

Appendix A

Technical description of the prototype

The system was built as an extension of the existing `lagen.nu` system.²⁹¹ Two new modules (`EurlexCaselaw` and `EurlexTreaties`) were built to download and analyze the documents, as well as performing different kinds of relevance rankings, and to evaluate the results. The code is written mainly in python, and is licensed under the BSD license. The system can be set up by anyone wishing to verify the results or develop the ideas further.

A.1 Acquiring, installing and running

A.1.1 Prerequisites

The system depends on Python and Java. Both these are cross-platform, and the system has been developed on and runs on Windows, Mac OS X and Unix.

- Python, at least version 2.5.²⁹² Does not work with python 3.*
- The following third-party Python modules. Recommended way of installing is by using `pip`.²⁹³
 - `BeautifulSoup`
 - `configobj`
 - `genshi`
 - `matplotlib`
 - `mechanize`

²⁹¹Staffan Malmgren: `Lagen.nu` - Öppen rättsinformation, in: *Lov & Data* 97 (2009), pp. 24–30.

²⁹²Available from <http://www.python.org/download/>

²⁹³Available from <http://www.pip-installer.org/>

- networkx
 - numpy
 - rdflib
 - simpleparse
 - whoosh
- Apache Tomcat (preferably version 6.*).²⁹⁴
 - The Sesame RDF triple store.²⁹⁵
 - (For acquiring the source) Mercurial.²⁹⁶

A.1.2 Installing

First, set up the Tomcat server and deploy the `openrdf-sesame` WAR file to it. You should be able to access `http://localhost:8080/openrdf-sesame` and receive a simple welcome message. You must also deploy the `openrdf-workbench` WAR file in order to create a repository for the data.

Next, download the code from the project mercurial server:

```
hg clone https://code.google.com/p/ferenda/ ferenda
cd ferenda
```

Make sure all prerequisites are met:

```
python ferenda-setup.py -preflight
```

A.1.3 Running

Set up a workspace for the document collection. This creates a new directory containing a configuration file (`ferenda.ini`) and a control script (`ferenda-build.py`) for running various commands.

```
python ferenda-setup.py myworkspace
cd myworkspace
```

Note: You also need to create a repository in the Sesame triple store. Instructions are given by the `ferenda-setup.py` script.

Enable the two modules we will be using (which adds some directives to the `ferenda.ini` file):

```
python ferenda-build.py enable ferenda.sources.EurlexTreaties
python ferenda-build.py enable ferenda.sources.EurlexCaselaw
```

²⁹⁴ Available from <http://tomcat.apache.org/>

²⁹⁵ Available from <http://www.openrdf.org/>

²⁹⁶ Available from <http://mercurial.selenic.com/>

Now we're ready to start processing data. There are three main steps to this process: The downloading of treaty text and cases, the semantic analysis of the downloaded raw texts, and the indexing of the resulting semantically structured texts. First step:

```
python ferenda-build.py download_everything eut
python ferenda-build.py download_everything ecj
```

The latter will take several hours as it downloads over 14 000 individual documents. You can verify the results in the `data/eut/downloaded` and `data/ecj/downloaded` directories.

The next step is to perform the semantic analysis for the treaty and the cases. This will take several hours as well (if you have a multiprocessor machine, you can perform the case analysis in parallel over several processor cores by appending `--processes=4` to the last command):

```
python ferenda-build.py parse_all eut
python ferenda-build.py parse_all ecj
```

The next step is to collect all the semantic data into a big RDF database. For ECJ cases, this command will also build an index for traditional IR using the `whoosh` library.

```
python ferenda-build.py relate_all eut
python ferenda-build.py relate_all ecj
```

Now we're ready to perform analysis on this set of data. The first step will find out which TFEU articles are most often referenced, and from this create a set of key terms for the baseline queries:

```
python ferenda-build.py analyze eut
```

The set of key terms are stored in `data/eut/analyzed/keyterms.n3`, and can be adjusted prior to the next evaluation step, if desired.

The final step is to evaluate the performance of various configurations of the link analysis ranking algorithms, as well as a reference baseline algorithm, against the pre-determined gold standard relevance judgment set. This set is stored in `./ferenda/res/eut/goldstandard.n3` and can be adjusted as well. As the algorithms are run on a large set of different citation graphs (particularly the age-compensated configurations), they will take around 30 minutes in all.

```
python ferenda-build.py evaluate eut
```

This will print out the various configurations MAP score, as well as creating the graph shown on page 82. This should enable you to recreate the results presented in this thesis.

A.2 System and information architecture

The existing lagen.nu system was mainly built to create a useable, hyper-linked web representation of Swedish law (statutes and cases).

A.2.1 Processing of information

Handling each particular source of documents is done by implementing a python class (e.g. `ferenda.sources.EurlexCaselaw`) that derives from a base class that implements basic functionality, which can be overridden if desired. Each class has a short code (e.g. `ecj`) that is used for naming directories and in other places where a short identifier is needed. It does this in a five step process, three of which are illustrated above.

- **download:** Acquire the raw sources of documents in some way (normally by “spidering”, i.e. recursively downloading, them from the web). Documents are stored in `data/[sourceid]/downloaded`.
- **parse:** Transforming the raw, unstructured sources into a semantically rich XML representation. These are stored in `data/[sourceid]/parsed/`.
- **relate:** Extracting RDF metadata from the XML documents into a RDF triple store (for the `EurlexCaselaw` module, this also creates a whoosh index).
- **generate:** For each original document, create a structured but web-adapted HTML document. This normally includes all text from the original document, but also page navigation tools and may also pull in information from other sources. E.g. for a statute this may add a list underneath each article with legal cases that cite the article. Such information is fetched from the RDF triple store.
- **toc:** Creates a set of static “Table-of-contents”-like pages sorted by various criteria as an entry point to support browsing of information.

The steps `analyze` and `evaluate` were new to the system, and added to support this thesis work.

A.2.2 Document representation and semantics

The goal of the `parse` step is to represent the document with high semantic fidelity. This is done by analyzing the individual parts of the text, why they have been put in a particular position, and with a particular font or other visual attribute. A series of digits and hyphens in the top right-hand corner of the document might be the date when the document was written. A string put in bold, centered at the top of the page might be the title of the

document. A string consisting of two individual words, traditionally used as surname and family name, put at the bottom of the document might be the name of the author of the document. And so on.

In many cases, the document will not be one of a kind. Court verdicts are typically written in a style that is consistent for all verdicts by that court, both regarding what text actually goes on the page, and where on the page it's placed.

We can represent this knowledge using a semantically oriented document format. The common way to do this is to use XML, and to use a document type definition or schema that can represent the semantic concepts in our document. For statutory law, this will be things like the title of the act, the enactment date and the individual articles. For a case report, this will be things like the date of the verdict, the verdict itself, any dissenting opinions, and headnotes. For this application in particular, it is important to be able to represent references from cases to statutory law and other cases.

A.2.3 Semantical analysis of the corpus

TFEU has a hierarchical structure. Articles are contained within titles. Each individual article consists of one or more paragraphs. The general structure of the treaty is as follows:

```
<Body>
  <Preamble>
  <Part>
    <Title>
      <Chapter>
        <Section>
          <Article>
            <Subarticle>
              <Paragraph>
              <UnordedList>
                <ListItem>
              <OrderedList>
```

This is a simplified view – not all articles have subarticles, ordered lists contain ListItems, not all Titles have Chapters and Sections, but on the whole this shows the hierarchical nature of the texts.

However, this structure is only apparent to the human reader. The HTML code on the EURLEX website marks up every piece of text – whether it is the start of a Part or a single ListItem – as a HTML paragraph. In order to go from the non-semantic model of the EURLEX data where everything is described as a paragraph, to the semantically more meaningful model described above, a computer program containing a state machine based parser was written. The output of this program is a XHTML rendition of the TFEU structure.

