

Modeling Case-Based Reasoning with the Precedent Model Formalism: An Overview

Heng Zheng

Department of Artificial Intelligence, Bernoulli Institute,
University of Groningen, The Netherlands

Abstract

Research in artificial intelligence (AI) and law (e.g., case-based reasoning) is often associated with computational argumentation theory. This paper, as a preliminary work of my PhD research, summarizes an approach for modeling case-based reasoning with the precedent model formalism. By the proposed approach, we show that the validity of arguments in case-based reasoning can be described in a formal logical language. We also discuss the potential for analyzing other issues in AI and law with the formalism we present, such as the argument moves in case-based reasoning and the dynamics of case-based reasoning.

with a case study about Dutch tort law. One of the distinctive attributes of Verheij's approach is the use of a formal logical language for the modeling of legal reasoning. In this paper, we extend the approach developed by Verheij with a more specific focus on precedents in case-based reasoning.

The approach we introduce in this paper, i.e., the precedent model formalism, based on Verheij's approach, can be used for discussing the validity of arguments [Zheng et al., 2020a] and the comparison of precedents [Zheng et al., 2020b] in case-based reasoning with factors by following typical case-based reasoning systems, such as HYPO [Ashley, 1990] and CATO [Aleven, 1997].

1 Introduction

The paper we present here is a summary of [Zheng et al., 2020a], which aims for discussing the validity of arguments in case-based reasoning. The paper is a preliminary work of my PhD project, which is about modeling case-based reasoning with the formal argumentation theory that was first addressed by [Verheij, 2016a], in order to develop a hybrid AI system that combines data and knowledge. As we show in [Zheng et al., 2020a], artificial intelligence and law is a good application of argumentation theory (e.g., [Prakken and Sartor, 1998, Horty and Bench-Capon, 2012, Prakken et al., 2013]). In 2017, [Verheij, 2017] discusses the validity of arguments in legal reasoning

2 Method

We use a propositional logic language L generated from a set of propositional constants. We write \neg for negation, \wedge for conjunction, \vee for disjunction, \leftrightarrow for equivalence, \top for a tautology, and \perp for a contradiction. The associated classical, deductive, monotonic consequence relation is denoted \models .

We introduce our approach with an example from the trade secret law in the United States that has been discussed in [Ashley, 2017, Zheng et al., 2020a].

As shown in Figure 1, the *Mason* case¹ is considered as a current situation of which the result needs to

¹Mason v. Jack Daniel Distillery, 518 So.2d 130 (Ala.Civ.App.1987)

be decided based on the analysis of the given precedents, namely the *Yokana* case² and the *American Precision* case³.

HYPO considers cases as sets of factors. Each factor favors either the plaintiff or the defendant. For instance, Figure 1 shows that in HYPO, the *Yokana* case is represented by set $\{F7, F10, F16\}$. F7 favors for the plaintiff; both F10 and F16 favor for the defendant.

In the precedent model formalism, we consider precedents as consisting of factors and outcomes. Both *factors* and *outcomes* are literals. A literal is either a propositional constant or its negation. We use $F \subseteq L$ to represent a set of factors, $O \subseteq L$ to represent a set of outcomes. The sets F and O are disjoint and consist only of literals. If a propositional constant p is in F (or O), then $\neg p$ is also in F (respectively in O). For instance, Figure 1 shows that in the precedent model, the *Yokana* case is represented by sentence $F7 \wedge F10 \wedge F16 \wedge \neg \text{Pla}$.

Notice that our use of factors is related to but differs from factors in HYPO. Instead of sets, we represent the precedents as logical conjunctions of factors and outcomes. A factor in our formalism represents an element of a case, namely a factual circumstance. Its negation describes the opposite fact. For instance, if a factor φ is “A kills B”, then its negation $\neg\varphi$ is “A does not kill B”. If an outcome ω is “A is guilty”, its negation $\neg\omega$ is “A is not guilty”.

