FACT PATTERN:

Your Client Rivers Phillip, was recently hired to work as an architect with a San Diego architectural firm, Nuts and Bolts (Bolts). The firm has an annual flag football game each September against rival firm, The Ramming Raiders (Raiders). Rivers was hired in February and was told about the longstanding football rivalry by his superiors. Rivers was once a professional athlete but lost his position after his team relocated to Los Angeles. Over the course of the summer, his colleagues at Bolts constantly encourage Rivers to compete in the game. One of the partners even implied, presumably in jest, that Rivers’ prospects at the firm were dependent on his participation.

At the game, which occurred on a Saturday in September, Rivers was hit while (awkwardly) running the ball and sustained a fractured humerus. He has been unable to draft for the last several months. He has come to you to determine whether he can claim the injury occurred during a work-related event and would be covered by workers’ compensation.

JURISDICTION: California

FOUR STEP RESEARCH PLAN:
1. Secondary Sources – Treatises and Practice Guides
2. Statutes
3. Cases
4. Citators – Shepard’s and KeyCite

SIGN-ON: Lexis Law School Page:
http://www.lexis.com/lawschool
STEP 1: USING SECONDARY SOURCES TO UNDERSTAND TOPIC

1. Type: workers' compensation for playing sports and hit search
2. Narrow by Secondary Materials
3. Narrow by Category to Treatises (or select multiple categories)
4. Narrow by Jurisdiction to California
5. Click result #6 – California Workers' Compensation Law § 10.03
   a. Click on Table of Contents and expand § 10.03 to reveal [6] Recreational, Athletic and Social Activities and click on it OR scroll down to that heading in the text – [6] Recreational, Athletic and Social Activities
6. Learn more about the elements at issue in your fact pattern – "reasonable expectancy" and "objective reasonableness."
7. Note important statutory sections and cases

STEP 2: STATUTES

   a. Note the currency listed at the top of the page
   b. Review the Notes to Decisions in sections 40 and 43
2. You can also search statutes by natural language, but it is usually not efficient. To view natural language search, return to your search for: workers' compensation for playing sports
   a. Select the Statutes and Legislation box
   b. Narrow by Jurisdiction to California
3. As a third option, you can try a terms and connectors (Boolean) search
   a. In the main search box type in the following: recreat! or sport! or athlet! "workers' compensation”
   b. Select Statutes and Legislation box
   c. Narrow by Jurisdiction to California
   d. Narrow by Category to Codes
STEP 3: CASES

1. Review all important cases from Step 1(7), starting with Ezzy v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd., 194 Cal. Rptr. 90 (1983).
2. Use LexisNexis Headnotes - Topics and subtopics
   - Make sure that the jurisdiction is correct before clicking the Headnote
   - To narrow the results, scroll down to Search within Results on the left and type sport
3. Use LexisNexis Headnotes - Shepardize - Narrow by this Headnote
4. Use LexisNexis Headnotes – More like this Headnote and the Legal Issue Trail
5. Searching for more cases
   a. You can also search cases by natural language.
      - Return to your search for: workers' compensation for playing sports
      - Select the Cases tab
      - Narrow by Court to California
      - You could narrow within results or browse and read the brief descriptions of the results, but you will not find Ezzy
      - Be cautious using natural language search for cases, as it is not always the best option
   b. You may want to try a terms and connectors (Boolean) search
      - In the main search box type in the following: recreat! or sport! or athlet! "workers' compensation"
      - Select the Cases tab
      - Narrow by Jurisdiction to California
      - Ezzy is listed due to change in search terms – result #9.

STEP 4: SHEPARDIZE TO VALIDATE YOUR RESEARCH AND ENSURE GOOD LAW

1. Return to Ezzy case – click on citation at top of Shepard’s report
2. Note the Shepard's preview on the right side of the page
3. Click on Shepardize this document
4. Note any Appellate History, then click on Citing Decisions
5. In this instance, we have one case that has distinguished itself from Ezzy: Childers v. Shasta Livestock Auction Yard, 235 Cal. Rptr. 641
   a. Review Childers to understand why it doesn’t use the Ezzy test
6. Return to the Shepard's report and use the facets on the left to limit by
FACT PATTERN:

Sydney Williams was handing out fliers and speaking to passers-by in Balboa Park, protesting a new California state law that bars school employees with concealed carry licenses from bringing firearms on to campus. A police officer approached and asked if she had been issued a permit to demonstrate by the City of San Diego. She did not have a permit and refused to cease the activity when the officer told her she would need to stop. She was arrested for demonstrating without a permit. Ms. Williams is suing the city for violation of her right to free speech.

JURISDICTION: Federal, 9th Circuit

STEP 1: USING SECONDARY SOURCES TO UNDERSTAND TOPIC

1. Browse for sources by clicking on Secondary Sources without entering in any search terms
2. Select your Topic: Constitutional Law and select Publication Type: Texts & Treatises. Click Apply.
3. Examine list of Secondary Sources to see all available options
   a. Note possible sources, e.g. Constitutional Law Deskbook; The First Amendment: Freedom of Speech; Rotunda and Nowak's Treatise on Constitutional Law-Substance and Procedure; Smolla & Nimmer on Freedom of Speech
4. In this instance, it would be difficult to quickly find relevant results by browsing these titles
5. Click on Advanced next to search box at the top of page
   a. Search within the selection of secondary sources using the fields
      i. type in All of these terms: public park
      ii. type in This exact phrase: free speech
6. Click on § 8:18.Examples of public and nonpublic forums—Parks (Smolla & Nimmer on Freedom of Speech)
7. Learn more about the elements at issue in your fact pattern
   a. Did your client apply for a permit? Is that important?
b. What are the city’s requirements to qualify for a permit?

