



16th BILETA Annual Conference

April 9th - 10th, 2001.
University of Edinburgh, Scotland.

Outline paper on practitioners' use of on-line law reports.

MAUREEN SPENCER AND PENNY KENT
(University of Middlesex, UK)

JOHN SPENCER
(Law Reporter, UK)

- [Table 1. Average use of e-law reports](#)
 - [Table 2. Solicitors: Average use of e-law reports](#)
 - [Table 3. Barristers: Average use of e-law reports](#)
 - [Table 4. Law centres: Average use of e-law reports](#)
 - [Solicitors](#)
 - [Barristers](#)
 - [Law Centres](#)
 - [Academics](#)
 - [Comment and conclusions](#)
- [We append the form of questionnaire sent to solicitors. A slightly different form of words was sent to other groups.](#)

We have conducted a small pilot survey on the use made by practitioners, academics and students of electronic law reports and legal databases. Our interest in this area was sparked by the conference in Cambridge on Law Reporting, Legal Information and Electronic Media in the New Millennium organised by the Incorporated Council of Law Reporting in March 2000 (1). It has become a commonplace that new technology is transforming legal practice. We were interested to get an idea how far this process has gone in the field of law reporting, traditionally a paper-based activity but now increasingly penetrated by electronic media, including on-line and CD-Rom reports and databases. How far have these replaced paper reports? Where they are used are they used in the same way as paper media? What new possibilities do they open up for practitioners?

We were also interested in the impact of the use of the technology on university teaching. At the Cambridge conference Professor Richard Susskind emphasised that with proliferating sources of information available, for example through the internet, the ability to analyse, to classify, to categorise, to summarise, was going to be ever more important (2). It seemed to us that in order to teach students how to do this we needed a clearer indication of the pattern of use of those sources.

The survey was sent in January this year to solicitors and barristers randomly selected from the current Solicitors' and Barristers' Directory. We included both London and provincial practitioners. At the time of writing we have had replies from 88 of the 304 solicitors we surveyed (29 per cent

response rate) and 31 of the 117 barristers (26 per cent response rate). With the kind assistance of the Law Centres Federation we surveyed all law centre managers and had 19 replies out of 55 questionnaires sent out (35 per cent). Replies are still coming in and the final response rate will be higher. In early February we also surveyed 58 University law lecturers, selecting one post-1992 university and one pre-1992 university. At the time of writing this conference note only a handful of these have been returned, but some comments by academics are included here. Finally we distributed questionnaires to two cohorts of second year law students, one at a new and one at an old university. Their responses have not yet been analysed. This preliminary paper therefore concentrates on the responses from practitioners including law centre managers. Their responses have been totalled and analysed also, where appropriate, as separate groups.

Obviously our survey is very small and therefore does not bear advanced analysis. However we submit it as giving an impression at least of the use and expectations of use of electronic Law Reports. We are particularly grateful to the 32 respondents who took the trouble to comment beyond the survey questions on their own use of electronic media, giving our survey an unexpected extra dimension. The survey questions are appended to this paper.

All respondents were asked whether they made any use of subscription electronic law reports, and were offered a checklist of possibilities, with space to add others not listed. The overall results showed that just over 65 per cent of respondents personally made use of electronic law reports. Seventy per cent of women respondents did, compared with 66 per cent of the men. Sixty per cent of solicitors who replied said they personally made use of electronic reports, whereas 87 per cent of barrister respondents did so. Only 58 per cent of law centre workers answered this question in the affirmative - no doubt a reflection of their less lavish resources. Of the people who did use them 36.5 per cent used them on average at least once a week. Twenty-seven per cent used them less than once a month. See Table 1 below.

