

Case Study Annotation Guidelines

I. Question Design Requirements

(I) Question Requirements

1. Question types:

- Court cases: 40%
- Law firm practice: 40%
- Complex and difficult cases: 20%

2. Question format: Must include Level-1 tag, Level-2 tag, tested knowledge points, and difficulty level.

3. Form requirements

- a. **Must be written as a case analysis**, and must not be written in the style of a judgment. Terms commonly used in judgments such as “plaintiff/defendant/appellant/appellee” must not appear. You may use expressions such as “Company A/Company B/parties/counterparty/platform/contractor,” etc.

- b. **De-identification and adaptation:**

- Must not use any of the following from the original judgment text: names, addresses, ID numbers, phone numbers, specific doorplate numbers, identifiable enterprise names, etc.
- Industry attributes, transaction structure, and dispute focus may be retained, but details must be changed (time, amount, region, number of entities, wording of contract clauses, etc.).

- c. **No new facts outside the prompt.** The reference answer, rubric, and model scoring must not introduce new facts that do not appear in the prompt.

4. Requirements for Case Content:

- a. The case details in the question should not be overly simplistic. Minimum complexity: it must satisfy **at least any three** of the following items (it is recommended to satisfy four where possible):
 - At least **2 parties** (company/individual/platform/regulator, etc.)
 - At least **2 timeline segments** (earlier and later conduct giving rise to the dispute)
 - At least **2 legal relationships** (e.g., contract + tort / employment + non-compete / corporate governance + guarantee, etc.)

- At least **2 disputed issues** (validity, liability, procedure, evidence, amount/scope, etc.)
 - At least **1 evidentiary or factual uncertainty** (e.g., unclear scope of authorization, questionable data source, dispute over payment conditions, etc.)
- b. Under the same Level-2 tag, the tested points must be different. For example, under the Level-2 tag “Data Compliance,” different questions may test:
- Definition of personal information / sensitive personal information
 - Lawful basis (consent / contract necessity / statutory duty, etc.)
 - Notification obligations and validity of consent
 - Compliance pathways for cross-border data transfer (assessment / certification / standard contract)

II. Rubric Writing Requirements

(I) General principles

1. The reference answer and scoring points must be output strictly in four parts:
Conclusion → Case Summary → Analytical Process → Legal Basis.
2. The “analysis-process scoring” in the rubric is a highly summarized outline (framework) of the analysis in the reference answer:
 - The rubric’s analytical process emphasizes “how to reason, and whether the reasoning points are covered,” and in principle should not lock in a single unique conclusion;
 - However, the “Conclusion / Case Summary / Legal Basis” sections in the rubric should be consistent with the reference answer.

(II) Sections and scoring rules

- **Conclusion :** +5 points for one conclusion. If one conclusion element is missing, deduct 1–3 points depending on the importance of the element; deductions may not exceed 5 points in total.
- **Case Summary:** +5 points for one key fact. If elements within a key fact are missing, deduct 1–3 points depending on importance; deductions may not exceed 5 points in total.
- **Analytical Process :**
 - If the question has a reasoning order, analyze according to that order; points are awarded only if each step is followed, and each step is worth 10 points.
 - If there is no reasoning order, each reasoning point is worth +10 points.
- **Legal Basis:** +5 points for each cited statutory provision. If there are alternative provisions, list them as well.