8. Note important statutory sections and cases.
   a. Note 9th Circuit cases
      i. U.S. v. Baugh, 187 F.3d 1037 (9th Cir. 1999)
      ii. U.S. v. Griefen, 200 F.3d 1256 (9th Cir. 2000)
      iii. Wong v. Bush, 542 F.3d 732 (9th Cir. 2008)
      iv. Berger v. Seattle, 569 F.3d 1029 (9th Cir. 2009)

STEP 2: STATUTES

1. Review any important statutes from Step 1(8): None
2. Note that with major constitutional issues, it is best to go straight from the secondary sources to cases and skip the annotations. Annotations are too great in number and difficult to use effectively.

STEP 3: CASES

1. Review important cases from Step 1(8): U.S. v. Baugh, 187 F.3d 1037 (9th Cir. 1999)
2. Find more cases starting from this case by using West Headnote 3 – Narrow by Headnote – 6 cases that cite this headnote
3. You can also click on West Headnote 3 – Topic (Constitutional Law) and key number (Parks and Forests) – 90 case squibs
4. You can also search for more cases using natural language or terms and connectors
   a. Select Cases from Content Types
   b. Select Ninth Circuit
   c. Search for public park "free speech"
STEP 4: KEYCITE TO VALIDATE YOUR RESEARCH AND ENSURE GOOD LAW

1. Return to Baugh case – Reading through Baugh, you would learn that members of an advocate group for the homeless were convicted of demonstrating without a permit on National Park property. They appealed and the court found in their favor that the National Park Service violated the First Amendment. Specifically, the court addressed the issue of whether failure to apply for a permit deprived the protestors of standing. In reaching its decision, the court applied the standard that prior restraints on speech may be imposed if they amount to reasonable time, place, and manner restrictions.

2. What signal is indicated for U.S. v. Baugh? What is your initial reaction to the signal? Look at the chart to refresh your memory on the value of each signal.

3. Since you cannot determine whether this case is good law without knowing what legal issue to examine, here is the issue: we are most interested in Baugh for its discussion of prior restraints on speech. We want to know the standard for determining if prior restraints may be imposed on speech, such as a requirement to obtain a permit, and whether that standard is still valid.

What steps would you take to determine whether Baugh is good law for this issue? Think about your strategy. You can look to #1 above for a review of Baugh.
Citators are a general class of research materials designed to help you find sources that cite a source that you have identified. The two basic uses for Shepard’s and KeyCite are:

1. **Verification**: to make sure that precedent you are analyzing remains good law, i.e., that it has not been overturned; and

2. **Research**: to find other sources that cite to the legal material you are analyzing, in the hopes that these new sources deal with similar subjects as or shed further light on the law you have already found.

While you will use Shepard’s and KeyCite to look up, or “citeate,” cases, understand that you can also use both services to find materials that have cited other research sources, including statutes and some secondary sources.

**Online Legal Citators—Treatment Signals**

Remember: when you find or pull up a case or other legal resource on either Lexis or Westlaw, there is a strong likelihood that you will see the citator symbol. These symbols are designed to indicate a snapshot, vague, general precedential value of the case being researched. On both services, the symbols should remind you of the importance of citing the case.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shepard’s Signals on Lexis:</th>
<th>KeyCite Symbols on Westlaw:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strong Negative Treatment, including no longer</td>
<td>Some Negative Treatment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>good law</td>
<td>Strong Negative Treatment, No longer good law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>for AT LEAST ONE point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some Negative Treatment for a statute</td>
<td>Document has been appealed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Validity questioned</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some Negative Treatment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citing references have some positive treatment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citing references provide analysis that is</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neither positive nor negative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citing references exist but those references</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>are not primary law sources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RESEARCH TIPS:
- Choose cases that include good discussion of elements and how they are applied. Look for courts to set out tests, standards, or define certain elements.
- Too many results? Focus on specific element in cause of action or a legally significant fact.
- Too few results? Remove specific facts or try to think of broader category that fact might fit under.

TERMS AND CONNECTORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operator</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>or</td>
<td>Find Synonyms/ Alternatives</td>
<td>car or auto or vehicle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and</td>
<td>Require Both Terms in Doc</td>
<td>“assumption of risk” and golf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/#</td>
<td>Within a Certain # of Words</td>
<td>car /10 injure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/s</td>
<td>Within the Same Sentence</td>
<td>copyright /s infringement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/p</td>
<td>Within the Same Paragraph</td>
<td>injury /p damages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>!</td>
<td>Root expander to search for words with multiple endings like objected, objection, and objecting</td>
<td>object!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q: Is it better to use a natural language search, terms and connectors (Boolean), or advanced field/segment search?

A: It depends. Natural language is often the most intuitive for new researchers and can yield excellent results after using necessary limiters on jurisdiction and content type. However, a natural language search may not always find all results or even the best results. A well-constructed terms and connectors search may find documents you would otherwise have missed. Using segments/fields can help you retrieve only specific relevant documents. For example, if you are searching for all of the opinions written by Judge John Smith, use the judge segment/field and you will not retrieve cases where the attorney or party is named John Smith.