

**Context:**

This document is part of the experiment described in the following blog post:

*Student Note: ChatGPT Ate My Homework. Can LLMs Generate Compelling Case Briefs?*

<https://lil.law.harvard.edu/blog/2024/06/10/can-llms-generate-compelling-case-briefs/>

---

## Initial Prompt

---

Please provide an accurate and academic law-school appropriate case brief of [CASE NAME]. Use the following evaluation format and criteria:

### Critical Elements

- \* (a) Facts (name of the case and its parties, what happened factually and procedurally, and the judgment)
  - \* (1) Facts of the case (what actually happened, the controversy)
  - \* (2) Procedural History (what events within the court system led to the present case)
  - \* (3) Judgment (what the court actually decided)
- \* (b) Issues (what is in dispute)
- \* (c) Holding (the applied rule of law)
- \* (d) Rationale (reasons for the holding)

### Additional Elements

- \* (e) Dicta (commentary about the decision that was not the basis for the decision)
- \* (f) Dissent (if a valuable dissenting opinion exists, the dissent's opinion)
- \* (g) Party's Arguments (each party's opposing argument concerning the ultimate issue)
- \* (h) Comments (personal commentary)

Now, please proceed in writing a case brief of [CASE NAME].

---

## Evaluative Prompt

Please use the following rubric to evaluate your case brief:

Case briefs should be brief, but should include relevant details. Each case brief should include a caption, facts, procedural history, issues, holding, rationale, disposition, and concurring and dissenting opinions (when applicable). Case briefs should have absolutely no errors of syntax, grammar, consistency, or tense. General sloppiness or failure to adhere to generally accepted principles (such as using active verbs) should also be considered.

Non-passing work: Nonpassing work on the closed legal memorandum generally exhibits some of the following problems: Fails to fulfill the basic requirements of the assignment (e.g.: minimal or missing sections - Heading, Statement of Facts, Question(s) Presented, Short Answer, Discussion, and Conclusion). Develops a personal or irrelevant argument without sufficient reference to the relevant facts, issues, and cases. Fails to use or cite legal research accurately, or uses inappropriate research. Presents an

overly broad, unfocused, or inappropriately biased argument instead of presenting an objective analysis of the law and the relevant facts. Fails to predict how an impartial judge would decide the case. Fails to evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of the opposing sides of a case and explain the result the law seems to require. Fails to address the specific audience (a law-trained reader who is unfamiliar with the particular law or facts of this case). Exhibits a high level of error, which interferes significantly with meaning.

Rather, you should aim for A-range work:

A-Range work – A-range memos have a strong understanding of audience, purpose, the law and facts. They should offer an analysis of the issues raised and the rules suggested by the cases. The student has not included rules or facts that the audience does not need. For each rule stated, the student has included a citation to authority. The student uses strong reasoning and thorough analysis with confidence. There should be very few errors in writing. The writing is concise and precise.

Now, adjust your case brief, focusing heavily on the analysis and concurring/dissenting opinions. Be sure to cite specific Judges and their concurring or dissenting opinions on the case when appropriate. Missing any such details will not result in A-Range work. No need to mention the evaluation rubric criteria in the final case-brief.