| Item | Content | Score Allocation | Example | Notes |
|----------------------|-------------------------|---|---|--|
| Conclusion scoring | Evaluate the Conclusion | +5 points per conclusion. If one conclusion element is missing, deduct 1–3 points depending on importance; total deduction capped at 5 points. | <p>[Conclusion scoring]</p> <p>(+5) Pitaya Co. is entitled to require Banana Machinery Co. to pay RMB 18.88 million in arrears and corresponding interest (if RMB 18.88 million is not specified: –2; if interest is not mentioned: –2).</p> | The Conclusion must correspond one-to-one with each question. A Conclusion must not include reasons. If the question is open-ended, the Conclusion must be complete. |
| Case Summary scoring | Evaluate key facts | +5 points per key fact. If elements within a key fact are missing, deduct 1–3 points depending on importance; total deduction capped at 5 points. | <p>[Case Summary scoring]</p> <p>(+5) Lychee Trading Co., Banana Co., and Mango Engineering Co. share the same executive holding overlapping positions; (if not mentioned: –5).</p> <p>(+5) The three companies have highly overlapping business scopes, share sales materials, and consolidate performance. (For the three items—overlapping scope / shared sales materials / consolidated performance—deduct –2 for each missing item until 5 points are deducted.)</p> <p>(+5) The three companies share bank accounts; large transfers involving an individual account require only Durian's signature; finance seals are used interchangeably. (For the three items—shared bank</p> | Case Summary scoring covers only key facts that affect the Conclusion; irrelevant facts do not score. |

| | | | | |
|--------------------------|------------------------------------|---|---|---|
| | | | <p>accounts / large transfers requiring only Durian's signature / mixed use of finance seals—deduct –2 for each missing item until 5 points are deducted.)</p> <p>(+5) Banana Machinery Co., as Pitaya Co.'s exclusive distributor in East China, has defaulted on RMB 18.88 million plus interest to date. (If RMB 18.88 million is not specified: –2; if interest is not mentioned: –2.)</p> | |
| Analysis Process scoring | With a required reasoning sequence | Analyze in the required sequence; points are awarded only per reasoning step; 10 points per step. Reasoning steps do not involve the Conclusion; they focus on how to reason. | <p>[Analysis Process scoring]</p> <p>Scoring condition: points are awarded only if reasoning follows Step 1, then Step 2; if out of order, no points.</p> <p>Step 1: Determine whether the image constitutes a “work” protected by copyright law. (+10)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analyze whether it falls within literature, art, or science; mention Lin Yue's prompt-based image is an artistic creation. (omit: –1) • Analyze fixation/expressed-in-a-form; mention the prompt-generated image can be expressed in a certain form. (omit: –2) • Analyze intellectual achievement; mention it is a human-created intellectual achievement. (omit: –2) • Analyze originality; mention the image was generated via Midjourney; Lin Yue submitted a screen recording | <p>For questions with a required reasoning sequence, confirm the sequence is legally or logically necessary.</p> <p>Scoring condition: points are awarded only if reasoning follows Step 1 then Step 2; if out of order, no points. This sentence must be included where a required reasoning sequence applies.</p> |

| | | | |
|--------------------------|---------------------------------------|---|--|
| | | <p>demonstrating a similar generation process; Lin Yue made personalized choices and substantive intellectual contributions by adding prompts, changing parameters, adjusting composition, etc.; analyze whether originality is satisfied. (omit: -5)</p> <p>Step 2: Determine whether Dongshan Trading Co., Shen Qing, and Hengtong Plastics infringed copyright. (+10)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Analyze “access”: mention the design originated from independently generated drafts and third-party optimization; the prompts are “ideas” rather than protected “expression”; prompts are simple and not distinctive and elements were previously presented. (omit: -5) • Analyze “substantial similarity”: mention significant differences at the expression level (e.g., wing curvature, patterns, leg shape, overall style), and that industrial production adaptation design was performed. (omit: -5) | |
| Analysis Process scoring | Without a required reasoning sequence | <p>+10 points per reasoning point</p> <p>[Analysis Process scoring] Under Article 122 of the Civil Procedure Law, analyze four elements:</p> <p>(1) Plaintiff standing (+10): mention A is the owner of the Xiaomi phone; mention B possesses the phone and</p> | <p>Each reasoning point is one major point worth 10 points and may include several subpoints. For example,</p> |