Table 1. Average use of e-law reports

	Frequency	Percent
Daily	20	21.5
Weekly	36	38.7
Fortnightly	7	7.5
Monthly	11	11.8
Less than once a month	19	20.4
Total users	93	100.0
Non-users	51	
Total	144	

Table 2. Solicitors: Average use of e-law reports

	Frequency	Percent
Valid	Daily	8 15.4
	Weekly	19 36.5
	Fortnightly	5 9.6
	Monthly	6 11.5
	Less than once a month	14 26.9
Total users	52	100.0
Non-users	35	

Total 87

Table 3. Barristers: Average use of e-law reports

	Frequency	Percent
Daily	11	40.7
Weekly	12	44.4
Fortnightly	2	7.4
Less than once a month	2	7.4
Total users	27	100.0
Non-users	4	
Total	31	

Table 4. Law centres: Average use of e-law reports

	Frequency	Percent
Daily	1	9.1
Weekly	4	36.4
Monthly	4	36.4
Less than once a month	2	18.2
Total users	11	100.0
Non-users	8	
Total	19	

All respondents who used electronic law reports (97 in total) were asked to choose from two checklists, one of named subscription reports, the other of non-subscription services. While neither list was exhaustive, respondents did have an opportunity to write in the names of any other services they used. Only ten respondents made no use of any paid-for service. For those who did, Lawtel was by far most frequently cited service, used by 40 respondents. Other popular services were Current Legal Information (23 respondents); and Lexis and Casetrack (19 apiece). Nineteen used the All England Law reports, there were nine who ticked the box for Law Reports, eight Context, and nineteen the Law reports CD Rom version. Other services (EUinteractive, EuroLaw, Celex, LocallawUK) appeared to be used by small numbers of respondents. Most of these serve niche markets, whereas the more popular series cover general law. Other specialist services mentioned by respondents included New Law online, Butterworth Family Law BOS, Kemp & Kemp on CD-Rom, Electronic Industrial Relations Law Reports, Famlex, Garant, Forrest CD-Rom, Electronic Immigration Network, Archbold Crime Desktop and Estates Gazette.

The most used non-subscription law reports were those relating to the European Court of Human Rights (27 respondents). The British and Irish Legal Information (BAILII) and the European Court of Justice website were each accessed by 16 respondents. Casebase was used by eight and the Incorporated Council's website by six respondents. Other non-subscription sources which were mentioned were House of Lords transcripts, Times Law Reports on-line, Law Alert, the Courts Service, Beagle, Supreme Court of Canada, South African Constitutional Court and EAT. We were told that Casetrack is free to law centres.

The respondents were asked to specify the purpose for which they made use of electronic law reports. Again they were given a checklist, and could select any all of the possible responses. The most frequently cited use was for research and updating (80 respondents, 86 per cent of users),

whereas only about half that number used the electronic media for citing in court or in written opinions, though the electronic reports were used for preparing advices or opinions by 61 respondents. Other uses mentioned were for preparing seminars and training course, citing in correspondence, for assessing quantum and preparing for the New York Bar Examination!

The place where electronic law reports were most often accessed was in the office, hardly a great surprise. But 11 said they used the electronic facilities of specialist law libraries, while only three used the public library. Thirty-seven said they had facilities on their personal computer. One used a lap-top at court.

One of the most significant questions in the survey concerned the users' requirements from electronic law reports. Whereas services such as the Electronic Law reports, Law Reports CD-Rom, All England and Lexis provide the full text of judgments, some of the reports, such as the popular Lawtel and Current Legal Information, are summary only. The respondents were given a checklist designed to differentiate these requirements. The replies are clearly not mutually exclusive, since the same person might require full transcripts, daily summaries and literature about decided cases. Full transcripts were required by 73 of the 97 respondents who used electronic resources, case summaries by 66 and daily summaries by 35. Twenty-five wanted references for printed law report series and 23 literature about decided cases. Eighteen ticked a box to indicate that there were interested in cases decided in other jurisdictions. Famlex was mentioned by one respondent, who described it as very full though not complete but said: "If you subsequently want to rely on the case in court you have to get a hard copy of the Family Law Report because the page references, &c are not the same."

One barrister listed as an additional requirement: "Good search mechanism like Current Legal Information. Good digest - like New Law On-Line. Hotlink to most up-to-date cases which cite the Authority and hotlink to the reported version of the Authority."

