data management for legal practitioners but also mitigates the risk of data inconsistency and inaccuracy that can arise from manual data handling.

[0007] Recognizing the dynamic nature of legal data, the system is designed to be adaptable, with the ability to update its normalization algorithms in response to changes in legal classifications, naming conventions, and documentation styles. This adaptability is crucial for maintaining the integrity and relevancy of the data within the rapidly evolving legal landscape.

[0008] A key advantage of the system is its ability to avoid vendor lock-in by providing a flexible and open framework that can interface with a wide range of data sources and legal management systems. This interoperability is enhanced by the system's compliance with SOC-2 security certification standards, ensuring that all data transactions are secure and that the system can be trusted to handle sensitive legal information.

[0009] The invention represents a novel approach to legal data management, offering a solution that not only simplifies and automates data integration and replication but also provides law firms with the confidence that their data is accurate, up-to-date, and secure.

[0010] The system also incorporates visualization tools for data insights, including predictive cost curves, phase-based cost modeling, and quartile-based analysis of litigation expenses. Interactive charts, such as overlapping trapezoidal phase models, provide users with a clear picture of matter progression and associated costs. These tools enable professionals to compare cases, assess profitability, and make data-driven decisions on pricing and resource allocation.

DETAILED DESCRIPTION

[0011] The aim of the present system is to efficiently link disparate legal records, each characterized by their unique set of fields, through an integration of advanced machine learning algorithms, domain expertise, external databases, and, when necessary, human confirmation via UX design. This innovative approach is pivotal in addressing the diversity and complexity inherent in legal data, where different jurisdictions, institutions, and databases use varied nomenclature and formats.

[0012] In a preferred embodiment, the system first acquires matter records from a private law firm database. Each record may contain a citation number, client name, billing data, attorney assignments, and any other metadata integral to the firm's internal processes. A specialized module, referred to herein as the "auto-pairing engine," searches public or third-party databases (such as CourtListener or Docket Alarm) for matching docket records. Once potential matches are identified, the system presents them alongside each matter, enabling either automated or manual pairing. This pairing process is logged, providing an evidentiary trail of which candidate docket was selected and when.

[0013] To mitigate issues related to data uniformity, the system uses a robust normalization pipeline. This pipeline includes a GPT-based model that reads the external docket or document text, extracting standardized field values for judge name, case cause, and associated SALI codes for claim or matter type. Where SALI's terminology is highly interconnected, the invention refines these taxonomies into more practical two-tier structures, for example by grouping Constitutional or Civil Rights claims under one heading and

subdividing them into Race or Sex Discrimination sub-claims. By adopting an approach that partially streamlines SALI's multi-directional graph, the system allows attorneys to quickly locate the correct classification for a matter without navigating an overly complex hierarchy.

[0014] Once matter data is fully normalized, the system's synchronization module updates both the firm's internal database fields and any connected practice management software. This synchronization can be scheduled or triggered manually and is performed in a manner that ensures each user sees the most current docket events, billing details, and phase timelines. The process is governed by field-level security controls and ethical firewalls, ensuring that matters with sensitive statuses or client information remain restricted to authorized personnel only.

[0015] One of the key enhancements made possible by this integrated approach is the system's ability to align litigation phases with actual costs. By combining docket data with a firm's time entries and billing records, the system can automatically identify when the Pleading phase began and ended, how many hours were billed in the Discovery phase, or how overhead expenditures changed during Pretrial proceedings. This information is then surfaced through a user interface that supports both textual grids and interactive charts. A user might open a matter's "phase chart" to see the start date, end date, evidence supporting these dates (such as docket entries or time narratives), and total costs. Extended charting options, including candlestick or box-and-whisker plots, allow for side-by-side comparisons of cost distributions across multiple phases or matters.

[0016] The invention further includes advanced budget forecasting modules that leverage the aggregated data from many matters. A time-based cost chart can show how the combined spending for a set of matters progresses quarter by quarter and how these expenditures break down by phase. This is invaluable for firms seeking to structure alternative fee arrangements by anticipating high-cost intervals, identifying outliers, and communicating realistic budgets to clients. If desired, attorneys can also filter matters by claim type, enabling a targeted view of how certain claims (for instance, patent infringement) historically evolve in cost and duration relative to other claims.

[0017] A customizable user interface ties together these functionalities. For instance, the "Column Manager" allows each user or team to select the fields most relevant to them, ensuring that an IP litigation group may emphasize patent-specific codes and claim durations, while a personal injury group can focus on Torts or settlement amounts. In parallel, advanced sync logs track each step of the system's data updates, including the date and time of field-level modifications. This persistent audit trail not only supports compliance with SOC-2 and internal risk controls but also gives firm leadership reassurance that data integrity is maintained.

[0018] By uniting external data aggregation, robust security, AI-based normalization, cost-phase integration, and a flexible user interface, the invention forms a cohesive system for managing legal data. The resulting platform reduces duplicative data entry, promotes consistency across firm databases, and enables proactive budgeting, ultimately providing law firms with a more streamlined, accurate, and forward-looking approach to matter management.

INTEGRATING WITH LAW FIRM DATABASES

[0019] The primary goal in integrating with law firm databases is to achieve seamless synchronization while maintaining high security standards. This integration process is pivotal for the system's functionality, ensuring that all necessary data is accurately and efficiently replicated across different platforms.

[0020] Security and Privacy: The integration must occur without any risk of data leakage between databases. Implementing field-level role and access security is critical, with specific scenarios such as:

[0021] Partners and Associates: Partners may have access to broader client information, including billings and collectibles, whereas associates have limited access.

[0022] Sensitive Fields: Fields like billing information, client communications, drafts, and discovery documents require stringent access controls.

[0023] Ethical Firewalls: Within a firm, there might be restrictions on information access to prevent conflicts of interest.

[0024] Commingling Funds: Proper safeguards must be in place to avoid unethical handling of client funds. Confidential Case Details: Specific case details may be restricted based on the user's role. For instance, junior associates or paralegals might have limited access to highly sensitive or high-profile case information, which is available only to senior partners or specifically assigned attorneys.

[0025] Client Financial Information: Access to client financial information, such as payment histories, trust account details, and settlement amounts, could be restricted to senior financial staff and partners, preventing unauthorized viewing by other staff members.

[0026] Internal Review and Approval Documents: Drafts of legal documents or internal memos awaiting review or approval might only be accessible to the authors and designated reviewers. This ensures control over document versions and maintains the integrity of internal processes.

[0027] Litigation Strategies and Research: Details about litigation strategies or sensitive legal research may be available only to the legal team directly involved in the case. This helps in maintaining strategic confidentiality, especially in competitive or adversarial legal situations.

[0028] Human Resources and Personnel Records: Access to human resources-related information, such as employee records, performance evaluations, and salary details, is typically restricted to authorized HR personnel and senior management, ensuring privacy and compliance with employment laws.

[0029] Each of the above security related embodiments is conceived in connection with a single data field, group or family of fields, or access to an entire system. Thus, stressing the importance of a full security model underlying each data field (independently or under group policy).

Database Types

[0030] The integration with law firm databases is challenged by their inherent complexity, which arises from a variety of factors:

[0031] Law firms employ diverse database systems for different functions. Prominent among these are Matter Management systems, like Foundation and InTapp, which handle case-related information. APIs with Varied Fields: These systems come equipped with APIs featuring a wide array of

pre-built and custom fields. For instance, matter management systems might include fields for client details, case statuses, associated documents, and billing information. One significant challenge is the absence of a universal mapping standard across these systems. Custom fields in one system may not have direct equivalents in another, necessitating a mapping mechanism to ensure data consistency and accuracy.

Matter Field Variations

[0032] On particular field that presents numerous challenges and must be dealt with directly, is the “Matter field”. The field is typically a string or sequence of numbers. Common formats include:

[0033] CLIENT_CODE-MATTER_CODE: A simple concatenation of client and matter codes.

[0034] CLIENT_CODE-BILLING-MATTER_CODE: Incorporates billing details with client and matter codes.

[0035] MATTER_CODE-CLIENT_CODE: A reversal of the client and matter code order.

[0036] CLIENT_CODE-MATTER_CODE-EMPLOYEE: Adds an employee identifier to the client and matter codes.

[0037] Besides variations in formats, there are often inconsistencies in usage: Leading zeros, for instance, might be used inconsistently across different records or systems. This variation can cause discrepancies in data synchronization and requires normalization. The invention discloses a machine learning system for differentiating between codes and inconsistencies.

Citation Field and Variation Analysis

[0038] Legal citations are a fundamental component of legal data, serving as references to case laws, statutes, and legal precedents. However, the wide variation in citation formats, the presence of incomplete or outdated citations, and the complexity inherent in understanding the context and relevance of these citations pose significant challenges in legal data management.

