

William & Mary Law School

William & Mary Law School Scholarship Repository

Incorporating ChatGPT in the Legal Research &
Writing Classroom

Full Conference Schedule

Aug 3rd, 1:00 PM

What Did I Miss? A Demonstration of the Differences Between ChatGPT-4 and 3.5 that Impact Legal Research and Writing

Laura Killinger

William & Mary Law School

Leslie A. Street

William & Mary Law School

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarship.law.wm.edu/incorporating_chatgpt



Part of the [Science and Technology Law Commons](#)

Killinger, Laura and Street, Leslie A., "What Did I Miss? A Demonstration of the Differences Between ChatGPT-4 and 3.5 that Impact Legal Research and Writing" (2023). *Incorporating ChatGPT in the Legal Research & Writing Classroom*. 6.

https://scholarship.law.wm.edu/incorporating_chatgpt/schedule/fullschedule/6

Copyright c 2023 by the authors. This article is brought to you by the William & Mary Law School Scholarship Repository.

https://scholarship.law.wm.edu/incorporating_chatgpt

What Did I Miss? ChatGPT-4 vs. 3.5

LAURA KILLINGER & LESLIE STREET

WILLIAM & MARY LAW SCHOOL

Overview

Overview: What is ChatGPT-4 vs. 3.5?

Summary of Differences

ChatGPT-4 vs. 3.5 for Legal Writing

ChatGPT-4 vs. 3.5 for Legal Research

Overview: What is ChatGPT-4 vs. 3.5?

What is ChatGPT-4?

ChatGPT 3.5 is the FREE version offered by OpenAI. It is the version many people tried in the spring, and it is the free version available if you go to openai.com right now.

ChatGPT-4 is newest publicly available version of ChatGPT. It costs money to use, currently a \$20/month subscription plan.

If your school looked at what ChatGPT could do earlier in the year, it likely did so with version 3.5.

ChatGPT-4 is significantly more sophisticated in its problem-solving abilities.

Summary of Differences

ChatGPT-4: General



Can generate longer, more detailed responses: 25,000 words compared to 4,000 words



Can analyze pictures and drawings



Considered “safer.” It is more difficult to get it to break its own guidelines and safety parameters



Version 4 has a longer “memory,” with the ability to remember 50 pages of text (versus about 4 pages for version 3.5)

Biggest Change for Lawyers: Improved Problem-Solving Capability





I'm in my house. On top of my chair in the living room is a coffee cup. Inside the coffee cup is a thimble. Inside the thimble is a single diamond. I move the chair to my bedroom. Then I put the coffee cup on the bed. Then I turn the cup upside down. Then I return it to rightside-up, and place the coffee cup on the kitchen counter. Where is my diamond?

Problem Solving Example: Prompt

ChatGPT 3.5



Based on the actions you described, the diamond should still be inside the thimble, which is inside the coffee cup on the kitchen counter. Moving the chair to the bedroom and turning the cup upside down would not have affected the diamond's location inside the thimble. Therefore, the diamond should still be inside the coffee cup, which is now on the kitchen counter.

ChatGPT-4



When you turned the coffee cup upside down on your bed, the diamond inside the thimble would have likely fallen out onto the bed. The diamond is now on your bed.



CPA Exam

Notoriously difficult exam

ChatGPT 3.5: Score 53% (Fail)

ChatGPT-4: Scored 85% (Pass)



Uniform Bar Exam

8 Essays, 200 Multiple Choice Questions

ChatGPT 3.5: Outscored 10% of actual test takers

ChatGPT-4: Outscored 90% of actual test takers



ChatGPT-4 vs. 3.5 for Legal Writing

Legal Writing: Summary

Tone:

ChatGPT-4 is more adept at changing the “tone” of written output

It is easier to direct Version 4 to write like a pirate, a lawyer, a law professor...or a law student

Input:

Can feed CHatGPT-4 much longer fact patterns

Analysis:

ChatGPT-4 shows significantly more sophisticated fact-based analysis



Legal Writing Examples



First Question: Is a parking garage a “public place” for purposes of Texas DWI law?

