

### Federal Case Law Coverage Comparison

<u>Database</u>	<u>U.S. Supreme Court</u>	<u>Federal Circuit Courts</u>	<u>Federal District Courts</u>	<u>Other Federal Courts</u>
<b>Fastcase</b>	1790 - current (ALL)	1924 - current	1912 - current	Tax Court 1924 - current Bankruptcy 1979 - current BIA 1996 - current
<b>Casemaker</b>	1790 - current (ALL)	1930 - current	1932 - current	Tax Court 1999 - current Bankruptcy 1999 - current BIA 1996 - current
<b>Loislaw</b>	1790 - current (ALL)	Generally 1924 - current 10th Circuit 1929 - Current 11th Circuit 1981 - Current Federal Circuit 1929 - Current	1921 - Current <b>(SELECTED)</b>	Tax Court 1942 - Current Bankruptcy 1975 - Current <b>(SELECTED)</b>
<b>VersusLaw</b>	1886 - current	Generally 1930 - current DC Circuit 1950 - current 9th Circuit 1941 - current	Varies widely - Some back to 1930, others to early 1970s	Tax Court 1999 - current BIA 1996 - current

### U.S. Code Coverage Comparison

<u>Database</u>	<u>Full Text Search</u>	<u>Browsable</u>	<u>Find by Citation</u>	<u>Currency</u>	<u>Session Laws</u>
<b>Fastcase</b>	Yes	Yes	Yes	2006 version	None
<b>Casemaker</b>	Yes	Yes	Yes	Titles 1-41 through 01/08/2008 Titles 42-50 through 01/03/2007	Current <b>NOT</b> integrated into Code
<b>Loislaw</b>	Yes	Yes	Yes	2006 Version	Current Integrated into Code
<b>Versuslaw</b>	Yes	Yes	Yes	2006 Version	Current Integrated into Code

### Search & Finding Functions

<u>Database</u>	<u>T &amp; C</u>	<u>Natural Language</u>	<u>Links Across Materials</u>	<u>Federated Searching</u>	<u>Sorting Options</u>
<b>Fastcase</b>	Yes	Yes	No*	Yes	Date Relevance Most Cited Party Name
<b>Casemaker</b>	Yes	No	No	Yes – with limited search functions	Date Relevance
<b>Loislaw</b>	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Date
<b>Versuslaw</b>	Yes	No	No	Yes	Date Jurisdiction Party Name

Compiled by Todd Venie, Reference Librarian, Georgetown Law Library.

<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/3.0/us/>

## Ideas for Introducing Low-Cost Research Tools

Following are three options for introducing low-cost research tools for access to primary law. Assumes you need cases and statutes not found in existing services (e.g. CCH Intelliconnect or RIA Checkpoint). Which might work, and what methods are people already using?

### ***Option #1: Spend Nothing; Leverage Existing Investment***

Possibly every firm with a librarian in D.C. has attorneys with existing access to primary law through bar benefits (e.g. Fastcase for Virginia).

**Pros:** Costless to law firm; Isn't billed to library; Emphasizes bar "loyalty" and activities

**Cons:** Homogeneous access difficult with mixed bar membership; Training and ease of use could be tricky.

### ***Option #2: "Carrots" → Incentives to Promote Use***



One-on-One training or simple online tutorials;  
Embed search tools on intranet (e.g. Loislaw widget)  
Promotional lunch or dessert (Casemaker carrot cake?)

Other ideas?

---

---

---

### ***Option #3: "Sticks" → Prohibitions & Penalties***



Require "Pre-searching" before using Westlaw  
Prohibit use of Lexis for non-billable research

Other ideas?

---

---

---

## ***Perceived Problems***

User behavior is hard to change: Lexis & Westlaw can be hard habits to break  
Fixed subscription costs contribute to overhead, every Lexis/West search *could be* billed  
Initial efficiency concerns: Research process is very personal & is a learned behavior.  
No integrated connection between alternative services & Lexis/Westlaw.  
Risk tolerance: How much do you "trust" alternatives? Will people understand updating needs?



<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/3.0/us/>