

PREMONITION™

The World's Largest Litigation Database

A very, very unfair advantage in litigation.

Australia Courts Report 2017



Content

Introduction	Pg. 3 - 4
Foreword	Pg. 5 - 7
Australia Courts 2017	Pg. 8 - 12
Court Results - Barristers and Law Firms	Pg. 13
Supreme Court of the Australian Capital Territory (Court of Appeal)	Pg. 14 - 17
Supreme Court of the Australian Capital Territory	Pg. 18 - 21
High Court of Australia	Pg. 22 - 25
Federal Court of Australia	Pg. 26 - 29
Federal Court of Australia (Full Court)	Pg. 30 - 33
Federal Circuit of Australia	Pg. 34 - 37
Australian Patent Office	Pg. 38 - 41
Australian Trade Marks Office	Pg. 42 - 45
Supreme Court of New South Wales	Pg. 46 - 49
District Court of New South Wales	Pg. 50 - 53
Supreme Court of New South Wales - Court of Appeal	Pg. 54 - 57
Land and Environment Court of New South Wales	Pg. 58 - 61
New South Wales Civil and Administrative Tribunal (Appeal Panel)	Pg. 62 - 65
New South Wales Civil and Administrative Tribunal (Administrative and Equal Opportunity Division)	Pg. 66 - 69
New South Wales Civil and Administrative Tribunal (Consumer and Commercial Division)	Pg. 70 - 73
Supreme Court of the Northern Territory	Pg. 74 - 77
Northern Territory Civil and Administrative Tribunal	Pg. 78 - 81
Supreme Court of Queensland	Pg. 82 - 85
Queensland District Court Decisions	Pg. 86 - 89
Land Court of Queensland	Pg. 90 - 93
Magistrates Court of Queensland	Pg. 94 - 97
Queensland Civil and Administrative Tribunal	Pg. 98 - 101
Industrial Court of Queensland	Pg. 102 - 105
Supreme Court of Tasmania	Pg. 106 - 109
Supreme Court of Tasmania (Court of Criminal Appeal)	Pg. 110 - 113
Supreme Court of Victoria (Court of Appeal)	Pg. 114 - 117
County Court of Victoria	Pg. 118 - 121
Supreme Court of Victoria	Pg. 122 - 125
Victorian Civil and Administrative Tribunal	Pg. 126 - 129
Magistrates Court of Victoria	Pg. 130 - 133
Supreme Court of Western Australia	Pg. 134 - 137
Supreme Court of Western Australia (Court of Appeal)	Pg. 138 - 141
District Court of Western Australia	Pg. 142 - 145
Methodology	Pg. 146 - 147
Additional Publications	Pg. 148
Services	Pg. 149 - 150
Contact	Pg. 151

A Revolution is Happening in Law

Most lawyers may not be aware of it, but all will be consumed by it before long. I refer to the application of data in all its forms to legal issues, projects and organisation of law. We could say lawyers have always used data since that's what legal cases are—bundles of facts arranged into logical sequences. But lawyers typically argue by analogy searching for particular cases that match theirs at the time. A case that fits foursquare is the grail they seek.

In 2013 IBM reported that 90% of all data had been created in the previous two years. We are data-creating machines, our likes on Facebook and Twitter feed the insatiable maw that is big data. Machines like airplanes and motor vehicles generate terabytes of data for analysis. And sources of data will exponentially grow when the Internet of Things combined with smart cities and the like become reality. But while data producing streams are increasingly active, many professionals are sitting on sources of data that could be extremely advantageous to them without their being aware of it.

Lawyers, for example, have to retain client files, as part of their regulatory obligations, within which are repeated tasks like intellectual property renewals, contract and lease due diligence, licence renewals, and more. Besides these repetitive tasks their files contain much information about clients' businesses that could be of value in predicting client needs. These are data that lawyers could use to begin to understand properly and to predict clients' needs.

Courts everywhere are publishing more and more case reports—in the US there are 14 million case reports. Government and its agencies are pushing out thousands of pages of new legislation and regulations annually. The sheer volumes of data are potentially overwhelming, which is why data analytics are so important and why lawyers must become competent here. Lawyers will have to be comfortable with predictive analytics so as to forecast potential outcomes of cases and transactions.

Big data comes in many forms, data aren't merely a clean set of statistics derived from a hypothesis-driven research program—they are complex and varied. Data scientists need to create algorithms that extract the maximum utility from data. Several years ago Google were able to track the spread of influenza across the US by analysing people's searches for flu symptoms. They were quicker than the Centers for Disease Control, required no hypothesis and relied on "found" data. Yet they got it wrong. The Google scientists believed correlation would provide all the answers whereas the CDC looked for causation which showed a much slower spread than Google's analytics. Examples like these show there is much to be done to ensure confidence in the field through the development of more nuanced methods and our appreciation of them.



While data analytics might be in the early stages, it's growing fast and will become so embedded in business and law, we will wonder how we managed without it. A typical corporate legal relationship these days can comprise one or more law firms, an inhouse legal department, the business procurement division, and a legal operations unit to inform the inhouse lawyers on the business metrics and law firm scorecards. All will be dependent on metrics and data analytics to drive future relationships. And this reinforces my point about lawyers developing competence in these fields. Data, algorithms, artificial intelligence are the new normal to which the legal industry is adapting. They apply across the entire range of legal services from chatbots assisting with parking tickets to major intellectual property cases and hostile mergers and acquisitions. Artisanal approaches to law will occupy less legal space in future than the data-driven adaptation that is now inexorably invading the law. The law is living in interesting times..

John Flood

Professor of Law and Society
Inaugural Director of the Law Futures Centre
Griffith University
Brisbane, Queensland
Australia

Twitter: @johnaflood

Email: j.flood@griffith.edu.au

Foreword



Is the market for legal services a lemons market? Are all lawyers similarly placed in terms of competency and skills? How does a consumer distinguish between a good lawyer and a mediocre one? How do consumers distinguish between two 'good' lawyers? Are the fees charged by a lawyer a good signal of the quality of her legal work? Is an expensive lawyer better than a cheap lawyer? If you care about these questions – whether you are a potential consumer, a General Counsel, a lawyer, an academic, or a regulator – this brilliant work by Toby Unwin and Premonition's team of analysts is a must read.

For too long, the legal services market has shared many uncomfortable similarities with a lemons market. A consumer does not know whether a lawyer is good or mediocre prior to engaging her, and possesses no sure way of making an assessment of quality. Consumption decisions often turn on referrals and pure guesswork. In this milieu, pricing bears little or no correlation to actual quality, leading both to consumers overpaying for mediocre services and good lawyers being underpaid for high quality work. On the demand side, many prospective consumers choose to stay away from the market because they are unable to accurately assess the value of consuming legal services leading to an under-developed market (evidenced by many surveys which show that a high proportion of people whose rights have been violated do not engage a lawyer). Equally, the supply side has not grown to provide affordable and quality services, despite the significant expansion in the number of law students over the last two decades – many graduates opt out of practice altogether, and many lawyers exit the market after a few years.