Texas DWI Law Regarding Public Place— Successive Prompts:


1) For purposes of Texas DWI law, is a parking garage considered a public place?



2) Please share some case law authority regarding what is considered a public place in Texas DWI law



3) Under this law, would a parking garage be considered a public place?



4) What about a parking garage that does not have a gate?

“What about a parking garage that does not have a gate?”

Version 3.5
Response

If a parking garage does not have a gate and is open to the public or accessible to the general public, it is more likely to be considered a public place under Texas DWI law. In such cases, law enforcement may have the authority to enforce DWI laws within that parking garage.

The absence of a gate can suggest that the parking garage is not intended to be restricted to specific individuals or tenants and is open for public use. However, whether a location is considered a public place is still subject to interpretation and may depend on other factors as well, such as any posted regulations or access restrictions.

“What about a parking garage that does not have a gate?”


Version 4 Response

The presence or absence of a gate can be a factor in determining whether a parking garage is considered a "public place" under Texas DWI law, but it isn't the sole determinant.

A parking garage without a gate might suggest that it's more accessible to the general public, and thus could be seen as a public place. However, the totality of circumstances surrounding the garage would be considered:

- 1. Signage:** Even without a gate, if there's clear signage indicating the garage is private or for specific use only (e.g., residents of an apartment complex or employees of a business), that could impact its designation.
- 2. Location:** If the garage is situated in a commercial area or attached to public spaces like malls, theaters, or restaurants, it's more likely to be seen as a public place. Conversely, a garage located deep within a private residential community might be seen differently, even if ungated.
- 3. Usage:** The actual use of the garage is crucial. If the garage, even without a gate, is predominantly used by the general public or a substantial group of the public, then it's more likely to be considered a public place.
- 4. Overall Accessibility:** Beyond the gate, if the garage is easily accessible with no barriers or deterrents to entry, it lends itself more readily to being viewed as a public place.

While the absence of a gate might suggest a higher likelihood of the garage being considered a public place, it's just one of several factors courts might consider when interpreting the law.



Second Question: Does the Court have Subject Matter Jurisdiction?

Subject Matter Jurisdiction



Prompt 1:

Pretend you are a lawyer handling a civil matter in federal court. You are asked to write a memo regarding whether subject matter jurisdiction is appropriate in a lawsuit where the Plaintiff is a graduate student and lives in Virginia, while the Defendant is a Florida corporation. You must base your analysis on existing federal case law and case facts taken from the interrogatory below:

(Followed by a six-page interrogatory of the Plaintiff)

SMJ: Version 3.5 Response

II. Subject Matter Jurisdiction

Subject matter jurisdiction refers to the authority of a court to hear and decide a particular type of legal case. In federal court, subject matter jurisdiction must be based on either federal question jurisdiction or diversity jurisdiction.

A. Federal Question Jurisdiction

Federal question jurisdiction exists when a case involves a question or issue arising under the laws of the United States. In this case, the plaintiff's claims do not arise under federal law. The lawsuit seems to revolve around personal injury, emotional distress, and other related state law claims, as there is no mention of any federal law claim being raised in the provided facts. Therefore, federal question jurisdiction is not appropriate in this matter.

SMJ: Version 3.5 Response, Continued

B. Diversity Jurisdiction

Diversity jurisdiction exists when there is complete diversity of citizenship between the parties and the amount in controversy exceeds \$75,000. Complete diversity means that no plaintiff is a citizen of the same state as any defendant. In this case, we have a plaintiff who is a Virginia resident and a defendant that is a Florida corporation. Therefore, diversity of citizenship is satisfied.

Next, we need to examine the amount in controversy. The plaintiff is seeking damages related to personal injury, emotional distress, and other claims. While the exact amount of damages is not explicitly stated in the provided facts, it appears that the plaintiff's claims are likely to exceed \$75,000, considering the severe injuries suffered in the accident and the emotional impact of the loss of the plaintiff's parents.

