



JustCite
Community
Guide

Revision	1
Author	Benjamin Newton

How do you find current legal information?

When a lawyer needs assistance interpreting areas of law, to whom can they turn? Weighty texts may well cover the detailed intricacies, but they are published annually, and cannot be expected to cover recent events.

Often the answer would be a journal: legal commentary arranged by subject area and written by those who know the law they discuss. Yet journals have their limitations: subscriptions cost money and since they are published monthly you still need to wait for information.

Some lawyers have found legal blogs (or **blawgs** as they have come to be known) to be useful. Since they are published over the internet, they can be much more up to date than a traditional journal, and often their authors have practical legal expertise. However discovering which of these sites are relevant to your practice may take time, and it is rare that there is an effective index of the information. In some cases, the anonymity of the author can also raise questions over the credence that can be given to the discussion you read.

What you need is a service that combines the free, instant accessibility of a blog with the credibility and the certainty of a traditional legal journal. This is where the JustCite Community comes in.

JustCite Community – Information from the people that matter.

The **JustCite Community** is the exciting new project launched here at Justis, as a new area of our JustCite citator service. It allows users of JustCite to contribute directly to the content on our service. They will be able to add commentary, suggest keywords and generate ideas relating to any of the more 2 million documents we have indexed.

Every contribution will be link to the author's profile, so you will be able to identify and track those who are clearly experts in their field – just like a standard journal. Every profile and every **commentary** will be freely accessible to the internet at large. This has many advantages, including:

1. Speed - Anything you submit instantly uploads to JustCite, meaning commentary can be as up to date as any current events reporting.
2. Accessibility – No need to wait for clients or solicitors to read your insightful article in hardcopy, you can simply send them the link.
3. Cross-linking – Already have a blog? You can provide direct links in your page.
4. Simplicity – Using **JustCite** is incredibly easy. No need to pay server fees to host your articles, simply use our platform to give the world the benefit of your expertise.

How to use JustCite Community

Using our service to add information is incredibly simple:

1. Find the case you want on **JustCite**.
2. Click any **JustCite Community** button
3. Enter your Username and password, and accept the Terms and Conditions.
4. Select your topic areas and then start typing.
5. When you are done, click ok to post instantly.



Summary
Commentaries

If this is your first time, you will need to create a JustCite profile. This takes no more than a few seconds:

Select your occupation.

If you have a LinkedIn Profile, you can add further information from there.

Once you click confirm, you are ready to start contributing.

*Only JustCite Users with **Personal Usernames** can contribute to JustCite at this time. If your organisation uses IP recognition, you will need to contact your Administrator or the [Justis Helpdesk](#).*

What can I do?

There are several different areas of the Community for you to choose from when you create your content. This is to guide the expectations of readers and ensure the correct information is in the right place.

Summary

Summaries are designed to contain **factual** information regarding a case, and act a bit like a headnote. As such, you can fill in various fields regarding a case and thereby improve the information about it. The available fields are:

Subject Terms

Legal keywords can be selected to highlight the crucial information about a case.

The first set of keywords is selected from a pre-determined list. This ensures continuity between different users, whilst ensuring that all categories of law are covered.

The second set is also selected from a list, but the available choices depend upon your primary selection.

*Top Tip: Always try to select the **most relevant** keywords from the drop down list.*

The final text box allows you to type in keywords of your own. Whilst you can type as many as you wish, do remember that the Subject terms should be words and phrases rather than sentences.

Top Tip: Rather than duplicating terms that appear in the JustCite Keywords, it might be more useful to add synonyms or useful phrases that might help you find the case again.

There can only ever be one set of Subject Terms for any case.

Issues

This section is for describing the legal issues and dilemmas which the court faced.

Issues

1. Whether Judge had misled the jury regarding dishonesty.
2. Is dishonesty objective or subjective?

#Lord Lane C.J.#
#Lloyd and Eastham JJ#

[Save](#)

Any legal dilemma or quandary which is faced can be added. Whilst there can only be a single entry for any case, you may edit and contribute to the writings of others.

This section uses the **Summary Text Editor**, see the instructions below on how to use this input method.

Once you have added you Issues, click Save to add them to the Case Summary.

