

Rules of Engagement

With MiAI



Rules of Engagement – Index

- **To get the best out of MiAI Law, the following rules set out how the system is intended to be used:**
 1. MiAI Law Features – Document Driven vs Prompt based features (pp.3-4)
 2. What MiAI Law Is (and Is Not) – Scope and system limits (pp. 5-6)
 2. Your Role as Lawyer – Professional judgment, responsibility, and verification (p. 7)
 3. How MiAI Law Thinks – Mixture of Experts and system behaviour (pp. 8-10)
 4. Prompting as Legal Reasoning – How to brief MiAI Law properly (pp. 11-13)
 5. Choosing the Right Research Mode – Case Research vs Legislation Research (pp. 14-16)
 6. Case Research – Rules & Examples – How courts apply the law (pp. 17-21)
 7. Legislation Research – Rules & Stopping Points – Statute-first reasoning (pp. 22-32)
 8. Guardrails, Hallucinations, and Verification – System limits and risk management (pp. 33-38)
 9. **APPENDIX:** Foundational Principles – Judgment, ethics, and accountability (pp. 39-56)

What MiAI Law Can Do

Document-Driven Features (No Prompting Required)

Legal Summarisation

Upload the document – MiAI distils it.

- **Cases**

Ratio decidendi, obiter, and impact on doctrine.

- **Pleadings**

Structured digest of claims and issues.

- **Affidavits**

Clear, evidentiary summary of deposed facts.

Contract Review

Upload the contract – MiAI does the rest.

- **Lite Review**

- **Deep Review**

- **Negotiation Pack**

- **Contract Summary**

- **Audit**

Definitions, cross-references, inconsistencies.

CheckMate

Upload the document – MiAI runs the check.

- **Pleadings Check**

Procedural and formal compliance.

- **LawCheck**

Substantive legal accuracy.

- **AppealCheck**

Appellate review of decisions.

Upload Limit: Up to 20 documents per submission for each feature.

Credits in Escrow: Credits are held in escrow and transferred only upon successful completion of the research.



Prompt-Based Research

Three Research Families with Verifiable Outputs

MiAI Law reveals the stepwise retrievals and provides hyperlinks and pinpoint references.

Case Research

How have the courts decided this issue?

- **Lite**

Quick analysis across all jurisdictions.

- **Deep**

Detailed analysis across all jurisdictions.

Legislation

What does the statute say — and what did it say then?

- **Substantive**

Current legislation across all jurisdictions.

- **Point in Time**

Legislation as it stood on a specific date.

Procedural Research

How do I plead it — and how do I run it through the court or tribunal?

- **Pleadings Research**

Elements of causes of action, material facts, common pitfalls.

- **Procedural Research**

Procedural legislation, practice notes, court rules, bench books, case law for all courts and civil administrative tribunals.

Understanding MiAI Law

- Scope
- System limits

MiAI Law is NOT ChatGPT

Purpose built with embedded legal reasoning

- We do not generate speculative or made-up answers.
- We are purpose-built for legal research, contract review and legal verification.
- MiAI Law has constrained its closed system to reason like a lawyer.
- Our verifiable outputs are grounded in legislation + case law only.
- We do not give client-specific legal advice.
- We support your professional judgment – we do not replace it.

What MiAI Law CANNOT Do

Replace you as a lawyer

- **Draft** pleadings or submissions.
- MiAI Law is legal research and verification. It unearths the law so that you can provide **legal advice** on client scenarios.
- MiAI **cannot** tell you whether your client “has a claim”, is “entitled to compensation” or the quantum of damages recoverable.
- Replace your **professional judgment** - MiAI assists with research, analysis and verification. However, you are responsible for verification, conclusions and advice.

How MiAI Thinks

MiAI is built on a Mixture of Experts model

Think of it as a set of barristers' chambers:

- You brief the clerks (the system).
- The clerks decide which barrister (expert model) is best suited.

Clear instructions = the right expert is chosen.

Vague prompts = risk of the wrong expert being engaged.

Your role: give MiAI a proper brief – context, issue, jurisdiction.

First-Case Limits & Tracing Principles

Development of Doctrines

- MiAI **cannot** identify the 'first case' on an issue. MiAI Law reasons from precedent chains and doctrinal structure and does not rely on pre-training knowledge.
- **Instead:** ask MiAI Law to trace the development of a principle.

For Example:

Trace the development of the principles surrounding the recoverability of pure economic loss in Australian law with a particular emphasis on NSW and High Court Cases.