This bleak state of affairs is not just a concern for the legal profession. A society in which adequate legal services are beyond the reach of most people, where breaches of legal rights find no redress, and where the justice system delivers just for big businesses undermines support for the rule of law. The justice gap has also been shown to have adverse consequences for health and mental wellbeing.

Fortunately, we are not reliant on just the profession and insiders to reduce opacity; innovators such as Toby Unwin are ushering in sunlight and clarity. This report is a powerful incursion in helping to develop more precise signals about quality and price in the legal services market. The analysis will be of benefit both to individual consumers – for whom legal services consumption can be prohibitively expensive – and sophisticated business consumers.

Finally, Premonition's work also has the potential to transform the justice delivery system. Systematic analysis of court and judicial performance has been long overdue, and as the tools get more sophisticated, the data will drive reform to deliver more efficient and affordable justice. This process will be hastened if government agencies collaborate with innovators such as the Premonition team and provide better access to data such as parole board decisions etc., in order to determine whether these important decisions are made based on evidence, exhibit consistency, and meet the test of fairness.

Professor Sandeep Gopaian
ProVice-Chancellor (Academicinnovation)





"A truly disruptive technology will invade the legal services sector. All we can say about it is that until it appears, no-one will see it coming; and it will not resemble anything people are speculating about today." – Bruce MacEwen, Adam Smith Esq.

Since 2015, Premonition has been issuing regional reports on the performance of law firms and lawyers from around the world. The impact of these reports has been wide-ranging, touching off controversy and debate in domestic legal establishments faced for the first time with the naked statistical truth. Despite strong initial resistance to the idea of a technology business with the audacity to analyze the performance of lawyers and question whether their clients were receiving value, acceptance has set in. In the US and UK in particular, legal analytics is "the new black."

Many general counsel now require performance data from their law firms. This goes beyond customer service questions like, "Was your lawyer responsive and courteous?" to hard outcome and results data. General counsel are asking piercing questions of their lawyers, insurers are seeking data on their insured risks and law firms are playing catch up. A few law firms realize that winning new clients is simple when you can prove you are better than their existing lawyers. Rather than risk falling further behind, displaced firms are reluctantly joining the performance bandwagon.

The Premonition database contains tens of millions of court records from around the globe. In recent years we have added comprehensive records from Canada, the Netherlands, Australia, New Zealand, India and many more specialty courts on our way to becoming the world's largest litigation database, bigger than former market leaders LexisNexis, Thomson Reuters and Bloomberg combined.



More Detail

It is surprising to learn that many of the law firms that publicly tout their expertise in emerging areas of practice such as Bitcoin, autonomous vehicles and drone law have never tried a single case in any of these fields. While our early reports contained just the highlights of the cases in the database (judges, lawyers, parties involved, who won), Premonition now automatically downloads, reads and keeps a copy of every legal document it lays its digital tentacles on. With more than 1.2 million documents filed each day in America alone this is no small feat. Fortunately, the Premonition system can read 50,000 documents in less than a second. Asking the system questions like, "Which law firms and lawyers have actually won cases involving self-driving cars?" and "What were the settlement amounts involved and which judges ruled for which side?" are now simple queries.

Worse Than Random

Things lie exposed in the public record that anyone with a first-class analytics platform can uncover. Without it, parties involved in litigation are flailing in the dark. Our reports have proven, for example, that United Kingdom law firms' choice of barristers was 38% worse than random and General Counsel's choice of law firms was 18% worse than random.

The legal landscape is changing and analytics is driving that change. With only a 3% correlation between higher fees and better performance, the profession is ready for Perception/Reality Arbitrage. The way law firms and lawyers are instructed will never be the same again. Champions will rise, idols will fall.

A.D. could well stand for "After Data".

It is a brave new world, and it will belong to the early adopters.

Toby Unwin

Co-Founder and CIO Premonition



Australia Courts – 2017 Report

“Whenever a man can get hold of numbers, they are invaluable: if correct, they assist in informing his own mind.” Charles Babbage

Rarely a week passes without the legal press reporting yet another new initiative in AI, many of them are about how large solicitors' firms are using machine learning to manage documents and their contents. There are also the usual scare stories about how robots might (or might not) take over some of the work lawyers do.

Most of the reports concern qualitative processes and how time-consuming, repetitive tasks can be made easier, better and, tellingly, cheaper. Read what Chrissie Lightfoot, author of *The Naked Lawyer*, thinks of the current situation [here](#).

There are fewer stories about numbers, or Big Data as it has become known. Maybe that is because numbers seem less headline-worthy than some of the wilder AI stories. Perhaps it's because lawyers are more comfortable with words than numbers. Or maybe it is because there is concern about what quantitative, objective, verifiable data can show about the way the law works.

In the absence of such data about the performance of solicitors, lawyers, expert witnesses, judges and courts, the decision to instruct a lawyer for a case has, traditionally, followed the path of recommendation, reputation and referral. This approach, while useful in the past, no longer meets the market's need for transparency and accessibility. Daniel van Binsbergen of *Lexoo* shares some views about this [here](#).

There are, of course, more traditional methods that purport to evaluate how a lawyer performs in court. The legal directories all run regular 'awards ceremonies' and rate firms and litigators on the basis of word of mouth. But the validity of these awards is highly questionable, as Sue Bramall of Berners Marketing [writes](#). Recently, Dr. Chris Hanretty, Reader in Politics at the University of East Anglia, published a compelling [article](#) about how legal directories entries have little in common with performance data from court appearances.

Similarly, researchers at Liverpool University led by Professor Katie Atkinson have been modelling historical court performance data to predict future case outcomes, with high levels of accuracy.



Premonition has the world's largest legal database, covering many countries and jurisdictions where court results are digitally available. Data from the courts has been electronically crawled, subjected to statistical analysis, and categorized. Australia litigation data represents less than 1% of the total Premonition international legal database.





“If you can’t measure it you can’t manage it.” Peter Drucker

There are those who will dismiss the idea of measuring the performance of a law firm or a lawyer statistically, and feel that this reduces the art and skill of case presentation, advocacy and the mastery of evidence to mere numbers.

Numbers, of course, play a major role in shaping human societies. Very few national governments are entirely without means of tracking the behaviour and opinions of their citizens, and numbers such as social security numbers and the results of opinion polls are closely watched as an aid to social control and central planning.

In science, the habit of either proving a general concept or of quantifying an observed phenomenon requires a sophisticated use of numbers. Making sense of the data available to astronomers, chemists and biologists among others would be impossible without a system of assigning values and weighing variables.

Economically, numbers are central to human activity. Without numbers, there would be no civilization and, to manage any element of that, measurements are required. Any activity can be measured, that data analyzed and decisions taken using the results. The law and legal work is no exception and the availability of data and its analysis can only help improve choice and standards for both practitioners and their clients.

There will be those who argue that the legal processes in the courts are too multi-dimensional to measure; that the weight of evidence will decide; that judges are not infallible; that some lawyers take on only the hardest cases; and that some of the plaintiff or defendant protagonists are surprisingly unreliable on the day. Even so, it is inarguable that those who are on either side of the case want to win. What client goes to the courthouse hoping to lose?