III. Conclusion

Based on the provided case facts and analysis of subject matter jurisdiction, it is reasonable to conclude that subject matter jurisdiction is appropriate in this lawsuit under diversity jurisdiction. The lawsuit involves complete diversity of citizenship between the parties, and it is likely that the amount in controversy exceeds the jurisdictional threshold of \$75,000.

As the plaintiff is a graduate student residing in Virginia and the defendant is a Florida corporation, the case is suitable for federal court under diversity jurisdiction. Therefore, the court would have subject matter jurisdiction to hear and decide the case.

SMJ: Version 4 Response

I. ISSUE

Whether federal subject matter jurisdiction is appropriate in a lawsuit where the plaintiff is a graduate student residing in Virginia and the defendant is a Florida corporation.

II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

Federal subject matter jurisdiction is generally premised on two main avenues: 1) federal question jurisdiction (28 U.S.C. § 1331) where the plaintiff's claim arises under federal law, and 2) diversity jurisdiction (28 U.S.C. § 1332) where the parties are citizens of different states and the amount in controversy exceeds \$75,000. For diversity jurisdiction purposes, an individual's domicile determines citizenship. An individual's domicile is generally the state where they are physically present with the intent to remain indefinitely.

SMJ: Version 4 Response, Continued

1. Physical Presence: The plaintiff moved to Virginia in June 2022 and has been residing there since.

2. Intent to Remain: Several factors indicate the plaintiff's intent to remain in Virginia:

- The plaintiff is enrolled in a master's program in Virginia.
- The plaintiff has a joint lease in Virginia with an expiry in June 2024.
- The plaintiff has transferred their driver's license, vehicle registration, and voter registration to Virginia.
- The plaintiff has opened a bank account in Virginia.
- The plaintiff hopes to work in Virginia post-graduation.
- The plaintiff has expressed no desire to move back to Florida due to negative memories associated with the state.

Although the plaintiff has visited Florida multiple times and has connections there (sibling living in Florida, trust account, and joint tenancy in a condominium), these connections are not determinative of domicile. The most indicative factors of domicile – intent to remain and actual residence – point to Virginia.

The defendant is a corporation domiciled in Florida. Therefore, there is complete diversity between the plaintiff (Virginia) and the defendant (Florida).



Subject Matter Jurisdiction

Prompt 2:

Now, please analyze the same facts using the case law of *Mas v. Perry*, 492 F2d 1242 and *Scoggins v. Pollock*, 727 F2d 1025

SMJ: Version 3.5 Response

Analysis of Subject Matter Jurisdiction based on Mas v. Perry, 492 F2d 1242, and Scoggins v. Pollock, 727 F2d 1025

I. Introduction

In this analysis, we will examine whether subject matter jurisdiction is appropriate in the lawsuit where a graduate student is the plaintiff residing in Virginia, and the defendant is a Florida corporation. We will apply the relevant principles from the case law of Mas v. Perry and Scoggins v. Pollock to determine the jurisdictional issue.

II. Mas v. Perry, 492 F2d 1242

In the case of Mas v. Perry, the court considered subject matter jurisdiction in a diversity action. The court held that complete diversity of citizenship must exist between all plaintiffs and all defendants. Specifically, no plaintiff should be a citizen of the same state as any defendant.

Applying Mas v. Perry to our case, we find that the plaintiff is a Virginia resident, and the defendant is a Florida corporation. There is no indication of any other plaintiffs or defendants involved in the case. Therefore, based on Mas v. Perry, complete diversity of citizenship appears to be satisfied, which could confer diversity jurisdiction.

SMJ: Version 3.5 Response, Continued

III. Scoggins v. Pollock, 727 F2d 1025

Scoggins v. Pollock dealt with the issue of the amount in controversy for diversity jurisdiction. In this case, the court clarified that the amount in controversy is determined by the sum claimed by the plaintiff in good faith. If the plaintiff's claim is made in good faith and exceeds the jurisdictional threshold, diversity jurisdiction may be appropriate.