[0039] The invention proposes an advanced citation analysis system capable of interpreting and contextualizing legal citations within law firm databases. This system utilizes AI and machine learning technologies to recognize various citation formats, verify their accuracy, and understand the underlying legal documents and fields associated with these citations.

[0040] Contextual Understanding of Citations: The system can interpret the context in which a citation is used, differentiating between historical and current citations, and understanding the implications of superseded or parallel citations. For example, citation analysis would be employed to recognize “35 F.3d 123” is a citation to caselaw, a single document with written text outlining the outcome of a decision. With NLP processing, it could contain the outcome of the case. However, it will unlikely be able to tell you all the attorneys, and the exact sequence of events within the case. Similarly “1:12-cv-00789” A docket citation to a single docket sheet. This may have metadata on the sequence of events, but not the substance.

[0041] The system includes a Citation Format Recognition and Normalization component, capable of handling a wide range of citation formats, including traditional reporter cita-

tions, neutral citations, electronic citations, and foreign legal citations. Normalizes these varying formats into a standardized form for consistent data management.

[0042] The system includes a Cross-Referencing and Verification components, which cross-references citations with official legal databases and updates inaccurate or incomplete citations. Recognizes and reconciles parallel and pinpoint citations, ensuring precise legal referencing.

[0043] The system integrates with Legal Documents and Fields. The system links citations to the relevant legal documents and fields in the database. The system Understands the nature of the documents referenced by the citation, whether they are court decisions, statutes, or legal commentaries.

[0044] The system includes a Handling Unreported and Annotated Citations component, which identifies and categorizes unreported cases, providing context and significance where official reporter citations are absent. Processes annotated citations, extracting and utilizing editorial comments and annotations for enhanced legal understanding.

[0045] The system includes a Foreign Citation Analysis component: For law firms dealing with international law, the system can analyze and integrate foreign citations, accommodating different languages and legal systems.

[0046] The system includes a User Interface for Manual Review and Correction component, which incorporates an interactive user interface allowing legal professionals to manually review, verify, and correct the system’s citation analysis when necessary.

Additional Fields Relevant to Legal

[0047] Additional fields embodied in the invention that are specifically considered include:

[0048] First and Last Names: The system employs entity resolution algorithms to differentiate individuals with similar or identical names. It links records that refer to the same individual under different name variations, ensuring accurate individual identification. This capability is crucial in a legal context where precise client identification is essential.

[0049] Company Names: With regard to company names, the invention applies AI-based entity matching techniques to manage variations in company names, subsidiaries, and parent companies. This feature is particularly important for accurately linking records across different cases or transactions involving the same corporate entity, despite potential discrepancies in how the company’s name is recorded.

[0050] Address Fields: To ensure uniformity and prevent duplication in address data, the system normalizes and standardizes address formats using AI algorithms. This process is vital for maintaining the integrity of client and case data, where address accuracy is essential for correspondence and legal notices.

[0051] Email Addresses and Phone Numbers: The system also addresses the complexities associated with email and phone number records. By applying pattern recognition and correlation techniques, it accurately associates these contact details with the correct individual or company profiles, an important aspect for effective communication and case management.

[0052] Case and Docket Numbers: In managing case and docket numbers, the system implements algorithms to maintain uniqueness and consistency, crucial for organizing and tracking legal cases efficiently. It also cross-references

docket numbers with external legal databases for verification and correct linkage to case files.

[0053] Billing and Invoice Numbers: For billing and invoice numbers, the AI system assists in matching these numbers with corresponding client accounts and services rendered, ensuring accurate billing and financial management.

[0054] Sensitive Identifiers (Social Security/National ID Numbers): Handling sensitive identifiers like Social Security or national ID numbers, the system employs secure AI algorithms for identity verification, crucial for maintaining confidentiality and preventing data breaches.

[0055] Legal Citations: The system's advanced citation parsing and linking algorithms are designed to manage the complexities of legal citations, linking them accurately to the relevant cases or statutes, a key aspect in legal research and case preparation.

[0056] Relationship Fields: Finally, the system analyzes relational patterns to maintain accurate linkages between related records, such as clients and their attorneys, an essential feature for understanding and managing the dynamics of legal representation.

CONNECTION TO PUBLIC DATA SOURCES

[0057] In the current market, there are several sources of public legal information, including major players like Lexis and Westlaw, and a growing number of other sources such as Bloomberg, vLex, Unicourt, Trellis, judyrecords, and Leagle. However, a significant gap exists in the ability to aggregate and integrate this data effectively into law firm databases, especially considering the varying data collection methods and field formats provided by these sources.

[0058] The invention proposes a comprehensive system capable of connecting with a multitude of public legal data sources and standardizing the onboarding of this data into law firm databases. The system is designed to understand and adapt to the diverse data formats and structures of different legal information providers.

Integration With Public Legal Data Sources

[0059] The system integrates with various public legal data sources, each with unique data offerings and formats. This includes established sources like Lexis and Westlaw, as well as emerging platforms. A special focus is given to sources like Docket Alarm, which provides detailed docket information from government websites. A legal data source can also include periodical information (such as news) or custom databases such as Pitchbook.

[0060] Unlike existing products, this system can take a legal citation and link it across multiple data sources, a task previously possible only through manual processes in large companies.

[0061] To handle the diversity of data, the system employs a flexible common data model that supports all legal providers, regardless of their specific data structures. This model is crucial for aggregating legal information across different entities and matters.

[0062] Each data source is modeled using specifications like OpenAPI/Swagger, with a process in place to correct common inaccuracies in these specifications (e.g., field requirements, data types). The system preprocesses these specifications, applying corrections and standardizations to ensure accurate data integration.

[0063] Applying Cost Savings to Data Aggregation: Requires a deep understanding of collection methods, and fields of each provider. For example, PACER has RSS feeds, for-pay feeds, and one-off data collection options. Each provider may offer different slices of this data at different coverage depth. Some may not have all the fields. For example, in PACER, there are some fields, e.g., like the "case summary" field, that is only available via a separate pay-wall, in this case at the sub-path "/qrySummary.pl". A provider that offers "all cases" may not offer the "case summary" field across all cases. Avoiding vendor lock-in is another benefit.

[0064] Handling Complex Data and Metadata: The system is equipped to handle complex hierarchical metadata and binary data, addressing a significant limitation in current legal data management systems. This includes normalizing diverse citation formats from different sources, ensuring consistency and accuracy.

[0065] Improvements Over Prior Art: A plug-and-play architecture allows for easy addition and integration of new data sources. See Universal Migrator (<https://www.universalmigrator.com/>) which connects many law firm databases, but not a single legal data source is listed. There is no simple way of aggregating legal information across entities or matters from multiple sources. The system's ability to handle complex data structures represents a significant advancement over existing technologies.

Advantages of the Invention

[0066] This invention stands out in its ability to seamlessly integrate a wide range of public legal data sources into law firm databases, addressing the need for a unified and efficient legal data management system. By standardizing the data onboarding process and handling the complexities of diverse data formats and sources, the system greatly enhances the accessibility and usability of legal information for law firms. The advanced integration and normalization capabilities make it a pioneering solution in the field of legal technology.

AUTO-SUGGEST CASE LINK AND NORMALIZE

[0067] The present system incorporates an advanced machine learning algorithm to identify, interpret, and normalize a wide array of legal codes, including case types and court names, into standardized SALI codes. It is supported by an extensive cross-referencing database and employs a format translation protocol for comprehensive code conversion. This feature is augmented by an interactive user interface for manual verification and adjustment, enhancing the continuous learning capabilities of the AI model. The system is designed to manage the complexity inherent in legal code standardization, addressing not only common case types and court names but also adapting to less common and jurisdiction-specific nomenclature.

[0068] Comprehensive AI Model for Case Type Normalization: The system employs an AI model trained on a diverse dataset encompassing thousands of case types, capable of recognizing and converting numeric, textual, and hybrid identifiers into the corresponding SALI codes.

[0069] Dynamic Cross-Referencing Database: An integrated database serves as a repository for case types and related legal identifiers, constantly updated to reflect new legal classifications and changes within jurisdictions.

[0070] Format Translation Protocol: A protocol within the system allows for the interpretation of various case type references, such as “3.740” or “Enforcement of Judgment Limited (20)”, normalizing them into standardized formats.

[0071] Context-aware Normalization Algorithm: Algorithms consider contextual data, such as jurisdiction-specific information and legal terms, to ensure the accurate categorization of case types.

[0072] Geographically-aware Court Name Normalization: A module is dedicated to translating court names, recognizing various naming conventions from “SDNY” to “Southern District” or “the mother court”, and linking them to an up-to-date registry of standardized names.