Indeed, the client, especially with the high costs of litigation, is becoming wiser about how law firms and lawyers are chosen to represent them. Those who finance commercial litigation risk a lot by making a bad choice of representation. Read what Peter Petyt and David Vines of 4 Rivers Services say about this [here](#).



There will also be those who will take issue with the concept of ‘winning’ or ‘losing’ a case: perhaps reducing the quantum might have been the best possible result for a client, or an unreported out of court settlement was reached which mitigated a case our system tracks as a loss. These points are for the lawyers concerned to argue and explain when asked about their track record by those clients who have Premonition’s data. Essentially, the traditional ways of choosing legal representation have changed with the increasing influence of AI, Big Data and other irresistible forces. Andrew Weaver of *LawyerFair* sees this [here](#).

The charts in this report are anonymized. It is not the objective of Premonition’s work to declare any firm or lawyer ‘good’ or ‘bad’ at their jobs but to highlight those with winning track records. Those who subscribe to the detail in the reports will have all the information of the law firms, solicitors and barristers involved in each chosen case. No one, however, expects representation to be instructed on the basis of this information alone. Those who have already subscribed to Premonition data have used it as a major part of their decision process: the performance data is a persuasive, quantitative and objective tool in an otherwise qualitative and subjective process.

This report will concentrate on cases for the three calendar years of 2014, 2015 and 2016. The charts contained will show a scatter of data points representing performance (in terms of winning the case) against the number of times a law firm or lawyer has appeared in the given court. The last three years have been selected for illustrative purposes and, plainly, the more years selected for any court, law firm or lawyer, the more densely populated with data points the chart will be. Similarly, the identity information behind the data points will provide rich detail and information on these litigators and their successes.



Australia Courts

All the available data from the following courts has been analysed:

Supreme Court of the Australian Capital Territory – Court of Appeal

Supreme Court of the Australian Capital Territory

High Court of Australia

Federal Court of Australia

Federal Court of Australia – Full Court

Federal Circuit Court of Australia

Australian Patent Office

Australian Trade Marks Office

Supreme Court of New South Wales

District Court of New South Wales

Supreme Court of New South Wales – Court of Appeal

Land and Environment Court of New South Wales

New South Wales Civil and Administrative Tribunal – Appeal Panel

New South Wales Civil and Administrative Tribunal – Administrative and

Equal Opportunity Division

New South Wales Civil and Administrative Tribunal – Consumer and Commercial Division

Supreme Court of the Northern Territory

Northern Territory Civil and Administrative Tribunal

Supreme Court of Queensland

Queensland District Court Decisions

Land Court of Queensland

Magistrates Court of Queensland

Queensland Civil and Administrative Tribunal

Industrial Court of Queensland

Supreme Court of Tasmania

Supreme Court of Tasmania – Court of Criminal Appeal

Supreme Court of Victoria – Court of Appeal

County Court of Victoria

Supreme Court of Victoria

Victorian Civil and Administrative Tribunal Magistrates Court of Victoria

Supreme Court of Western Australia

Supreme Court of Western Australia – Court of Appeal

District Court of Western Australia



Court Report

ALL, ALL

Country: Australia

State: ALL

Court: ALL


Date Range: 1/1/2014 to 12/31/2016

www.PREMONITION™.ai

The World's Largest Litigation Database

Supreme Court of the Australian Capital Territory - Court of Appeal

Barristers Performance



Court Report: ALL, ALL

Supreme Court of the Australian Capital Territory - Court of Appeal

Top Barristers


Appearances: 3 - 44

Win Rates: 50% - 100%

Top Barristers (Alphabetical)
Mr K Archer
Ms E Beljic
Mr S Gill
Mr S D Malcolmson
Mr B Meagher SC
Mr J Sexton SC
Mr J White SC
Mr K Rewell SC
Mr A Bartley SC
Pro Se

Supreme Court of the Australian Capital Territory - Court of Appeal

Law Firms Performance



Court Report: ALL, ALL

Supreme Court of the Australian Capital Territory - Court of Appeal

Top Law Firms


Appearances: 3 - 48

Win Rates: 50% - 80%

Top Law Firms(Alphabetical)
Act Government Solicitor
Ben Aulich & Associates
Craig Lynch & Associates
Darryl Perkins Solicitors
Director Of Public Prosecutions
Eaton Lawyers
Kamy Saeedi Law
Legal Aid Act
Mr P Clough
Pro Se

Supreme Court of the Australian Capital Territory

Barristers Performance



Supreme Court of the Australian Capital Territory

Top Barristers


Appearances: 6 - 38

Win Rates: 70% - 100%

Top Barristers (Alphabetical)
P Bevan
G Blank
S Drumgold
T Hickey
S Jowitt
D Sahu Khan
S Saikal
P Walker SC
L Taylor
C Wanigaratne

Supreme Court of the Australian Capital Territory

Law Firms Performance



Court Report: ALL, ALL

Supreme Court of the Australian Capital Territory

Top Law Firms


Appearances: 5 - 42

Win Rates: 57% - 100%

Top Law Firms(Alphabetical)
Ben Aulich And Associates
Canberra Criminal Lawyers
Darryl Perkins Solicitor
Director Of Public Prosecutions
Farrar Gesini Dunn
Goodman Law
Kamy Saeedi
Kim Bolas Criminal Law
Legal Aid
Sparke Helmore Lawyers

High Court of Australia

Barristers Performance



High Court of Australia

Top Barristers


Appearances: 3 - 12

Win Rates: 50% - 86%

Top Barristers (Alphabetical)
S B Lloyd SC
J T Gleeson SC
G O'I Reynolds SC

High Court of Australia

Law Firms Performance



Court Report: ALL, ALL

High Court of Australia

Top Law Firms


Appearances: 4 - 30

Win Rates: 50% - 100%

Top Law Firms(Alphabetical)
Australian Government Solicitor
Crown Law Qld
Director Of Public Prosecutions Sa
Fragomen
Herbert Smith Freehills
Minter Ellison Lawyers
Shine Lawyers
Solicitor For Public Prosecutions Nsw

Federal Court of Australia

Barristers Performance



Court Report: ALL, ALL

Federal Court of Australia

Top Barristers


Appearances: 5 - 10

Win Rates: 100% - 100%

Top Barristers (Alphabetical)
R Francois
A Gibson
R Graycar
Mr M Izzo
Mr P M Knowles
Mr Mj Smith
Ms A Stoker
Mr J O Sullivan
Mr N Swan
Mr K Tredrea

Federal Court of Australia

Law Firms Performance



Court Report: ALL, ALL

Federal Court of Australia

Top Law Firms


Appearances: 5 - 38

Win Rates: 86% - 100%

Top Law Firms(Alphabetical)
Act Government Solicitor
Archibald & Brown
Beazley Boorman Lawyers
Central Desert Native Title Services
Clayton Utz Lawyers
Fox Tucker Lawyers
Jackson Mcdonald
Kimberley Land Council
Lillas & Loel Lawyers
The Australian Government Solicitor

