



Litigation, Rewired: First-Principles Research for Faster, Verified Strategy

By Laina Chan

The promise of artificial intelligence in litigation is often framed as speed. But speed without *method* is a liability. What the profession needs is research that is rapid **and** reasoned, traceable **and** court-fit. That is the gap MiAI Law set out to close: moving from keyword hunting to **first-principles, audit-ready** analysis that helps lawyers set strategy early and defend it later.

1. The problem with “search”

Traditional research starts with keywords and ends with exhaustion. Even the best databases return long lists of authorities; the real work is hidden—extracting the **ratio decidendi**, distinguishing facts, and reconstructing the governing rules before you can apply them to novel facts. Public chatbots add a fresh risk: fluent answers that lean on secondary commentary and sometimes invent sources. In high-stakes disputes, neither deluge nor guesswork will do.

2. From search to structured reasoning

MiAI Law reverses the sequence. It looks **only to primary law** (legislation and judgments) and systematises each case up front: issues, parties’ arguments, reasoning, outcome, and the rules for which the case is known. When a question is posed, MiAI runs a **stepwise reasoning plan**, retrieving at each step from its own structured analyses rather than sweeping the web for prose that “sounds right”.

Outputs are not generic summaries. They are **IRAC-structured research reports** (Issue, Rule, Application, Conclusion), each proposition **footnoted to a pinpoint** with a live link to the source. The model is constrained to say “*I don’t know*” where the base cannot support an answer. It classifies and organises; it does not adjudicate.

3. Early clarity, better strategy

Good litigation begins with a credible hypothesis about the law and an honest appraisal of the facts. By surfacing controlling principles and on-point authorities



quickly—sometimes reaching back a century or more—MiAI lets teams **triage early**: identify viable causes of action, map elements to facts, and specify the **evidence** needed to prove each element. That front-loaded clarity reduces missteps, calibrates settlement posture, and reserves human time for judgment and persuasion.

4. “Audit-ready” as a strategic asset

In an era where advice is second-guessed by boards, counterparties, and (sometimes) clients pasting text into public LLMs, **audit-readiness** is not cosmetic. MiAI exposes its reasoning trail: the questions asked, the material retrieved, the cases considered, and the subset relied on. Every rule cited is tied to a bull’s-eye pinpoint. That transparency changes the conversation—from “trust me” to “**verify me**”—and it travels well from conference room to courtroom.

5. Contract review that reasons, not merely compares

Many review tools flag deviations from a firm’s precedent but cannot explain **why** a clause is risky. MiAI’s contract suite performs a **risk and legal analysis from first principles**, indicating the legal and commercial risk, the authority that underpins that assessment, recommended remediation, and proposed alternate wording. An **audit** of defined terms and cross-references then stress-tests internal consistency—catching the small drafting slips that become large disputes.

6. Human judgment remains central

No responsible system claims to replace counsel. Novel factual matrices still require the advocate’s craft: weighing rival constructions, deciding which points to press, and balancing legal doctrine with litigation realities. MiAI shortens the road to the right authorities; it does not walk into court for you. The lawyer still **reads, tests, and owns** the analysis.

7. A principle-first north star

MiAI’s core belief is simple: **first principles before flourish**. By grounding every answer in primary law, revealing the reasoning path, and accepting honest limits, the system aligns with the profession’s values—accuracy, accountability, and transparency. That is why endorsements from senior practitioners and judges have focused less on novelty and more on **trustworthiness**.



8. Conclusion

Litigation is not solved by speed alone. It is improved by **method**: research that is fast *because* it is structured, persuasive *because* it is verifiable, and strategic *because* it arrives early enough to matter. That is the shift from search to **structured legal intelligence**—and it is how litigation gets rewired.