[0073] Registry of Courts and Standard Names: Maintenance of a comprehensive, current registry of courts includes historical and recent changes in court naming conventions, aiding the normalization process.

[0074] Case Title Parsing System: The system includes a parsing mechanism for case titles, capable of normalizing names into a standardized format, whether they follow the Bluebook style or local captioning rules.

[0075] Interactive Database for Naming Conventions: An interactive database supports the AI, storing and updating naming conventions to ensure that case titles are consistently standardized.

[0076] Docket Event Recognition System: The docket event recognition system of this invention is specifically designed to address the multifaceted nature of docket entries, recognizing and classifying the varied fields they comprise. These fields, including but not limited to filing date, contents, summary, motion type, attorney and party details, can vary significantly from one court to another, adding layers of complexity to the data normalization process. Key enhancements to this system, over prior art (see patent application Ser. No. 17/746,447, which shares an inventor).

[0077] Multi-Field Analysis and Classification: The system is equipped to analyze each field within a docket entry, employing specialized algorithms to categorize and standardize data according to field type. This allows for a more granular and accurate representation of docket entries.

[0078] Court-Specific Data Handling: Acknowledging the variability of docket entry structures across different courts, the system is designed to adapt its processing algorithms based on court-specific data formats and requirements. This ensures consistency and accuracy in data normalization, regardless of the source court.

[0079] Comprehensive Data Integration: The system integrates data from various fields of a docket entry into a cohesive and standardized format. This integration is crucial for maintaining data integrity and facilitating ease of access and analysis.

[0080] Advanced Data Mapping: Given the diverse range of fields in docket entries, the system employs advanced data mapping techniques to align each field with its corresponding standard code or category, as per the SALI standard or other relevant legal data frameworks.

[0081] Implementation of a common data language provides a standardized method for discussing and reconciling docket events across different legal platforms.

[0082] User-Assisted Validation: The system incorporates user interface elements that allow for manual validation or correction of the AI’s classification, particularly in complex

or ambiguous cases. This feature ensures that the system’s outputs remain accurate and reliable, benefiting from human expertise where necessary.

[0083] Real-time Updating Mechanism for Docket Events: The system incorporates a mechanism for real-time updates of docket events to ensure the database reflects the most current legal activities.

[0084] Verification and Feedback System: A verification loop allows users to provide feedback on AI-generated normalizations, which the system uses to refine its algorithms and improve accuracy over time.

AUTOMATED PAIRING SYSTEM FOR LEGAL DATA INTEGRATION

[0085] Efficiently pairing internal case records with external legal data sources is a significant challenge due to the varied nature of data formats and the importance of accuracy in legal document handling. This invention provides a methodical and automated approach to identify, search, and pair relevant legal records with external data, streamlining data management processes within law firms.

[0086] The system begins by conducting a thorough search of the remote firm database to locate pertinent records. Upon identifying relevant records, the system captures the record link, which is then cataloged in a centralized database and queued for the pairing process.

[0087] Once the pairing process initiates, the system sequentially retrieves record links from the queue, triggering the start of the pairing sequence. During this phase, the system meticulously identifies citations and outward links embedded within the firm’s database records.

[0088] A key component of the system is the citation analyzer, which determines the relevance of various external databases to the identified citations. It may cross-reference information across multiple sources to ensure the accuracy of the pairing.

[0089] Subsequently, the system crafts a unique “search strategy” for each database relative to the record in question. These strategies comprise one or more queries tailored to external data sources, which are then added to an execution queue.

[0090] The execution queue is responsible for carrying out the search queries, procuring results from the designated databases. An optional step allows for additional intermediate transformations on the search results to prepare them for the pairing process.

[0091] At the heart of the system is the matching algorithm, an architectural construct that evaluates the compatibility of law firm records with database results. It employs an accumulator mechanism, allowing for the retention and forward progression of contextual information, which aids in the matching decision process.

[0092] When a unique match is identified, the system, by default, automatically pairs the case record with the corresponding external data. This default behavior is adjustable to accommodate different firm preferences and policies.

[0093] In scenarios where multiple potential matches are found, the system defers to a user interface designed for reconciliation, as previously disclosed. This interface allows for human intervention to determine the most accurate pairing based on the presented options.

[0094] The invention significantly augments the capability of law firms to manage their data efficiently, reducing the time and resources required for manual data pairing while

enhancing accuracy and compliance with legal standards. This system offers a robust solution to one of the most complex and time-consuming aspects of legal data management.

ENHANCED AI ACCURACY AND RELIABILITY IN LEGAL DATA NORMALIZATION

[0095] The current system significantly advances beyond the limitations of existing AI models, particularly addressing the challenge of AI ‘hallucinations’, a common issue in current AI technologies where models generate incorrect or nonsensical information. This is a critical concern in the legal domain, where accuracy is paramount.

[0096] To mitigate this issue, the system incorporates a multi-source verification method akin to human cross-referencing practices. This approach involves validating AI-generated suggestions by cross-checking multiple independent data sources, ensuring that the final output is not only generated by AI but also corroborated by reliable external data. This process is crucial for achieving high accuracy in legal data normalization, where diverse and complex data must be standardized.

[0097] Moreover, the system enhances the user experience (UX) by integrating a workflow that leverages dual AI models connected to multiple data sources. Unlike a stand-alone GPT translator, which may not be reliable due to the risk of hallucinations, the system’s dual AI setup provides a robust check-and-balance mechanism. When both AI models, drawing upon different datasets, arrive at the same conclusion independently, the level of trust in the output significantly increases. This dual-confirmation approach is critical in a legal setting where the stakes of data accuracy are high.

[0098] This advanced methodology is a substantial improvement over existing technologies in several ways:

[0099] Reduction of AI Hallucinations: By cross-referencing multiple data sources, the system substantially reduces the risk of AI-generated errors, providing a more reliable and accurate normalization of legal data.

[0100] Enhanced Decision Confidence: The use of dual AI models working independently and corroborating each other’s findings increases the confidence in the system’s outputs, as it mimics the human method of cross-verification for accuracy.

[0101] Improved User Experience: The UX is designed to be intuitive and transparent, allowing users to understand the rationale behind the AI’s suggestions. This is crucial for users to trust and effectively interact with the system.

[0102] Adaptability to Complex Legal Data: The system’s architecture is specifically tailored to handle the intricacies of legal data, which often involves complex matching and normalization across various jurisdictions and legal terminologies.

[0103] The system described exhibits a higher level of sophistication than current market tools, such as those provided by companies like Surfe and ZoomInfo, which augment data like email addresses with corresponding LinkedIn profiles. While these tools perform well within the scope of commercial people searches, they do not possess the capabilities necessary for the complex task of legal data normalization.

[0104] These advancements offer a level of sophistication and reliability that is currently unmatched in the prior art.

AI INTERFACE TO FIRM CONFIDENTIAL DOCUMENTS

[0105] The function of the AI Interface to Firm Confidential Documents is to securely and efficiently interface law firm’s confidential documents with external AI analysis tools. This process is designed to enhance security, observability, auditability, and to avoid model lock-in. The invention facilitates the safe transmission of arbitrary legal data to chosen AI tools for analysis, ensuring both the integrity of the data and the flexibility in AI tool selection.

Specific Embodiment—Integration With External With Prior Art AI Tools (Harvey.ai)

[0106] Harvey.ai, a new tool among attorneys, offers a GPT-4 prompt builder and manages user-generated prompts and workflows. However, it requires the manual uploading of documents, leading to issues regarding document selection, access control, update frequency, and completeness. These limitations can undermine the trust in and effectiveness of the tool.

[0107] In contrast, the proposed system automatically integrates all relevant firm documents with external tools like Harvey.ai. This ensures that the most current and complete set of documents is always available for AI analysis, eliminating the manual intervention and uncertainty inherent in the prior art.

Enhanced Security and Data Management

[0108] Secure Data Transmission: Implements robust encryption and secure data transmission protocols to ensure that confidential documents are safely sent to external AI tools, safeguarding sensitive information.

[0109] Data Correlation and Transmission: The system not only grabs firm data but also correlates it with other relevant data sources before transmitting it. This enriched data set provides a more comprehensive basis for AI analysis.

[0110] Clean Separation of Data: Maintains a clear separation of data between different firm clients and AI models, ensuring that client confidentiality is preserved and there is no cross-contamination of data.

User-Centric Workflow Management

[0111] The system allows law firms to integrate with their preferred AI analysis tools, promoting freedom from model lock-in and enabling firms to leverage the most suitable tools for their specific needs. These tools may include natural language processing models, predictive analytics frameworks, or specialized AI solutions designed for legal data analysis. The flexibility ensures that the system remains adaptable to evolving technological landscapes, allowing seamless integration with both existing and emerging AI tools.