Consider the start of the actual TEU treaty text (not including the preamble). In the EURLEX version, this is represented by the following HTML (somewhat abridged):

```
<p>TITLE I</p>
```

```
<p>COMMON PROVISIONS</p>
```

```
<p>Article 1</p>
```

```
<p>(ex Article 1 TEU) [2]</p>
```

```
<p>By this Treaty, the HIGH CONTRACTING PARTIES establish among themselves a EUROPEAN UNION, hereinafter called "the Union" on which the Member States confer competences to attain objectives they have in common.</p>
```

```
<p>This Treaty marks a new stage in the process of creating an ever closer union among the peoples of Europe, in which decisions are taken as openly as possible and as closely as possible to the citizen.</p>
```

```
<p>The Union shall be founded on the present Treaty and on the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (hereinafter referred to as "the Treaties"). Those two Treaties shall have the same legal value. The Union shall replace and succeed the European Community.</p>
```

```
<p>Article 2</p>
```

```
<p>The Union is founded on the values of respect for human dignity, freedom, democracy, equality, the rule of law and respect for human rights, including the rights of persons belonging to minorities. These values are common to the Member States in a society in which pluralism, non-discrimination, tolerance, justice, solidarity and equality between women and men prevail.</p>
```

In this text, the only semantic element used is the `<p>` tag. According to the HTML specification,²⁹⁷ “The P element represents a paragraph”. Clearly, some of the sections marked up as paragraphs could better be described as headings, and some of them represent the start of structural sections within the document (Titles and articles)

A more semantic representation of the same excerpt (using an ad-hoc document type) would be:

```
<Title ordinal="1" ordinaltitle="TITLE I"
```

²⁹⁷see <http://www.w3.org/TR/html4/>

```
    title="COMMON PROVISIONS">
<Article exarticlenumber="(ex Article 1 TEU)"
    id="A1" ordinal="1"
ordinaltitle="Article 1">
  <Paragraph>
    By this Treaty, the HIGH CONTRACTING PARTIES establish
    among themselves a EUROPEAN UNION, hereinafter called
    "the Union" on which the Member States confer
    competences to attain objectives they have in common.
  </Paragraph>
  <Paragraph>
    This Treaty marks a new stage in the process of
    creating an ever closer union among the peoples of
    Europe, in which decisions are taken as openly as
    possible and as closely as possible to the citizen.
  </Paragraph>
  <Paragraph>
    The Union shall be founded on the present Treaty and
    on the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union
    (hereinafter referred to as "the Treaties"). Those two
    Treaties shall have the same legal value. The Union
    shall replace and succeed the European Community.
  </Paragraph>
</Article>
<Article id="A2" ordinal="2" ordinaltitle="Article 2">
  <Paragraph>
    The Union is founded on the values of respect for
    human dignity, freedom, democracy, equality, the rule
    of law and respect for human rights, including the
    rights of persons belonging to minorities. These
    values are common to the Member States in a society in
    which pluralism, non-discrimination, tolerance,
    justice, solidarity and equality between women and men
    prevail.
  </Paragraph>
</Article>
</Title>
```

A state machine is a series of instructions modeling a system of different states, and triggers that, depending on the input to that system, changes the systems state.

Initially, the system is in the Body state. The system reads line after line, and when a line consisting only of the text "PREAMBLE" is encountered, the system moves to the Preamble state. Reading of lines continue, and when a line with the text "PART " followed by a roman numeral is encountered, the system moves to the Part state. Defining the different possible states, and the triggers to move from one state to another, is fairly simple once the general structure of the document is known. While reading lines, the

system creates objects for (possibly containing other objects) for every state change, and adds the current line to the current object.

This results in an object structure that matches the document structure. It is then simple to serialize this object model to a file. Above, we've used XML syntax, but any other serialization syntax can be used.

A.2.4 RDF representation of EURLEX information

The XHTML rendition uses RDFa to represent high level semantic constructs in the documents to avoid loss of semantic fidelity. The RDF data model relies on the concept of resources.²⁹⁸ A resource is anything that one can make a statement about, and it's represented by a URI. In the treaty, we'd like to make statements about the treaty as a whole, but also individual articles (and subarticles). Therefore, each article gets a URI on the form `http://lagen.nu/ext/celex/12008E001` for Article 1, `http://lagen.nu/ext/celex/12008E002` for Article 2 and so on. The URIs are based on the existing CELEX numbers.

A.3 Extending the system

The system could be fairly simple to adapt to other datasets, such as national case law, if the information is available in a structured format. I am very interested to hear of any attempts to run and extend the code, and would be happy to help using it to examine other legal information corpora.

Please send questions or notes of successes or failures to `staffan.malmgren@gmail.com`

²⁹⁸For more on RDF, particularly as it applies to legal information, see Staffan Malmgren: Legal Information Systems and the Semantic Web, in: Stanley Greenstein (ed.): Vem reglerar informationssamhället, 2011

Appendix B

The gold standard

The process for creating this set of relevance judgments is described in sec. 5.3.3.

B.1 Article 101

(ex Article 81 TEC): Prohibition of prevention of competition. References are taken from “EU Law”, section 29.2

These cases have a high ratio of Court of First Instance (CFI) to ECJ verdicts. This could be because of a requirement to bring such cases up in CFI, before they can be appealed to ECJ.

Celex	Case
61964J0056	Établissements Consten SA v Commission (Joined cases 56, 58/64)
61965J0056	Société Technique Minière v Maschinenbau Ulm GmbH (Case 56/65)
61969J0005	Völk v Établissements Vervaecke Sprl (Case 5/69)
61969J0048	Imperial Chemical Industries Ltd v Commission (dyestuffs) (Case 48/69)
61972J0008	Vereenign van Cementhandelaren v Commission (Case 8/72)
61976J0026	Metro-SB-Grossmärkte GmbH & Co KG v Commission (Case 26/76)
61978J0258	LC Nungesser v Commission (Case 258/78)
61980J0031	L'Oréal (Case 31/80)
61982J0096	NV IAZ International Belgium v Commission (Case 96/82)
61982J0107	AEG-Telefunken (Case 107/82)
61983J0229	Centres-Leclerc v 'Au Blé Vert' Sàrl (Case 229/83)
61984J0025	Ford Werke AG v. Commission (Case 25/84)
61984J0161	Pronuptia v Schillgalis (Case 161/84)
61985J0089	A Ahlström OY v Commission (re wood pulp) (Joined cases C-89,104,114, 116, 117, 125-129/86)
61986J0065	Bayer AG v Süllhöfer (Case 65/86)
61992A0066	Herlitz AG v Commission (Case T-66/92)
61994A0374	European Night Services v Commission European Night Services v Commission (Joined cases T-374/94, T-375/94, T-384/94 and T-388/94)

Celex	Case
61999A0112	Metropole Television v Commission (Case T-112/99)
61999A0319	Fenin v Commission (Case T-319/99)
61999J0309	Wouters (Case C-309/99)
62000A0185	Metropole Television SA (M6) and ors v Commission (Joined cases T-185, 216, 99, 300/00)
62001A0208	Wolkswagen (Case T-208/01)
62002J0002	Bayer (Case C-2/02, C-3/01)

B.2 Article 263

(ex Article 230 TEC): Direct action for annulment by ECJ for legislative acts etc by Council, Commission, Parliament and ECB. References from chapter 12, except 12.7 (deals with article 264 (231 TEC)) and 12.8 (deals with article 277 (241 TEC))

There seems to be relative few standout landmark cases that deal with art 263. Rather, each miniscule aspect of each requirement have been defined in several cases. Therefore, the list of relevant cases is rather long.