Issues [Edit](#)

1. Whether Judge had misled the jury regarding dishonesty.
2. Is dishonesty objective or subjective?

Lord Lane C.J.
Lloyd and Eastham JJ

Last edited by JustCite User on 22/05/2012 15:00:59 | [View revision history](#)

Held

This is a space for a short outline of the outcome of the case. Suitable information for this page includes the verdict of the court, any significant legal points and other points of law that come from the outcome.

Top Tip: Obiter dicta should be marked clearly to avoid confusion.

Held

Verdict

The Appeal was dismissed.

Legal Points

1. Dishonesty describes the state of mind (Mens Rea) rather than the action.
2. Standard of Dishonesty is subjective.
3. Standard of Honesty is reasonable man test.

For tips on how to use the different styles, check the **Summary Text Editor Guide**.

Facts

This is the section to place factual material information that does not fit into the previous sections. It is primarily meant for the facts of the case, but it could also include sections of legislation that were worth considering, highlighting which of the legal arguments were effective and whether or not there was a dissenting judgment.

Facts  Edit

Case
A surgeon claimed fees that another surgeon had performed. He was convicted of obtaining property by deception.

Appeal
His appeal rested on the failure to properly direct the jury under [section 15 \(4\) of the Theft Act 1968](#) and therefore misunderstood the concept of dishonesty.

Last edited by JustCite User on 22/05/2012 15:26:35 | [View revision history](#)

Summary Style Guidelines

The summary is intended to provide legal information quickly to fellow JustCite users, covering the various sections and directed to be most useful. To aid you in your contributions, here are some useful ideas.

- Summaries should be short, with enough information to help the user decide if they need to read the full text.
- Lists are easier to read than paragraphs. Use the **Summary Text Editor Guide** to help you split your contributions into lists and subsections.
- Synonyms and alternative phrases are more useful than using the keywords already provided by JustCite editorial staff.
- Keep it simple, if the information is unnecessary then don't add it to the summary. JustCite Summaries should streamline research rather than increasing the load.
- If you can, provide cross references to JustCite documents, the **Summary Text Editor Guide** will show you how.
- If you see a summary which is incorrect or incomplete – edit it. By improving the information, you help all JustCite users.

Commentaries

Deliberately separated from the Summary, commentary is intended to act like a live online journal. Using a standard text editor, you can provide commentary on any case you like: just like a legal blog or magazine. However any commentary will not only be instantly visible to the world, it will also be linked to your JustCite profile.

Title

B *I* U ABC x_2 x^2 | **A** ▾ | | |

Oh my Ghosh! Written by you 22 May 2012 [Edit](#)

★★★★★ 0 reviews

Is dishonesty subjective or objective? That really was the question that underpinned this case.

[Section 15 of the Theft Act 1968 c.60](#) may have been repealed by the [Fraud Act 2006 c.35](#) but this case is still a useful benchmark on how to treat the thorny concept of the dishonest mind. The considered authority tended to vary considerably, in particular [R v Mclvor \[1982\] 1 WLR 409](#).

The first test considered was whether a criminal considered themselves to be dishonest, otherwise known as the true subjective test. This has been widely misunderstood as thinking that *belief* in honesty would be sufficient. As the Court is at pains to point out, in actual fact it is a question of *knowledge*; therefore if a criminal *knows* what they are doing is dishonest, then they *are dishonest*.

The weakness of this test is that the jury must infer the knowledge of the defendant, imposing directly his or her own standards or positions. It also flies in the face of the principle that **ignorance of the law is no excuse**.

The second test to consider is the strict objective test: that if a reasonable man would see an action as dishonest then it is. Whilst that is an ingenious simplification, it fails to address that Dishonesty is a mental state of mind, and not an action. When it comes to inferring states of mind, it fails to do justice but instead seems arbitrary.

The resolution provided by the Court was simple yet elegant in that by combining the two tests, the jury could be confident in expressing their verdict. The first requirement is to test by objective standards - would a reasonable man feel this is dishonest. If that is deemed true, the second test is to apply a subjective test to the individual defendant.

By combining the two requirements, it ensures that the Defendant must have a specific reason for **not** knowing or believing dishonesty, because by the objective standards the jury must have determined that it is in general a dishonest action, unless the Defendant can cast doubt on the matter.

Once you have written your commentary, you can save it to the case. Other users are able to rate your commentary on how useful it has been, as well as provide comments. You may only write a single commentary on any one case, but you may edit it as many times as you like.