Applying Scoggins v. Pollock to our case, we note that the plaintiff's claims include personal injury, emotional distress, and other damages arising from the car accident and the loss of parents. While the exact amount of damages is not provided, it is reasonable to infer that the claims are substantial, given the severity of the plaintiff's injuries and the emotional impact of losing both parents. Therefore, it is likely that the plaintiff's claim exceeds the jurisdictional threshold of \$75,000.

IV. Conclusion

Based on the analysis of the case law of Mas v. Perry and Scoggins v. Pollock, it appears that subject matter jurisdiction is appropriate in the present lawsuit. Complete diversity of citizenship exists between the plaintiff and the defendant, as required by Mas v. Perry. Additionally, the plaintiff's claims, as described in the interrogatories, likely exceed the jurisdictional threshold, as per Scoggins v. Pollock.

SMJ: Version 4 Response

For federal diversity jurisdiction, the domicile of the parties determines citizenship. Domicile is established by both physical presence and an intent to remain indefinitely. The cases *Mas v. Perry* and *Scoggins v. Pollock* shed light on how courts evaluate these factors.


- 1. *Mas v. Perry*, 492 F2d 1242 (5th Cir. 1974):** This case involved a French student who moved to Louisiana for study. The court held that enrollment in a university, even for an extended period, does not necessarily establish domicile. The court looked beyond mere residence to consider other indicators of intent.
- 2. *Scoggins v. Pollock*, 727 F2d 1025 (11th Cir. 1984):** This case concerned a college student's domicile. The court used an objective test and considered a variety of factors, including where the plaintiff was registered to vote, had a driver's license, paid taxes, and the person's statements about their intent.

SMJ: Version 4 Response, Continued

B. Intent to Remain: Based on the guiding principles of the above-mentioned cases, we consider multiple factors:

- 1. Educational Enrollment:** Per *Mas v. Perry*, while enrollment in an educational institution might not conclusively establish domicile, it can be a strong indicator. The plaintiff is not just in Virginia for short-term studies but has committed to a master's program.
- 2. Voter Registration and Voting:** According to *Scoggins*, where one registers to vote is a substantial factor. The plaintiff registered to vote in Virginia in July 2022 and intends to vote there in November 2022.
- 3. Driver's License and Vehicle Registration:** The plaintiff transferred both to Virginia. As shown in *Scoggins*, this is a concrete demonstration of intent.
- 4. Employment and Future Plans:** The plaintiff worked in Florida previously but has expressed the hope to work in Virginia or another state post-graduation. This is indicative of an intent to remain outside of Florida for the foreseeable future.
- 5. Property Ownership and Financial Connections:** The plaintiff's joint tenancy in the Orlando condominium and trust in a Florida bank might link him to Florida. However, his active lease and bank account in Virginia are more indicative of his present intent and situation.
- 6. Statements of Intent:** The plaintiff has openly stated he has no desire to return to Florida due to traumatic memories. Such personal statements, as considered in *Scoggins*, are important.

ChatGPT-4 vs. 3.5 for Legal Research




Prompt from 1L Research Class:




In your diversity jurisdiction case, the plaintiff is from Florida but currently lives in Virginia where he is enrolled in graduate school at William & Mary. He filed a lawsuit in Florida federal district court over an accident that occurred in Florida, relying on diversity of citizenship for subject matter jurisdiction. The plaintiff claims he is now domiciled in Virginia, while the defendants are domiciled in Florida. The defendant maintains that the plaintiff is still domiciled in Florida and has filed a motion to dismiss for lack of subject matter jurisdiction on the grounds that there is no diversity of citizenship. **What standards and factors do courts consider when deciding where out-of-state students are domiciled?**

ChatGPT 3.5

< 2 / 2 >




Courts consider various standards and factors when determining the domicile of an out-of-state student for diversity jurisdiction purposes. Domicile is a legal concept that refers to a person's permanent and principal home, to which they have the intention of returning, even if they are temporarily residing elsewhere for certain reasons, such as attending school.