AI can be temperamental

Rerun the research if it fails the first time

The MiAI Law system is complex and relies upon many elements supplied by third parties that can independently fail.

Do not be alarmed if the same research question does not return identical reports.

The Mixture of Expert model means that different runs will call different experts leading to different research reports.

The Prompt Determines The Output

You Shape The Strategy

MiAI will respond to what you ask. If you ask poorly, you get poor results. That makes lawyers not just users—but designers of the thinking process. Prompting is not just typing—it's thinking legally.

The Perfect Prompt Formula

Plain + Precise = Powerful

Three steps:

1. Set the scene briefly (one or two sentences).
2. Ask the legal question directly.
3. Always include jurisdiction to help direct the system and start the chain of inquiry.

Example:

“There is a clause in a services contract requiring parties to mediate disputes before litigation. In NSW, to what extent is a contractual agreement to mediate enforceable?”

Checklist for Lawyers In a Nutshell

When prompting MiAI, always ask yourself:

1. Have I set the scene? (facts, clause, statute if relevant)
2. Have I asked the question clearly?
3. Have I named the jurisdiction?

Think like a lawyer. Nothing more, nothing less.

Choosing the Right Research Mode

Legislation Research and Case Research answer different legal questions.

Rules of Engagement

Select Research Mode

Before asking a question, determine which research function to use.

Use Case Research if your question asks:

- how courts have addressed similar situations;
- how courts have applied the law in practice; or
- what approach has been taken in comparable scenarios.

Use Procedural Research for:

- **Pleadings:** how a cause of action must be pleaded – elements, material facts, common pitfalls;
- **Procedural:**
 - what court rules, practice notes or bench books govern the step; or
 - how to run a matter through the Courts or Civil Administrative Tribunal procedurally.

Use Legislation Research if your question asks:

- how a statute treats a set of facts;
- what statutory consequences follow;
- there is no case law on the issue and legislation governs the outcome.

Rules of Engagement

Boundary between Legislation and Case Research

Move to Case Research when you need:

- Cases on point - examples of how courts have applied ratio from first principles;
- deep doctrinal analysis; or
- guidance informed by judicial outcomes.

Case Research builds on Legislation Research. It does not replace it.

Case Research: Rules of Engagement

- This mode focuses on how courts have interpreted and applied the law in practice.

Golden Rule 1 of prompting case research

Prompt MiAI as you would your junior

Use plain but precise instructions.

State the issue and specify the jurisdiction if relevant.

Be directive: tell us exactly what you need.

Don't assume MiAI knows what you're focusing on.

The more context you provide, the more relevant and accurate the output.

Examples of Case Research prompts¹

Try lite first for a quick answer

1. In Australia, to what extent is a party's subjective intention relevant when interpreting a contract?
2. To what extent is a contractual agreement to mediate a dispute enforceable?
3. In NSW, to what extent will communications between a client and a foreign (non-Australian) lawyer attract legal professional privilege?
4. The customer and supplier are party to a five-year office cleaning contract covering one office in Parramatta. The supplier invoices the customer on a weekly basis. The customer says it will not pay 50% of the supplier's invoice for one week's cleaning because the cleaning was carried out to a poor standard. The customer has no right under the contract to do this. To what extent is the customer in repudiatory breach of contract, and what remedies are available to the customer?

Further Examples of Case Research prompts

Use Deep Research for a Detailed Report

1. **Contracts:**

There is a clause in a construction contract allowing the principal to terminate at will by giving 7 days' notice. In NSW, to what extent is such a termination clause enforceable?

2. **Torts:**

A customer slipped on a wet supermarket floor that had no warning signs. In Queensland, what duty of care does the supermarket owe and what defences may be available?

3. **Evidence:**

A client has emailed their solicitor in London for advice. In Commonwealth proceedings in Australia, to what extent will those communications attract legal professional privilege?

Examples of Case Research prompts

Provide rich context

1. An agreement contains the following gross up clause for withholding tax: 'If a Tax Deduction is required by law to be made by an Obligor, the Obligor shall pay an additional amount together with the payment so that, after making any Tax Deduction, the Finance Party receives an amount equal to the payment which would have been due if no Tax Deduction had been required. The Obligor shall make that Tax Deduction and any payment required in connection with that Tax Deduction to the relevant Tax Authority within the time allowed and in the minimum amount required by law'. An interest payment made by the Obligor of \$100 is subject to Australian withholding tax. How much does the Obligor have to pay to the foreign recipient of the payment and how much does it have to pay to the Australian Taxation Office?
2. Explain whether and, if so, why the non-compete restraint set out below is unenforceable in Victoria? You shall not, without the prior written consent of the Company, directly or indirectly, either alone or jointly with or on behalf of any third party and whether as principal, manager, employee, contractor, consultant, agent or otherwise howsoever at any time within the period of six months from the date of termination of your employment directly or indirectly engage or be concerned or interested in any business carried on in competition with any of the businesses of the Company or any Group Company which were carried on at the date of termination of your employment or during the period of 12 months prior to that date and with which you were materially concerned during such period.