Question eight was asked of all respondents, bothg users of electronic law reports and non-users. We were anxious to discover which features of electronic reports were considered positive and which negative. The overwhelming view of respondents was that subscriptions were expensive. Forty-five respondents strongly agreed with this proposition. Only six disagreed. The results are shown in Table 5 below.

Table 5: Responses to Question Eight

	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Neutral/ don't know
They offer more scope for research than printed sources	25	72	15	1	27
They are of little interest to me because older cases are not included	3	13	67	24	31
Transcripts are helpful because they are produced quickly	36	70	4	0	31
Transcripts are of limited use because they do not sufficiently identify the principles of cases	0	21	63	13	39
Subscription rates to Electronic Law Reports are expensive	45	50	5	1	39

More than half the respondents intended to make more use of electronic law reports in the next two years.

All respondents were asked their views on a series of propositions about printed law reports. The results are shown in Table 6.

Table 6: Responses to Question 10.

	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Neutral/ don't know
Other practitioners prefer references to printed rather than electronic reports	13	48	26	1	50
Judges/magistrates/tribunal chairs prefer citations of printed rather than electronic reports	13	51	14	1	59
I find paper sources easier to use	9	57	41	5	28
Printed reports are more readily available	3	43	52	10	29
I prefer printed reports because I am more familiar with them	6	52	59	7	16
I prefer printed reports because I have not been trained to use electronic sources	5	33	61	24	16
I use printed reports because I do not have the facilities to use electronic reports	7	22	68	34	8
I prefer printed reports because only those cases which add to existing law are reported	0	23	61	11	38

As can be seen a majority still favour printed reports, finding them easier to use, more familiar, and preferred by the courts. A minority lacked the facilities to make use of electronic media. But a majority disagreed with the proposition that printed reports were preferable because they contained only those cases which added to existing law. Clearly, this would merit further investigation.

Respondents were given the opportunity to add general additional comments. Interestingly, about a fifth took the opportunity to append their own comments, some in detail. Some examples are included below:

Solicitors

"As a small provincial practice the cost of accessing established law report providers e.g. Lexis, is prohibitive. If such services could be used on a pay as you use basis or could be provided on a share basis between a number of small firms then that could be far more attractive."

"The internet is an ideal medium for legal research. I would be happy if 95 per cent of my law library could be replaced by electronic data!"

"Electronic law reports are readily available and their use encouraged by LPC providers to their credit. However, the practices we have so far come across do not subscribe, but prefer printed material. Perhaps subscription rates for electronic materials act as a deterrent to their use by smaller firms? Perhaps LPC providers should not weight the use of electronic materials in legal research so heavily when not all firms do likewise."

"We do not subscribe to any electronic series but Law Alert has more than once proved useful in 'flagging up' developments. This has not led to the need to print or cite reports. If detailed research were needed I would go to the nearby University Law Library. Basically electronic reports and sources (e.g. statutes and statutory instruments) are additional tools but not a first point of reference."

"The only reason why our firm has not got electronic law reports etc. is the cost."

"We do very occasionally use electronic reports through an informal arrangement with a neighbouring firm - this suits our needs at present."

"As a non-contentious commercial property lawyer, very little use of law reports is made."

"Although I have marked that I agree that on line subscriptions are expensive, I do feel that they offer value for money. This is a big issue, obviously, for a small practice such as mine. A secondary issue of course is that by using the on-line facilities we have far greater research facilities than we would be able to have with the paper version - simply due to the amount of space the old `traditional' style takes. We are a new practice, small but growing, and space is therefore an expensive luxury for us. We cannot afford to tie it up with books that do not earn us anything."

"We make regular use of `Current Legal Information' from the desk but in my area, commercial property, there is such a plethora of regular periodicals with in depth reviews of changing areas that these are the first port of call. I do not deal with litigious matters."

"I make very little use of reports in my areas of practice - civil property and business - and do need to incur the expense of a subscription to electronic reports, nor indeed what I presume to be the more extensive resource that would provide."

