Research Assistant Training: Case Law Research

Melissa Abernathy
mabernathy@sandiego.edu

What we will cover

- Effective search strategies
- Searching by topic
- Dockets
- New tools on Westlaw Precision

Questions to ask before you start

- Which jurisdictions do you want me to focus on?
- Do you want all published cases or unpublished as well?
- Do you want a list of cases or do you want the actual cases?

Effective Search Strategies

Tips for broadening your search

- Include **synonyms**
  - Use tobacco and cigar in addition to cigarette
  - Use Westlaw's Thesaurus or Lexis' "Suggest terms"
- Use truncators to capture all forms of a word
  - Root expander = !
  - Litigat! = litigate, litigator, litigation
- Use the wild card (*) to find a word you're not sure how to spell
  - Marb*ry = Marbury, Marbary, Marbery
  - Wom*n = woman, women

Tips for narrowing your search

- Narrow your search by choosing less inclusive terms
  - Instead of “bird”, use “parrot” or “macaw”
- Take advantage of advanced search prompts to narrow your search
  - To search for ERA and not era: allcaps (era)
  - To search for “damage” and not “damages”: Westlaw: #damage; Lexis: singular (damage)
- add narrower proximity connectors such as /p, /s, /5.

Field and segment searching

Cases

Advanced Search Fields

125 S.Ct. 2655 ← Citation

Supreme Court of the United States

Susette KELO, et al., Petitioners,

v.

CITY OF NEW LONDON, CONNECTICUT, et al.

Party Name

Docket Number → No. 04-108. Argued Feb. 22, 2005. Decided June 23, 2005. Rehearing Denied Aug. 22, 2005. See 545 U.S. 1158, 126 S.Ct. 24.

Synopsis

Synopsis

Background: Owners of condemned property challenged city's exercise of eminent domain power on ground takings were not for public use. The Superior Court, Judicial District of New London, Corradino, J., granted partial relief for owners, and cross-appeals were taken. The Supreme Court, Norcott, J., 268 Conn. 1, 843 A.2d 500, upheld takings. Certiorari was granted.

Background

Holding: The Supreme Court, Justice Stevens, held that city's exercise of eminent domain power in furtherance of economic development plan satisfied constitutional "public use" requirement.

Holding

Affirmed.

Justice Kennedy concurred and filed opinion.

Justice O'Connor dissented and filed opinion in which Chief Justice Rehnquist and Justices Scalia and Thomas joined.

Lexis+™

Client: -None- Folders History Help

Home > Cases

Cases

Advanced Search | Tips

Enter a source name, a citation, terms or shep: [citation] to Shepardize®

Cases

Cases

All Federal
All States
All Trial Court Orders
All Tribal
All Reported Federal
All Reported States

Federal Cases by Court

U.S. Supreme Court Cases, Lawyers' Edition
U.S. Court Military Commission Review
United States Courts of Appeals
Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation Cases
United States Bankruptcy Courts
American Maritime Cases

Searching by Topic

Westlaw Headnotes

- West headnotes utilize the topic and key number system which Identifies and indexes legal concepts so you can find cases stating or applying a legal concept, even if those terms don't appear in the text of the opinion. Essentially, the topic and key number system functions as an index to all published cases.

- First identify a headnote you are interested in, then click on the topic and key number combination associated with that headnote.

Broadcom Corp. v. Qualcomm Inc.

Related documents

United States Court of Appeals, Third Circuit. • September 4, 2007 • 501 F.3d 297 • 2007-2 Trade Cases P 75,852 • 84 U.S.P.Q.2d 1129 • 42 Communications Reg. (P&F) 741 (Approx. 51 pages)

Document | Filings (32) | Negative Treatment (15) | History (3) | Citing References (2,367) | New! Cited With (6,316) | New! More Like This | Table of Authorities | Fullscreen

Page Go

Synopsis

West Headnotes

Attorneys and Law Firms

Opinion Of The Court

All Citations

Footnotes

Affirmed in part, reversed in part, and remanded.

Procedural Posture(s): On Appeal; Motion to Dismiss; Motion to Dismiss for Failure to State a Claim.

Notes

Outlines

Quick Check

West Headnotes (37)

1 **Federal Courts**

A district court's dismissal of a complaint for failure to state a claim upon which relief can be granted is subject to plenary review. Fed.Rules Civ.Proc.Rule 12(b)(6), 28 U.S.C.A.