In order to make your commentary easy to use, you may wish to consider using traditional [OSCOLA](#) style citing and cross referencing. Another way of assisting readers is to use crosslinking.

Crosslinking

The text editor for Commentaries allows you to emphasise words, use paragraphing and provide hyperlinks. One way to make sure your commentaries are useful to fellow users is to cross reference your commentary with other JustCite pages.

Any JustCite page can be linked to. Simply find the document you are looking for on JustCite and copy its address (URL).



Then, select the text you want to link and click the hyperlink button.



CPD Points for Legal Writing

As part of the Bar Standards Board CPD programme, a barrister can collect up to 4 hours of unaccredited time for 'legal writing'. Since any contributions you make will be of assisting all future users of JustCite, this is a perfect way for you to gain some of those much needed points whilst also furthering your own legal interests.

To claim CPD for contributing to JustCite, simply fill in your CPD record card and list JustCite as the organisation and the number of hours you have spent writing online.

Summary Text Editor

The **Summary** text editor is simplified, designed to make writing text online incredibly easy. It is designed for people who have little or no experience in writing on the web, and therefore all you need to do is type to publish. It is different to the **Commentary** editor, which is similar to a standard word processor.

To make your contributions into the Summary look their best, there are some simple functions you can use to highlight specific areas of the document.

Basic Features

What you type	What you see	What it does
word	<i>word</i>	Italicise words
word	word	Emboldens the word
1. 1.	1. 2.	Sequential lists

Advanced Features

Legal Points

An underlined heading like this is created by typing:
##Legal Points##

Case

A surgeon claimed fees that another surgeon

Appeal

A line break between paragraphs can be created by typing: ***

the jury under [section 15 \(4\) of the Theft Act 1968](#) and t

Hyperlinks to other webpages can be created. To create this link, use this coding style.

[What you want to see](www.justis.com) = [What you want to see](#)

To get the cross-references to work at their best, you will want to cross-reference other JustCite documents. To do this, replace the ([www.justis.com](#)) with the URL (web address) of the JustCite page you want to link to. So to recreate the above example, type:

[Section 15(4) of the Theft Act 1968](http://www.justcite.com/Document/d7jsrUrxA0LxsKjloYmZm1iZn0WliikvNCPnhzPngDP9MBjrMi6atF)

Frequently Asked Questions

Can I link to other cases/statutes/websites in my commentary?

You can create hyperlinks within your commentary by using the link editor. Simply select the text you wish to become a link and select the Insert Link button. Then enter the internet address of the second case or outside website you wish to link to. JustCite pages are **static** which means if you link to a specific case, that link will always link to that document.

If you link to outside content, please remember the **Terms and Conditions** of using this part of the JustCite service.

Do I have to write the commentary in the text editor?

You may prefer to write the text in a word processor: to take advantage of the spell checking and saving facilities. Once you have written your text in any form, simply copy and paste it into the JustCite text editor to upload it.

Bear in mind, some word processors add meta-data to text, so double check the finished result before you submit it.

I made a mistake!

Don't worry; you can always edit your commentaries. Simply find the commentary and you will see the **Edit Commentary** button, which allows you to amend your contribution.

Is there anything I cannot post?

There are limits to what can be posted on JustCite as a commentary:

- The **Terms and Conditions** of JustCite prohibit you from posting illegal, abusive or inflammatory.
- The **Bar Standards Board Code of Conduct** has specific rules on barristers commenting upon cases in which they have been involved with. We would like to specifically remind all barristers of their ethical obligations under the code.
- JustCite is a serious legal resource, and these commentaries are intended to act as a supplement rather than a distraction. Therefore, we ask that all contributions be relevant to the case they are assigned to.

Who can see my commentary?

Anyone with an internet connection can see your contributions to the site, because your profile page and comments are freely accessible.

Will you edit my posts?

Justis Publishing takes no responsibility for the editing or monitoring of user contributions – so we ask you to be sensible with your posting. We do however have the right to remove or edit contributions under the terms of the **licence agreement**.

Users retain the power to edit their commentary, so it is possible for you to rectify errors at a later date. Also, the Summary can be edited by any eligible JustCite user.

Why can't I sign up for a profile?

Only users who have an individual JustCite user id can contribute, which means those who have their email address registered. If you want to add commentary but your organisation has IP recognition, contact your administrator or the Justis Help Desk team.

Email: justishelpdesk@justis.com

Telephone: 0207 284 8100