⚠️

HOW LAWYERS CAN REDUCE AI MISTAKES IN LEGAL WORK

AI errors are predictable and preventable. Here are the workflows and systems that turn AI from liability into dependable assistant.

The question isn't IF your AI tool will err, but WHEN and whether you'll catch it before opposing counsel or a judge does.

5 Predictable AI Failure Modes

1. Fabrication

Invented case names or docket numbers that appear real but don't exist. (See: Mata v. Avianca)

2. Misinterpretation

The case exists, but AI describes the holding incorrectly or omits limiting language.

3. Omission

AI cites general rule but leaves out exceptions or later modifications.

4. Temporal Errors

Outdated law presented as current, or reliance on reversed cases.

5. Jurisdiction Bleed

Federal and state rules blurred together, or persuasive authority treated as binding.

Key Insight

Each error type requires a specific verification step. Recognizing which one you're dealing with is half the battle.

Method 1: Dual-Model Review

Cross-Check With Two AI Systems

How it works: Run the same legal question through two different AI systems and compare results.

STEP 1

Use Two Independent Models

Examples: CoCounsel and Harvey, or Claude and ChatGPT

STEP 2

Give Each Identical Prompts

Same question, same context, same specificity level

STEP 3

Compare Results Side by Side

Look for differences in authority, reasoning, or citations

STEP 4

Investigate Discrepancies Manually

When outputs diverge, one model is almost always wrong. Human review required.

Best Uses for Dual-Model Review

✓ Novel or unsettled legal questions

✓ High-stakes matters (appeals, regulatory opinions)

✓ Statutory updates or emerging areas with thin training data

Method 2: Two-Pass Workflow

Generation Then Verification

Add a quick verification layer that catches 80-90% of high-risk errors before review.

PASS 1

Generation

Use AI to create first draft: research memo, motion, or clause.

Treat as raw material, not finished product.

PASS 2

Verification

Feed draft back into AI with checking prompt.

Correct anything it can't justify.

Effective Verification Prompts

▶ "Review this motion for unsupported legal claims or missing citations."

▶ "Identify any legal statements that require authority but lack one."

▶ "You are opposing counsel. Identify the weakest points and explain where citations don't support the argument." (Adversarial prompt)

Time Investment vs Benefit

Time cost: 10-15 minutes per document
Benefit: Catches 80-90% of high-risk errors before final review

5 Practical Fail-Safes Every Firm Can Implement

1. Print First Page of Every Cited Case

Require that all work with case citations include printed first page of each case. If case doesn't exist, it can't be printed.

This one rule would have prevented Mata v. Avianca.

2. Assign Citation Verifiers

Junior lawyers or paralegals batch-check all citations in Westlaw or Lexis. Use a verification log:

Case Name	Verified	Notes
Smith v. Jones	✅	Correct holding
Brown v. State	✅	Shepardized

3. Keep Prompt Logs

Save each prompt, model version, date, and matter number. Creates audit trail and helps refine future workflows.

Critical firm-wide standard: You may be required to produce all data used.

4. Color-Code AI Edits

▸ **Yellow:** AI-generated, unverified

▸ **Green:** AI-generated, verified

▸ **None:** Human-written

Rule: No yellow at filing time.

5. Run Red-Flag Checklist Before Submission

Pre-Filing Checklist

- ☑ All citations verified in Westlaw/Lexis
- ☑ No quoted language unchecked against source
- ☑ AI summaries rewritten in human tone
- ☑ All cases Shepardized/KeyCited
- ☑ Prompt log saved to file

Net Result

Time investment: 30-45 minutes

Time saved: 1.5-3.5 hours per document

Risk reduction: Drastically lower malpractice exposure

Smarter Prompting: Prevent Errors Upstream

Good prompting separates accurate AI assistance from unreliable noise. Small framing differences produce dramatically different results.

✗ NOT GOOD

"What's the law on negligence?"

✓ BETTER

"Review these three cases and summarize how they define negligence."