Legislation Research: Rules of Engagement

- Applies to Legislation and Point in Time Research plus Procedural Research.
- This mode enforces first-principles, statute-first reasoning supplemented by case law.
- Stopping is expected behaviour.

Rules of Engagement

When to Use Legislation Research

Use Legislation Research where:

- the statute governs the issue; and
- there is little or no case law on the specific facts.

This includes:

- novel fact patterns;
- emerging technologies;
- regulatory change; or
- first-impression issues.

Rules of Engagement

How to Frame a Legislation Question

Your question must be legislation-shaped.

A legislation-shaped question asks:

- how the law treats a set of facts;
- whether the statute permits or prohibits an outcome; or
- what statutory consequences arise.

Rules of Engagement

Key Rules for Legislation Research

- You do not need to name the Act.
- You must ask a question the statute can answer.
- Legislation Research explains what the law does.
- Legislation Research will also check how the law has been applied.
- MiAI Law stops where the law stops.

Rules of Engagement

Act and Date Identification

- Although helpful, you **do not need** to name the Act in your question.
- MiAI Law will identify the governing legislation as part of legislation research.
- Do not guess or supply legislation unless you are certain it applies.
- For **Point in Time legislation research**, you will have to nominate the month and the year.

Rules of Engagement

What Not to Ask

Do not ask for advice or optimisation in legislation research.

Legislation research does not answer:

- What is the best way to structure this?
- How should I do this?
- What would you recommend?

Questions framed this way will stop or be redirected.

Rules of Engagement

When Legislation Research Stops

Legislation research will stop if:

- material facts are missing;
- the statute does not support the outcome; or
- the question requires professional judgment rather than statutory analysis.

Stopping is expected behaviour.

Legislation Research

Examples That Work

1. Under **Australian tax law**, how are crypto-based employee incentives treated where the statute is silent on token vesting?
2. Does the **Corporations Act** permit the issue of redeemable preference shares with voting rights?
3. Under the **Migration Act**, what statutory conditions apply before detention may occur?
4. Does **environmental legislation in NSW** permit reuse of waste material?

Examples of Legislation Research that Identify the statutory instrument

1. Describe the situations in which a criminal offence might be committed under the [My Health Records Act 2012 \(Cth\)](#).
2. I own a shop and have CCTV that captures the footpath outside my shop. The police ask me to disclose CCTV footage on a voluntary basis in connection with a robbery. Would disclosing the CCTV footage be a breach of the [Privacy Act 1988 \(Cth\)](#)?
3. Is obesity a health condition that is capable of satisfying the definition of a disability under section 4 of the [Disability Discrimination Act 1992 \(Cth\)](#)?
4. How do the provisions relating to an 'existing use' under the [Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979 \(NSW\)](#) operate?

Rules of Engagement

Examples That Will Not Work

The following questions are not suitable for Legislation Research:

- What is the best way to structure this arrangement?
- How do lawyers usually deal with this situation?
- How can I minimise tax here?
- What approach should I take?
- What would you recommend?

These questions must be asked in Case Research.

Rules of Engagement

Mixed Questions

If your question involves objectives, reframe it.

Incorrect:

- What is the best way to structure equity to avoid tax?

Correct:

- Under Australian tax law, are these outcomes permitted together?

Legislation Research tests permissibility, not optimisation.

User Responsibility and Professional Judgment

- MiAI Law supports legal research.
- It does not replace professional judgment.
- Users remain responsible for verifying outputs and applying the law to facts.

Guardrails & Hallucinations

LLMs have been trained to always answer

MiAI Law cannot guarantee that its guardrails will always work:

- **Case vs Legislation Research:** always choose the right mode.
- **Hallucinations:** Always check the output and rerun if output looks incorrect. If there are no hyperlinks to the cases then run the question again.
- If it sounds **too good to be true** then it probably is!
- **Verify** the answer against your own knowledge base and common sense.
- Edge cases are fine, but **avoid 'malicious' prompts.**

Trust Comes From Checking Never Skip Verification. AI Hallucinates

AI can make things up even though MiAI has put in guardrails to prevent this. Verification isn't optional. In law, an invented case isn't just an error—it's malpractice. Lawyers must remain the last line of truth.