[0112] Users can create and manage their own AI prompts directly within the platform or through external tools, tailoring AI-driven analyses to meet unique requirements. For example, prompts can be configured to focus on specific tasks such as extracting claims, analyzing litigation trends, or generating cost forecasts. This capability extends to the management of workflows, enabling firms to define how and when documents are processed by AI tools. Workflows can include automated triggers for specific tasks, such as data

normalization, phase categorization, or claim extraction, and allow users to integrate additional validation steps for quality assurance.

[0113] The system incorporates a highly flexible custom data grid interface, enabling users to organize, filter, and compare legal data with precision. Users can dynamically adjust the grid to display relevant fields, such as litigation phases, cost metrics, or case groupings, and apply advanced filters to refine the dataset. For instance, filters can be configured to isolate matters by phase-specific costs, jurisdiction, or type of alternative fee arrangement.

[0114] The comparison workflows enable users to analyze similar matters side-by-side, identifying trends, outliers, and actionable insights. For example, users can compare the cost per deposition across cases with similar claims or evaluate success rates by court or jurisdiction. These workflows support iterative refinement, allowing firms to experiment with different groupings or filters to identify optimal configurations for reporting or decision-making. The grid supports live updates, ensuring that any changes to the underlying data are reflected instantly, and provides options for exporting results for collaborative review or integration with other systems.

[0115] By combining AI tool flexibility with the custom data grid, the system supports the creation and management of entirely user-defined workflows. Law firms can design workflows that span from initial data ingestion to final report generation, incorporating intermediate steps such as AI-driven analysis, manual review, and comparison workflows. This customization allows firms to align their workflows with internal policies, client requirements, and regulatory standards. For example, a workflow might begin with the import of docket data, followed by automated claim extraction, manual validation within the custom data grid, and the generation of a report summarizing phase-specific costs and success rates.

[0116] By integrating flexible AI interactions, custom data grids, and user-centric workflow design, the system empowers law firms to manage their legal data with unparalleled precision and adaptability. This comprehensive approach ensures that workflows are both efficient and aligned with the complex demands of modern legal practice.

Observability and Auditability

[0117] Activity Tracking and Reporting: The system includes features for tracking and reporting on all interactions with external AI tools, enhancing the observability of the data processing and analysis.

[0118] Audit Trails: Generates comprehensive audit trails documenting the transmission and use of data, aiding in regulatory compliance and internal audits.

[0119] Real-Time Data Tracking: The system is engineered to track data and interactions in real-time, ensuring that any information retrieved or processed is the most current. This feature is essential in legal settings where the value of information can depreciate rapidly with time.

[0120] Integration with Legal Timelines and Deadlines: The system incorporates a comprehensive understanding of various legal timelines, including local rules, the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure (FRCP), Criminal Law (Crim-LAW), and the Civil Practice Law and Rules (CPLR). It actively monitors these legal frameworks to provide timely

updates and alerts, ensuring that all actions taken are in alignment with the relevant deadlines and procedural requirements.

[0121] Local Rules and Jurisdiction-Specific Data Handling: Recognizing the diversity of legal procedures across jurisdictions, the system includes modules specifically tailored to understand and apply local legal rules and deadlines. This ensures that the legal analysis and document processing are not only accurate but also contextually relevant.

[0122] Automated Timing Analysis: The system features automated timing analysis tools that evaluate the relevance of legal information based on its timeliness. This tool assists legal professionals in prioritizing tasks and managing their workflow in accordance with the most pressing deadlines.

[0123] Enhanced Audit Trails with Time-Stamped Entries: Audit trails are meticulously time-stamped, providing a clear historical record of data interactions, changes, and accesses. This level of detail is vital for maintaining a transparent record for regulatory compliance and internal audits, especially in scenarios where timing and sequence of events are legally significant.

[0124] Customizable Alerts for Legal Deadlines: Law firms can configure the system to receive customized alerts for approaching legal deadlines, court dates, and other time-sensitive events. This customization ensures that practitioners never miss critical deadlines and can prepare adequately for upcoming legal obligations.

BUDGET PREDICTION MODELS

[0125] The present invention incorporates a Trapezoidal Model designed to provide accurate budget predictions for litigation matters, segmented by phases such as Pleading, Discovery, and Pretrial. This model utilizes historical billing data, quartile statistics, and overlapping timelines to offer dynamic and precise cost projections. Each litigation phase is represented as a trapezoid, with costs rising gradually during an on-ramp period, stabilizing at a plateau, and decreasing during an off-ramp period. This phased approach reflects the real-world progression of litigation, where activities overlap and costs fluctuate based on case demands.

[0126] The trapezoidal model is selected for its explainability and computational efficiency, making it particularly suited for legal practitioners and stakeholders who require transparency in budgeting processes. Unlike more complex forecasting techniques, the trapezoidal approach provides an intuitive visualization of costs, breaking them into distinct phases that correspond directly to real-world legal activities. This simplicity ensures that the model's outputs are interpretable and actionable, even for non-technical users.

[0127] Although the trapezoidal model is the primary method implemented in this invention, it is understood that other forecasting models can also be applied to litigation budget predictions. Time-series forecasting methods, such as those available in the Prophet library, may be integrated into the system to account for nonlinear trends, seasonality, or other complex patterns in the data. These advanced techniques allow for the prediction of costs in situations where historical data or phase structures deviate from standard distributions. The flexibility of the system ensures that any suitable forecasting model can be incorporated, provided it meets the requirements of accuracy, scalability, and interpretability.

[0128] The budgeting process begins by aggregating historical billing data for each phase and calculating the

quartile statistics for both cost and duration. The model determines the lower quartile (Q1), median, and upper quartile (Q3) costs, as well as corresponding durations. These statistical measures serve as the foundation for constructing the trapezoids. For each phase, the plateau duration is calculated based on the median duration and adjusted for variability between the quartiles. The on-ramp and off-ramp durations are defined by the spread between Q1 and Q3, creating smooth transitions that reflect real-world cost variability.

[0129] Each phase is plotted on a timeline, with time represented on the X-axis and cost per unit of time on the Y-axis. The height of each trapezoid is determined to ensure that the area under the curve equals the total cost for the phase. This ensures that the visualization remains both accurate and interpretable, with the trapezoid's dimensions reflecting the full distribution of costs and durations. To account for phase transitions, trapezoids are dynamically adjusted to overlap where necessary, such as when Discovery begins before Pleading concludes. This overlap is essential for capturing the complexity of real-world litigation processes, where phases rarely occur in isolation.

[0130] The resulting visualization enables legal practitioners to predict costs for individual phases and aggregate budgets across matters with shared attributes. The model provides insights into the variability of costs, highlights high-cost phases, and allows for the evaluation of potential budget scenarios. By supporting dynamic adjustments to time units and billing measures, such as hours billed or monetary values, the system offers unparalleled flexibility for tailoring budget predictions to the specific needs of a case or firm.

[0131] Through the combination of statistical rigor, practical applicability, and flexibility to incorporate alternative forecasting techniques, the invention enables legal professionals to predict and manage litigation budgets with precision. This advancement addresses the challenges of cost forecasting in complex litigation environments while ensuring transparency and scalability for diverse use cases.

Alternative Fee Arrangements (AFAs)

[0132] The present invention is designed to support a wide variety of Alternative Fee Arrangements (AFAs), addressing the evolving needs of legal practitioners and their clients. AFAs provide a flexible and tailored approach to legal billing, moving beyond the traditional billable hour to align incentives and manage costs more effectively. The invention integrates data from multiple sources to facilitate the creation, evaluation, and optimization of AFAs, ensuring a balance between cost management and value delivery.

[0133] The system is capable of handling a diverse range of AFA types, including but not limited to capped fees per phase, monthly or annual caps, and task-based caps. For example, a matter may be structured such that the Discovery phase has a capped fee, the entire matter is subject to a monthly billing limit, or specific tasks such as depositions or legal research are constrained by predefined budgets. The flexibility of the system allows law firms to adapt their billing strategies to client preferences, ensuring predictability in costs while maximizing profitability.

[0134] To accommodate these varied AFA structures, the invention considers multiple ways of grouping and analyzing matters. A matter may involve a single, discrete proceeding, such as a specific court case, or encompass a

broader scope, such as a patent campaign spanning multiple filings and jurisdictions. In some instances, matters may be grouped by practice area, aggregating all related work under a unified budget and AFA strategy. This grouping flexibility enables the system to scale from granular tasks to comprehensive legal campaigns, meeting the needs of both small engagements and complex, long-term projects.