"I do not carry out work that necessitates use of Law Reports."

"The practice is mainly a planning niche firm with development work flowing from it. The planning lawyers find access to electronic law reports/cases useful - not only whilst in the office, but also by PC whilst at lengthy planning inquiries etc."

"The only reports I use are family law reports which I access through Famlex - which is excellent. Electronic law reports are a bit like dishwashers - once you have used one you'll wonder how you ever managed before. No more dreary trips to the library only to find that the report you wanted is missing and no one know where it is."

"All law reports should be made available on the internet by the Government as part of a free information service to professionals and the general public. Together with statutes, statutory instruments, forms for all courts and tribunals. The public has a right to know and to be able to help themselves."

"I once had a High Court Judge who refused to accept a copy of a case report printed from Justis on the grounds `It is not an approved report and how do I know that the communications link hadn't `slipped' resulting in words being lost!'"

"Lawtel search facilities are difficult to use."

Barristers

"The new judgement format and paragraph system should remove, for the future, the intense nuisance of the electronic and printer copier not matching exactly - the omission of the marginal lettering by the ELR was a serious mistake. It would be helpful if editors of permanent record material recognised that lists of cases cited, but not mentioned in judgements, and, where possible cases mentioned in skeleton arguments but not cited orally, are important."

"I tend to use electronic law reports as a research tool but will photocopy from `hard copy' if I need to take authorities with me to court."

"There is quite a difference in the types of electronic reports available: (i) Electronic versions of 'traditional' reports. These are good for research and saving time on photocopying. (ii) Updated summary reports e.g. Lawtel - good for research. Some use in court. Current law - good for quantum cases and research. Electronic version makes it very easy to research. (iii) Transcripts - limited use - Judges don't like them unless there have been no reports. I use them mainly to follow up a Lawtel or Current Law Search."

"I find an electronic law library (consisting of 2 CD subscription and LCD) crucial to working from home and staying up-to-date."

Law Centres

"We intend to use electronic reports but have had teething problems with our computer system that have worried staff about reliability of access."

"(i) Enjoy using Electronic Research Methods. (ii) Unable to do so due to costs

(iii) We are a charity and funds are very, very stretched! If the price was right I know myself and other colleagues would jump at the chance to use them. (iv) Other staff members use the electronic Benefits Calculators on a regular basis and the Benefits CD Rom provided by child poverty Action for Free. So the demand is there, it's access that is the issue."

"My main comment, which actually applies to all electronic law, is that it is a grotesque rip-off. To take but one minor example, we subscribe to the paper version of IRLR at a cost of around £500 pa. Given that in most months around 70% of the content is in the public domain (e.g. in the EAT, ECJ, House of Lords etc.) to those in the know, that is a hefty wack to pay for production and limited added value. However, notwithstanding that one has paid this hefty wack for commentary and the convenience of easy access to some unpublished material, Eclipse want twice that to supply the same material on CD Rom as well, despite very, very low production costs and very, very little additional added value, e.g. a minimal licence fee re. Folio, the minimal cost of burning a CD Rom and someone to set up the data. To add insult, taking the CD alone, thus saving on printing, postage etc. produces virtually no saving.

The position with most books is worse. If you subscribe to say, the Encyclopaedia of Housing Law (S&M) or whatever, in paper format, you pay a substantial initial sum and then a smaller sum in subsequent years. With CD's you buy at the initial elevated price every year e.g. circa £1500 for the fullest version of the Encyc. with the HLRs etc.

Its a criminal abuse which, when I am a Pensioner with time on my hands, I want to have a go at. The Government/Court Service/whatever should, for example, ensure that it uses its control of original materials to ensure public service operations like us get this stuff at a reasonable cost. It would, for example, be wonderful if Context followed ICLR in making the electronic WLR and ICR available to us, and operations like us, at about 25% of normal cost. A glowing exception to all this is Smith Bernal with Casetrack, which is available free to Law Centres etc.