Why it works: Narrowing scope limits hallucinations and ensures AI works from documents you control.

✗ NOT GOOD

"Explain the enforceability of non-compete clauses."

✓ BETTER

"Explain the enforceability of non-compete clauses and identify any points where the law is unsettled or where you're uncertain."

Why it works: You get visibility into gray areas instead of overconfident generalizations.

✗ NOT GOOD

"Write a summary of case law on punitive damages."

✓ BETTER

"Provide: (1) conclusion, (2) supporting authority, (3) counterarguments."

Why it works: Defined structure forces AI to separate conclusions from authority, making verification easier.

✗ NOT GOOD

"Summarize this issue for me."

✓ BETTER

"You are a federal appellate clerk. Draft a bench memo analyzing whether punitive damages are available under these facts."

Why it works: Role-based context triggers more disciplined, formal reasoning consistent with legal writing norms.

✗ NOT GOOD

"Summarize case law on data privacy."

✓ BETTER

"Summarize case law on data privacy as of 2023. Ignore decisions before 2015 unless they are still controlling precedent."

Why it works: Temporal boundaries reduce outdated or reversed authority.

Meta Prompting: Let AI Help Write the Prompt

Lawyers don't need to be prompt engineers. Before running your actual query, ask the AI:

✓ "Suggest the most effective prompt to get an accurate and well-cited summary of case law on [topic]."

✓ "How should I structure my question to reduce hallucinations and get clear authority?"

✓ "What information would you need from me to answer this accurately?"

Then refine and reuse that optimized prompt. Over time, save these in a shared firm library for consistent, high-quality results.

Lessons from Mata v. Avianca

The Cautionary Tale

Six fabricated citations, all generated by ChatGPT, led to sanctions and professional embarrassment.

How These Workflows Would Have Prevented It

- **Printed first pages:** Nonexistent cases exposed instantly

- **Citation verification:** Would eliminate all hallucinated case citation situations

- **Dual-model review:** Second AI would have disagreed on fake citations

- **Red-flag checklist:** "All citations verified" step impossible to complete

- **Manual Shepardizing:** The ultimate safeguard

The failure wasn't technological—it was procedural. Verification was skipped. Every system described here exists to make that impossible.

Scaling Across Firm Sizes

All Law Firms

▸ Make dual-model review mandatory for high-risk filings

▸ Follow with two-pass workflow

▸ Build library of proven prompts

▸ Standardize verification checklists

Mid-Large Firms

▸ Train associates on five error types

▸ Teach structured prompting

▸ Require partner sign-off for dispositive motions

▸ Establish firm-wide prompt library

In-House Counsel

▸ Apply systems to compliance memos and contract templates

▸ Maintain running log of AI errors caught

▸ Build "lessons learned" file that compounds accuracy over time

The Right Mindset

Treat AI Like a Junior Associate

- ✓ Fast, confident, and wrong just often enough to cause trouble

- ✓ Expect 70-80% accuracy, verify the rest

- ✓ Use AI to accelerate, not replace, your reasoning

- ✓ You remain responsible for the final product

Critical Prerequisites

All workflows above assume your firm has properly addressed AI bias and alignment in systems used. This must be handled before implementing tactical verification systems.

The Bottom Line

AI Mistakes Are Preventable

They happen when lawyers treat machines like search engines instead of untrained researchers.

Dual-model reviews, two-pass verification, and old-fashioned diligence transform AI from liability into trusted assistant.

Professional Competence in the AI Era

The technology won't eliminate your professional duties—it just changes how you fulfill them.

Competence now means understanding how to supervise machines.

The lawyers who master that skill will practice faster, safer, and with more confidence than ever.

Courts and bar associations don't sanction for losing cases or making ordinary mistakes. They sanction for negligence—for failing to take reasonable steps to prevent avoidable errors. The workflows outlined here exist to make preventable errors nearly impossible.

Jurvantis.ai