

Introduction: Welcome to the Enchanting Lawyer Podcast. The show that walks you step by step to improving strategies you can use today to grow your business. We show you how being kind, useful and, of course, enchanting will bring you more clients and build a thriving community. Now here's your host from sunny San Diego, Jacob Sapochnick.

Jacob: Hello everybody, this is Jacob Sapochnick with the Enchanting Lawyer podcast. Today we are going to be talking to a very special guest, Tim Stanley, the CEO of Justia. Him and his wife, Stacy, they are also the original founders of FindLaw.

Before we talk to Tim, I had a few discussions the past few weeks with legal innovators like Kevin O'Keefe from LexBlog and others. I consider Tim to be in that category.

We talked about building sustainable businesses, we talked about creating innovation in law with many of the attorneys that we engage here on the podcast and email us. I want to go back to the industry and understand some core elements and where is the future of law. Tim has a lot of insights on building content, websites, and, of course, free law. The free law movement and what it is.

Tim, I'm honored and privileged to have you on the show. How are you today?

Tim: Doing great. I'm glad to be here. Thank you very much for inviting me.

Jacob: Excellent.

Most of our listeners who are attorneys, they know that in the legal space right now there's just few companies who know what it takes to build solid websites. I consider Justia to be one of those companies.

Small disclaimer, I am actually a customer of Justia. I've been working with Justia I think from late 2005, and I have to tell you that a lot of my success I owed to Tim and Stacy and their support over the years. I wanted to share some of that with our listeners. Hopefully will be inspired and will take some takeaways.

Tim, welcome to the show.

Tim: Thanks.

Jacob: Tim, why don't you tell us a little bit ... I mean I gave you a little bit intro. You're the CEO of Justia and I mentioned about FindLaw. Why don't you tell me a little bit about yourself. You are an attorney, Stacy is an attorney; a bit about the journey of you transitioning from an attorney to a legal technology innovator.

Tim: Sure.

I was a Math and Computer Science major [unclear 00:02:39] graduate, then did a master's degree in Engineering at Stanford, went off to law school and then came back with actually Ph.D. program at Stanford. That was sort of at the beginning of the internet's time, so this is '92, '93 when I was back there. There was just ... Things were just sort of starting to happen on the web. So the web had just come out. [Gopher 00:03:08] probably still had more information than the web did.

And then as things started moving along myself, Stacy and Martin Roscheisen were putting up different free legal information, doing different engineering projects. We sort of started FindLaw. Initially we had taken the idea and had want to do something at Stanford – ideally with the law school. But at that time they weren't that interested in doing the free law stuff. So we just started putting it up.

Martin and I were two pretty good programmers and basically we'd get ideas and we'd program, we put things up and get another idea and we'd go to conferences. Yeah, we just ... [we had seen 00:03:54], we program it and put it live onto our website. Things just sort of took off from there.

By no means we're really thinking of this a business necessarily. Or if it was a business we're really thinking CLE was actually going to be our business at the time which did not turn out to be the core of it. But we were able to do things very quickly and very fast in terms of the programming side. Things were getting more and more scalable. That was sort of initial driving force for us.

We put up a lot of free law, we put up – we had free websites at the time, we had a free directory, we had a lot of free stuff up. Our business model at the time was really getting advertisements from West and Lexis which were competing against each other. I was very thankful that they help fund all the free law stuff we were doing at the time. It was great – at least while it lasted.

Jacob: I remember that when I was in law school late 90s, FindLaw was one of my main sources to get articles, get free case law. It was just one of those beautiful resources, and I didn't have to pay for it.

Take me back to the time ... How did you come up with ... or maybe before we go there, why don't you explain to our listeners what is actually free law, what is the free law movement, and how did you get involved with it after you started testing all these things with your colleague?

Tim: I think there's a lot of folks [unclear 00:05:28] with their free law movement. It's really sort of trying to get the primary law online for free. So that's the codes, the regulations, and the case law. When it first started out it was really being driven by Cornell. Peter Martin who was the Dean at Cornell Law School and

Tom Bruce who was the other sort of co-founder of the legal information instituted Cornell. They did a lot of work on the US code, on the rags and grabbing some of the federal appellate decisions on the New York court of appeal's decision. They were putting online.