[0135] The invention also incorporates a comprehensive analysis of cost drivers within a matter. These drivers include direct expenses such as legal research, artificial intelligence tools, depositions, and travel, as well as indirect costs like attorney salaries. While attorney salaries may influence profitability more than direct costs, the system integrates these factors into a cohesive profit and cost analysis framework. Additionally, the system evaluates value-driven metrics such as the number of motions filed, depositions taken, court hearings won, and other measurable outcomes. By correlating these value metrics with associated costs, the invention provides law firms with actionable insights to optimize AFAs for both profitability and client value.

[0136] The system achieves this through a fully connected legal data architecture, integrating cost and value elements across phases, tasks, and overall matter groupings. By unifying these data points, the invention enables firms to evaluate the financial impact of various AFA structures, predict outcomes, and negotiate terms that maximize both profitability and client satisfaction. This interconnected approach is essential for effectively managing AFAs, as it allows firms to account for the complexities of legal work while maintaining transparency and predictability in their billing practices.

[0137] In this context, a system like the present invention becomes nearly indispensable for creating and managing AFAs. Its ability to handle the interplay of costs, value, and diverse billing structures ensures that law firms can offer competitive and client-focused pricing strategies, while maintaining their own financial health and profitability. This capability represents a significant advancement in the field of legal technology, bridging the gap between cost management and value delivery in modern legal practice.

INTUITIVE AND COMPREHENSIVE USER INTERFACE SYSTEM FOR STREAMLINED LEGAL DATA MANAGEMENT AND COMPLIANCE

[0138] This invention resides in the domain of legal technology, specifically addressing the need for an advanced user interface (UX) system tailored for legal data management. It focuses on enhancing the interaction between legal professionals and complex data systems, facilitating efficient data validation, compliance with legal standards, and effective policy implementation.

[0139] In the evolving landscape of legal technology, the interface through which legal professionals interact with data systems plays a pivotal role in the efficiency and accuracy of legal data management. Traditional systems often fall short in offering the needed intuitiveness and comprehensive functionality required for handling complex legal data. This invention introduces an innovative user interface designed to bridge this gap. It combines user-centric design with technological underpinnings to deliver an unparalleled experience in legal data validation and management.

[0140] The system offers a multifaceted approach to handle various aspects of legal data management, such as entity naming verification, AI-driven data analysis, policy compliance, audit trail maintenance, and document version control. The interface is crafted to cater to the specific needs of the legal industry, focusing on ease of use, accuracy, and adherence to regulatory requirements. By integrating these features into a single, cohesive user interface, the invention significantly streamlines the workflow within legal practices, enhancing productivity and ensuring compliance with the highest standards of legal data management.

[0141] Entity Naming Verification Interface: The invention includes an embodiment featuring a specialized interface for entity naming verification. This interface allows users to select and verify the top entity names from AI and rule-based suggestions, integrating these with manual verification processes. The primary function of this component is to enhance the accuracy of conflict checks in legal cases, ensuring precise entity identification and reducing the risk of conflicts of interest.

[0142] AI Guidance Mechanism: Another critical embodiment of the invention is an AI guidance mechanism within the user interface. This feature enables users to provide feedback and corrective inputs to AI algorithms, ensuring that the data processed by AI is accurate and consistent with legal standards. The AI guidance mechanism serves a dual purpose: it not only helps in maintaining data accuracy but also contributes to the continuous improvement and adaptation of AI behavior to specific legal contexts and requirements.

[0143] Policy Implementation Tools: The invention also incorporates tools for implementing and enforcing specific data management policies within the legal firm. These tools are customizable within the user interface, allowing firms to ensure that all data handling and processing align with their internal policies, ethical standards, and legal obligations. This aspect of the invention is crucial for law firms that need to adhere to strict data management and privacy regulations.

[0144] Audit Trail Generation and Management: A key feature of the invention is the generation and management of comprehensive audit trails. This embodiment includes a histogram view within the user interface, showing detailed logs of all activities and changes within the system. The audit trail functionality is vital for maintaining transparency, ensuring compliance with legal regulations, and providing a clear record of data handling for internal and external audits.

[0145] Regulatory Compliance Checker: The invention integrates a regulatory compliance checker, providing users with a feed of the latest regulations relevant to their legal practice. This feature ensures that the firm remains compliant with current legal standards and adapts to any regulatory changes, making it an essential tool for risk management and compliance monitoring.

[0146] Document Version Control: Another embodiment of the system is a document version control feature that connects with popular legal management platforms such as Foundation, InTapp, iManage, and NetDocuments. This integration allows users to manage multiple versions of legal documents, ensuring they are working with the most current and correct versions, which is critical in legal practice where document accuracy and currency are paramount.

LITIGATION CLAIMS ANALYSIS

[0147] The invention incorporates an advanced Litigation Claims Analysis system designed to extract, identify, and normalize causes of action from litigation complaints with minimal human intervention. The process begins by parsing the docket to locate all complaints associated with a matter. Using the docket text, filing parties, and document update timestamps, the system identifies the operative complaint—typically the most recent and comprehensive version—while also assessing the availability and relevance of older complaints. A decision engine evaluates whether sufficient criteria are met to proceed with extraction or flag the document for manual review.

[0148] Once the operative complaint is identified, the system opens the document and uses a natural language processing (NLP) pipeline to extract its text. This pipeline employs large language models (LLMs), regex-based patterns, and traditional NLP techniques to identify key sections of the document that may contain claims or causes of action. Extracted snippets surrounding these sections are captured to preserve contextual relevance, providing a foundation for further processing.

[0149] The extracted snippets are then normalized into a standardized taxonomy of litigation claims, including SALI (Standards Advancement for the Legal Industry) codes, using an embedding-based approach with cosine similarity or prompt-driven classification in an LLM. By comparing the snippets against a list of hundreds of predefined claims, the system ensures consistency and precision in mapping disparate legal language into a universal format. Additionally, the system applies a secondary QA process, either rule-based or using another LLM, to sanity-check these mappings, validate the extracted claims, and flag anomalies. This multi-step approach not only enhances accuracy but also enables law firms to classify claims efficiently, aggregate them across cases, and derive actionable insights.

[0150] Through this analysis pipeline, the system bridges the gap between unstructured legal documents and structured data formats, enabling firms to streamline case classification, analyze trends in litigation claims, and improve the reliability of their legal databases.

LITIGATION PHASE ANALYSIS

[0151] The invention incorporates Litigation Phase Analysis, which synthesizes data from multiple sources to divide matters into distinct litigation phases and associate them with relevant time entries. By analyzing docket sheets, including their sequence and dates, alongside underlying pleadings and court rules or statutes dictating procedural timelines, the system constructs a clear picture of each phase. This is augmented by leveraging law firms' internal data, such as time entry narratives, which often indicate phase-specific activities like discovery.

[0152] A phase is distinct from an event in that it represents a time period characterized by a defined start and end, whether based on specific dates or observable characteristics. For example, the "Discovery" phase begins with the first request for production and ends when all depositions are completed. Unlike a discrete event, such as a hearing or filing, a phase encompasses a sequence of activities over time and serves as a framework for aggregating data, such as costs or resources, tied to that period. This distinction

ensures accurate categorization and analysis of legal data, providing a more comprehensive understanding of litigation progression.

[0153] The trapezoidal function, commonly used in time series forecasting and archaeological chronologies, has not been applied to the unique context of litigation. While prior art utilizes trapezoidal models to represent gradual transitions between phases or states, these models are typically confined to static historical data or natural processes. In contrast, this invention dynamically applies trapezoidal modeling to litigation phases, incorporating real-time data updates from docket entries, billing records, and procedural rules. This allows for more precise and actionable predictions of phase-specific durations and costs, tailored to the evolving nature of legal proceedings.

[0154] Unlike existing docket sync or time series tools, which often rely on static or retrospective data, this invention integrates live updates from multiple data streams to dynamically model phase transitions and associated costs. Additionally, existing tools do not interpret docket entries to identify precise start and end characteristics for phases. By incorporating domain-specific insights, such as procedural rules and narrative time entries, this system goes beyond simple chronological segmentation to provide a detailed, real-time understanding of litigation phases. This innovation bridges the gap between traditional phase modeling and the practical needs of litigation management, enabling firms to predict, visualize, and optimize resource allocation across phases with unparalleled accuracy.

[0155] The system integrates these datasets to create a timeline of litigation phases, enabling precise aggregation, querying, and comparison of costs across phases and matters. Because phases are tied to start and end dates, they can be connected to many other sources, including bills. The system allows users to query for cases meeting specific criteria (e.g., case type, jurisdiction), and aggregate the cost of certain phases. For example, users can analyze the average cost of discovery across all patent cases in new York, or all discrimination cases in Kansas. This phase-based organization aids in budgeting, alternative fee arrangements, and allows firms to identify patterns in resource allocation and cost variability across similar matters.

DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF THE FIGURES

[0156] Referring to FIG. 1, the illustrated interface presents an overview of multiple litigation matters arranged within a unified display. A filter panel [B] is positioned on the left portion of the interface and comprises various selectable categories, such as Status, Role, Forum Type, Courts, Class Action, Claim Type, and Claims. Each category displays the number of corresponding records present in the data set, enabling users to quickly gauge how many matters fall under a specific criterion. The panel allows for real-time interaction, so that when a user applies or removes a filter, the displayed list of matters in the main data grid automatically updates to match the newly refined criteria. A “Clear all” function is provided to revert the data set to an unfiltered view.

[0157] To the right of the filter panel [B], a main data grid [C] is shown listing a series of litigation matters, each occupying a single row. The grid includes columns labeled “Matter ID,” “Docket ID,” “Title,” “Judge,” “Litigation Claims,” “Pleading: Phase Chart,” and “Discovery: Phase

Chart.” The Matter ID column presents an internal firm reference code (for example, “MD-762555”), while the Docket ID column provides a public docket number (for example, “5:15-cv-04864”) for cross-referencing with court systems. Each row’s Title identifies the parties or short caption of the matter (such as “Align Technology, Inc. v . . .”), and the Judge column notes the presiding judge. The Litigation Claims column displays a short descriptor of the key claims (for instance, “Copyright Infringement”) and may include an indicator (for example, “+3 claims”) showing there are additional claims beyond those visible in the truncated text.

[0158] Phase Chart columns present simplified horizontal bar charts illustrating time expended or hours billed during those litigation stages, accompanied by numeric labels (for example, “237 billed hours, 5 Months” in the pleading phase). In this manner, users can rapidly assess how many resources have been allocated to each phase of the case. The interface further includes pagination controls near the bottom of the data grid, allowing for navigation through multiple pages of search results, and a tab or button mechanism near the top enabling toggling between table and chart views. By consolidating filter controls, matter-level data, and visualized metrics within a single user interface, the system provides a streamlined workflow for attorneys and support staff to locate, evaluate, and act upon relevant legal matters.

[0159] Referring to FIG. 2, the illustrated interface presents a hierarchical filter mechanism for selecting and categorizing claims and related procedural events in litigation matters. At the top portion of this figure, a set of collapsible claim categories is shown, including, for example, Constitutional and Civil Rights Claims, Criminal and Statutory Violation Claims, Employment Claims, and Intellectual Property Claims. Each category can be expanded to reveal sub-claims, such as Anti-Discrimination Retaliation or Race Discrimination under the Constitutional and Civil Rights heading, or Copyright Infringement and Patent Infringement under the Intellectual Property heading. Adjacent to each category or sub-claim, a checkbox is provided that, when selected, refines the displayed matters according to the chosen claim. A numerical value associated with each heading indicates the number of matters that fall within that claim group. Below the list of claims, the figure shows a separate section titled Summary Judgment, which similarly employs a hierarchical organization for distinguishing motions or orders filed by either a Defendant or Plaintiff. Within that section, additional checkboxes allow the user to filter matters based on the status of a motion, such as whether summary judgment was Filed, Granted, Denied, or Partially Granted. The phrase “A matter must include all claims” indicates that the system expects multiple potential claims to be associated together when refining search results, ensuring that matters meeting each selected criterion are included in the final data set.

[0160] Referring again to FIG. 2, the interface depicts a two-tiered hierarchical structure for organizing litigation claims, which were extracted from an external data source and automatically classified by the system. This classification process employs an underlying taxonomy that, while referencing the SALI framework for industry-standard terminology, refines that framework into a more straightforward hierarchy suited to legal practitioners’ workflow. SALI, as a fully connected graph, allows a wide range of

cross-associations and complex relationships among legal concepts; however, the illustrated two-tier approach streamlines the navigation by pairing each broad category of claims (for example, “Constitutional and Civil Rights Claims” or “Intellectual Property Claims”) with discrete, subordinate claim types (such as “Race Discrimination” or “Trademark Infringement”). By imposing this improved hierarchy, the system reduces cognitive load for attorneys, enabling them to select relevant claims efficiently without the need to navigate multiple intersecting links. Each claim group is accompanied by a numerical label indicating the total number of litigation matters associated with that category or subcategory, thus assisting in rapid filtering and retrieval. Once selected, the relevant claims form part of the search criteria, ensuring that any matter in the database matching all chosen claims is included in the filtered result. This hierarchical arrangement constitutes a structural advance over the unbounded, multi-directional nature of SALI data, as it allows lawyers to quickly locate and choose the most appropriate claim elements while still preserving the depth of classification enabled by SALI’s underlying industry-standard nomenclature.

[0161] Referring now to FIG. 3, the illustration depicts a phase-based filtering interface derived from the phase analysis component of the system. Within this interface, each litigation phase (for example, Pleading, Discovery, Pre-Trial, or Trial) is presented with collapsible sections that, when expanded, reveal two primary filtering mechanisms. The first mechanism, labeled “Phase Duration Range,” includes a bar chart indicating how many matters fall within various day-length intervals for the selected phase. Below that bar chart, a slider and corresponding numeric input fields permit the user to restrict matters based on minimum and maximum phase duration (for instance, between 54 and 2582 days). The second mechanism, labeled “Date Phase Started,” presents another bar chart correlating start dates to the number of matters commencing the selected phase on or near those dates; a separate slider and a “Date Range” dropdown further refine which matters appear, allowing the user to specify a custom date window. By enabling the user to select a particular phase (such as Pleading) and then constrain the result set either by phase length or by start date, the system provides detailed insight into how litigation activities progress over time, allowing for more precise searches of the underlying docket data and historical time records.

[0162] Referring to FIGS. 4a-i, collectively illustrating an auto-pairing process, the user interface presents a table of records retrieved from an internal matter repository, each record having columns for ID, Citation, Name, Client, Attorney, and Status. A text field near the top allows users to enter a query string, here labeled “Foundation query,” followed by a “Search” button. Once the query is submitted, the system identifies candidate public docket matches for each listed matter, aggregating information from external sources such as CourtListener or Docket Alarm. The “Status” column indicates whether an individual record already has a paired data source—for example, “Paired: Docket Alarm”—or how many potential matches have been detected (e.g., “Candidates: 10”). An “Auto-Pair” button appears near the top right, enabling the system to systematically match one or more selected records without requiring individual user confirmation. When this process is initiated, the Status field transitions to labels such as “Performing sync operation” or

“Auto-pairing,” denoting that the system is actively cross-referencing and linking the internal record with the best-fitting external docket.

[0163] In FIG. 4c, once a matter is selected from the left-side table, the interface reveals a details panel to the right, listing possible public records that match the Citation, Name, or other identified metadata of the matter. Each potential match is displayed with attributes such as court name, judge, and case title. A “Pair record to this case” option appears alongside each candidate, allowing the user to confirm which public docket source corresponds to the matter. The system may automatically pair the record if a single best match is found, or it may present multiple viable candidates for manual user selection. Through this interface, legal professionals can rapidly synchronize internal case records with authoritative court data, ensuring that each matter in the firm’s repository links accurately to its corresponding external docket or record.

[0164] Referring to FIGS. 4d, 4e, 4f, and 4g, the interface further illustrates the record-pairing workflow and the confirmation step that solidifies the linkage between a law firm’s internal matter record and external docket data. In FIG. 4d, the user has selected the matter corresponding to docket number “6:06-cv-00549,” revealing a list of possible public cases on the right side of the screen. Each candidate record is shown with identifying information, including the court venue, judge, case cause, and parties. FIG. 4e displays a confirmation dialogue overlay that appears after the user initiates pairing, prompting the user with a question such as “Are you sure you want to pair ‘6:06-cv-00549’ with this link?” and offering Yes or No responses. This confirmation step aims to prevent accidental associations and ensures that each pairing operation is intentional and reviewable. In FIG. 4f, once the user confirms the pairing, the system updates the Status field from “Candidates: X” or “Auto-pairing” to a state such as “Paired: Docket Alarm,” signifying that the record is now synchronized with the selected external source. Finally, FIG. 4g presents the updated matter details on the right side of the interface, showing an “Overview” tab that summarizes the linked public record, including a docket link, judge, cause, and other metadata. By consolidating the candidate selection and confirmation steps within one continuous view, the system provides a seamless mechanism for verifying, pairing, and reviewing external docket matches, significantly reducing the manual overhead typically involved in linking internal records to authoritative legal data.