The specific standards and factors that courts may consider can vary depending on the jurisdiction and the particular circumstances of the case. However, some common standards and factors that courts often take into account include:

- Intent to Establish Domicile:** Courts will look at the individual's subjective intent to establish domicile in a particular state. This can be demonstrated through actions such as registering to vote, obtaining a driver's license, or declaring residency for tax purposes in the new state.
- Length of Residence:** The duration of time the individual has lived in the new state is a relevant factor. If the student has been living in Virginia for an extended period and has taken steps to integrate into the community, it may support the claim of domicile.
- Home Ownership or Rental:** Owning a home or leasing a residence in the new state can indicate an intention to establish domicile there.
- Family and Social Ties:** Courts may consider the presence of close family members or social ties in the new state as evidence of an intent to establish domicile.
- Employment and Financial Ties:** Evidence of the student's employment or financial connections to Virginia, such as having a job or maintaining a bank account, may be relevant.
- Educational Intent:** The purpose of the student's presence in Virginia is also significant. If the primary reason for being in Virginia is attending graduate school, it may support the claim of domicile in that state.
- Registration as an In-State Student:** If the student has qualified for in-state tuition at the university, it could be considered evidence of domicile.
- Registration for Federal Benefits:** Whether the student has registered or claimed residency in Virginia for purposes of receiving federal benefits can also be a relevant factor.



It's important to note that each case is unique, and the weight given to each factor can vary depending on the specific circumstances. Courts will examine the totality of the evidence to determine the individual's true domicile. The burden of proving domicile usually falls on the party asserting diversity jurisdiction, which in this case would be the plaintiff. The court will assess the evidence presented by both parties to make a determination on whether d

 Regenerate

ChatGPT 4.0



Domicile is the key concept when it comes to establishing diversity jurisdiction in federal court. While it can be a complex and fact-specific determination, generally speaking, domicile is the place where a person has their true, fixed, and permanent home and principal establishment, and to which they intend to return whenever they are absent.




For the purpose of determining domicile, courts often consider a variety of factors, including but not limited to:

- Physical Presence:** The individual must be physically present in the state.
- Intent to Remain:** The individual must have an intent to remain in that location indefinitely. This does not mean the person can never plan to move, but they must not have any fixed plans to leave. This is typically the most important factor.

When considering where an out-of-state student is domiciled, courts would likely weigh the following factors:

- Duration of Residency:** How long the person has lived in the state and the nature of their residence. Temporary or intermittent residency often does not establish domicile.
- Residence:** Where the person actually lives. If the person has a home in one state but is temporarily residing in another for school, courts may find the person is domiciled in the state where their home is.
- Intent:** If the person intends to return to their original state after their studies, this may show that they are still domiciled in their original state. But if the person intends to remain in the new state indefinitely, this may establish a new domicile.
- Ties to the State:** This may include factors such as whether the person has family in the state, if they have registered to vote in the state, if they have a driver's license in the state, if they are working in the state, etc.
- Financial Independence:** If the student is financially independent and supporting themselves in the new state, this could indicate an intent to establish a new domicile.
- Employment:** If the person has a job in the new state, this could indicate an intent to

 Regenerate

What are some cases that address these factors? (3.5 Results)



As an AI language model, I don't have real-time access to databases or the ability to browse the internet for up-to-date information, including the latest legal cases. However, I can provide you with some landmark cases and general principles that have discussed the factors relevant to determining domicile for diversity jurisdiction purposes. Keep in mind that this information is based on legal knowledge up to September 2021, and there may have been more recent cases that address these factors.