34 Cases that cite this headnote

170B	Federal Courts
170BXVII	Courts of Appeals
170BXVII(K)	Scope and Extent of Review
170BXVII(K)2	Standard of Review
170Bk3576	Procedural Matters
170Bk3587	Pleading
170Bk3587(1)	In general

(Formerly 170Bk763.1)

2 **Antitrust and Trade Regulation**

Monopoly power liability under the Sherman Act requires (1) the possession of monopoly power in the relevant market and (2) the willful acquisition or maintenance of that power as distinguished from growth or development as a consequence of a superior product, business acumen, or

29T	Antitrust and Trade Regulation
29TVII	Monopolization
29TVII(A)	In General

Back to top

Lexis Headnotes

- West topic and key numbers are specific to Westlaw however you can use the headnotes in cases on Lexis to find similar caes on that point of law.

- Note that Westlaw and Lexis headnotes are not identical.

- Jurisdiction is not automatically applied to your results in Lexis

Broadcom Corp. v. Qualcomm Inc.

3rd Circuit Court of Appeals September 4, 2007 501 F.3d 297

Shepardize® - Narrow by this Headnote(6

Antitrust & Trade Law > Sherman Act > Claims

View more legal topics

HN5 Sherman Act, Claims

Proving the existence of monopoly power through indirect evidence requires a definition of the relevant market. The scope of the market is a question of fact as to which the plaintiff bears the burden of proof. Competing products are in the same market if they are readily substitutable for one another; a market's outer boundaries are determined by the reasonable interchangeability of use between a product and its substitute, or by their cross-elasticity of demand. Failure to define the proposed relevant market in these terms may result in dismissal of the complaint. More like this Headnote

Shepardize® - Narrow by this Headnote(36) 2 10

Antitrust & Trade Law > ... > Monopolies & Monopolization > Actual Monopolization > Claims

View more legal topics

HN6 Actual Monopolization, Claims

Because market share and barriers to entry are merely surrogates for determining the existence of monopoly power, direct proof of monopoly power does not require a definition of the relevant market.

Dockets & Case-Tracking

Dockets & Case-Tracking

- Court filings: briefs & petitions, complaint, answer, motions, etc.
- Status of the case: check the docket
- Places to look: Bloomberg Law, Westlaw & Lexis, court websites

My Favorites 0

Click the ☆ icons to save useful pages here

Popular Links

SEARCHES

- All Legal Content
- Court Opinions Search
- Dockets Search
- Points of Law Search
- News Search
- Books & Treatises
- Transactional Precedents Search

LAW SCHOOL RESOURCES

- Live & Recorded Webinars
- On-Demand Certification Courses
- Law Review Resources
- Career Resources
- Librarian Resources
- Videos & Reference Guides
- Circuit Splits Charts
- Practice Centers & Tools

FEATURED

- In Focus: Coronavirus NEW
- Brief Analyzer NEW
- Bloomberg Law News
- Subscribe to Newsletters
- Alerts Management
- Litigation Analytics
- Practical Guidance
- State Law Chart Builders
- In Focus Resources
- New on Bloomberg Law

Other Sources for Court Filings

- Court websites
- Contact Court Clerk's office
- Contact counsel

A note on new tools in Westlaw Precision

Additional filters

THOMSON REUTERS
WESTLAW PRECISION

ABERNA... History Folders My links Notifications Sign out

All content | religious use of cannabis | All State & Federal | Search Tips | Advanced

Content types | Filters

Content type: Cases (181)

Select multiple filters

Restore previous | Clear

View cases

Search within results

Documents | Material facts

Precision filters

- Legal issue & outcome
- Fact pattern
- Cause of action
- Motion type & outcome

Cases (181)

1 - 100 | Relevance

Select all items • No items selected | Related documents

1. **United States v. Christie**

United States Court of Appeals, Ninth Circuit. • June 14, 2016 • 825 F.3d 1048 • 2016 WL 3255072

Show synopsis

Headnote Headnote 6

Government had compelling interest in preventing marijuana allegedly **used** for **religious** purposes from being diverted to non-**religious**, recreational users, for purpose of defendants' RFRA challenge to their convictions under the Controlled Substances Act, especially in light of specific evidence that distribution methods **used** by defendants' ministry created realistic possibility that marijuana intended for ministry members would be distributed to outsiders and possibly

Red and white striped flag

U.S. v. Lee

All Citations es Court of Appeals, Seventh Circuit. • April 25, 1994 • 22 F.3d 736 (Approx. 12 pages)

Rela

Document | Filings (1) | Negative Treatment (8) | History (0) | Citing References (80) | New! Cited With (461) | Table of Authori

Overruled in part | Go

Synopsis

West Headnotes

Attorneys and Law Firms

Opinion

Concurrence

All Citations

Footnotes

Brief It

Download original image (PDF)

Overruled by U.S. v. Howze, 7th Cir.(Wis.), September 22, 2003

22 F.3d 736
United States Court of Appeals,
Seventh Circuit.

UNITED STATES of America, Plaintiff-Appellee,
v.
Gregory L. LEE, Defendant-Appellant.

No. 93-2910.