Celex	Case
61955J0008	Fédération Charbonnière de Belgique v High Authority (case 8/55)
61962J0016	Confédération Nationale des Producteurs de Fruits et Légumes v Council (Case 16/62, 17/62)
61962J0025	Plaumann & Co v Commission (case 25/62)
61963J0106	Alfred Toepfer KG v Commission (cases 106 and 107/63)
61964J0001	Glucoseries Réunion v Commission (case 1/64)
61966J0008	8-11/66 Re Noordwijk's Cement Accord
61970J0022	22/70 Commission v Council (Re European Road Transport Agreement) AKA ERTA
61970J0041	41-4/70 International Fruit NV v Commission (No 1)
61970J0062	Werner A Bock KG v Commission (case 62/70)
61974J0017	Transocean Marine Paint Association v Commission (case 17/74)
61976J0026	26/76 Metro-SB-Grossmärkte GmbH & Co KG v Commission
61976J0101	101/76 Koninklijke Scholten-Honig NV v Council and Commission
61977J0103	Royal Scholten-Honig (Holdings) Ltd v Intervention Board for Agricultural Produce (cases 103 and 145/77)
61977J0112	August Töpfer & Co GmbH v Commission (case 112/77)
61977J0113	Japanese ball-bearing cases (cases 113, 118-121/77)
61977J0118	Japanese ball-bearing cases (cases 113, 118-121/77)
61977J0119	Japanese ball-bearing cases (cases 113, 118-121/77)
61977J0120	Japanese ball-bearing cases (cases 113, 118-121/77)
61977J0121	Japanese ball-bearing cases (cases 113, 118-121/77)
61977J0123	UNICME v Council (case 123/77)
61979J0138	Roquette Frères SA v Council (case 138/79)
61979J0139	Maizena GmbH v Council (case 139/79)
61979J0730	Philip Morris BV v Commission (case 730/79)
61979J0789	789/79, 790/79 Calpak SpA v Commission

Celex	Case
61981J0230	230/81 Luxembourg v Parliament
61982J0011	AE Piraiki-Patraiki v Commission (case 11/82)
61982J0231	Spijker Kwasten BV v Commission (case 231/82)
61982J0239	239, 275/82 Allied Corporation v Commission
61982J0264	264/82 Timex Corporation v Council
61983J0145	Adams v Commission (No 1) (case 145/83)
61983J0294	294/83 Partie Ecologiste ('Les Verts') v Parliament
61987J0302	302/87 Parliament v Council (Comitology)
61988J0070	C-70/88 Parliament v Council (Chernobyl)
61988J0152	C-152/88 Sofrimport v Commission
61989J0298	C-298/89 Gibraltar v Council
61989J0309	C-309/89 Cornidou SA v Council
61989J0358	C-358/89 Extramet Industrie SA v Council
61991J0181	C-181/91, C-248/91 Parliament v Council (Re aid to Bangladesh)
61991J0195	Bayer-AG v Commission (Case C-195/91 P)
61991J0316	C-316/91 Parliament v Council (Re European Development Fund)
61992J0037	BEUC v Commission (case T-37/92)
61992J0188	TWD Textilwerke Deggendorf GmbH v Germany (case C-188/92)
61992J0359	Germany v Commission (case C-359/92)
61993A0003	T-3/93 Air France v Commission
61993A0447	T-447-449/93 Associazione Italiana Tecnico Economica del Cemento (AITEC) v Commission
61993A0465	Consorzio Gruppo di Azione Locale 'Murgia Messapica' v Commission (case T-465/93)
61993J0156	Parliament v Commission (case C-156/93)
61994A0115	Opel Austria GmbH v Council (case T-115/94)
61994J0122	Commission v Council (case C-122/94)
61994J0233	Germany v Parliament (case C-233/94)
61994J0268	Portugal v Council (case C-268/94)
61995B0134	T-134/95 Dysan Magnetics Ltd v Commission
61995J0057	C-57/95 France v Commission (Re Pensions Funds Communication)
61995J0241	C-241/95 R v Intervention Board for Agricultural Produce, ex parte Accrington Beef Co Ltd
61996B0122	T-122/96 Federolio v Commission
61996J0162	Racke (case C-162/96)
61998A0172	T-172, T-175-177/98 Salamander and ord v European Parliament and Council
61999A0054	T-54/99 max.mobil v Commission
62000A0147	Laboratoires Servier v Commission (case T-147/00)
62000A0353	Le Pen (Case T-353/00)
62003J0208	Pen (Case C-208/03)
62000A0377	T-377/00, T-379/00, T-380/00, T-260/01 and T-272/01 Philip Morris International and others v Commission
62000J0050	Union de Pequenos Agricultores (UPA) v Council (case C-50/00)
62001A0033	Infront (case T-33/01)
62001A0033	T-33/01 Infront
62001A0033	T-33/01 P Infront WM AG v Commission
62006J0125	C-125/06 P Infront WM AG v Commission

Celex	Case
62001A0177	Jego-Quere et Cie v Commission (case T-177/01)
62001B0167	T-167/2001 Schmitz-Gotha Fahrzeugwerke v Commission
62002J0263	Jego-Quere (case C-263/02)
62006J0373	C-373/06 P, C-379/06 P, C-382/06 P Flaherty and others v Commission

B.3 Article 267

(ex Article 234 TEC): Preliminary rulings. References from Chapter 10.

Celex	Case
61961J0013	De Geus en Uitdenbogerd v Robert Bosch GmbH (case 13/61)
61962J0028	Da Costa en Schaake NV (cases 28-30/62)
61964J0006	Costa v ENEL (case 6/64)
61973J0146	Rheinmühlen-Düsseldorf (case 146/73)
61975J0043	Defrenne v Sabena (No 2) (case 43/75)
61979J0066	Salumi Srl (cases 66, 127 and 128/79)
61979J0104	Fogilia v Novello (No 1) (case 104/79)
61979J0811	Ariete SpA (case 811/79)
61980J0066	International Chemical Corporation SpA v Amministrazione delle Finanze dello Stato (case 66/80)
61980J0244	Fogilia v Novello (No 2) (case 244/80)
61980J0246	Broekmeulen (case 246/80)
61981J0102	Nordsee Deutsche Hochseefischerei GmbH (case 102/81)
61981J0283	CILFIT Srl (case 283/81)
61985J0309	Barra (case 309/85)
61986J0024	Blaizot (case 24/86)
61988J0143	Zuckerfabrik Süderdithmarschen AG v Hauptzollamt Itzehoe (cases C-143/88 and C-92/89)
61988J0262	Barber v Guardian Royal Exchange Assurance Group (case 262/88)
61988J0297	Dzodzi v Belgium (cases C-297/88 and case C-197/89)
61990J0006	Francovich (case C-6 and 9/90)
61991J0083	Meilicke v ADV-ORGA AG (case C-83/91)
61991J0271	Marshall (No 2) (case C-271/91)
61992J0188	TWD Textilwerke GmbH v Germany (case C-188/92)
61993J0392	R v Her Majesty's Treasury, ex parte British Telecommunications plc (case C-392/93)
61993O0428	Monin Automobiles - Maison du Deux-Roues (case C-428/93)
61995J0028	Leur Bloem (case C-28/95)
61995J0074	Criminal Proceedings against X (Cases C-74 and 129/95)
61995J0241	R v Intervention Board for Agriculture, ex parte Accrington Beef Co Ltd (case C-241/95)
61996J0054	Dorsch Consult (case C-54/96)
61998J0110	Gabalfrisa v AEAT (cases C-110-47/98)
61999J0516	Schmid (case C-516/99)
62000J0017	de Coster (case C-17/00)
62000J0099	Lyckeshog (case C-99/00)

Celex	Case
62000J0318	Bacardi-Martini SAS v Newcastle United Football Company Ltd (case C-318/00)
62000J0453	Kühne & Heitz NV v Productshap voor Pluimvee en Eiren (case C-453/00)
62001J0206	Arsenal Football Club v Reed (case C-206/01)
62001J0224	Köbler (case C-224/01)
62003J0053	Synetairismos Farmakopoion Aitolas & Akarnanias v GlaxoSmithKline plc (case C-53/03)
62003J0461	Gaston Schul v Minister van Landbouw (case C-461/03)
62004J0125	Denuit v Transorient (case C-125/04)
62008J0014	Roda Golf and Beach Resort (case C-14/08)

