D.C.

* **Antique Reporter Names**
	+ Cranch, Volume 6 (1-5 D.C.) 1801-1841 is missing.
		- Did cross-check looking at pdf of actual reporter and typing up some cases from there, nothing showed up. Oldest case is McCauley v. McCauley, 1 Hay. & Haz. 1 (1840).
	+ Other antique reporters (matching D.C. [Supreme Court of District of Columbia]) are recorded in CAP (Old reporter, D.C.), but they do NOT show up on <https://cite.case.law/>. However, they show up when conducting individual case search.
		- Examples
			* Green v. Lake, 13 D.C. 162, 2 Mackey 162 (1882) <https://cite.case.law/dc/13/162/>
			* United States ex rel. Wilson v. Ames, 11 D.C. 278, 1 MacArth. & M. 278 (1880), https://cite.case.law/dc/11/278/

Tenn.

* **Antique Reporter Names**
	+ Tenn. Volume 1-59 include antique reporters with comma next to registered CAP (Tenn.). But the ones after volume 59 do not. The antique reporters registered in CAP was put in the “Other Variations” tab.

Cali

* **Antique Reporter Names**
	+ “Pac.” Reporter correspond to Cal. Reporter (in CAP) and Cal. App. Reporter (in CAP) and Cal. Unrep. But cases in Pac. Reporter volumes don’t seem to correspond nicely one to one to any reporters in CAP and seem random.
		- Examples
			* Cal. 108, 115 [291 Pac. 184]; Kennedy v. Lee, 147 Cal. 596, 601 [82 Pac. 257]; Eastman v. Piper, 68 Cal. App. 554 [229 Pac. 1002; 13 C. J., p. 525]; 205 Cal. 541, 550 [271 Pac. 1091] ; Henika v. Lange, 55 Cal. App. 336, 339 [203 Pac. 798]
			* Most of the Pac.’s citations are not picked up by CAP.
				+ Ex) *Tedford, v. Michler*, ante, p. 214, [121 Pac. 730] cited in <https://cite.case.law/cal/162/762/>
	+ But “Pac.” Is registered alongside 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7 Cal. Unrep. Reporter in CAP in “comma” format seen in Tenn. It’s not 1 to 1 conversion for volume numbers; 3 Cal. Unrep. Includes 18 Pac. ~ 33 Pac. (Also, Pac. Reporter seems to include Washington State cases in Wash.)
	+ For now, I decided not to put Pac. Into any category in CAP sheet, even though a lot of them are left out. Please let me know how to proceed.

Pacific Reporter

* Looks like it was a headache for CAP, because it contains a lot of cases from different states. For Pacific Reporter 1st edition (Pac.), they put only some of it under Cal. Unrep. for matching ones, but left most of it out. For P.2d, P.3d (Pacific Reporters 2nd and 3rd, they put them under Utah, Wyoming, Colorado, Hawaii, Oklahoma, and Alaska.

Alaska

* Note on Alaska Reporter (currently being published in Thomson Reuters since 1960)
	+ Judges in Alaska seem to cite to P.2d or P.3d for the Alaska cases and put parenthesis (Alaska Year)
	+ Example
		- RA Helicopters, Inc. v. Digicon Alaska, Inc., 518 P.2d 1057, 1059-60 (Alaska 1974); State v. Stanley, 506 P.2d 1284, 1293 (Alaska 1973); \*226 Beaulieu v. Elliott, 434 P.2d 665, 670-71 (Alaska 1967).

Colorado

* Colo. Dec. (Colorado Decision with 4 volumes) is not registered on CAP.
	+ It seems to contain cases in Colo. or Colo. App. (overlap without any pattern)
		- Ex) *Kephart v. People*, 28 Colo. 73; 62 Pac. Rep. 946; 2 Colo. Dec. 341
		- Ex) *U. S. Security Co. v. Wolfe*, 27 Colo. 218; 1 Colo. Dec. 259
		- Ex) *Keely et al. v. East Side Improvement Co.,* 16 Colo. App. 365, 65 Pac. 456, 3 Colo. Dec. 457.
	+ But there are some cases that are on Colo. Dec. but not in other volumes in CAP
		- Ex) *Board of Co. Com’rs of Rio Grande Co v. Whelan*, 3 Colo. Dec. 294,