Accountability Cannot Be Outsourced

Humans fulfil that role

Judges, regulators, and clients hold people accountable—not algorithms. You can't cross-examine an LLM. Responsibility for legal advice, decisions, and outcomes will always fall to a human.

Bias In, Bias Out

AI Reflects History, Not Fairness

AI is trained on historical data—and history is full of injustice. That data often reflects systemic discrimination. If MiAI Law did not intervene, AI would reproduce and even amplify those patterns.

Beware The Black Box

Transparency Is Non-Negotiable In Justice

The legal system depends on reasoned decisions. If we don't know how a recommendation was made, we can't evaluate, challenge, or appeal it. Black boxes have no place in open justice.

APPENDIX



The Foundations of MiAI Law

Principles that Govern the Design of
Legal AI

The Future Of Law Is Hybrid, Not Robotic

The Core Premise

AI will dramatically change how law is practiced, but not who practices it. Legal work involves strategy, ethics, and empathy—none of which machines can replicate. The future is collaboration, not replacement.

Justice Is A Human Endeavour

Empathy & Ethics

AI can process information, but it doesn't feel injustice. It can't understand suffering, shame, fear, or dignity. Justice isn't just about outcomes—it's about how decisions are made and who makes them. That's why lawyers are essential.

Law Demands More Than Efficiency

Experience & Human Judgment

AI delivers speed. But speed alone doesn't solve legal problems. Real justice demands fairness, proportionality, and moral reasoning. We don't measure justice by how fast it's delivered—but by how right it is.

AI Accelerates Research Lawyers Ensure Relevance

Yes, AI can comb through millions of documents in seconds. But only a lawyer knows which documents matter and why. Relevance isn't about frequency—it's about meaning in context.

AI Sees Patterns Lawyers See Context

AI is excellent at statistical insight. But law isn't just about patterns—it's about consequences. A lawyer understands that two similar patterns may require very different actions based on facts, people, and purpose.

AI Summarises Lawyers Strategise

Summarising is mechanical. Strategy is creative. Lawyers know when to hold back, when to push, when to appeal. Machines don't understand power dynamics, goals, or consequences.

AI Amplifies Effort It Does Not Replace It

AI can make us more productive, more informed. But it can't replace human effort—especially in uncertain, high-stakes, or emotionally complex legal matters. AI lightens the load, but lawyers still carry it.

AI Informs Strategy Lawyers Execute It

Even the best legal tech is only advisory. Decisions—especially those involving risk or rights—must be made and defended by human lawyers. Clients want someone to take a stand, not cite a model.

AI Is A Lens Navigation Is Still Yours

AI gives you a sharper view, but not direction. It doesn't know where your client wants to go, or what's most important in the broader legal, commercial, or ethical landscape.

AI Doesn't Replace Thinking It Enhances It

AI extends your reach, but it doesn't think for you. Legal analysis is about drawing lines, making distinctions, and forming arguments – none of which AI can do without human framing.

Ethical Judgment Is Human. Machines Can't Weigh Right From Wrong

Ethics is not math. It involves compassion, values, and culture. AI can't know when it's time to bend a rule, to speak out, or to hold a line – only humans can.

Lawyers Are Storytellers

AI Is Not

Justice isn't just about facts — it's about narrative. Lawyers persuade through story, emotion, and timing. AI can draft, but it can't move a judge or jury the way a lawyer can.

AI May Reduce Cost, But It Can't Replace Trust

Clients come to lawyers for confidence, clarity, and care. No matter how cheap or fast AI is, it won't comfort a parent in a custody dispute or help a CEO sleep before a merger.

AI Is A Tool

Your Expertise Is Irreplaceable

Tools change – but expertise endures. Legal thinking, judgment, and experience are what make lawyers valuable. AI may do tasks, but it will never replace wisdom.

There Will Not Be A Future Without Lawyers — Because Justice Cannot Be Automated

Justice is not an engineering problem. It's a human challenge. No machine, no matter how advanced, can replace the lawyer who knows the law — and understands people.

Verification, Limits, and Professional Responsibility

- Understanding system limits.
- Knowing when analysis must stop.
- Maintaining professional responsibility.