B.4 Article 107

(ex Article 87 TEC): Restrictions on state aid. References from chapter 31 (except 32.2, 31.5 and 31.6)

Celex	Case
61976J0078	Steinike und Weinleg (case 78/76)
61979J0730	Philip Morris Holland BV v Commission (case 730/79)
61985J0067	Kwekerij Gebroeders van der Kooy BV v Commission (cases 67/85, 68/85 and 70/85)
61991J0072	Firma Sloman Neptun Schiffahrts AG v Seebetriebsrat Bodo Ziesmer of Sloman Neptun Schiffahrts AG (cases C-72/91 and 73/91)
61994J0039	Syndicat Francais de l'Express International (SFEI) v La Poste (case C-39/94)
61995A0214	Vlaams Geweest v Commission (case T-214/95)
61997J0075	Belgium v Commission (Maribel bis-ter case, case C-75/97)
61997J0256	DMT (case C-256/97)
62000J0053	Ferring SA v Agence centrale des organismes de securite sociale (ACOSS) (case C-53/00)
62000J0280	Altmark Trans GmBH v Nahlverkehrsgesellschaft Altmark GmBH (case C-280/00)
62002J0345	Pearle (case C-345/02)
62004A0196	Ryanair v Commission (case T-196/04)

B.5 Article 296

(ex Article 253 TEC): Procedural requirements for adoption of acts. References from 12.6.2.

Note: this article is hardly mentioned in "EU Law". Why do so many cases (815) refer to it? It's possible that they overlap with art 263 (230 TEC) cases, as art 296 states a procedural requirement, which if unfulfilled can be a ground for annulment of an act under art 263.

B.7: Article 258

Celex	Case
61962J0024	Germany v Commission (Re Tariff Quotas on Wine) (case 24/62)

B.6 Article 108

(ex Article 88 TEC): State aid (procedural rules) References from 31.2.1 - 31.2.3.

Very few cases (and not much text in the book), therefore we include cases only mentioned in paranthesis.

Celex	Case
61973J0120	Gebrüder Lorenz GmbH v Germany (case 120/73)
61982J0084	Commission v Germany (case 84/82)
61984J0052	Comission v Belgium (case 52/84)
61985J0223	RSV Maschinefabrieken & Scheepswervem NV v Commission (case 223/85)
61985J0259	Commission v France (case 259/85)
61988J0303	Re aid to ENI Lanerossi (case C-303/88)
61989J0005	Commission v Germany (case C-5/89)
61991J0198	William Cook v Commission (case C-198/91)
61993A0244	TWD Textilwerke Deggendorf GmbH v Commission (cases T-244 and 486/93)
61993A0459	Siemens SA v Commission (case T-459/93)
61993J0349	Commission v Italy (case C-349/93)
61998J0099	Austria v Commission (case C-99/98)
61999J0261	Commission v France (case C-261/99)
62000J0036	Spain v Comission (case C-36/00)
62003J0346	Atzeni (joined cases C-346/03 and 529/03)
62006J0177	Commission v Spain (case C-177/06)

B.7 Article 258

(Ex Article 226 TEC). References from 11.1 - 11.6

Celex	Case
61961J0007	Commission v Italy Re Ban on Pork Imports (Case 7/61)
61963J0090	Commission v Luxembourg and Belgium re Import of Powdered Milk Products (cases 90/63 and 91/63)
61965J0048	Alfons Lütticke GmbH v Commission (cases 48/65)
61969J0031	Commission v Italy Re payment of export Rebates (case 31/69)
61973J0167	Commission v France Re French Merchant Seamen (case 167/73)
61978J0128	Commission v United Kingdom (Re Tachographs) (case 128/78)
61980J0142	Amministrazione della Finanze dello Stato v Essevi SpA (cases 142/80 and 143/80)
61981J0028	Commission v Italy (case 28/81)

Celex	Case
61984J0029	Commission v Germany re Nursing Directives (case 29/84)
61984J0101	Commission v Italy re transport statistics (Case 101/84)
61985J0085	Commission v Belgium (case 85/85)
61985J0168	Commission v Italy (case 168/85)
61985J0293	Commission v Belgium Re university fees (case 293/85)
61986J0296	McNicholl v Ministry of Agriculture (case 296/86)
61995J0191	Commission v Germany (case C-191/95)
61995J0265	Commission v France (case C-265/95)
61999J0230	Commission v France (case C-230/99)
62000J0129	Commission v Italy (case C-129/00)
62002J0058	Commission v Spain (case C-58/02)
62002J0441	Commission v Ireland (case C-441/02)
62005J0110	Commission v Italy motorbike trailers (case C-110/05)

B.8 Article 45

(ex Article 39 TEC): Freedom of movement for workers. References from chapter 22 (particularly 22.3.1, but all references that deal with freedom of movement for workers (as opposed to establishment or services))

Celex	Case
61969J0015	Ugliola (case 15/69)
61973J0152	Sotgiu v Deutsche Bundespost (case 152/73)
61979J0149	Commission v Belgium (case 149/79)
61984J0307	Commission v France (French nurses) (case 307/84)
61985J0066	Lawrie-Blum v Land Baden-Württemberg (case 66/85)
61987J0379	Groener v Minister for education (case 379/87)
61991J0004	Bleis v Ministère de l'Education Nationale (case C-4/91)
61992J0272	Spotti v Freistaat Bayern (case C-272/92)
61993J0415	Bosman (case C-415/93)
61994J0237	O'Flynn v Adjudication Officer (case C-237/94)
61996J0015	Schöning-Kougebetopoulou v Freue und Hansestadt Hamburg (case C-15/96)
61998J0190	Volker Graf v Filzmoser Maschinenbau (case C-190/98)
61998J0281	Angonese v Cassa di Risparmio di Bolzano SpA (C-281/98)
62002J0400	Merida (case C-400/02)
62005J0212	Hartmann v Freistaat Bayern (case C-212/05)

B.9 Article 34

(ex Article 34 TFEU): Quantitative restrictions on import. References from ch 19.3 - 19.6

Celex	Case
61961J0007	Commission v Italy Re Ban on Pork Imports (Case 7/61)

Celex	Case
61968J0013	Salgoil SpA v Italian Ministry for Foreign Trade (case 13/68)
61971J0051	International Fruit Co NV v Produktschap voor Groenten en Fruit (cases 51/71 - 54/71)
61973J0002	Riseria Luigi Geddo v Ente Nazionale Risi (case 2/73)
61974J0008	Procureur du Roi v Dassonville (case 8/74)
61975J0065	Tasca (case 65/75)
61977J0082	van Tiggele (case 82/77)
61978J0120	Rewe-Zentral AG v Bundesmonopolverwaltung für Branntwein (Cassis de Dijon) (case 120/78)
61979J0034	R v Henn (case 34/79)
61979J0788	Gilli (Italian cider vinegar case) (case 788/79)
61981J0249	Commission v Ireland ('Buy Irish' campaign) (case 249/81)
61981J0261	Walter Rau Lebensmittelwerke v De Smedt PVBA (case 261/81)
61983J0207	Comiision v UK (origin marking of retail Goods) (case 207/83)
61984J0021	Franking Machine (case 21/84)
61988J0145	Torfaen Borough Council v B & Q plc (case 145/88)
61989J0023	Quietlynn Ltd v Southend Borough Council (case C-23/89)
61991J0003	Exportur SA v LOR SA et Confiserie du Tech (case C-3/91)
61991J0267	Keck and Mithouard (case C-267/91 and C-268/91)
61993J0412	Leclerc-Siplec (Case C-412/93)
61994J0140	DIP SpA (cases C-140/94 - C-142/94)
61994J0231	Pistre (joined cases C-231/94 - 234/94)
61995J0034	Konsumentombudsmannen v De Agostini (C-34/95 - C-36/95)
61995J0265	Commission v France (Angry Farmers) (case C-265/95)
61995J0368	Verinigte Familiapres Zeitungsverkags- und Vertriebs GmbH v Heinrich Bauer Verlag (case C-368/95)
61997J0067	Ditlev Blume (case C-67/97)
61997J0412	ED Srl v Fenocchio (case C-412/97)
61998J0044	BASF AG v Präsident des Deutschen Patentamts (case C-44/98)
61998J0190	Volker Graf (caes C-190/98)
61998J0254	Schutzverband gegen unlauteren Wettbewerb v TK-Heimdienst Sass GmbH (Case C-254/98)
61998J0405	Gourmet International Products (case C-405/98)
62000J0112	Schmidberger (case C-112/00)
62000J0325	Commission v Germany (Quality Labels) (case C-325/00)
62000J0416	Morellato (case C-416/00)
62001J0322	Deutscher Apothekerverband eV v 0800 DocMorris (case C-322/01)
62002J0071	Karner (case C-71/02)
62003J0470	AGM-COS MET (case C-470/03)
62004J0158	Alfa- Vita Vassilopolous and Carrefour-Marinopoulos (cases C-158/04, C-159/04 and C-82/05)
62004J0170	Rosengren (case C-170/04)
62004J0366	Schwarz (case C-366/04)
62006J0244	Dynamic Medien (case C-244/06)
62007J0141	Hospital Pharmaceutical Supply case (Commission v Germany (case C-141/07)