In my humble opinion, this totally unreasonable approach encourages piracy and discourages growth. I'll bet a lot that if the pricing structure was less unreasonable all the stuff about not liking books on screen etc. would disappear. I can confirm that with instant access to an up-to-date version of the Encyc., HLRs, etc. on CD and fairly minimal training, my colleagues' early objections faded rapidly.

As I say, I have spent a lot of time reviewing what is available."

"Law reports in general are expensive as are much of legal publications."

"The Word / Querie Search facility of electronic law reports is far superior than any index of printed law reports. ELR's are much easier to obtain from any jurisdiction."

"The Law Centre can't afford Lawtel (wonderful) or any of the others mentioned. We subscribe to EIN (electronic immigration network) and we have the Nacab information system on line. We have Halsbury's/Laws & Statutes, All ER, Housing Law Report, Community care Law Reports, IDS, Harveys, Hsg Encyclopaedia. Printed and many other more informal reports such as Refugee Legal service, legal report service etc."

Academics

"Both my students and I are forced to use electronic law reports because library facilities are inadequate to meet the demand (student numbers have doubled in the past decade) or are very late - ECHR decisions are frequently 6 months old before being reported in E.H.H.R, the Law Reports/WLR/All ER are frequently weeks or months behind, whereas electronic law reports are out a week or two at most after decision are announced.

I prefer the convenience of printing off a copy of a transcript from my office PC rather than having to go to the library and photocopy it. It's also free of charge for me, which involves a considerable saving off a low salary, in relative terms.

It saves my having to subscribe to law reports at exorbitant cost.

I can also download and then use (with acknowledgement of course) extracts from cases cut and pasted directly into lecture notes, articles etc. which is far more convenient than printed sources."

"Your survey is strongly biased. You don't take account of foreign law databases."

"My answers are not much use to you since I am a historian of legal and political thought and only rarely refer to law reports and then it is for cases prior to 1830."

"(i) Electronic Law Reports are excellent for recent cases that have not yet appeared in printed format and that have not been included in text books.

(ii) But because they (or at least BAILII) do not cover older cases they are not a complete substitute for printed law reports. Also, obviously they have no accompanying commentary (which is useful as e.g. in reports in the Criminal Law Review, which includes abstracts and commentaries).

(iii) Electronic law reports are much more easily accessible than printed reports both in terms of finding cases and also reading them (with printed reports you are competing with some 100 students to read them at the same time)."

Comment and conclusions

Our survey suggests that practitioners are now making extensive and enthusiastic use of electronic versions of decided cases in various forms, ranging from instant alert services to full law reports with headnotes and lists of cases cited. The fact that many of these sources are in non-traditional forms which are unsuitable for citation in court does not appear, at least for a majority of users, to be a deterrent to their use. More research is needed on the exact manner in which these materials are utilised, but it is clear that they are considered useful. Research is facilitated by easy access to cases which in the past would neither be reported nor readily available. This does raise an issue relating to the quality of the search engines. If the user relies too heavily on keyword searches, the results can be quite misleading because as Lord Justice Buxton has pointed out, it is not possible effectively to search legal material simply by word recognition, since judges talk in concepts, not just in words. By

way of example, Buxton cited *Sinclair v Brougham* [1914] AC 398 which lies at the heart of a whole huge modern law of restitution, but in which the word "restitution" does not appear at all (3).

This does raise difficult issues for legal education. When lawyers had to deal only with a smallish subset of the whole corpus of judicial decisions, since only "reportable" cases were actually reported, the information base of legal scholarship was more manageable because every element in it added something to the development of the law. Now wrong decisions are just as accessible as correct decisions, and cases which add nothing to the law stand alongside those which alter its course fundamentally. This puts an ever greater premium on teaching students how to discriminate, analyse and synthesise, in a word how to combine information management with the application of principles of law. Too often the principles are drowned in the sheer volume of material. It becomes harder to disabuse students of the idea that the search for precedent involves finding previous decisions on similar facts, rather than seeking the principles of law to be applied to the legal nexus in front of the student. Teaching such sophisticated research skills has resource implications: lavishly endowed universities may find this easier than those with restricted budgets and less affluent students.

