

University of Groningen

Identification, Categorisation and Forecasting of Court Decisions

Medvedeva, Masha

DOI:
[10.33612/diss.236807643](https://doi.org/10.33612/diss.236807643)

IMPORTANT NOTE: You are advised to consult the publisher's version (publisher's PDF) if you wish to cite from it. Please check the document version below.

Document Version
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Publication date:
2022

[Link to publication in University of Groningen/UMCG research database](#)

Citation for published version (APA):
Medvedeva, M. (2022). *Identification, Categorisation and Forecasting of Court Decisions*. [Thesis fully internal (DIV), University of Groningen]. University of Groningen. <https://doi.org/10.33612/diss.236807643>

Copyright

Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

The publication may also be distributed here under the terms of Article 25fa of the Dutch Copyright Act, indicated by the "Taverne" license. More information can be found on the University of Groningen website: <https://www.rug.nl/library/open-access/self-archiving-pure/taverne-amendment>.

Take-down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Downloaded from the University of Groningen/UMCG research database (Pure): <http://www.rug.nl/research/portal>. For technical reasons the number of authors shown on this cover page is limited to 10 maximum.

Identification, Categorisation and Forecasting of Court Decisions

Masha Medvedeva

1. The majority of the academic papers claiming to predict court decisions do not actually provide a method to predict decisions that were not made yet. (Chapter 4)
2. Forecasting court decisions is a hard task that is far from being solved. (Chapters 4 and 7)
3. Categorising published court decisions requires explainable methods to be able to do document analysis, otherwise it is useless. (Chapters 4 and 6)
4. Legal outcome-prediction models are not designed to be used to make (judicial) decisions. (Chapter 9)
5. Increasing availability of legal datasets has created an environment where computational methods are often used to process the data without understanding it, resulting in models that cannot actually be used by legal professionals. (Chapter 4)
6. An algorithm that works for a specific court is not a guarantee that it will work for a court in a different jurisdiction or documents in a different language. (Chapter 10)
7. “As more and more databases come onstream, lawyers will become totally dependent on the computer.” (Vernon 1995, *Bluff Your Way in Law*)
8. “Unfortunately, for most law books you need a degree in philosophy, nuclear physics and higher mathematics to understand the index.” (Vernon 1995, *Bluff Your Way in Law*)