In the formalism, we consider both legal precedents and current situations as *precedents*. If a precedent contains an outcome, for instance, a legal precedent, then we say it is a *proper precedent*. If a precedent doesn’t have any outcome, then we say it is a *situation* that describes a current case. The outcomes of these situations need to be decided upon. A precedent is formally defined as follows [Zheng et al., 2020a]:

Definition 1 (Precedents) *A precedent is a logically consistent conjunction of distinct factors and outcomes $\pi = \varphi_0 \wedge \varphi_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \varphi_m \wedge \omega_0 \wedge \omega_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \omega_{n-1}$, where*

²Midland-Ross Corp. v. Yokana, 293 F.2d 411 (3rd Cir.1961)

³American Precision Vibrator Co. v. National Air Vibrator Co., 764 S.W.2d 274 (Tex.App.-Houston [1st Dist.] 1988)

m and n are non-negative integers. We say that $\varphi_0, \varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_m$ are the factors of π , $\omega_0, \omega_1, \dots, \omega_{n-1}$ are the outcomes of π . If $n = 0$, then we say that π is a situation with no outcomes, otherwise π is a proper precedent [Zheng et al., 2020a].

Example 1 We assume the set of outcomes $O = \{\text{Pla}, \neg\text{Pla}\}$. Pla stands for plaintiff wins the claim, $\neg\text{Pla}$ stands for defendant wins the claim.

The *Yokana* case shown in Figure 1 is represented as sentence $F7 \wedge F10 \wedge F16 \wedge \text{Pla}$, the *American Precision* case is represented as $F7 \wedge F16 \wedge F21 \wedge \neg\text{Pla}$. Both these two cases are proper precedent.

The *Mason* case is represented as $F1 \wedge F6 \wedge F15 \wedge F16 \wedge F21$, it is considered as a situation.

Notice that both m and n in the definition of precedents can be equal to 0. When $m = 0$, there is one single factor. When $n = 0$, the precedent has no outcome and the empty conjunction $\omega_0 \wedge \dots \wedge \omega_{n-1}$ is equivalent to \top .

Now we turn to precedent models, which can be considered as a special kind of case models introduced by [Verheij, 2016a]. Details of this account can be found in [Zheng et al., 2020a]. The precedent models are defined as:

Definition 2 (Precedent models) *A precedent model is a pair (P, \geq) where P is a set of precedents such that for all $\pi, \pi' \in P$ with $\pi \neq \pi'$, $\pi \wedge \pi' \models \perp$; and \geq is a total preorder over P .*

Example 2 Following Example 1, Figure 1 shows the precedent model (P, \geq) formed by the *Yokana* case and the *American Precision* case. As in HYPO, all legal precedents are with equal preference, therefore, in the precedent model, $\geq = P \times P$, which is the trivial preference relation where all precedents are equivalent. It is shown by the size of the boxes.

As customary, the asymmetric counterpart of \geq is denoted $>$. The symmetric counterpart of \geq is denoted \sim . Formally, \geq means ‘higher in the ordering than or equally high as’. When it is used for the sentences that expresses precedents in a precedent model, the ordering means preference.

One of the main contributions of HYPO-style case-based reasoning is *3-ply arguments*. They are used for illustrating the process of reasoning. As described in




Figure 1: A Venn diagram [Ashley, 2017] and a precedent model [Zheng et al., 2020a] about the *Mason* problem

[Ashley, 2017], the 3-ply argument comprised:

1. A case cited by Side 1.
2. A response from Side 2.
3. A rebuttal from Side 1.

Example 3 In the *Mason* problem, a 3-ply argument in HYPO can be generated as follows:

1. The defendant uses set {F16} for analogizing the *Yokana* case with the *Mason* case.
2. The plaintiff uses set {F6, F10, F15, F21} to distinguish the *Yokana* case from *Mason*, and uses set {F16, F21} to cite the *American Precision* case as a counterexample of *Yokana*.
3. The defendant distinguishes *American Precision* with set {F1, F7}.

