

New enhancements help you uncover key information about judges, attorneys, expert witnesses, arbitrators and companies ... more quickly and easily with **LexisNexis® Analyzer**

When you need critical information about people or companies, LexisNexis Analyzer provides a comprehensive and easy-to-use solution. Simply click one of the tabs, identify a person or company, add any additional search terms, specify the date range and check off any or all of the sources. Recently added content and improved functionality can help you uncover the facts you need with even more efficiency.

- Search new content sources, including the Factiva® MegaNews menu.
- Edit the “behind the scenes” searches that underlie each of the sources searched by Analyzer.
- See how many results your search will retrieve for free! Try before you buy!
- View the results page and then go either directly to the Cite List, or edit your search, as needed.
- Supplement your results directly from Analyzer with links to relevant exclusionary content.

Follow these steps to find detailed information on individuals or companies:

**Step 1**

Select the **Analyzer** link in the Reference section of the Legal tab, the Litigation Research Tasks pages or LexisNexis® Total Litigator and click the tab for Judge, Attorney, Expert, Arbitrator, or Company.

**Step 2**

Type the name of the person or company in the **Name** box(es). Enter additional search terms, select date restrictions, and indicate the maximum number of documents you want from each source.

**Step 3**

Click the box next to each individual source in which you want the search to run.

**Step 4**

You can now view and edit the underlying searches that Analyzer uses to find information by simply clicking **View & Edit Searches**.

**Step 5**

If you want to save the set of sources you selected, type a name for the set and click **Save**.

**Step 6**

Click **Search**.

**Step 7**

Check the View and Edit Searches screen. If you are satisfied, click **View Results**.

The screenshot shows the LexisNexis Analyzer search interface. At the top, there are tabs for Judge, Attorney, Expert, Arbitrator, and Company. A red circle with the number 1 is next to the 'Judge' tab. Below the tabs is a search bar with the text 'Search for a Judge'. To the right of the search bar is a 'Search Help' section. Below the search bar are several input fields: 'Judge's Last Name' (with 'roberts' entered), 'Judge's First Name', 'Jurisdiction' (with 'us supreme court' entered), and 'Date Restrictions' (with 'No Date Restrictions' selected). Below these fields is a 'Maximum Documents per Source' field set to '40'. To the right of these fields is a 'Select a Source' section with a list of sources and checkboxes. A red circle with the number 2 is next to the 'Jurisdiction' field, and a red circle with the number 3 is next to the 'Select a Source' section. Below the 'Select a Source' section is a 'Save selection as favorite source set' field with a 'Save' button. A red circle with the number 4 is next to the 'View & Edit Searches' link. At the bottom right, there is a 'Search' button and a 'Clear Form' button. A red circle with the number 5 is next to the 'Save' button, and a red circle with the number 6 is next to the 'Search' button.

The screenshot shows the 'Summary of Search Criteria' screen in LexisNexis Analyzer. It displays the search criteria entered in the previous step. Below the criteria is a table showing the number of results for each source.

Sources	Number of Results
Federal & State Cases	27
Judicial Staff Directory (Judicial Profiles)	1
Martindale-Hubbell(R) Law Directory - United States Listing	1
Law Reviews	40 retrieved, more available
News	40 retrieved, more available
Daubert Tracker Case Reports	No result matched search

At the bottom right of the screen, there is a 'View Results' button and an 'Edit Search' button. A red circle with the number 7 is next to the 'View Results' button.

# LexisNexis Analyzer

## Uncover key information about judges, attorneys, expert witnesses, arbitrators and companies ... quickly and easily with LexisNexis Analyzer

Remember, you can edit the search for each publication. Your search will generate a list of possible results. Simply select the boxes to the left of the results you want to review and click the **Generate Report** button at the top left. Analyzer will then generate a customized report providing citations for all the retrieved documents sorted by category. Just click on a citation to view the full text of a document.

### With LexisNexis Analyzer it's easy to:

#### Find background on attorneys

- Get the details on an attorney's particular area of expertise
- Discover if the attorney has handled similar lawsuits in the past
- See what kinds of verdicts the attorney has obtained in other cases

#### Research companies

- Find current company and financial information
- Review relevant news and press releases
- Read about related intellectual property and legal information

#### Learn more about expert witnesses

- Review discussions of their testimony in case opinions
- Uncover their relationships with other attorneys
- Determine the status of their licenses

#### Examine information on judges

- Learn of their experience with a particular area of law
- Uncover tendencies, such as citing unpublished opinions
- Read authored materials, such as opinions and law review articles

Additional information on key players is available by accessing **CourtLink® Strategic Profiles** (which are drawn from in-depth court-records research) from either the listing of possible results or the final report.

### Integration with LexisNexis® Total Litigator

Analyzer and Total Litigator are now closely integrated making it easier to use the Multiple Source option in Analyzer to search the vast majority of relevant content and products in a single search.