B.10 Article 288

(ex Article 249 TEC): Adoption of secondary law. Cases deal primarily with direct effect and indirect effect. References from chapter 5 except 5.2.3 (which deals with the founding treaties) 5.2.8 (which deal with international agreements).

Celex	Case
61970J0009	Grad v Finanzamt Traunstein (case 9/70)
61974J0041	Van Duyn v Home Office (Case 41/74)
61976J0051	Verbond van Nederlandse Onderemingen (VNO) v Inspecteur der Invoerrechten en Accijnzen (case 51/76)
61978J0148	Pubblico Ministero v Ratti (case 148/78)
61981J0008	Becker v Finanzamt Munster-Innenstadt (case 8/81)
61983J0014	von Colson v Land Nordrhein-Westfalen (case 14/83)
61983J0079	Harz v Deutsch Tradax GmbH (case 79/83)
61984J0152	Marschall v Southampton & South West Hampshire Area Health Authority (Teaching) Case (152/84)
61988J0103	Fratelli Costanzo SPA v Commune di Milano (Case 103/88)
61988J0322	Grimaldi v FOnDs des Maladies PProfessionelles (case C-322/88)
61989J0106	Marleasing SA v La Comercial Internacional de Alimentacion SA (case C-106/89)
61989J0188	Foster v British Gas plc (case C-188/89)
61990J0087	Verholen (cases C-87/90 to C-89/90)
61991J0271	Marschall (No 2) case (C-271/91)
61992J0091	Dori v Recreb Srl (case C-91/92)
61992J0091	Dori v Recreb Srl (case C-91/92)
61992J0236	COMitato di Coordinamento per la Difesa della Cava v Regione Lombardia (case C-236/92)
61992J0334	Wagner Miret v Fondo de Garantira Salaria (case C-334/92)
61994J0192	El Corte Inglés SA v Riviera (case C-192/94)
61994J0194	CIA Security International SA v Signalsson SA (case C-194/94)
61995J0066	R v Secretary of Stat for Social Security, ex parte Sutton (case C-66/95)
61995J0168	Arcaro (case C-168/95)
61996J0129	Inter-Environment Wallonie ASBL v Region Wallonie (cas C-129/96)
61997J0226	Lemmens (case C-226/97)
61998J0240	Oceano Grupo Editorial v Rocio Murciano Quintero (case C-240/98)
61998J0443	Unilever Italia SpA v Central Food SpA (case C-443/98)
61999J0441	Riksskatteverket v Soghra Gharehveran (case C-441/99)
62000J0253	Antonio Munoz Cia SA v Frumar Ltd (case C-253/00)
62002J0201	Wells v SoS for Transport, Local Government and the Regions (Case C-201/02)
62002J0387	Berlusconi and others (joined cases C-387/02, C-391/02 and C-403/02)
62004J0144	Mangold (C-144/04)
62006J0080	Ecorad (case C-80/06)
62006J0404	Quelle AG v Bundesverband der Verbraucherzentralen und Verbraucherverbände (case C-404/06)
62007J0152	Arcor (case C-152/07 - 154/07)

Bibliography

- Bing, Jon: Book Reviews: A Symbolic and Connectionist Approach to Legal Information Retrieval, in: *Information Processing & Management* 31.6 (1995), pp. 903–910.
- Bing, Jon: *Handbook of Legal Information Retrieval*, Oslo 1984.
- Bing, Jon: Legal Decisions and Computerized Systems, in: Peter Seipel (ed.): *From Data Protection to Knowledge Machines*, 1990, pp. 223–250.
- Bing, Jon: Text Retrieval in Norway, in: *Program* 15.3 (1981), pp. 150–162.
- Bing, Jon: The Policies Of Legal Information Services: A Perspective Of Three Decades, in: Lee Bygrave (ed.): *Yulex 2003*, Oslo 2003, pp. 37–58.
- Bing, Jon: Third Generation Text Retrieval Systems, in: *Journal of Law and Information Science* 1.3 (1981), pp. 183–209.
- Bing, Jon and Trygve Harvold: *Legal Decisions and Information Systems*, Oslo 1977.
- Blair, David C. and M. E. Maron: An Evaluation of Retrieval Effectiveness for a Full-text Document Retrieval System, in: *Communications of the ACM* 28.3 (Mar. 1985), pp. 289–299.
- Borlund, Pia: The Concept of Relevance in IR, in: *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology* 54.10 (2003), pp. 913–925.
- Borodin, Allan et al.: Link Analysis Ranking: Algorithms, Theory, and Experiments, in: *ACM Transactions on Internet Technology* 5.1 (2005), pp. 231–297.
- Brodda, Benny: Gimmie More O’ That. A Potential Function in Document Retrieval Systems?, in: Peter Seipel (ed.): *From Data Protection to Knowledge Machines. The Study of Law and Informatics*, 1990, pp. 251–270.
- Buckley, Chris and Ellen M. Voorhees: Retrieval Evaluation with Incomplete Information, in: *SIGIR ’04*, 2004.
- Bueno, Tania C. D’Agostini et al.: *JurisConsulto: Retrieval in Jurisprudential Text Bases using Juridical Terminology*, in: *Proceedings of the ICAIL-99 conference*, 1999.
- Burson, Scott F.: A Reconstruction of *Thamus: Commends on the Evaluation of Legal Information Retrieval Systems*, in: *Law Library Journal* 79 (1987), pp. 133–143.