But then it gave
this list:

1. *Mas v. Perry* (M.D. Fla. 2004): In this case, the court considered factors such as the location of the plaintiff's bank accounts, driver's license, voter registration, and employment to determine the plaintiff's domicile.
2. *Dean v. Dean* (11th Cir. 1987): This case emphasized that the "animating purpose" or subject of the person is a crucial factor in determining domicile for diversity jurisdiction. The court also considered factors such as the plaintiff's permanent residence, business interests, and voter registration.
3. *Lew v. Moss* (S.D. Ohio 2006): The court in this case considered factors such as the location of the plaintiff's bank accounts, vehicle registration, driver's license, voting registration, and other evidence of intent to determine domicile.
4. *Houston v. Darsam* (N.D. Miss. 2012): This case focused on the plaintiff's actions and intent, taking into account where the plaintiff spent holidays, filed tax returns, and registered vehicle.
5. *Krasnow v. Dinan* (D.C. Cir. 1970): In this case, the court stated that a student's residence at a university is not necessarily indicative of a change in domicile; the court may look beyond the student's presence at the university to determine domicile.
6. *Dyer v. Fair* (4th Cir. 2005): The court examined factors such as where the plaintiff maintained a primary residence, voter registration, and where the plaintiff was employed.

It's essential to remember that each case is fact-specific, and the relevance of these factors can vary depending on the jurisdiction and the particular circumstances of the case. Courts may use these cases and the factors they consider as guidance when evaluating domicile issues for diversity jurisdiction, but the outcome will always depend on the specific facts and evidence presented in each case. If you need the most up-to-date information on relevant cases, it's best to consult legal databases or resources, or seek advice from a qualified attorney.

What are some cases that address these factors? (In Chat GPT 4.0)



There are many cases that address the determination of domicile for the purposes of diversity jurisdiction, but the specific issue of domicile for out-of-state students is less frequently addressed. Below are two cases that deal generally with determining domicile for diversity jurisdiction:

1. **Mississippi Band of Choctaw Indians v. Holyfield, 490 U.S. 30 (1989):** This Supreme Court case emphasizes the significance of domicile as more than just physical presence but a combination of physical presence and an intention to remain in that place indefinitely. This concept is applicable to the situation with the out-of-state student. The student's intention after graduating from the out-of-state institution will be critical.
2. **Lew v. Moss, 797 F.2d 747 (9th Cir. 1986):** This case specifically addressed the domicile of students. In this case, the Ninth Circuit found that a person attending school in another state does not automatically become a citizen of that state for diversity jurisdiction purposes. The court held that the student's intent to remain in the state was the critical factor.

These cases are useful in demonstrating how courts might approach the determination of domicile in your situation. However, every case is fact-specific, and the precise factors that a court will consider can vary depending on the particular circumstances. The determination of domicile for diversity jurisdiction often requires a detailed factual inquiry into the individual's current living situation, their intentions regarding where they plan to live in the future, and other connections to the respective states.

In Summary

ChatGPT 3.5

Out of six suggested cases, four did not exist. Two were grossly mischaracterized.

ChatGPT 4

Suggested two cases, both exist. However, both cases were not about students. The citations were correct, unlike in 3.5.



The decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court and the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit (which includes Florida) are binding on federal district courts in Florida. If either of those courts has ruled on the specific issue in question, those rulings would constitute mandatory authority for the federal court in Florida.

One notable Eleventh Circuit case is **McCarty v. Gilchrist, 646 F.2d 1281 (11th Cir. 1981)**, which confirms the rule that a person's domicile is established by physical presence in a place in connection with a certain state of mind concerning one's intent to remain there.

The case of **Freeman v. Northwest Acceptance Corp., 754 F.2d 553 (5th Cir. 1985)** might also be considered binding on the Eleventh Circuit as well, as Florida was part of the Fifth Circuit, and decisions from the Fifth Circuit prior to October 1, 1981, are binding precedent in the Eleventh Circuit as well.

However, I could not find any case from the U.S. Supreme Court or the Eleventh Circuit that deals specifically with the domicile of out-of-state students. Therefore, the court in Florida would likely rely on decisions from other circuits and district courts, as well as state court decisions, although these would be persuasive authority rather than mandatory authority.