In our formalism, arguments and their validities in precedent models (first discussed in [Verheij, 2016a]) are shown as follows:

An *argument* from χ to ρ is a pair (χ, ρ) with χ and $\rho \in L$. For $\lambda \in L$, if $\chi \models \lambda$, λ is a *premise* of the

argument; if $\rho \models \lambda$, λ is a *conclusion*; if $\chi \wedge \rho \models \lambda$, λ is a *position* in the case made by the argument. We say that χ expresses the *full premise* of the argument, ρ the *full conclusion*, and $\chi \wedge \rho$ its *full position*, also referred to as the *case made* by the argument [Verheij, 2016a].

Arguments have three kinds of validities. As defined in [Verheij, 2016a, Zheng et al., 2020a]:

1. If an argument is logically implied by one of the precedents in a precedent model, then the argument is *coherently valid* in the precedent model;
2. If all precedents in a precedent model logically implying an argument's full premise also logically imply its full conclusion, then the argument is *conclusively valid* in the precedent model;
3. If an argument's conclusion is logically implied by a precedent which is the most preferred among the precedents that logically imply the argument's full premise, then the argument is *presumptively valid* in the precedent model.

Example 4 We analyze the arguments discussed in Example 3 with the precedent model in Figure 1:

1. (F16, \neg Pla) The defendant’s argument for analogizing cases in the first ply. The argument is presumptively valid in the model.
2. (F10, Pla) and (F6 \wedge F15 \wedge F21, Pla) The plaintiff’s argument for distinguishing cases in the second ply. Both of the arguments are not coherent in the model.
3. (F16 \wedge F21, Pla) The plaintiff’s argument for citing a counterexample in the second ply. The argument is conclusively valid in the model.
4. (F1, \neg Pla) and (F7, \neg Pla) The defendant’s argument for distinguishing the counterexample in the third ply. (F1, \neg Pla) is not coherent in the model, while (F7, \neg Pla) is presumptively valid.

The example shows arguments for analogizing *Yokana* and *American Precision* with *Mason* are at least presumptively valid in the model, while most of the arguments for distinguishing them with the situation are incoherent, except for one of the arguments for distinguishing *American Precision* from *Mason*.

3 Discussion

As discussed in [Zheng et al., 2020a], unlike other case-based reasoning modeling approaches [Prakken and Sartor, 1998, Horty and Bench-Capon, 2012, Prakken et al., 2013], our method uses a standard formal logical language. The formalization of the validity of arguments in case-based reasoning can give a different perspective on argument moves. For instance, the argument (F16, \neg Pla) for citing *Yokana* is only presumptive in the model, while the argument (F16 \wedge F21, Pla) for citing its counterexample *American Precision* is conclusive. In a formal sense the latter argument is stronger.

As preliminary research of my PhD project, the paper describes a formal method for modeling the validity of arguments in case-based reasoning with factors. It shows the potential to further apply the formalism to analyze case-based reasoning. For the future development of my PhD research, we go beyond the

formal evaluation of arguments with the models, and further apply the formalism to case-based reasoning in AI and Law. For instance, in [Zheng et al., 2020b], we’ve already formally discussed precedent comparisons with the formalism.

The formalization can also be used for discussing the dynamics of case-based reasoning. As a high-relevant issue in AI and law and part of my PhD research project, the topic focuses on the precedential values in case-based reasoning, which has been discussed by many research (e.g., [Hafner and Berman, 2002, Henderson and Bench-Capon, 2019, Verheij, 2016b]). Our formalism can explain that after adding a precedent incorporating a groundbreaking decision, the previously incoherent argument can become coherent in the adapted model. For instance, the decision of the *Mason* case can be considered as groundbreaking. After it is decided, the validity of argument (F1 \wedge F6 \wedge F15 \wedge F16 \wedge F21, Pla) will shift from incoherent to coherent in the adapted model. Thereby our approach has the potential to formally analyze the dynamics of case-based reasoning.

4 Conclusion

In this paper, we summarize the idea of a preliminary work of my PhD research which formalizes the validity of arguments in case-based reasoning [Zheng et al., 2020a] based on a formal logical method developed by [Verheij, 2016a]. We show that the formalism has the potential to be used to formally model elements of case-based reasoning.