Some sections of the judiciary have expressed alarm about the extent to which blanket reporting of High Court and Court of Appeal decisions leads to citation of cases which in the past would never have been put before the court. As Lord Bingham put it at the Cambridge conference: "The quick, effortless and relatively inexpensive availability of vast new swathes of material hitherto inaccessible, unorganised, unfiltered, unedited, presents a very real risk to the system which may, could, simply succumb under the weight of the material presented." (4)

By contrast, in Lord Bingham's view: "We have, in a high quality law report, the building block on which our common law system depends. An accurate statement of what the judge has decided, a very clear understanding of the circumstances in which he made his decision, and a definition of the principle which may bind other courts." (5)

In principle, in the higher courts, leave is required to cite transcripts of unreported cases (though in these days when virtually every case is reported in some form or another what is an unreported case?). Nearly 20 years ago, in *Roberts Petroleum Ltd v Bernard Kenny Ltd* [1983] 2 AC 192, 202 Lord Diplock, with the support of the other Law Lords, laid down that unreported court of appeal authority ought not to be cited without leave. Practice Direction (Court of Appeal: Authorities) [1996] 1 WLR 894 even states that "Leave to cite unreported cases will not usually be granted unless counsel are able to assure the court that the transcript in question contains a relevant statement of legal principle not found in reported authority and that the authority is not cited because of the phraseology used or as an illustration of the application of an established legal principle." But it appears there are few if any instances of leave having been refused.

In *Hamblin v Field* (Lawtel, 11 April 2000) the Court of Appeal deplored the citation in argument of a number of Lawtel case summaries. This was not a satisfactory way to put judicial decisions before the court. The object of the Lawtel summary was to give practitioners notice that a particular case dealing with particular points had been decided in a particular way.

The issue was more extensively dealt with by Laddie J in *Michaels v Taylor Woodrow Developments Ltd* [2001] 2WLR 224, 249: "Even in the 1970s, there were no readily available and cheap means for copying unpublished reports, even if they could be found. The lawyers who attended court had to bring with them those volumes of the law reports containing the particular reports on which they intended to rely. Logistics problems helped to lessen the enthusiasm for over-citation of authority.

"Now there is no pre-selection. Large numbers of decisions, good and bad, reserved and unreserved, can be accessed. Lawyers frequently feel that they have an obligation to search this material.

Anything which supports their clients' case must be drawn to the attention of the court. This is so even when it is likely that the court which gave the judgment probably never intended it to be taken as creating a new legal principle. ... A poor decision of, say a court of first instance used to be buried silently by omission from the reports. Now it may be dug up and used to support a cause of action or defence which, without its encouragement, might have been allowed to die a quiet death. ... It seems to me that the common law system, which places such reliance on legal authority, stands the risk of being swamped by a torrent of material, not just from this country, but from other jurisdictions, particularly common law ones."

As Laddie J points out, the leave requirement is not a remedy, because it is usually easier to let counsel cite a case rather than argue over whether it should be cited. In addition, while the approach might work in the House of Lords, "it is difficult to see how either a court of first instance or the Court of Appeal itself could refused to allow citation of, say, a unanimous decision of the Court of Appeal since, on current principles of stare decisis, both would be bound by it whether they liked the decision or not."

Laddie J advances the possibility that the courts should adopt a procedure where all extempore judgments of any court and any judgment of courts of first instance are not to be cited unless the court, at the time of giving judgment or shortly thereafter, indicated to the contrary. All judgments would be available to the public, but only the selected ones could be used for citation.

Paradoxically, citation of unreported cases will to be made easier by the introduction of neutral citation and paragraph numbering: see Practice Direction (Judgments: Form and Citation) [2001] 1 WLR 194.

A final word about terminology. We have used the term "law report" promiscuously to describe any account of a case and to differentiate accounts of cases from other legal media such as statutes and subordinate legislation. Many people might find our use of the term too wide, and seek to confine it to established series of reports.