LexisNexis® Analyzer

Search Terms: Judge[Last\_Name(roberts)],Search\_Terms(john w/2 roberts and chief w/5 judge or justice),Jurisdiction(us supreme court)

Selected Documents: 3

Generate Report

Sources: Federal & State Cases - 27, Judicial Staff Directory (Judicial Profiles) - 1, Law Review - 40, Court Tracker Case Reports - 0

Federal & State Cases - Select All Clear All

1. Cuno Engineering Corp. v. Automatic Devices Corp., No. 37, SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES, 314 U.S. 84; 62 S. Ct. 37; 86 L. Ed. 58; 1941 U.S. LEXIS 1250; 51 U.S.P.Q. (BNA) 272, October 22, 23, 1941, Argued, November 10, 1941, Decided

OVERVIEW: Respondent's invention was not new but improved upon a prior invention with existing prior art, so respondent's patent was not valid and the infringement action against petitioner was dismissed. ... Starr Allyn and Carlton Hill, with whom Messrs. Hyland R. Johns and Roberts B. Larson were on the brief, for petitioner Mr. Drury Stone, Roberts, Black, Reed, Frankfurter, Douglas, Murphy, Byrnes, Jackson MR. CHIEF JUSTICE STONE: I concur in the result. I agree that the ...

2. West Coast Hotel Co. v. Parrish, No. 295, SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES, 300 U.S. 379; 57 S. Ct. 578; 81 L. Ed. 703; 1937 U.S. LEXIS 1119; 1 Lab. Cas. (CCH) 937 (O); 8 Ohio Op. 89; 106 A.L.R. 1330; 1 L.R.R.M. 754; 7 L.R.R.M. 754, December 16, 17, 1936, Argued, March 29, 1937, Decided

OVERVIEW: A female employee was properly awarded back pay under the Washington Minimum Wages for Women Act (Act) because the Act did not violate the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment. ... Mr. E. L. Sneed, with whom Mr. John W. Roberts was on the brief, for appellants. The statute was passed ... MR. CHIEF JUSTICE HUGHES delivered the opinion of the Court. [I]n this case presents ... of Appeals holding the Act invalid was affirmed, but with Chief Justice Taft, Mr. Justice Holmes and Mr. Justice Sanford dissenting, and Mr. Justice Brandeis ... That challenge persists and is without any satisfactory answer. As Chief Justice Taft observed: "In absolute freedom of contract the one term ... laws that have been upheld." 261 U.S., p. 570. And Chief Justice Taft forcibly pointed out the consideration which is basic in ...

3. STATE v. RICHMOND, Supreme Court No. CR-80-2914-AP, SUPREME COURT OF ARIZONA, 180 Ariz. 573; 886 P.2d 1329; 1994 Ariz. LEXIS 131; 179 Ariz. Adv. Rep. 57, December 15, 1994, FILED

OVERVIEW: On remand from United States Supreme Court, state supreme court chose to reweigh sentencing factors rather than submit matter to original trial court because inmate had been on death row for 20 years. His sentence was reduced to life imprisonment. THOMAS A. CLARKE, Justice. CONCURRING: STANLEY G. FELDMAN, Chief Justice. JAMES MOELLER, Vice Chief Justice. ROBERT J. CONCORRAN, Justice.

LexisNexis® Analyzer

Search Terms: Judge[Last\_Name(roberts)],Search\_Terms(john w/2 roberts and chief w/5 judge or justice),Jurisdiction(us supreme court)

Report Navigation

Further Searches: 5 BNA, 5 CCH, 5 CourtLink Strategic Profile

Federal & State Cases (Document number: 1)

314 U.S. 84, \*, 62 S. Ct. 37, \*\*  
86 L. Ed. 58, \*\*\*, 1941 U.S. LEXIS 1250

SHEPARD'S Cuno Engineering Corp. v. Automatic Devices Corp.

CUNO ENGINEERING CORP. v. AUTOMATIC DEVICES CORP.

No. 37

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

314 U.S. 84; 62 S. Ct. 37; 86 L. Ed. 58; 1941 U.S. LEXIS 1250; 51 U.S.P.Q. (BNA) 272

October 22, 23, 1941, Argued  
November 10, 1941, Decided

PRIOR HISTORY: CERTIORARI TO THE CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SECOND CIRCUIT.

CERTIORARI, 313 U.S. 553, limited to the question whether claims 2, 3, and 11 of the Mead patent No. 1,736,544 are valid. In a suit for infringement, the judgment of the District Court that the claims were not infringed, 34 F.Supp. 146, was reversed by the Circuit Court of Appeals, which held them valid and infringed.

DISPOSITION: 117 F.2d 361, reversed.

CASE SUMMARY

PROCEDURAL POSTURE: Certiorari was granted to review a judgment of the Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit finding that respondent had a valid patent and petitioner was infringing upon the patent.

OVERVIEW: Respondent improved upon a car cigarette lighter and obtained a patent on the new design. At some later date, respondent filed an infringement action against petitioner alleging infringement of the patent. The district court found for petitioner. The appellate court reversed that order, finding that respondent had a valid patent that was infringed upon. Petitioner sought review, and the United States Supreme Court reversed that order. The Court held that respondent took an existing invention and improved upon it with prior art. The Court stated that respondent was not permitted to patent a new application of an old device because the device was not new or useful. As a result, the Court held that the patent was not

LexisNexis and the Knowledge Burst logo are registered trademarks of Reed Elsevier Properties Inc., used under license. CourtLink is a registered trademark of LexisNexis CourtLink, Inc. Factiva is a registered trademark of Dow Jones Reuters Business Interactive LLC. © 2008 LexisNexis, a division of Reed Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved. LRS00344-0 0108