Since past cases can be considered as a kind of data, and valid arguments show patterns that hold in the data, the approach provides a step in the development of hybrid AI systems that combine structured knowledge grounded in data [Verheij, 2020]. In the future, we will continue to analyze more issues in artificial intelligence and law with the formal argumentative approach presented in this paper.

5 Acknowledgment

I thank my supervisors Bart Verheij and Davide Grossi for their valuable advice and help on the research described by this paper, which is supported by the Guangzhou Elite Project.

References

- [Aleven, 1997] Aleven, V. (1997). *Teaching case-based argumentation through a model and examples*. PhD thesis, University of Pittsburgh.
- [Ashley, 1990] Ashley, K. D. (1990). *Modeling Legal Arguments: Reasoning with Cases and Hypotheticals*. MIT Press, Cambridge.
- [Ashley, 2017] Ashley, K. D. (2017). *Artificial Intelligence and Legal Analytics: New Tools for Law Practice in the Digital Age*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- [Hafner and Berman, 2002] Hafner, C. and Berman, D. (2002). The role of context in case-based legal reasoning: teleological, temporal, and procedural. *Artificial Intelligence and Law*, 10(1):19–64.
- [Henderson and Bench-Capon, 2019] Henderson, J. and Bench-Capon, T. (2019). Describing the development of case law. In *Proceedings of the Seventeenth International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Law*, ICAIL ’19, page 32–41. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA.
- [Horty and Bench-Capon, 2012] Horty, J. and Bench-Capon, T. (2012). A factor-based definition of precedential constraint. *Artificial Intelligence and Law*, 20(2):181–214.
- [Prakken and Sartor, 1998] Prakken, H. and Sartor, G. (1998). Modelling reasoning with precedents in a formal dialogue game. *Artificial Intelligence and Law*, 6(2-4):231–287.
- [Prakken et al., 2013] Prakken, H., Wyner, A., Bench-Capon, T., and Atkinson, K. (2013). A formalization of argumentation schemes for legal case-based reasoning in ASPIC+. *Journal of Logic and Computation*, 25(5):1141–1166.
- [Verheij, 2016a] Verheij, B. (2016a). Correct Grounded Reasoning with Presumptive Arguments. In Michael, L. and Kakas, A., editors, *15th European Conference on Logics in Artificial Intelligence, JELIA 2016. Larnaca, Cyprus, November 9–11, 2016. Proceedings (LNAI 10021)*, pages 481 – 496. Springer, Berlin.
- [Verheij, 2016b] Verheij, B. (2016b). Formalizing value-guided argumentation for ethical systems design. *Artificial Intelligence and Law*, 24(4):387–407.
- [Verheij, 2017] Verheij, B. (2017). Formalizing Arguments, Rules and Cases. In *Proceedings of the Sixteenth International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Law*, ICAIL 2017, pages 199–208. ACM, New York.
- [Verheij, 2020] Verheij, B. (2020). Artificial Intelligence as Law. Presidential Address to the Seventeenth International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Law. *Artificial Intelligence and Law*, 28(2):181–206.
- [Zheng et al., 2020a] Zheng, H., Grossi, D., and Verheij, B. (2020a). Case-Based Reasoning with Precedent Models: Preliminary Report. In Prakken, H., Bistarelli, S., Santini, F., and Tacicchi, C., editors, *Computational Models of Argument. Proceedings of COMMA 2020*, volume 326, pages 443–450. IOS Press, Amsterdam.
- [Zheng et al., 2020b] Zheng, H., Grossi, D., and Verheij, B. (2020b). Precedent Comparison in the Precedent Model Formalism: A Technical Note. In Villata, S., Harašta, J., and Kšemen, P., editors, *Legal Knowledge and Information Systems. JURIX 2020: The Thirty-third Annual Conference*, volume 334, pages 259 – 262. IOS Press, Amsterdam.