Maureen Spencer

Penny Kent

John Spencer

Saturday, 10 March 2001

Notes

- (1) See transcript of conference published by Smith Bernal International.
- (2) Sup cit, page 83.
- (3) Sup cit, page 25.
- (4) Sup cit, page 13.
- (5) Sup cit, page 11.

Appendix: Questionnaire

We append the form of questionnaire sent to solicitors. A

slightly different form of words was sent to other groups.

Please tick the appropriate boxes and supply additional information as requested.

1. Do you personally make use of Electronic Law Reports?

YES NO

If NO, please go to Question 8.

2. How often on average do you make use of Electronic Law Reports?

DAILY WEEKLY FORTNIGHTLY MONTHLY

LESS THAN ONCE A MONTH

3. Do you make use of any of the following subscription Electronic Law Reports?

Please tick all that apply.

Current Legal Information Lexis

Lawtel Westlaw UK

EU Interactive Law Reports

EUROLAW CELEX

OJCD Locallaw UK

Context All England Law Reports

Law Reports CD Rom NONE

Casetrack

Other, please specify.....

.....

4. Do you make use of any of the following non-subscription Electronic Law Reports?

Please tick all that apply.

BAILII Incorporated Council

SCAD European Court of Justice

RSLP European Ct of Hmn Rights

Casebase

Other, please specify.....

.....

5. For what purposes on the whole do you make use of Electronic Law Reports?

Please tick all that apply.

Research/Updating q Citing in Written Opinions q

Preparing Advice/Opinions q Citing in Court q

Other, please specify.....

.....

6. Where do you access Electronic Law Reports?

Please tick all that apply.

Office q Personal Computer q

Specialist Law Library q Public Library q

Other, please specify.....

.....

7. What do you require from Electronic Law Reports?

Please tick all that apply.

Full transcripts q Case summaries q

Daily summaries q Cases heard in other jurisdictions q

Summaries of out of court settlements q Literature about decided cases q

References for the printed law reports series q

Other, please specify.....

.....

8. Do you agree with any of the following statements about Electronic Law Reports?

Please tick all that apply.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Neutral/ Don't know
-------------------	-------	----------	----------------------	---------------------------

They offer more scope for research than printed sources	<input type="checkbox"/>				
They are of little interest to me because older cases are not included	<input type="checkbox"/>				
Transcripts are helpful because they are produced quickly	<input type="checkbox"/>				
Transcripts are of limited use because they do not sufficiently identify the principles of cases	<input type="checkbox"/>				
Subscription rates to Electronic Law Reports are expensive	<input type="checkbox"/>				

9. Do you intend to make more use of Electronic Law Reports in the next two years?

YES NO Don't know

10. Do you agree with any of the following statements about printed Law Reports?

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Neutral/ Don't know
Other practitioners prefer references to printed rather than Electronic Reports	<input type="checkbox"/>				
Judges/Magistrates/Tribunal Chairs prefer citations of printed rather than Electronic Reports	<input type="checkbox"/>				
I find paper sources easier to use	<input type="checkbox"/>				
Printed Reports are more readily available	<input type="checkbox"/>				
I prefer printed Reports because I am more familiar with them	<input type="checkbox"/>				
I prefer printed Reports because I have not been trained to use electronic sources	<input type="checkbox"/>				
I use printed Reports because I do not have the facilities to use electronic sources	<input type="checkbox"/>				
I prefer printed Reports because only those cases which add to existing law are reported	<input type="checkbox"/>				

Please tick the appropriate boxes:

AGE: 20-30 31-45 46+ SEX: Female Male

Number of partners in practice:.....

Number of years in practice: 0-5 6-10 11-20 21+

Area of work: Mainly civil Mainly criminal Even mix civil/criminal

Please add overleaf any other comments you would like to make.

Thank you for completing this questionnaire. The information you have provided will be treated in the strictest confidence. If you would like us to send you a copy of your report please give your name and address below.

Name.....

Address:.....

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS