Overview of Information Access in Legal domain @ FIRE 2013

Parth Mehta 1 , Madhulika Agrawal 1 , Kripabandhu Ghosh 2 and Abhik Majumdar 3

DA-IICT Gandhinagar¹ ISI Kolkata² NLUO Odisha³

December 4, 2013

- Initiate research in Legal informatics in India

- Initiate research in Legal informatics in India
- Supplement the project by providing benchmark dataset and relevance judgements

- Initiate research in Legal informatics in India
- Supplement the project by providing benchmark dataset and relevance judgements
- Final goal is to make an automated system that can provide guidance in legal matters to the end user.

- Initiate research in Legal informatics in India
- Supplement the project by providing benchmark dataset and relevance judgements

- Final goal is to "attempt" to make an automated system that can provide guidance in legal matters to the end user.

1 Adhoc retrieval from legal documents

- 1 Adhoc retrieval from legal documents
- 2 (a) Identification of propositions from legal documents

- 1 Adhoc retrieval from legal documents
- 2 (a) Identification of propositions from legal documents
 - (b) Classification of propositions into one of the nine categories.

Corpus Details

- Adhoc Retrieval

High court and Supreme court verdicts: 180,000 Consumer court verdicts: 170,000 20 topics (10+10) taken from various online forums, representing the actual queries related to *Consumer Rights* and Hindu Marriage Act

Classification and Identification of Propositions
10 manually segmented and annotated documents
900 unannotated documents

Evaluation criteria

- ▶ Task 1: Mean Average Precision
- ▶ Task 2(a): $A_{ik} = \max_j \frac{\{P_{ik} \cap Q_{jk}\}}{\{P_{ik} \cup Q_{jk}\}}$ P_{ik} : is the proposition number i of k^{th} original text Q_j : is the proposition number j of k^{th} text in submitted run $A_{overall} = \frac{\sum_{k=1}^{N} \sum_{i=1}^{M_k} A_{ik}}{\sum_{k=1}^{N} M_k}$ M_k is number of propositions in in K_{th} document.
- ► Task 2(b): Macro and Micro Precision

Participation Overview

Team	Task Participated	Runs Submitted
EVORA	Ad-hoc Retrieval	2
ISM	Ad-hoc Retrieval	1
TRDDC	Proposition Classification	1

Results

Adhoc Retrieval

Team	Runs Number	Mean Average Precision		
		Focused Corpus	Overall Corpus	
EVORA	Run 1	0.1627	0.1489	
EVORA	Run 2	0.2186	0.2159	
ISM	Run 1	0.1995	0.1413	

Results

Proposition Classification Participating team: TRDDC

Category	Total	Correct	Precision
Intrinsic Facts	60	51	0.85
Extrinsic Facts	18	0	0
Issue	2	0	0
Arguments	40	0	0
Ruling by lower court	12	1	0.08
Statute	38	9	0.24
Precedent	40	4	0.1
Other general standards	6	0	0
Ruling by present court	174	139	0.79

Macro Precision: 0.52 Micro Precision: 0.23

There will be a next time

Possible problems

- Focused passage level retrieval
- Classification of propositions depending on their positive/negative impact on the decision

Questions ??