- Bush, Vannevar: As We May Think, in: *The Atlantic*, July 1945.
- Cooper, W. S.: A definition of relevance for information retrieval, in: *Information Storage Retrieval* 7 (1971), pp. 19–37.
- Cosijn, Erica and Peter Ingwersen: Dimensions of relevance, in: *Information Processing & Management* 36 (2000), pp. 533–550.
- Crestani, Fabio et al.: "Is This Document Relevant?...Probably": A Survey of Probabilistic Models in Information Retrieval, in: *ACM Computing Surveys* 30.4 (Dec. 1998), pp. 528–552.
- Croft, W. Bruce and Howard Turtle: A retrieval model incorporating hypertext links, in: *Proceedings of the second annual ACM conference on Hypertext (HYPERTEXT '89)*, New York, NY, USA 1989, pp. 213–224.
- Cuadra, Carlos A. and Robert V. Katter: Opening the black box of 'Relevance', in: *Journal of documentation* 23.4 (1967), pp. 291–303.
- Dabney, Daniel P.: The Curse of Thamuz: An analysis of Full-Text Legal Document Retrieval, in: *Law Library Journal* 78.5 (1986), pp. 5–40.
- DeBeer, Jan and Marie-Francine Moens: Rpref - A Generalization of Bpref towards Graded Relevance Judgments, in: *SIGIR '06*, 2006.
- Dworkin, Ronald: *Taking rights seriously*, 1977.
- Easley, David and Jon Kleinberg: *Networks, Crowds, and Markets: Reasoning about a Highly Connected World*, 2010.
- Eisenberg, Melvin Aron: *The Nature of the Common Law*, 1988.
- Eldridge: An Appraisal of a Case Law Retrieval Project, in: D Johnston (ed.): *Proceedings of the Computers and the Law Conference*, 1968.
- Eriksen, Martin: Rocchio, Ide, Okapi och BIM. En komparativ studie av fyra metoder för relevance feedback, MA thesis, Högskolan i Borås, 2008.
- Feinerer, Ingo and Kurt Hornik: Text Mining of Supreme Administrative Court Jurisdictions, tech. rep. 51, Department of Statistics and Mathematics Wirtschaftsuniversität Wien, Mar. 2007.
- Fowler, James H. and Sangick Jeon: The authority of Supreme Court precedent, in: *Social Networks* 30 (2008), pp. 16–30.
- Garfield, Eugene: Citation Indexes for Science - A New Dimension in Documentation through Association of Ideas, in: *Science* 122 (July 1955), pp. 108–111.
- Geist, Anton: Using Citation Analysis Techniques For Computer-Assisted Legal Research In Continental Jurisdictions, MA thesis, Edinburgh: The University of Edinburgh, 2009.
- Greenleaf, Graham: Jon Bing and the History of Computerised Legal Research - Some Missing Links, in: *Et tilbakeblikk på fremtiden*, Oslo 2004.
- Greenleaf, Graham, Philip Chung, and Andrew Mowbray: The Long Tail(s) of the Law: An exploratory study, in: *Law via the Internet 2011 Conference*, Hong Kong, Abstract and presentation available from <http://www.hklii.hk/conference/programme>, 2011.
- Harvold, Trygve: Is searching the best way to retrieve legal documents?, in: *Lov & Data* 98 (2009), pp. 22–26.

- Hettne, Jörgen and Ida Otken Eriksson (eds.): EU-rättslig metod. Teori och genomslag i svensk rättstillämpning, 2005.
- Hjørland, Birger: The Foundation of the Concept of Relevance, in: *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology* 61.2 (Feb. 2010), pp. 217–237.
- II, Michael J. Bommarito et al.: Distance Measures for Dynamic Citation Networks, in: *Physica A* 389.19 (2010), pp. 4201–4208.
- Jurafsky, Daniel and James H. Martin: *Speech and language processing*, 2nd ed., 2008.
- Karlgren, Jussi: *Information Retrieval: Statistics and Linguistics*, Excerpt from the PhD Thesis "Stylistic Experiments in Information Retrieval", 2000.
- Kekäläinen, Jaana: Binary and graded relevance in IR evaluations - Comparison of the effects on ranking of IR systems, in: *Information Processing and Management* 41 (2005), pp. 1019–1033.
- Kelso, Louis O.: Does The Law Need a Technological Revolution?, in: *Rocky Mountain Law Review* 18 (1946), pp. 378–392.
- Kirchberger, Christine: Paper and stone: How technology has not changed the retrieval of legal information, yet, in: *Proceedings of the BILETA 2007 Annual Conference*, 2007.
- Kleinberg, Jon M.: Authoritative Sources in a Hyperlinked Environment, in: *Journal of the ACM* 46 (1999).
- Königová, Marie: Mathematical and statistical methods of noise evaluation in a retrieval system, in: *Information Storage and Retrieval* 6 (1971), pp. 437–444.
- Li, Longzhuang, Yi Schang, and Wei Zhang: Improvement of HITS-based Algorithms on Web Documents, in: *WWW2002*, 2002, pp. 527–535.
- Li, Yanhong: Toward a Qualitative Search Engine, in: *IEEE Internet Computing* 2 (4 1998), pp. 24–29.
- Malmgren, Staffan: Lagen.nu - Öppen rättsinformation, in: *Lov & Data* 97 (2009), pp. 24–30.
- Malmgren, Staffan: *Legal Information Systems and the Semantic Web*, in: Stanley Greenstein (ed.): *Vem reglerar informationsområdet*, 2011.
- Manning, Christopher D., Prabhakar Raghavan, and Hinrich Schüze: *Introduction to information retrieval*, 2008.
- Maron, M. E. and J. L. Kuhns: On Relevance, Probabilistic Indexing and Information Retrieval, in: *Journal of the ACM* 7.3 (July 1960), pp. 216–244.
- Marx, Stephen M.: Citation Networks in the Law, in: *Jurimetrics Journal* 10 (1970), pp. 121–137.
- Maxwell, K. Tamsin, Jon Oberlander, and Victor Lavrenko: Evaluation of Semantic Events for Legal Case Retrieval, in: *Proceedings of the ESAIR '09 conference*, 2009.

- Maxwell, K. Tamsin and Burkhart Schaefer: Concept and Context in Legal Information Retrieval, in: *Legal Knowledge and Information Systems - Jurix 2008: The Twenty-First Annual Conference*, 2008.
- Miller, David James, Harry R. Silver, and Andrew L. Freisthler: Landmark Case Identification System and Method, US Patent 2006/0041608, Feb. 2006.
- Mizzaro, Stefano: How many relevances in information retrieval, in: *Interacting with computers* 10 (1998), pp. 303–320.
- Mizzaro, Stefano: Relevance: The Whole History, in: *Journal of the American Society for Information Science* 48.9 (Sept. 1997), pp. 810–832.
- Moens, Marie-Francine: Innovative techniques for legal text retrieval, in: *Artificial Intelligence and Law* 9 (2001), pp. 29–57.
- Moens, Marie-Francine: XML Retrieval Models for Legislation, in: *Legal Knowledge and Information Systems. Jurix 2004: The Seventeenth Annual Conference*, 2004.
- Mowbray, Andrew, Philip Chung, and Graham Greenleaf: Free-access case law enhancements for Australian law, tech. rep., *AustLII*, 2008.
- Page, Lawrence et al.: The PageRank Citation Ranking: Bringing Order to the Web. Technical Report 1999-66, Stanford InfoLab, Nov. 1999.
- Penner, J.E.: *Textbook on Jurisprudence*, 4th ed., Oxford 2008.
- Petkovsek, Marko, Herbert S. Wilf, and Doron Zeilberger: $A = B$, 1996.
- Rees and Schultz: A field experimental approach to the study of relevance assessments in relation to document searching, I: Final report, 1967.
- Rijsbergen, C. J. van: *Information Retrieval*, 2nd ed., London 1979.
- Rose, D. E. and R. K. Belew: Legal Information Retrieval: A Hybrid Approach, in: *Proceedings of the second international on conference on artificial intelligence and law*, 1989, pp. 138–146.
- Rose, Daniel E. and Richard K. Belew: A connectionist and symbolic hybrid for improving legal research, in: *International Journal of Man-Machine Studies* 35 (1991), pp. 1–33.
- Russel, Stuart and Peter Norvig: *Artificial Intelligence - A Modern Approach*, New Jersey 1995.
- Sahlgren, Magnus: An introduction to random indexing, tech. rep., SICS, Swedish Institute of Computer Science, 2005.
- Salton, G., A. Wong, and C. S. Yang: A Vector Space Model for Automatic Indexing, in: *Communications of the ACM* 18.11 (Nov. 1975), pp. 613–620.
- Salton, Gerard, Edward A. Fox, and Harry Wu: Extended Boolean Information Retrieval, in: *Communications of the ACM* 11.26 (Nov. 1983), pp. 1022–1036.
- Saracevic, Tefko: Relevance: A Review of the Literature and a Framework for Thinking on the Notion in Information Science, in: *Journal of the American Society for Information Science* 26 (1975), pp. 321–343.