Federal Court of Australia - Full Court

Barristers Performance



Court Report: ALL, ALL

Federal Court of Australia - Full Court

Top Barristers


Appearances: 5 - 14

Win Rates: 60% - 90%

Top Barristers (Alphabetical)
Ms T Baw
Ms R Francois
Mr N C Hutley
Mr L Karp
Mr S Lloyd
Dr S Donaghue QC
Mr T Reilly
Mr F Parry SC
Mr B Walker
Mr N Williams

Federal Court of Australia - Full Court

Law Firms Performance



Federal Court of Australia - Full Court

Top Law Firms

Appearances: 5 - 102

Win Rates: 60% - 83%

Top Law Firms(Alphabetical)
Australian Government Solicitor
Cosoff Cudmore Knox
DLA Piper
K & L Gates
King & Wood Mallesons
Maurice Blackburn Lawyers
Parish Patience Immigration Lawyers
Pricewaterhousecoopers
Sparke Helmore Lawyers
Tresscox Lawyers

Federal Circuit Court of Australia

Barristers Performance



Federal Circuit Court of Australia

Top Barristers


Appearances: 5 - 18

Win Rates: 100% - 100%

Top Barristers (Alphabetical)
Mr M P Cleary
Mr A Gerrard
Mr J Johns
Mr B O'Donnell
Mr Petrie
Mr Tim Reilly
Pro Se
Mr M Seck
Mr Smith
Mr M J Smith

Federal Circuit Court of Australia

Law Firms Performance



Court Report: ALL, ALL

Federal Circuit Court of Australia

Top Law Firms


Appearances: 5 - 11

Win Rates: 100% - 100%

Top Law Firms(Alphabetical)
Crown Law
Mr A Markus Of Australian Government Solicitor
Mr D McLaren Of Minter Ellison
Mr J Pinder Of Minter Ellison
Mr L Dennis Of Sparke Helmore
Mr M Wiese Of Clayton Utz
Ms A Wong Of Dla Piper
Ms E Warner Knight Of Australian Government Solicitor
Ms F Taah Of Australian Government Solicitor
Ms H Musgrove Of Sparke Helmore

Australian Patent Office

Barristers Performance



Australian Patent Office

Top Barristers


Appearances: 5 - 18

Win Rates: 54% - 100%

Top Barristers (Alphabetical)
Davies Collison Cave
Julian Cooke
Tom Cordiner
Spruson Ferguson
Ben Fitzpatrick
Phillips Ormonde Fitzpatrick
Griffith Hack
Katrina Howard SC
Stephen Burley SC
Anthony Franklin SC

Australian Patent Office

Law Firms Performance



Australian Patent Office


Top Law Firms

No Law Firm met our Top 10 criteria.

Top Law Firms(Alphabetical)
No data available

Australian Trade Marks Office

Barristers Performance



Australian Trade Marks Office

Top Barristers


Appearances: 3 - 22

Win Rates: 67% - 100%

Top Barristers (Alphabetical)
Julian Cooke
Brian Elkington
Ben Fitzp
Andrew Fox
Ian Horak
David Kell
Melissa Marcus
Siobhán Ryan
Gerard Skelly
Peter Wallis

Australian Trade Marks Office

Law Firms Performance



Australian Trade Marks Office

Top Law Firms


Appearances: 3 - 6

Win Rates: 60% - 100%

Top Law Firms(Alphabetical)
Baker & Mckenzie
Davies Collison Cave
Griffith Hack
Minter Ellison
Spruson & Ferguson

Supreme Court of New South Wales

Barristers Performance



Supreme Court of New South Wales

Top Barristers


Appearances: 5 - 11

Win Rates: 100% - 100%

Top Barristers (Alphabetical)
R P V Carey
S Docker
P Dowdy
L Fernandez
E Goh
R Lewin
P Newton
A P Coleman SC
D Sibtain
M Southwick

Supreme Court of New South Wales

Law Firms Performance



Court Report: ALL, ALL

Supreme Court of New South Wales

Top Law Firms


Appearances: 5 - 8

Win Rates: 100% - 100%

Top Law Firms(Alphabetical)
Archbold Legal
Dibbsbarker
Everett Evans
Firths The Compensation Lawyers
Gerard Malouf & Partners
Greg Walsh & Co
Low Doherty & Stratford
Pigott Stinson
Proceeds Of Crime Litigation, Australian Federal Police
T A Williams

District Court of New South Wales

Barristers Performance



Court Report: ALL, ALL

District Court of New South Wales

Top Barristers


Appearances: 5 - 27

Win Rates: 60% - 100%

Top Barristers (Alphabetical)
Mrs L Barnett
Mr D Benson
M King
Director of Public Prosecutions
Mr M Richardson
Mr P O Rourke
Mr I Roberts SC
Mr A Lidden SC
Mr B Vasic
Ms E Welsh

District Court of New South Wales

Law Firms Performance



Court Report: ALL, ALL

District Court of New South Wales

Top Law Firms


Appearances: 5 - 68

Win Rates: 67% - 100%

Top Law Firms(Alphabetical)
Banki Haddock Fiora
Brydens Compensation Lawyers
Brydens Law Office
Cmc Lawyers
Director of Public Prosecutions
Elie Rahme & Associates
Gerard Malouf & Partners
Johnson Winter & Slattery
Rankin Ellison Lawyers
Walter Madden Jenkins

Supreme Court of New South Wales - Court of Appeal

Barristers Performance



Supreme Court of New South Wales - Court of Appeal

Top Barristers


Appearances: 5 - 11

Win Rates: 80% - 100%

Top Barristers (Alphabetical)
P E King
P J Deakin QC
C Webster SC
J Stoljar SC
Tgr Parker SC
J E Sexton SC
N Polin SC
R Cavanagh SC
R E Dubler SC
D F Villa

Supreme Court of New South Wales - Court of Appeal

Law Firms Performance



Court Report: ALL, ALL

Supreme Court of New South Wales - Court of Appeal

Top Law Firms


Appearances: 5 - 9

Win Rates: 75% - 100%

Top Law Firms(Alphabetical)
Allens
Banki Haddock Fiora
Colin Biggers & Paisley
Kemp Strang
Makinson D`apice Lawyers
Mccabes Lawyers
Mcculloch & Buggy Lawyers
Meridian Lawyers
Mitry Lawyers
Tresscox Lawyers

Land and Environment Court of New South Wales

Barristers Performance



Land and Environment Court of New South Wales

Top Barristers


Appearances: 5 - 17

Win Rates: 80% - 100%

Top Barristers (Alphabetical)
Ms F Berglund
Mr V Conomos
Mr M Fozzard
Mr G Green
Mr S Griffiths
Ms H Irish
Mr S Nash
Scott Nash
Ms J Reid
Mr M Wright