| | | | | |
|---------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---|---|
| | | | <p>refuses to return it, directly infringing A's ownership.</p> <p>(2) Defendant identifiability (+10):</p> <p>mention the defendant is the sole proprietor B providing screen-replacement services; mention B's identity is clear and contact information and business address are clear (A can ship the phone to the repair station).</p> <p>(3) Specific claims and facts/reasons (+10):</p> <p>analyze the claim "ordering B to immediately return the phone and bear litigation costs"; analyze facts/reasons including the repair contract relationship, mistaken shipment, B's retention and refusal to return; A alleges the conduct lacks legal basis; A also submits preliminary evidence such as chat records and courier documents.</p> <p>(4) Scope of acceptance and jurisdiction (+10):</p> <p>mention it is a civil dispute arising from possession and return of property, i.e., a real-rights dispute; mention the Prompt indicates "A filed with a court having jurisdiction," showing jurisdiction is addressed and no further discussion is needed.</p> | <p>"whether copyright is infringed" is one major point, and it should include two subpoints: (1) substantial similarity and (2) access.</p> |
| Legal Basis scoring | Evaluate statutory provisions | +5 points per statutory provision | <p>[Legal Basis scoring] (+5) <i>Company Law of the People's Republic of China,</i></p> | 1) Provide the full text of the |

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| | <p>Article 23: Where shareholders abuse the independent legal person status of the company and the limited liability of shareholders to evade debts and seriously harm the interests of the company's creditors, they shall bear joint and several liability for the company's debts. Where shareholders use two or more companies under their control to carry out the acts prescribed in the preceding paragraph, each such company shall bear joint and several liability for the debts of any one of them. In a single-shareholder company, where the shareholder cannot prove that the company's property is independent from the shareholder's own property, the shareholder shall bear joint and several liability for the company's debts.</p> | <p>statute in this section.</p> <p>2) Avoid citing provisions that are outdated or overly new.</p> <p>Example: if the case occurred in 2023, avoid citing a 2025 newly amended Anti-Unfair Competition Law.</p> |
|--|--|---|

III. Quality Inspection (QA) Rules

(I) QA checklist

1. **Verify difficulty:** Score the model's answer based on the rubric and determine whether it meets the difficulty requirement. If not, provide the QA reviewer's specific scoring for each section.
2. **Verify the question:** Check the complexity of the fact pattern; if necessary, require supplementation of the fact chain. Check whether every question in the questions section is necessary; if there are too many unnecessary sub-questions, revise accordingly.

- 3. Verify whether the conclusions are correct and complete:**
 - Conclusions must correspond to each question one by one.
 - Conclusions must not include reasoning.
 - For open-ended questions, conclusions must be complete; otherwise, revise the question or narrow it.
- 4. Verify the Case Summary section:**
 - Whether it covers all key facts;
 - Whether deduction items are set and whether the deduction range is reasonable;
- 5. Verify the Analytical Process section:**
 - Whether a reasoning order is truly necessary;
 - Whether the reasoning chain is complete, with no missing steps and no circular reasoning;
 - Each major step is worth 10 points; sub-point deductions should be reasonable and the total deduction within a step should not exceed 10 points.
- 6. Verify the Legal Basis section:**
 - Whether required statutory provisions are complete (avoid “deliberately omitting key provisions to increase difficulty”);
 - Whether the provisions are quoted verbatim, currently effective, and time-appropriate.

(II) QA output format

- 1. Principles for QA modification:**
 - a. If it can pass after minor revisions: modify the original table in **red text** and output the “Final Version.”
 - b. If it cannot be fixed and must be rejected: where there are major issues such as substantial missing key facts / incorrect conclusions / insufficient difficulty, reject and state reasons.
- 2. Pass/Fail:**
 - a. If passing (including passing after revision), fill in “Yes” and provide reusable feedback.
 - b. If failing, fill in “No” and provide an actionable revision checklist (what facts are missing, what questions must be changed, which statutory provision to replace with which, the basis for incorrect conclusions, how to restructure the rubric, etc.).