- Saracevic, Tefko: Relevance: A Review of the Literature and a Framework for Thinking on the Notion in Information Science. Part II, in: *Advances In Librarianship* 30 (2006), pp. 3–71.
- Saracevic, Tefko: Relevance reconsidered, in: *Information science: Integration in perspectives. Proceedings of the Second Conference on Conceptions of Library and Information Science (CoLIS 2)*, 1996, pp. 201–218.
- Schamber, Linda, Michael B. Eisenberg, and Michael S. Nilan: A Re-Examination Of Relevance: Toward A Dynamic, Situational Definition, in: *Information Processing & Management* 26.6 (1990), pp. 755–776.
- Schweighofer, Erich: Computing Law: From Legal Information Systems to Dynamic Legal Electronic Commentaries, in: Cecilia Magnusson Sjöberg and Peter Wahlgren (eds.): *Festschrift till Peter Seipel*, 2006, pp. 569–584.
- Schweighofer, Erich and Doris Liebwald: Advanced lexical ontologies and hybrid knowledge based systems: First steps to a dynamic legal electronic commentary, in: *Artificial Intelligence and Law* 15.2 (July 2007).
- Seipel, Peter: *Juridik och IT. Introduktion till rättsinformatiken*, 8th ed., 1997.
- Shapiro, Fred R.: The Most-Cited Law Review Articles, in: *California Law Review* 75 (1985), pp. 1540–1554.
- Silveira, Maria L. and Berthier Ribeiro-Neto: Concept-based ranking: a case study in the juridical domain, in: *Information Processing & Management* 40 (2004), pp. 791–805.
- Sjöberg, Cecilia Magnusson: *Critical Factors in Legal Document Management*, Stockholm 1998.
- Smith, Thomas A.: The Web of Law, in: *San Diego Law Review* 44 (2007), pp. 309–354.
- Steiner, Josephine and Lorna Woods: *EU Law*, 10th ed., 2009.
- Susskind, Richard: *Expert Systems In Law*, Oxford 1987.
- Susskind, Richard E.: *The future of law : facing the challenges of information technology*, Oxford 1998.
- Tapper, C.: The use of citation vectors for legal information retrieval, in: *Journal of Law & Information Science* 1.2 (1981), pp. 131–161.
- Tapper, Colin: *An experiment in the use of citation vectors in the area of legal data*, 1982.
- Turtle, H. and W. B. Croft: Inference networks for document retrieval, in: *SIGIR '90: Proceedings of the 13th annual international ACM SIGIR conference on Research and development in information retrieval*, New York, NY, USA 1990, pp. 1–24.
- Turtle, Howard: Text Retrieval in the Legal World, in: *Artificial Intelligence and Law* 3 (1995), pp. 5–54.
- Vickery, B.C.: Subject Analysis for Information Retrieval, in: *Proceedings of the International Conference on Scientific Information*, 1959.
- Vickery, B.C.: The Structure of Information Retrieval Systems, in: *Proceedings of the International Conference on Scientific Information*, 1959.

- Wacks, Raymond: *Philosophy of Law - A Very Short Introduction*, Oxford 2006.
- Wacks, Raymond: *Understanding jurisprudence: an introduction to legal theory*, New York 2005.
- Wahlgren, Peter: *Automation of Legal Reasoning - A Study on Artificial Intelligence and Law*, Deventer-Boston / Stockholm 1992.
- Wahlgren, Peter: *Law and Information Technology - Swedish Views*, in: 2002, chap. *The Quest for Law. Legal Sources via IT*.
- Wahlgren, Peter: *Legal Reasoning: A Jurisprudential Model*, in: idem (ed.): *Scandinavian Studies in Law* vol. 40. *Legal Theory*, 2000.
- Wilson, Deirdre and Dan Sperber: *Blackwell's Handbook of Pragmatics*, in: 2004, chap. *Relevance Theory*, pp. 607–632.
- Zeng, Yiming et al.: *A Knowledge Representation Model for the Intelligent Retrieval of Legal Cases*, in: *International Journal of Law and Information Technology* 15.3 (2006), pp. 299–319.
- Zhang, Paul and Lavanya Koppaka: *Semantics-Based Legal Citation Network*, in: *Proceedings of the ICAIL '07 conference*, 2007.

Index

- Aboutness, 26
- Academic publishing, 56
- Acyclic digraphs, 75
- Affective match, 29
- Affective relevance, 26
- Age compensation, 68, 82
- Algorithmic relevance, 26, 27
- Algorithmic relevance model, 7
- Amendment, 9
- Amsterdam treaty, 77
- Arbitrator, 10
- Artificial neural networks, *see* Neural network
- Authentic text, 13
- Authority, 8, 42, 43
- Authority score, 59
- Automated reasoning, 12
- Automatic reasoning, 73
- Average precision, 61

- Background knowledge, 26
- Bag of words, 29
- Bag-of-words, 53
- Baseline, 76, 77
- Bayes theorem, 53
- Bayesian belief network, 72
- Bayesian network, 72
- Behavior, 27
- Belief match, 29
- Best match, 48
- Bibliometrics, 57
- Bibliometry, 29
- BIM, *see* Binary Independence Model
- Binary Independence Model, 53
- Binary measure of relevance, 31, 39
- Binding authority, 35

- BM25, *see* Okapi BM25
- BM25F, 80, 81
- Boolean retrieval, 48
- Boolean retrieval model, 31
- Bpref, 61

- CALR system, 8
- Case law, 8, 43, 56, 68
- Case-based reasoning, 12
- Citation analysis, 13
- Citation extracting, 13
- citation indexes, 29
- Citation network, 9, 56, 66, 68, 74, 77, 78
- Citation vectors, 52, 67, 74
- Citations, 9, 29
- Classification, 71
- Click-tracking, 7
- Clues research, 28
- Cluster hypothesis, 52
- Cluster-based retrieval model, 48
- Codification, 35
- Cognitive match, 29
- Cognitive process, 30
- Cognitive relevance, 26, 30
- Cognitive state, 30
- Common Market Law Review, 42
- Communication framework, 23, 34
- Communication process, 13
- Community detection, 75
- Community law, 10
- Component statement, 21
- Concept indexing, 71
- Conceptor, 48
- Conceptors, 12
- Connectionist retrieval model, 48, 67

Connectors, 48
 Content characteristics, 29
 Content relevance, 24, 40
 Context, 25
 Continuous measure of relevance, 31, 39
 Controlled vocabulary, 72
 Corpus, 6
 Cosine distance, 52
 Cosine similarity, 52
 Court, 10
 Cranfield paradigm, 31, 41, 60, 76

 Degree distribution, 58, 78
 Determination of relevance, 27
 Dewey Decimal System, 45
 Dichotomic clustering, 73
 Dictionary, 46
 Directed acyclic graph, 56
 Discrete measure of relevance, 31, 39
 Distributional hypothesis, 55
 Doctrine of legal sources, 10, 36, 37
 Document clustering, 52
 Document collection, 6
 Document frequency, 50, 54
 Document retrieval, 21, 47
 Document similarity, 50
 Domain experts, 73
 Dot product, 52
 Dynamic document, 6
 Dynamic model, 34
 Dynamic relevance, 30

 ECJ, 13, 76
 EGC, 76
 Euclidean length, 52
 EURLEX, 76, 78
 European Court of Justice, *see* ECJ
 Eurovoc, 55
 Evaluation, 64
 Exact match, 48
 Expert systems, 21, 73
 Extended Boolean retrieval, 50

 F-measure, 60

 Faceted browsing, 6
 Fact retrieval, 21, 47
 Facts of the case, 63
 Falsifiable propositions, 17
 Formal relevance, 40
 Four-star data, 62
 Framework of relevance, 33
 Full text retrieval, 11–13, 46
 Fully inferential system, 22

 General Court, 38
 General principles of law, 37
 Gold standard, 7, 15, 41, 60, 76, 81
 Google, 43
 Graph theory, 57
 Ground truth, 60