Land and Environment Court of New South Wales

Law Firms Performance



Court Report: ALL, ALL

Land and Environment Court of New South Wales

Top Law Firms


Appearances: 5 - 22

Win Rates: 81% - 100%

Top Law Firms(Alphabetical)
Hunt & Hunt
King And Wood Mallesons
L C Muriniti & Associates
Landerer & Company
Mckee Legal Solutions
Minter Ellison
Mr M Staunton
Mr P Jackson Of Pikes & Verekers Lawyers
Norton Rose Fulbright
Storey & Gough

New South Wales Civil and Administrative Tribunal - Appeal Panel

Barristers Performance



New South Wales Civil and Administrative Tribunal - Appeal Panel

Top Barristers


Appearances: 3 - 10

Win Rates: 50% - 80%

Top Barristers (Alphabetical)
P Bambagiotti
Mr D Barnett
P Batley
J O Connor
T Davie
Mr D Goldsmith
M McMahon
D Smallbone
R Zikmann

New South Wales Civil and Administrative Tribunal - Appeal Panel

Law Firms Performance



New South Wales Civil and Administrative Tribunal - Appeal Panel

Top Law Firms


Appearances: 3 - 3

Win Rates: 50% - 50%

Top Law Firms(Alphabetical)
Pro Se

New South Wales Civil and Administrative Tribunal - Administrative and Equal Opportunity Division

Barristers Performance



New South Wales Civil and Administrative Tribunal - Administrative and Equal Opportunity Division

Top Barristers


Appearances: 5 - 32

Win Rates: 50% - 86%

Top Barristers (Alphabetical)
A Douglas-Baker
I Fraser
J Harris
V Hartstein
M Higgins
R Lee
P Lowson
G Mahony
M Neville
K Eastman SC

New South Wales Civil and Administrative Tribunal - Administrative and Equal Opportunity Division

Law Firms Performance



New South Wales Civil and Administrative Tribunal - Administrative and Equal Opportunity Division

Top Law Firms


Appearances: 3 - 9

Win Rates: 50% - 100%

Top Law Firms(Alphabetical)
CDK
D Turner
Department Of Family And Community Services
G Burns
Henry Davis York
Lindsay Taylor Lawyers
Munro Lawyers
Pro Se
Searson Shannon & Co Pty Ltd
Sparke Helmore Lawyers

New South Wales Civil and Administrative Tribunal - Consumer and Commercial Division

Barristers Performance



New South Wales Civil and Administrative Tribunal - Consumer and Commercial Division

Top Barristers


Appearances: 3 - 9

Win Rates: 67% - 100%

Top Barristers (Alphabetical)
Mr Allan
Mr G Carolan
Mr A Cornish
Michelle McMahon

New South Wales Civil and Administrative Tribunal - Consumer and Commercial Division

Law Firms Performance



New South Wales Civil and Administrative Tribunal - Consumer and Commercial Division


Top Law Firms

No Law Firm met our Top 10 criteria.

Top Law Firms(Alphabetical)
No data available

Supreme Court of the Northern Territory

Barristers Performance



Court Report: ALL, ALL

Supreme Court of the Northern Territory

Top Barristers


Appearances: 4 - 7

Win Rates: 60% - 100%

Top Barristers (Alphabetical)
T Anderson
M Aust
D Dalrymple
G Dooley
D Jones
D McConnel
R Micairan
T Moses
W Roper
S Brownhill SC

Supreme Court of the Northern Territory

Law Firms Performance



Court Report: ALL, ALL

Supreme Court of the Northern Territory

Top Law Firms


Appearances: 3 - 44

Win Rates: 50% - 100%

Top Law Firms(Alphabetical)
Clayton Utz
De Silva Hebron
Director Of Public Prosecutions
Halfpennys
Minter Ellison
Northern Australian Aboriginal Justice Agency
Office Of The Director Of Public Prosecutions
Paul Maher
Roussos Legal Advisory
Solicitor For The Northern Territory

Northern Territory Civil and Administrative Tribunal

Barristers Performance



Northern Territory Civil and Administrative Tribunal

Top Barristers

Appearances: 3 - 3

Win Rates: 67% - 100%

Top Barristers (Alphabetical)
Mr Aughterson
Mr Ingrames
Mr Lindsay

Northern Territory Civil and Administrative Tribunal

Law Firms Performance



Northern Territory Civil and Administrative Tribunal


Top Law Firms

No Law Firm met our Top 10 criteria.

Top Law Firms(Alphabetical)
No data available

Supreme Court of Queensland

Barristers Performance



Supreme Court of Queensland

Top Barristers


Appearances: 5 - 10

Win Rates: 75% - 100%

Top Barristers (Alphabetical)
P O Higgins
K Philipson
J Horton QC
S Couper QC
P J Dunning QC
Pj Davis QC
K E Downes QC
A D Scott
P D Tucker
R Williams

Supreme Court of Queensland

Law Firms Performance



Supreme Court of Queensland

Top Law Firms


Appearances: 5 - 73

Win Rates: 75% - 100%

Top Law Firms(Alphabetical)
Allens
Barry Nilsson
Carter Newell
Creevey Russell Lawyers
Crown Law
Crown Solicitor
HWL Ebsworth Lawyers
Mccullough Robertson Lawyers
McInnes Wilson
Rostron Carlyle Solicitors

Queensland District Court Decisions

Barristers Performance



Queensland District Court Decisions

Top Barristers


Appearances: 5 - 13

Win Rates: 50% - 100%

Top Barristers (Alphabetical)
Stark A
D Castor
R Morton
Pro Se
J Sheridan
A Stark
M T O Sullivan
G I Thomson
J Trevino
C Wilson

Queensland District Court Decisions

Law Firms Performance



Queensland District Court Decisions

Top Law Firms


Appearances: 5 - 57

Win Rates: 60% - 100%

Top Law Firms(Alphabetical)
Butler Mcdermott Lawyers
Cronin Litigation Lawyers
Crown Solicitor
Director Of Public Prosecutions
Gadens Lawyers
Lawler Magill
McInnes Wilson
Mills Oakley Lawyers
Minter Ellison
PPCS Lawyers

Land Court of Queensland

Barristers Performance



Land Court of Queensland

Top Barristers


Appearances: 3 - 4

Win Rates: 50% - 100%

Top Barristers (Alphabetical)
Mr Ar Lonergan
Ms McIntyre
Mr P Prasad
Rn Traves QC
Mr S Holt QC
Dg Clothier QC
D O Brien QC
Pro Se

Land Court of Queensland

Law Firms Performance



Land Court of Queensland

Top Law Firms

Appearances: 3 - 12

Win Rates: 50% - 75%

Top Law Firms(Alphabetical)
Clayton Utz
Emanate Legal
Holding Redlich
In-House Legal, Department
P&E Law

Magistrates Court of Queensland

Barristers Performance



Magistrates Court of Queensland


Top Barristers

No Barrister met our Top 10 criteria.