[0165] Referring to FIGS. 4h and 4i, the interface provides additional features for monitoring synchronization and reviewing recent data-updates at both the matter and system levels. In FIG. 4h, a floating callout appears in the top-right corner, displaying the scheduled time for the next automatic synchronization cycle (for example, “Next sync: 9:51 PM”) and including a “Sync Now” option for initiating an immediate update. A link labeled “Reset demo” may also appear, allowing the user to revert the system to a baseline demonstration state if needed. By enabling both manual and scheduled sync triggers, the system ensures that each matter’s data remains continuously aligned with external sources while also accommodating user-driven update requests.

[0166] In FIG. 4i, the screen is divided between a list of matters on the left and a detail pane on the right, wherein the detail pane is labeled with the matter’s name, responsible

attorney, and docket identifier. Within this pane, an “Overview” section may provide summary information, while a “Sync Logs” tab displays a chronological record of synchronization events. Each log entry includes a timestamp, a log level (such as “Info”), a field identifier (for example, “RecordType”), and the updated value. Consecutive entries indicate that the system is repeatedly refining, confirming, or appending data (e.g., “Torts—Motor Vehicle”). These logs facilitate auditability by showing the exact nature and timing of each sync event, enabling legal professionals to trace the lineage of all system-generated data updates.

[0167] Referring to FIG. 5, the interface displays a pop-up overlay labeled “Pleading: Phase Chart,” which is triggered when the user selects the corresponding bar or metric in the main chart. Within this overlay, the system shows the designated start and end dates for the pleading phase, alongside links (for instance, “Show Evidence”) that enable the user to inspect underlying time entries or docket events substantiating these date assignments. Below the date range, the overlay provides key quantitative metrics, such as the overall duration of the phase (e.g., “4 Weeks”), total billed hours (for example, “230.7 hrs.”), and associated costs (for instance, “\$181,150”). By presenting these metrics within a single view, the system emphasizes the connection between litigation phase progression and financial outlay, ensuring that the cost of a particular stage—here, the pleading phase—can be readily assessed in the broader context of the matter’s substantive timeline.

[0168] Referring to FIG. 6, the user interface presents a candlestick (or box-and-whisker style) chart depicting the amount billed, broken down by litigation phase, such as Pleading, Discovery, and PreTrial. Along the left side of the screen, a filtering panel is shown, where “Litigation Claims” have been selected to limit the displayed matters to those involving specific claim types (e.g., Constitutional or Civil Rights). The resulting chart conveys how total costs vary across different phases of litigation within the filtered matter set. Each vertical column indicates a distribution of costs, showing minimum, maximum, and one or more quartile points for the relevant data. By using this visual representation, the system assists legal practitioners in identifying average or outlier expenditures in phases like Pleading or Discovery, while the integrated filter controls permit on-the-fly adjustments to the underlying data set. This arrangement provides an overview of cost patterns and budgeting insights, allowing a firm to analyze how various claims, or other attributes, correlate with expense levels in distinct phases of litigation.

[0169] Referring to FIG. 7, the system displays a time-based cost visualization labeled “Quarterly Estimate by Phase: Amount,” which assists legal teams in forecasting and evaluating alternative fee arrangements. Each vertical grouping on the horizontal axis corresponds to a successive quarter within the life of the matter, and each column is subdivided by litigation phase, including Pleading, Discovery, PreTrial, Trial, and Appeals. By hovering over a column, the user can view a tooltip summarizing the cost allocation for each phase in that particular quarter, along with an overall median value for the column. The interface further offers selectable overlays such as “Top 25%,” “Mid,” or “Bottom 25%” to highlight cost quartiles across the dataset. In this manner, the system facilitates a visual breakdown of how costs accrue over time, providing granular insight that can be used to negotiate or structure AFAs. By aligning

projected expenditures with distinct phases on a quarterly basis, the chart enables counsel and clients to anticipate potential cost spikes, reduce financial uncertainty, and more effectively plan for the progression of litigation.

[0170] Referring to FIG. 8, the interface presents a “Column Manager” dialog that enables the user to customize the data grid by selecting, ordering, or removing columns drawn from a hierarchical list of available fields. The left portion of the dialog organizes these fields under groupings, such as “Matter,” “Docket,” “Billings,” and “Phases,” each containing one or more specific data items (for example, “Total Hours,” “Total Amount,” or “Pleading: Phase Chart”). By clicking an “Add” button adjacent to any field, the user may include that column in the grid; fields that have already been included appear in a “Selected Columns” section on the right. Within this section, the user can rearrange or remove columns as desired, thereby configuring which metrics or attributes appear in the primary table view of matters. Once the user has selected the desired columns, pressing the “Update” button applies these settings, allowing attorneys or staff to tailor the presentation of matter data in real time to suit varied reporting or workflow needs.

[0171] Referring to FIG. 9, the figure illustrates a trapezoidal model for representing the total cost of a litigation phase, which is divided into three distinct periods: an on-ramp period, a plateau period, and an off-ramp period. The trapezoidal structure ensures that the total area under the shape corresponds to the billed amount (B) for the respective phase. The on-ramp period (Ru) is depicted as the initial segment of the trapezoid, representing a gradual increase in costs as the phase begins. The duration of this period is calculated based on the spread(S) and the median duration (Dmdn), where higher spreads result in longer ramp-up durations to reflect greater variability.

[0172] In FIG. 9, the plateau period (P) is the central portion of the trapezoid, characterized by a flat section indicating a steady rate of cost accumulation. The width of the plateau is inversely proportional to the spread(S), ensuring greater stability when variability is low. The off-ramp period (Rd) is the final segment of the trapezoid and represents the tapering of costs as the phase concludes. The duration of the off-ramp is calculated as D3 minus Dmdn, capturing variability in the phase’s conclusion.

[0173] In FIG. 9, the height of the trapezoid (H) corresponds to the cost per time unit and is determined such that the total area under the trapezoid equals the total billed amount (B). This relationship is expressed as $H \text{ equals } B \text{ multiplied by } 2 \text{ divided by the sum of } P \text{ and } D3$. The terms P, Ru, and Rd are calculated to satisfy the requirement that the area equals the total billed cost. This trapezoidal model is applied consistently across all phases to provide a visual and quantitative representation of the cost distribution.

[0174] FIG. 10 illustrates the trapezoidal modeling of sequential litigation phases, with overlapping transitions between consecutive phases. The X-axis represents time, such as days, weeks, months, or years, while the Y-axis represents the rate of cost accumulation per unit of time. The figure demonstrates the progression of three distinct phases: pleading, discovery, and pretrial, aligned in sequence to reflect their real-world temporal relationship. Each phase is represented by a trapezoid consisting of an on-ramp, plateau, and off-ramp. The plateau of each phase corresponds to its steady-state cost accumulation rate. The off-ramp of a preceding phase overlaps with the on-ramp of the subsequent

phase, reflecting a smooth transition of activity and resource allocation. The pleading phase begins at the origin and reaches a steady-state plateau before transitioning to its off-ramp, which overlaps with the on-ramp of the discovery phase. The discovery phase similarly progresses through its on-ramp, plateau, and off-ramp, with the pretrial phase starting its on-ramp during the off-ramp of the discovery phase. This overlap illustrates continuous cost flow across litigation stages and the interconnected nature of the phases.

[0175] While the trapezoid is used in this example due to its simplicity and ease of calculation, it is one of many possible shapes that can represent cost accumulation. Other shapes, such as a triangle, square, normal distribution curve, or any shape that rises and then falls, could also be used depending on the level of complexity or the specific characteristics of the phase being modeled. These alternative shapes allow for more precise modeling when the cost behavior deviates from the linear assumptions of the trapezoid, such as scenarios with abrupt starts and stops or gradual changes in cost accumulation rates.

[0176] Additionally, the model can account for pauses or stays in the progression of a case. Such interruptions can be represented mathematically by multiplying the litigation phase function with another function that introduces a dip during the period of the pause or stay. This approach allows the model to reflect the temporary suspension of cost accumulation while preserving the overall structure of the phase. By applying this technique, the model can more accurately represent real-world litigation scenarios, including delays caused by court orders, procedural issues, or strategic pauses by the parties involved.

[0177] FIG. 11 illustrates the transition between two litigation phases, focusing on the off-ramp of the pleading phase and the on-ramp of the discovery phase. The chart uses bars to represent the progression of costs over time for each phase, emphasizing the overlap during the transitional period. The bars on the left correspond to the pleading phase, which includes an off-ramp period where costs gradually decline as the phase concludes. The height of each bar decreases incrementally during this period, reflecting the tapering resource allocation and activity levels. The bars on the right represent the discovery phase, beginning with an on-ramp period. During this period, the height of the bars incrementally increases, signifying the ramp-up in activity and associated costs as this phase gains momentum.