 Headnotes, 42
 Hercules the Judge, 11
 Hilltop, 59
 HITS, 59, 68, 75, 80
 Hub score, 59
 Human ceiling, 32
 Human-based manifestations, 27
 Hyperlink Vector Voting, 59
 Hyperlink-induced Topic Search, *see* HITS

 Identification of legally relevant facts, 63
 IDF, *see* Inverse document frequency
 Impact ranking, 29
 Implicit use orientation, 20, 32
 InDegree, 58, 68, 80
 Index card, 25
 Index cards, 45
 Indexing, 46
 Automatic, 12, 55
 Manual, 12, 55
 Inference, 21
 Inference network, 72
 Information drought, 66
 Information lattice, 19
 Information need, 6, 7, 19, 25
 Information object characteristics, 29

Information overload, 10, 12, 66
 Information resource, 25
 Information retrieval, 18
 Information retrieval system, 6
 Information science, 17, 18, 23
 Integrative relevance models, 20
 Intellectual indexing, 12, 55
 Intellectual topicality, 26
 Interpretation, 64
 Interpretation, methods of, 37
 Intersection, 48
 Inverse document frequency, 50, 54
 Inverted index, 46, 51
 Inverted list, *see* Inverted index
 IR system interaction, 13

Jurimetrical method, 14, 85
 Jurisprudence, 10, 36
 Jurisprudence method, 14, 85
 Jurisprudential literature, 8
 jurisprudential relevance ranking, 14

K-means, 72
 Keyword clustering, 72
 Kind of relevance, 24
 Knowledge bases, 73
 Knowledge engineering, 12, 73
 Knowledge engineering-based retrieval,
 13
 Knowledge representation, 73

Landmark case, 30, 38, 68, 77
 Law search, 64
 Lawdex, 62
 Legal information, 8, 10, 14
 Legal information retrieval, 11, 62
 Legal IR process, 63
 Legal IR system, 8, 13, 14
 Legal knowledge structures, 35
 Legal method, 36
 Legal norms, 9, 13
 Legal ontology, 73
 Legal reasoning process, 9
 Legal relevance, 38
 Legal research, 8

Legal sources, 8, 64
 Legislation, 8
 Lemmatization, 46
 Lexicon, 46
 Librarianship, 28
 Library problem, 46
 Library science, 46
 Linguistics, 23
 Link analysis, 55, 58
 Link analysis algorithm, 82
 Link analysis algorithms, 43
 Lisbon treaty, 77, 78
 Logic, 23
 Logical relevance, 21, 26
 Logical retrieval model, 48

Maastricht treaty, 77
 Manifestation of relevance, 24
 MAP, *see* Mean average precision
 Marginal relevance, 33
 Mean average precision, 61, 76, 82
 Memex, 62
 Meta-norms, 10, 35
 Microfilm, 62
 Minimal premiss set, 21
 Model of relevance, 33
 Motivational relevance, 26
 Multidimensionality, 21

National law, 10
 Natural language processing, 12, 74
 Negative citations, 57
 NetworkX, 80
 Neural network, 67, 71
 NLP, *see* Natural language process-
 ing
 Normative interval, 64

Obliteration through incorporation,
 30, 57
 Odds ratio, 54
 Okapi BM25, 54
 Ontology, 73

PageRank, 43, 59, 68, 80

Parametric scoring, *see* Weighted zone scoring
 Peer-reviewed publishing, 18
 Persuasive authority, 35
 Pertinence, 24, 26, 40
 Phenomenon, 24, 27
 Information as a, 18
 Philosophy, 23
 Philosophy of law, 10
 Posting, 46
 Postings list, 46
 Power law, 58, 78
 Pragmatic view, 23
 Pragmatics, 23
 Precision, 11, 60
 Predicate, 10
 Predictable application of law, 11
 Preparatory works, 8, 37
 Principle of free assessment of evidence, 36
 Probabilistic model, 31
 Probabilistic models, 53
 Probability ranking principle, 53
 Psychological framework, 34
 Purely deductive system, 22
 Python, 80

Query, 25
 Query expansion
 Automatic, 12
 Manual, 7
 Query vector, 52

Random indexing, 55
 Ranking, 6
 Ratio decidendi, 35
 RDF, 80
 Reasoning, 21
 Recall, 11, 60
 Records, 45
 Reference, 56
 Relevance
 Concept of, 7, 17
 Differences in judgments of, 17, 32, 40
 Interpretations of, 18
 Intuitive understanding of, 17
 Legal, 10
 Subjective notion of, 7
 Relevance clues, 28, 41
 Relevance feedback, 7, 54
 Relevance judgments, 20, 30
 Relevance model, 7, 13
 General, 8
 Relevance number, 46, 55
 Relevance ranking, 6, 14
 Function for, 10, 14
 specific for legal documents, *see* Jurisprudential relevance ranking
 Relevance-determining rule, 13
 Representation of user problem, 25
 Reputational rating, 29
 Request, 25
 Result set, 6, 47
 Retrieval model, 31, 47
 Retrieval status value, 54
 Rome treaty, 77
 Rpref, 61
 RSJ-weight, 54
 RSV
 See Retrieval status value, 54
 Rule application, 64
 Rule of law, 11
 Rule-based retrieval model, 48
 Rules constituting relevance, 7

Scale-free network, 58, 75, 78
 Scientific communication, 18
 Scientific knowledge structures, 35
 Scientific method, 17
 Scientific publishing, 9
 Search for relevant legal norms, 64
 Semantic events, 74
 Semantic fidelity, 12
 Semantic indexing
 Automatic, 12

Semantic metadata, 12
 Semantic structure, 78
 Semantical retrieval model, 48
 Sesame triple store, 80
 Shepard's Citations, 62, 66
 Shepardization, 43, 62
 Sinks, 75
 Situational match, 29
 Situational relevance, 26, 30
 Small-world network, 58
 Socio-cognitive relevance, 26
 Sony v Universal, 12
 SPARQL, 80
 Statute, 8
 Stemming, 46, 77
 Stop words, 46
 Strata, 34
 Stratified model, 34
 String kernels, 73
 Subject area, 25
 Subject knowledge level, 33
 Subject knowledge view, 23
 Subject relevance, 26
 Subjective relevance, 40
 Substantive norms, 8
 Subsymbolic manipulation, 71
 Support vector machines, 73
 Surrogate, 25
 Symbolic AI, 71
 System model, 33
 System oriented view, 19
 System relevance, 26, 40
 System-based manifestations, 27

 Table of equivalencies, 77
 Tags, 46
 Task, 25
 Taxonomy, 19
 TEC, 77, 81
 Temporal flow, 9
 Term frequency, 50
 Term weighting, 47
 Terms, 48
 Terms and connectors, 50

 TF, *see* Term frequency
 TF-IDF, 50, 77, 81
 TFEU, 13, 77, 78, 81
 The Treaty establishing the European
 Community, *see* TEC
 The Treaty of Lisbon, *see* Lisbon treaty
 Thesaurus, 72
 Time-bound reference, 56
 Topic, 25, 28, 60
 Topical relevance, 19, 24, 26, 28, 30,
 40, 41
 Topicality, 19, 26
 Topics, 19
 Treaty of the Functioning of the Eu-
 ropean Union, *see* TFEU
 Type of relevance, 24

 Uncertainty, 22
 Union, 48
 URL, 57
 Usefulness, 21
 User model, 34
 User oriented view, 20
 User relevance, 24
 User satisfaction, 61
 User-based manifestations, 27
 Utility, 21, 22, 24, 26, 40

 Validity characteristics, 29
 Variables affecting relevance judgments,
 21
 VCRs, 12
 Vector space model, 31, 50, 51
 Videocassette recorders, 12
 View of relevance, 24
 Vocabulary, 46

 Web search engine, 8
 Weight, 39
 Weighted zone scoring, 48, 49
 Weighting, 7, 11
 Westlaw, 50
 Whoosh, 80