Top Barristers (Alphabetical)
No data available

Magistrates Court of Queensland

Law Firms Performance



Magistrates Court of Queensland

Top Law Firms


Appearances: 4 - 4

Win Rates: 50% - 50%

Top Law Firms(Alphabetical)
Murdoch Lawyers

Queensland Civil and Administrative Tribunal

Barristers Performance



Queensland Civil and Administrative Tribunal

Top Barristers


Appearances: 3 - 10

Win Rates: 67% - 100%

Top Barristers (Alphabetical)
Mr Craig Capper
Mr Ar Forbes
Ms K Heath
Carson Lloyd Principal Legal Officer
Mr D Pratt
Mr G Diehm QC
Ms K Mcmillan QC
Mr D Robinson
Mr Malcolm Robinson
A D Scott

Queensland Civil and Administrative Tribunal

Law Firms Performance



Queensland Civil and Administrative Tribunal

Top Law Firms


Appearances: 3 - 10

Win Rates: 50% - 100%

Top Law Firms(Alphabetical)
Lander & Rogers Lawyers
Legal Services, Public Safety Business Agency
Mahoneys
McInnes Wilson
Mills Oakley Lawyers
Ms N Strijland
Rodgers Barnes & Green Lawyers
The Legal Services Commissioner

Industrial Court of Queensland

Barristers Performance



Industrial Court of Queensland

Top Barristers


Appearances: 3 - 5

Win Rates: 50% - 100%

Top Barristers (Alphabetical)
J W Merrell
J Murdoch Qc
Mr P J Roney Qc
D Kent Qc
Pro Se
J J Wiltshire

Industrial Court of Queensland

Law Firms Performance



Court Report: ALL, ALL

Industrial Court of Queensland

Top Law Firms


Appearances: 3 - 18

Win Rates: 60% - 100%

Top Law Firms(Alphabetical)
Ashurst Australia
Hall Payne Lawyers
Pro Se
The Workers` Compensation Regulator

Supreme Court of Tasmania

Barristers Performance



Supreme Court of Tasmania

Top Barristers


Appearances: 3 - 10

Win Rates: 50% - 100%

Top Barristers (Alphabetical)
N A
C Gunson
A G Melick SC
B McTaggart SC
P Jackson SC
B R McTaggart SC
K E Read SC
M E O'Farrell SC
S Thompson

Supreme Court of Tasmania

Law Firms Performance



Supreme Court of Tasmania

Top Law Firms


Appearances: 3 - 7

Win Rates: 50% - 100%

Top Law Firms(Alphabetical)
C N Dockray
Fitzgerald & Browne
G A Richardson
Gunson Williams
Legal Aid Commission Of Tasmania
Murdoch Clarke
N, A
Page Seager
Rae & Partners
Wallace Wilkinson & Webster

Supreme Court of Tasmania - Court of Criminal Appeal

Barristers Performance



Supreme Court of Tasmania - Court of Criminal Appeal

Top Barristers


Appearances: 3 - 9

Win Rates: 67% - 100%

Top Barristers (Alphabetical)
J Dennison
J Hartnett
Y Prenc
T Jago SC
D G Coates SC
A Shand

Supreme Court of Tasmania - Court of Criminal Appeal

Law Firms Performance



Supreme Court of Tasmania - Court of Criminal Appeal

Top Law Firms


Appearances: 4 - 31

Win Rates: 50% - 68%

Top Law Firms(Alphabetical)
Acting Director Of Public Prosecutions
Butler McIntyre & Butler
Director Of Public Prosecutions
Rae & Partners

Supreme Court of Victoria - Court of Appeal

Barristers Performance



Court Report: ALL, ALL

Supreme Court of Victoria - Court of Appeal

Top Barristers


Appearances: 5 - 20

Win Rates: 80% - 100%

Top Barristers (Alphabetical)
Mr D J Lane
Mr J B B Lewis
Ms D I Piekusis
Mr J P Gorton QC
Mr R Kendall QC
Mr P D Crutchfield QC
Mr R A Elston QC
Dr N Rogers SC
Mr P B Kidd SC
Mr J Champion SC

Supreme Court of Victoria - Court of Appeal

Law Firms Performance



Court Report: ALL, ALL

Supreme Court of Victoria - Court of Appeal

Top Law Firms


Appearances: 5 - 15

Win Rates: 75% - 100%

Top Law Firms(Alphabetical)
Director Of Public Prosecutions
DLA Piper Australia
Garde Wilson Lawyers
King & Wood Mallesons
Maddocks
Mr C Hyland, Solicitor For Public Prosecutions
Mr John Cain
Office Of Public Prosecutions
SBA Law
Wisewould Mahony

County Court of Victoria

Barristers Performance



Court Report: ALL, ALL

County Court of Victoria

Top Barristers


Appearances: 5 - 38

Win Rates: 100% - 100%

Top Barristers (Alphabetical)
Mr A Albert
Mr A Donald
Mr N Goodfellow
Mr A Grant
Ms A Hassan
Ms A Kapitaniak
Mr D O'Doherty
Mr P Pickering
Mr M J Ruddle
Ms E Ruddle

County Court of Victoria

Law Firms Performance



Court Report: ALL, ALL

County Court of Victoria

Top Law Firms


Appearances: 5 - 43

Win Rates: 100% - 100%

Top Law Firms(Alphabetical)
Acting Solicitor For Public Prosecutions
Balmer And Associates
Commonwealth Director Of Public Prosecutions
Gadens Lawyers
Hounslow Lawyers
Leanne Warren & Associates
Melasecca
Michael J Gleeson & Associates
Nevin Lenne & Gross
Valos Black & Associates

Supreme Court of Victoria

Barristers Performance



Supreme Court of Victoria

Top Barristers


Appearances: 5 - 8

Win Rates: 100% - 100%

Top Barristers (Alphabetical)
Mr S Hay
Mr S Johns
Mr A Kirby
Mr J Levine
Mr J McWilliams
Ms D Piekusis
Mr S K Wilson QC
Mr I Hill QC
Mr C Scerri QC
Mr G Silbert QC

Supreme Court of Victoria

Law Firms Performance



Court Report: ALL, ALL

Supreme Court of Victoria

Top Law Firms


Appearances: 5 - 13

Win Rates: 92% - 100%

Top Law Firms(Alphabetical)
Australian Government Solicitor
Colin Biggers & Paisley
Gadens Lawyers
Jack Bock Lawyers
John Cain
Johnson Winter & Slattery
K&L Gates
Kenna Teasdale Lawyers
Logie-Smith Lanyon
Spencer Reyner Law Office Pty Ltd

Victorian Civil and Administrative Tribunal

Barristers Performance



Victorian Civil and Administrative Tribunal

Top Barristers


Appearances: 5 - 15

Win Rates: 100% - 100%

Top Barristers (Alphabetical)
Mr Andrew Bromley
Mr Jonathan Halaliku
Ms L Hannon
Peter Jewell
Ms S Moser
Tamara Orrlov
Ms R Sharp
Mr R Smith
Mr J Snow
Mr D Song

Victorian Civil and Administrative Tribunal

Law Firms Performance



Victorian Civil and Administrative Tribunal

Top Law Firms


Appearances: 5 - 13

Win Rates: 100% - 100%

Top Law Firms(Alphabetical)
Consultant Planner.
Consultant Town Planner Appeared For The Responsible Authority
Development Planner.
Ms Irene Plakidis
Planning Appeals Advocate.
Principal Planner
Ratio Consultants Pty Ltd
Senior Statutory Planner
Town Planner Ask Planning Services Pty Ltd
Town Planner Songbowden Planning Pty Ltd

Magistrates Court of Victoria

Barristers Performance



Magistrates Court of Victoria

Top Barristers


Appearances: 3 - 12

Win Rates: 50% - 100%

Top Barristers (Alphabetical)
Mr L Allan
Mr Chammings
Mr Dimsey
Mr Dunstan
Mr Johnstone
Mr P Johnstone
Mr Mckenzie
Mr B Mckenzie
Mr Richards

Magistrates Court of Victoria

Law Firms Performance



Magistrates Court of Victoria

Top Law Firms


Appearances: 3 - 17

Win Rates: 50% - 100%

Top Law Firms(Alphabetical)
Hall & Wilcox
Hounslow & Associates
IDP Lawyers
Lander & Rogers
Minter Ellison
Russell Kennedy

Supreme Court of Western Australia

Barristers Performance



Supreme Court of Western Australia

Top Barristers


Appearances: 5 - 12

Win Rates: 89% - 100%

Top Barristers (Alphabetical)
M G S Crowley
R J Lee
K J Levy
S Markham
A Metaxas
P D Yovich SC
P E Cahill SC
B Dharmananda SC
B C Smith
J L Winton

Supreme Court of Western Australia

Law Firms Performance



Court Report: ALL, ALL

Supreme Court of Western Australia

Top Law Firms


Appearances: 5 - 39

Win Rates: 76% - 100%

Top Law Firms(Alphabetical)
Arns & Associates
Clyde & Co Australia
Department Of Commerce
Frichot & Frichot
Gadens Lawyers
Jackson Mcdonald
Lawton Gillon
Lemonis & Tantiprasut Lawyers
Michael John Dunham
Norton Rose Fulbright Australia

Supreme Court of Western Australia - Court of Appeal

Barristers Performance



Supreme Court of Western Australia - Court of Appeal

Top Barristers


Appearances: 5 - 56

Win Rates: 75% - 100%

Top Barristers (Alphabetical)
Mr A G Elliott
Ms A L Forrester
Mr L M Fox
Mr D S Hunter
Ms A C Longden
Mr J D Maclaurin
Mr S Penglis
Mr J Mcgrath SC
Mr A J Sefton
Mr J C Whalley

Supreme Court of Western Australia - Court of Appeal

Law Firms Performance



Court Report: ALL, ALL

Supreme Court of Western Australia - Court of Appeal

Top Law Firms


Appearances: 5 - 369

Win Rates: 64% - 100%

Top Law Firms(Alphabetical)
Bennett, Co
Bowen Buchbinder Vilensky
Director Of Public Prosecutions
Eastwood Sweeney Law
Henry Sklarz
Jarman Mckenna
King & Wood Mallesons
Lavan Legal
Mcleods Barristers & Solicitors
MDS Legal

District Court of Western Australia

Barristers Performance



Court Report: ALL, ALL

District Court of Western Australia

Top Barristers

Appearances: 3 - 6

Win Rates: 60% - 100%

Top Barristers (Alphabetical)
D L Armstrong
G J Douglas
T J Hammond
P E Jarman
J R Ludlow
P A Martino
B L Nugawela
T H Offer
C H Thompson
D W Williams

This scatter plot displays the relationship between the number of closed cases and the winning percentage for 202 law firms. The x-axis represents 'Closed Cases' (0 to 120), and the y-axis represents 'Winning Percentage' (0 to 100). A vertical red dashed line indicates the average number of closed cases (approximately 3), and a horizontal orange dotted line indicates the average winning percentage (approximately 46%).

Closed Cases	Winning Percentage
1	0
1	1
1	2
1	3
1	4
1	5
1	6
1	7
1	8
1	9
1	10
1	11
1	12
1	13
1	14
1	15
1	16
1	17
1	18
1	19
1	20
1	21
1	22
1	23
1	24
1	25
1	26
1	27
1	28
1	29
1	30
1	31
1	32
1	33
1	34
1	35
1	36
1	37
1	38
1	39
1	40
1	41
1	42
1	43
1	44
1	45
1	46
1	47
1	48
1	49
1	50
1	51
1	52
1	53
1	54
1	55
1	56
1	57
1	58
1	59
1	60
1	61
1	62
1	63
1	64
1	65
1	66
1	67
1	68
1	69
1	70
1	71
1	72
1	73
1	74
1	75
1	76
1	77
1	78
1	79
1	80
1	81
1	82
1	83
1	84
1	85
1	86
1	87
1	88
1	89
1	90
1	91
1	92
1	93
1	94
1	95
1	96
1	97
1	98
1	99
1	100
2	0
2	1
2	2
2	3
2	4
2	5
2	6
2	7
2	8
2	9
2	10
2	11
2	12
2	13
2	14
2	15
2	16
2	17
2	18
2	19
2	20
2	21
2	22
2	23
2	24
2	25
2	26
2	27
2	28
2	29
2	30
2	31
2	32
2	33
2	34
2	35
2	36
2	37
2	38
2	39
2	40
2	41
2	42
2	43
2	44
2	45
2	46
2	47
2	48
2	49
2	50
2	51
2	52
2	53
2	54
2	55
2	56
2	57
2	58
2	59
2	60
2	61
2	62
2	63
2	64
2	65
2	66
2	67
2	68
2	69
2	70
2	71
2	72
2	73
2	74
2	75
2	76
2	77
2	78
2	79
2	80
2	81
2	82
2	83
2	84
2	85
2	86
2	87
2	88
2	89
2	90
2	91
2	92
2	93
2	94
2	95
2	96
2	97
2	98
2	99
2	100
3	0
3	1
3	2
3	3
3	4
3	5
3	6
3	7
3	8
3	9
3	10
3	11
3	12
3	13
3	14
3	15
3	16

Court Report: ALL, ALL

District Court of Western Australia

Top Law Firms

Appearances: 5 - 19

Win Rates: 56% - 80%

Top Law Firms(Alphabetical)
Bradley Bayly Legal
HWL Ebsworth Lawyers
Jackson Mcdonald
Jarman Mckenna
Kott Gunning
Shine Lawyers
SRB Legal
Thompson Downey Cooper
Vertannes Georgiou
Whl Legal Pty Ltd



Methodology

The purpose of Premonition is to provide shortlists of capable, proven lawyers for selection by the client. It is not an absolute, it's indicative. Factors such as lawyer availability, price, personal chemistry, etc, may all affect individual selection. A client may well feel that sixth of 20 is a better fit than first.

Determining Wins

What constitutes a win is an arguable point. If you call both lawyers on a closed case, both will claim to have 'won'. Every case is arguable. We consulted with a number of lawyers and judges asking them about the general winners and losers for various dispositions types (we have over 100 types in the system). There was broad agreement that judgements went for plaintiffs, dismissals for defendants and settlements shouldn't be counted. All cases are arguable on an individual basis. Premonition is not a 'rocket science' system where we strive for 100% unarguable analysis of every case, its function is to spot trends and outliers, which it does very well as data is 'smoothed out' over thousands of cases.