Also, please note that as of my knowledge cutoff in September 2021, no binding precedent may exist that deals specifically with the domicile of out-of-state students. For the most up-to-date and comprehensive legal research, consulting a legal professional or a legal research tool that is regularly updated is always advisable.

Next question for Version 4.0:
Are there cases that would be mandatory authority for a federal court in Florida on this issue?

Next Question: Are there any other cases from federal district courts within the Eleventh Circuit that you can find on this issue?



As an AI developed by OpenAI, I don't have real-time access to legal databases or the ability to search for specific court cases beyond my training cut-off in September 2021. The specifics you're asking for would require up-to-date, dynamic search capabilities, which I currently do not possess.



However, as of my last training data, the federal district courts within the Eleventh Circuit typically follow the principles established by the Eleventh Circuit Court of Appeals and the Supreme Court when deciding issues of domicile for the purpose of diversity jurisdiction. Those principles require an analysis of physical presence and an intention to remain indefinitely.

As a rule, it's important to remember that federal district court opinions, while they may be informative and persuasive, are not binding authority except upon the parties to the case. That means a district court in the Eleventh Circuit is not bound by the decisions of other district courts in the Eleventh Circuit, though it might find those decisions persuasive.

For a comprehensive legal research, it would be advisable to use a legal research tool like Westlaw, LexisNexis, or Bloomberg Law or to consult a legal professional.

Chat 4.0 - What are some cases that involve a student who is attempting to establish domicile for diversity jurisdiction purposes?

All real cases...but all descriptions are wrong. None of these cases are about students.



Determining domicile for students can be complex, as it often involves a detailed factual inquiry into the student's current living situation, intentions about future living arrangements, and other connections to the respective states. While the principle is the same, each case can be factually unique. Here are some cases that involve students or young people who are trying to establish domicile for diversity jurisdiction:



1. **Stifel v. Hopkins, 477 F.2d 1116 (6th Cir. 1973)**: This case involved a student attending school in Ohio while claiming domicile in New York. The court noted that an out-of-state student can gain domicile in a new state but didn't decide whether it had happened in this case, instead remanding to the district court for further proceedings.
2. **Lew v. Moss, 797 F.2d 747 (9th Cir. 1986)**: The Ninth Circuit held that an out-of-state student can establish a new domicile in the state where they are attending school, but there must be clear and convincing evidence of an intent to establish a permanent residence there. The court noted that intent is typically the determinative factor.
3. **Hukic v. Aurora Loan Services, 588 F.3d 420 (7th Cir. 2009)**: In this case, the Seventh Circuit ruled that a college student who lived with his parents during breaks but otherwise lived in his college town had established a new domicile in the college town.
4. **Hollinger v. Home State Mutual Ins. Co., 654 F.3d 564 (5th Cir. 2011)**: Here, the Fifth Circuit found that a college student had established a new domicile where he attended school, noting he had signed a year-long lease, registered to vote, obtained a driver's license, and sought employment in the new state.

Again, these are not from the Eleventh Circuit, but they demonstrate how courts might approach this issue. For the most accurate and comprehensive legal research, it is advisable to consult a legal professional or use a legal research tool.



What 4.0 Does Much Better than 3.5:

Correctly articulates the law/factors that are relevant

Orients the student/lawyer to the correct terms of art, factors, etc.

Much better for giving students the structure to formulate a search

Significantly better than “googling” to start a legal search



What you don't get with either version:

Limited as a Secondary Sources

Citators

Headnotes

Language from Case Opinions

Full Case Opinions

Missing Cases

Report Card for ChatGPT

February 2022 (ChatGPT 3.5)

- Legal Research: **F**
- Legal Writing: **C+**

Now (ChatGPT 4)

- Legal Research: **C+**
- Legal Writing : **B+** (with the right fact pattern and relevant cases)