

# AI AS YOUR LITIGATION PARALEGAL

Janet Gusdorff

GUSDORFF  
LAW<sub>P.C.</sub>  
*Law & Motion, Writs, Appeals*

# **Time = Money. Don't Waste It.**

## **How Can AI Save You Time as a Paralegal?**

- Creating Factual Summaries and Chronologies
- Deposition Analysis and Testimony Control
- Motion Practice and Summary Judgment Workflow
- Analyzing Medical Records and Damages
- Discovery Strategizing, Drafting and Responding
- Separate Statements and Fact Responses
- Evidentiary Objection Identification and Analysis
- Trial Preparation, Witness Preparation, Organization
- Mediation and Settlement Analysis
- Quality-Control (Opposing Party's Papers and Your Own)

# AI Is Powerful and Confident – Especially When it is Wrong

- Hallucinated legal authority
- Fabricated record citations
- Overstated testimony
- Ignored limiting language
- False factual assumptions
- Conflated allegations with evidence
- Missed factual disputes
- Smoothed over inconsistencies
- Invented procedural rules
- Misstated legal standards
- Assumed causation
- Lost contextual nuance
- Overconfident tone
- Ignored harmful facts
- Incomplete record review
- Silent citation gaps



**The Problem Is Your Process—Not the AI**



# **Control the Inputs, Control the Output**

What Makes Some Prompts More Effective Than Others?

# How to Draft a Poor Prompt

- Vague objective (“summarize,” “analyze,” “make persuasive”)
- No requirement for citations
- No restriction on using only provided materials
- Invites persuasion before verification
- Asks for “best facts” or “strongest arguments” only
- Encourages narrative over structure
- Fails to separate fact, inference, and argument
- No instruction to preserve context or limiting language
- No classification of evidence strength or type
- Assumes completeness of the record
- No requirement to identify disputes or inconsistencies
- No adversarial or defense perspective
- No instruction to flag uncertainty or gaps
- No audit or self-check step
- Encourages conclusions (causation, intent, liability) without support
- No constraint on legal authority (invites hallucination)
- Blends drafting and fact development in one step
- No prioritization (treats all issues equally)
- Overly broad scope without narrowing to issues
- Encourages confident tone regardless of evidentiary support

# Best Practices for Prompts

- Clearly defined, narrow objective tied to a litigation task
- Requires use of only provided materials
- Mandates specific citations for all factual assertions
- Separates workflow into steps (extract → classify → analyze → draft → audit)
- Distinguishes fact, inference, and argument
- Requires preservation of context and limiting language
- Classifies evidence (admission, testimony, document, inference, etc.)
- Requires identification of disputes, inconsistencies, and gaps
- Includes harmful facts and opposing arguments
- Forces adversarial or defense-side analysis
- Requires uncertainty flags (“unclear,” “support not found”)
- Prohibits assumptions about causation, intent, or knowledge
- Uses placeholders for legal authority rather than inventing it
- Includes verification checklist for lawyer review
- Includes final audit/self-critique step
- Prioritizes material issues over completeness for its own sake
- Structures outputs for real litigation use (not summaries)
- Emphasizes conservative, defensible language
- Separates drafting from analysis unless inputs are verified
- Treats AI as an assistant, not a decision-maker

## Bad Prompt

“Summarize these facts into a timeline.”

Why it fails: Encourages smoothing, inference, missing citations, and loss of disputes.

## Better Prompt

“You are assisting a trial lawyer with factual chronology. Extract only record-supported facts from the materials provided. For each entry, include date (or state ‘unclear’), event, actor, and exact citation. Do not infer missing facts or resolve disputes. Identify where facts conflict, where context limits a statement, and where the record is incomplete. Separate direct evidence, circumstantial evidence, and inference. After building the chronology, identify gaps, harmful facts, and items requiring verification. If support is missing, state ‘support not found.’”

## Bad Prompt

“Pull out the best testimony for my case.”

Why it fails: Cherry-picks, strips context, and creates fake “clean” admissions.

## Better Prompt

“Review the deposition transcript and identify testimony relevant to [issue]. For each item, quote the exact question and answer with page-line citation. Classify each as clear admission, qualified admission, helpful but limited, ambiguous, or harmful. Do not paraphrase testimony that may be used in briefing or impeachment. Identify where surrounding context changes meaning and include that context. Do not treat qualified or hedged testimony as a clean admission. Flag any testimony requiring verification or further review.”

## Bad Prompt

“Write a persuasive summary judgment opposition.”

Why it fails: Invites hallucinated law, unsupported facts, and over-advocacy.

## Better Prompt

“Assist in preparing a summary judgment opposition using only the provided record. First extract all relevant facts with citations and classify them as undisputed, disputed, or unclear. Then map those facts to each element of the claim and identify where a reasonable jury could find in plaintiff’s favor. Do not invent legal authority; use placeholders such as [authority needed] where required. Draft an outline first, then argument using only verified facts. Identify opposing arguments and weaknesses in the record. Audit the draft for overstatement, missing citations, and reliance on inference.”

## Bad Prompt

“Summarize the medical records and show causation.”

Why it fails: Encourages improper medical conclusions and conflation of history with opinion.

## Better Prompt

“Review the medical records and create a treatment chronology. For each entry, identify provider, date, symptoms, findings, diagnoses, and treatment, with citation where available. Classify each item as patient-reported history, provider observation, objective finding, or treatment. Do not infer causation or convert patient history into medical opinion. Separately identify evidence that may support or undermine causation, including gaps in treatment, prior conditions, inconsistent histories, and alternative causes. Flag all ambiguity and items requiring expert interpretation.”



Download your complimentary companion guide to this presentation:

**AI as Your Litigation Paralegal**

*thank you!*

**Janet@GusdorffLaw.com**

**GUSDORFF**  
**LAW<sub>P.C.</sub>**  
*Law & Motion, Writs, Appeals*