Case Difficulty

Every case differs in difficulty. Premonition does not assess the difficulty of a case. Lawyers often claim to "only take the toughest cases" when explaining low win rates. Occasionally this is true. Premonition is not designed to identify the 'surgeon' lawyers that only work the hardest cases. However, it does group cases with those of similar difficulty by using case type, sub-type and parties. In the US, Tax Court is notorious for its low win rates against the IRS; however top performing lawyers still stand out, not by their wins, but because they lose less. Cases group by court type, Appeals Court being a more rigorous black letter law venue than small claims, and by judge, where certain cases, (e.g. complex business claims) are assigned to certain judges. Over time, case difficulty variations are also smoothed out over large numbers of cases and lawyers who only take easy cases will de-select themselves when approached.



Multiple Attorney Cases

Premonition picks the first listed lawyer for each side and ignores the others. The system is not perfect, but brings the least overall inaccuracies. In courts where lawyers per party are not identified specifically, it uses an algorithm to predict which lawyer represents which party, then selects the first one for each side to analyze. Co-counsel are not automatically analyzed unless specifically requested by the client.


Gender and Diversity

Premonition matches names to census data and calculates the likely gender and race based on first and last names. On an individual basis, this is highly unreliable. However, at scale, accuracy approaches that of the census itself.

Overall Data Accuracy

In some cases, data entry courthouse issues make it difficult to import every field. Premonition data cannot be more reliable than the public record.

Additional Publications



Law's Secrets Revealed

- Do big law firms win more often than small ones?
- Are Partners really better than Associates?
- Do more expensive lawyers win more?
- Do men win more than women?

Learn these secrets and many more from the first ever big data look at litigation.

How Good Are The Big Law Firms?

- How do big law firms performance compare?
- How much does lawyer choice within a firm matter?
- How frequently does big law win?
- How does big law compare to picking lawyers by win rate?

www.premonition.ai/reports

PREM NITION™
Analytics



- Litigation History
- Case Types
- Legal Representation
- Attorney/Firm performance
- Case Duration
(overall, case type, judge, client)

Client Report: Dade County

Case Type Pie Chart

Case Type	Percentage
Conv Premises Liability	62%
Other Negligence	7%
Product Liability	3%
Auto Negligence (Greater Than \$15,000)	2%
Rpmf - Homestead (\$50,001 - \$249,999)	2%
Discrimination - Employment Or Other	1%
3 - Contract & Indebtedness	1%
22 - Products Liability	0%
105 - Negl Prem Liab Com	11%
Contract & Indebtedness (Greater Than \$15,000)	4%
107 - Negl Others	2%
10 - Auto Negligence	2%
Rpmf - Non-homestead (\$50,001 - \$249,999)	2%
Rpmf - Non-homestead (\$250,000 Or More)	1%
Rpmf - Homestead (\$250,000 Or More)	1%



- Litigation Experience
- Case Types
- Client Representation
- Performance (overall, case type, judge, client)
- Case Duration (overall, case type, judge, client)

Case Type Report						
Case Type	Cases	Closed Cases	Win Count	Loss Count	Average Case Duration	Outcome
189 - Mtg P Com (\$50,001-\$99,999)	1	0	0	0	0	0%
111 - Mtg P Res (\$0-\$50,000)	14	0	0	0	0	0%
112 - Mtg P Res (\$50,001-\$99,999)	256	21	2	19	78	10%
113 - Mtg P Res (\$250,000 or More)	128	6	1	5	37	17%

Judge Report						
Judge	Cases	Closed Cases	Win Count	Average Case Duration	Outcome	
Abby Cynamon	1	0	0	0	0%	
Antonio Accolla	2	0	0	0	0%	
Antonio Mata	1	0	0	0	0%	
Jim West LLC	1	0	0	0	0%	
Alt B-Cap, LLC	1	0	0	0	0%	
Alt K11 (GONZALEZ, Gloria J)	1	0	0	0	0%	

Top Clients List						
Client	Cases	Closed Cases	Win Count	Average Case Duration	Outcome	
260 Mortgage Group LLC	1	0	0	0	0%	
Alt I-LLC	2	0	0	0	0%	
Alt I LLC	1	0	0	0	0%	
Alt West LLC	1	0	0	0	0%	
Alt B-Cap, LLC	1	0	0	0	0%	
Alt K11 (GONZALEZ, Gloria J)	1	0	0	0	0%	

Lawyer Information						
Name	Email	Domain	Bar Number	Title	Firm	
Jonathan van Wassen	j.vanwassen@caplaw.com	caplaw.com	29230	Partner, Associate	Ramp, Schindl, P.L.L.C.	

Litigation History						
Overall						
Cases	Closed Cases	Win Count	Loss Count	Average Case Duration	Outcome	
2129	249	55	185	1508	23%	

Plaintiff						
Cases	Closed Cases	Win Count	Loss Count	Average Case Duration	Outcome	
2129	249	55	185	1508	23%	

Analytics




Judge Report

Premonition's Judge Report contains in-depth analytics on the outcomes of attorneys in front of a judge. It is used by General Counsel to identify the most effective and efficient attorneys in front of a judge. Law Firms use this report for gathering judicial intelligence, hiring co-counsel and identifying the strength of opposing counsel.

- Attorney Performance by case type
- Case Durations by case type and attorney
- Plaintiff/Defendant outcomes by case type
- Attorney Experience in front of a judge
- Performance Outliers

Useful for: Law Firms, General Counsel, Claims Managers, Litigation Finance



Law Firm Report

Premonition's Law Firm Report provides in-depth analysis of a Law Firm's performance and efficiency. General Counsel use this during their Panel Counsel Review process to identify top-performing firms. Law Firm's use this report to track their litigation experience/performance and to improve their business development by pitching to their strengths.

- Litigation History and Experience
- Client Representation
- Overall Firm Performance
- Specific Attorney Performance
- Average Case Durations (overall, case type, client)
- Case Types
- Benchmarking to Competitors

Useful for: Law Firms, General Counsel, Claims Managers



Court Report

Premonition's Court Report reveals the quantity of cases and performance of all the lawyers in a particular court. This report is used to identify top performing attorneys or identify potential venues in which to file a case.

- Attorney Experience (Number of Cases in a Court)
- Attorney Performance by Case Type
- Benchmarking to peer performance

Useful for: Law Firms, General Counsel, Claims Managers, Litigation Finance



Top Litigants Report

Premonition's Top Litigants Report ranks companies by volume of litigation in a court, state, or country. Law Firms use this report to identify potential hidden clients. Litigation Finance Firms use this to identify potential leads.

Useful for: Law Firms, General Counsel, Claims Managers, Litigation Finance

PREMONITION™

Lawyers By Win Rate™

Contact

Australia

Peter Fazio
pf@premonition.ai
+61 (414) 590 991

International

Nathan Huber
nh@premonition.ai
+1 (615) 364-0924

www.premonition.ai