[0178] In FIG. 11, the heights of the bars are labeled to reflect cost estimates based on quartiles, which correspond to the lower quartile, median, and upper quartile of the predicted costs. These quartiles provide a range of possible outcomes, with the highest quartile representing the upper bound of likely costs, the median representing the most probable cost, and the lowest quartile reflecting the lower bound of expected costs.

[0179] In FIG. 11, the overlap between the pleading's off-ramp and discovery's on-ramp visually represents the sequential nature of litigation phases, where the conclusion of one phase aligns with the initiation of the next. This overlap ensures continuity in the overall timeline and accounts for the natural progression of legal activities.

[0180] FIG. 11 demonstrates how cost modeling can reflect the dynamics of litigation by accommodating variability and uncertainty in each phase. The overlap and progression depicted offer insights into resource planning

and cost allocation, ensuring a more accurate representation of the transition between litigation phases.

DETAILED DESCRIPTION/NON-OBVIOUS INTEGRATION

[0181] Prior data integration methods, such as basic docket feeds or static ETL (Extract-Transform-Load) procedures, fail to address the complexity inherent in modern law firm operations. In particular:

[0182] No existing docket sync platform automatically interprets docket entries to determine "Pleading" versus "Discovery" cutoffs. Manual review typically remains necessary to link each phase with the firm's time or billing records.

[0183] Current solutions rarely employ a dual AI model approach to reduce the risk of mislabeling or "hallucinated" legal data fields.

[0184] Conventional docket aggregators do not offer a cost prediction engine that adapts to newly discovered claims or changes in the litigation schedule.

[0185] In contrast, the present invention overcomes these deficiencies by marrying a docket-based phase analysis engine with a budgeting module that can automatically recalculate litigation costs as soon as new data arrives. Moreover, it employs multi-source verification (e.g., cross-checking official court APIs, third-party databases, and internally curated references) to ensure that GPT-based suggestions are validated. Thus, the invention combines separate, previously unintegrated functionalities into a novel data architecture that yields more accurate, dynamic, and secure legal data management—an achievement not taught or suggested by any known reference.

ADDITIONAL INFRASTRUCTURE COMPONENTS OF THE INVENTION

[0186] The proposed system addresses multiple facets of law firm operations, and accordingly may include additional infrastructure that can meet the changing needs of modern legal practices.

[0187] The system features dynamic scalability options, allowing law firms to manage their resource needs in real-time. This is particularly useful for handling fluctuating workloads and growing data volumes, ensuring that the system's performance remains optimal without unnecessary resource expenditure.

[0188] Database Selection Justification: Included within the system is a justification mechanism for database selection, guiding firms to choose the most suitable database solutions. It favors PostgreSQL for its robustness and reliability, but it also allows for the integration of other databases should the firm's specific needs warrant it.

[0189] Logging Solution Determination: The system incorporates a customizable logging framework to meet the diverse requirements of legal data management. This framework ensures that all operations are tracked comprehensively, supporting thorough audits and facilitating compliance with legal requirements.

[0190] API Gateway Implementation: A secure API gateway is a critical component of the system, providing a controlled point of access between the law firm's internal databases and external data sources. This gateway enhances security, monitors traffic, and ensures that all data exchanges comply with established protocols.

[0191] Frontend Framework Decision: The system includes a decision support tool for selecting front-end technologies, weighing factors like usability, performance, and maintainability. Whether the choice falls on Blazor or another framework, the system ensures that the most appropriate technology stack is employed.

[0192] Service Modularization: The architecture of the system is modular, dividing a monolithic application into discrete services. This modularity improves maintainability, enables better scalability, and allows for independent updates and deployments.

[0193] Task Scheduling Infrastructure: Task scheduling is a core function of the system, automating various background operations essential to legal practice. This infrastructure is capable of integrating with tools like Hangfire or Quartz to streamline workflow and enhance efficiency.

[0194] Data Encryption Standards: Data security is paramount, and the system enforces stringent encryption standards for data at rest and in transit. This embodiment ensures that all sensitive legal data is protected against unauthorized access and breaches.

[0195] Permissions and Access Control: A robust permissions system controls access to the system's features and data. It is designed to reflect the firm's hierarchy and confidentiality requirements, ensuring that users only access information pertinent to their roles.

[0196] Billing System Integration: The system seamlessly integrates with accounting software such as QuickBooks, automating the billing process and ensuring accurate and timely invoicing. This integration is essential for maintaining financial clarity and simplifying the management of client accounts.

[0197] External Data Source Connectivity: Ensuring effective integration with external data sources like CourtListener and Docket Alarm, the system can import and export data in various formats, enhancing the firm's ability to leverage public legal information.

[0198] Notification and Communication System: The system features an advanced notification system to alert users about important updates, deadlines, and changes within the system. This feature is crucial for maintaining team awareness and facilitating prompt action on critical tasks.

1. A system for AI-enhanced legal data integration and management, the system comprising:

- a data receiving module configured to integrate data from multiple legal sources including public records and law firm databases;
- a data processing module equipped with an artificial intelligence model for normalizing and categorizing legal data into standardized formats;
- a security module implementing field-level role and access controls for data security and privacy;
- a synchronization module for updating and replicating legal data across various platforms in real-time;
- a user interface module providing functionalities for manual review, data correction, and system interaction;
- a database for storing and managing the integrated and processed legal data;
- a training mechanism for the AI model using historical legal data and ongoing data updates;
- a citation analysis module for analyzing and contextualizing legal citations within the integrated data;
- a reporting module for generating audit trails and compliance reports; and

a communication module for interfacing with external legal data sources and systems.

2. A system for AI-enhanced legal data integration and management, the system comprising:

- a data receiving module configured to integrate data from multiple legal sources including public records and law firm databases;
- a data processing module equipped with an artificial intelligence model for normalizing and categorizing legal data into standardized formats;
- a security module implementing field-level role and access controls for data security and privacy;
- a synchronization module for updating and replicating legal data across various platforms in real-time;
- a user interface module providing functionalities for manual review, data correction, and system interaction;
- a database for storing and managing the integrated and processed legal data;
- a training mechanism for the AI model using historical legal data and ongoing data updates;
- a citation analysis module for analyzing and contextualizing legal citations within the integrated data;
- a reporting module for generating audit trails and compliance reports; and
- a communication module for interfacing with external legal data sources and systems.

3. The system of claim 1, wherein the data receiving module is further configured to interface with and aggregate data from diverse public legal information sources including, but not limited to, Lexis, Westlaw, Bloomberg, vLex, Unicourt, Docket Alarm, CourtListener.

4. The system of claim 1, wherein the data processing module utilizes a Generative Pre-trained Transformer (GPT) model tailored for legal data analysis and summarization.

5. The system of claim 1, wherein the security module includes implementing ethical firewalls within the law firm to prevent conflicts of interest in data access.

6. The system of claim 1, wherein the synchronization module includes a real-time updating mechanism to reflect the most current legal activities in the database.

7. The system of claim 1, wherein the user interface module includes customizable alert settings for legal deadlines and court dates based on the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure (FRCP) and Civil Practice Law and Rules (CPLR).

8. The system of claim 1, wherein the citation analysis module is equipped with AI and machine learning technologies for format recognition and normalization of various legal citations.

9. The system of claim 1, wherein the reporting module's audit trails include time-stamped entries for detailed historical record keeping and regulatory compliance.

10. The system of claim 1, wherein the communication module includes an API gateway for secure data exchanges between the law firm's internal systems and external legal data sources.

11. The system of claim 1, wherein the data processing module further applies machine learning models to correlate docket events and time narratives, generating phase-specific billing estimates and updating those estimates.

12. The system of claim 1, wherein the user interface module provides interactive tools for generating litigation budgets, including predictive cost breakdowns by litigation

phase, comparisons of historical averages, and scenario modeling for alternative fee arrangements.

13. The system of claim 1, further comprising an entity resolution module within the data processing module, configured to reconcile conflicting legal party data by applying AI-based record matching and normalization techniques across multiple data sources.

14. The system of claim 1, wherein the synchronization module is further configured to enable bi-directional communication with external platforms, ensuring real-time updates to legal matter metadata and associated billing metrics.

15. A system for litigation phase forecasting and cost visualization, the system comprising:

a data ingestion module configured to collect docket entries, billing records, and time narratives from disparate legal sources;

a litigation phase detection module that identifies the start and end dates of distinct litigation phases by analyzing patterns in docket and billing data;

a forecasting engine that uses historical litigation data and machine learning algorithms to generate cost and duration predictions for each litigation phase, represented as time-based cost curves;

a visualization module configured to present predictive cost curves in a trapezoidal format;

a synchronization module for updating the predictive cost curves in real time as new docket entries or billing data are received;

a user interface module providing interactive tools for phase-specific budget adjustments, scenario comparisons, and reporting.

* * * * *