FindLaw came a little [unclear 00:06:07] conference up in Burlingame up here, in the Bay Area. There was a guy named Jimmy Love who was presenting, or sort of doing a debate, with a former Congressman who was sort of representing West. It was very much on the copyright ability of law. It should have been copyrightable or not in terms of the citations and things. There was just sort of a debate. I think that Martin and myself, and certainly Stacy, we sort of came on the free side of it. It should be open and free. I mean [unclear 00:06:44] it should be there for everybody.

And that was probably the first thing that sort of got us going on the free law side in terms of our own projects was the Jimmy Love discussion that he had.

I'd say the other person who's probably did a lot for the free law movement, much more, and he probably should get a lot more credit than he often gets, is Alan Sugarman who litigated with West and actually won a court case that was upheld in the 2nd Circuit and wasn't taken up by the Supreme Court. But were basically the internal page numbers were not copyrightable nor the small sort of corrections. Those were not copyrightable either by West. And West and him had been in litigation about that.

So really, Alan sort of opened it up for everybody on the legal standpoint and then since then there's just been a bunch of folks sort of aggregating the case law and sort of setting it out ... In case law and codes and everything else and sort of setting it out to folks like download it in batch.

What we do right now is that we're aggregating all the cases every day. We're also grabbing codes and regulations. And then we put this information up on publicresource.org, which is run by Carl Malamud, and then also gets distributed out to the internet archive and a few other places so that people can download it for free.

The other place that folks are interested is there's a free law website run by Brian Carver and Mike Lissner over at Berkley and they put up a lot of batches and API's for people to get some of the archive decisions and newer decisions as well. So, those are great places for people to get it.

In its very core ... we pay taxes on everything and you have the laws that come out and the laws really should be available for everyone to see in no cost. That's still the driving factor. I still think we still have a long ways to go but that's really it. It should be available to everyone for free. You should not have to pay West

or Lexis or whoever else. [unclear 00:08:55] or whoever else is charging money for access. We should get on there online for free and then sort of shared out.

Jacob: Absolutely.

Tim: It's been fun.

Jacob: Tim, give us examples maybe some of the major victories or wins for free case law in the past few years just so people can understand some of the power here that we have.

Tim: Well, I think that the biggest thing that's happened ... The Alan Sugarman, that's probably the biggest litigation win. That was back in 90s. But the biggest thing as we spend some databases that have come available which have really been quite good in terms of the archive. One database was provided by Fastcase to publicresource.org which had the federal appellate decisions back to [unclear 00:09:49]. Back to like the 1920s. So all those decisions around mine as well as all the Supreme Court cases which is very nice.

There's also a couple other databases that Brian Carver, Michael Lissner have. I think one came from LawBox, I'm not sure where the other one came from. But those have also been ... sort of large databases of decisions that had been quite well-received. Those include state case. I think the state case goes back to like 1950 or something like that. So that's also the good from the free law side.

In terms of the usability of it, probably the best free law site ... for case law that's out there is Google Scholar. Google Scholar is really good. They've built a lot of functionality into it. Normally, if someone ask me where they should look for doing research on free case law, that's where I would say. "Try out Google Scholar."

Justia has an archive of all the cases and everything else. So we have it online which is pretty good from a sort of fetching standpoint. We also write case summaries of all the daily case summaries of all the federal appellate decisions and all the top state level law courts. The California Supreme Court, New York Court of Appeals, the Civil and Criminal Courts and taxes. And then for California we actually write the same day case opinions of all the California Appellate court and send those out. And then we incorporate those into our case law as well as send them out to places like Fastcase so they can use them as well.

So, that part's been pretty good. And then there's a bunch of startups that have started creating new databases and communities around case law including [unclear 00:11:32] in case techs and Judicata has been doing some stuff on employment law. And there's been a few others like that. Think Computer has a

site called plainsite.org. He's also been doing some stuff there with the free law movement.

You're seeing a lot more stuff being built out of these documents once they became available. It just sort of shows that you could do a lot of stuff if you don't have to spend all your time trying to just get the raw materials. Once this start to comes in bulk people can really start using it and playing with it and we can sort of see what works best for end users in terms of doing legal research.

Jacob: Companies like freelawproject.org that were trying to do same kind of ...

Tim: Yeah, those are the guys at Berkeley. [unclear 00:12:16]. They have large archives you can download in bulk, as well as API's get new cases and things like that. We've done work with them as well as help them with financial support and things like that.

Jacob: I'm curious, Tim. How does it work in practice? For example for official court opinions. Where do those come from?

Tim: Right now it depends. Some courts will put them up on their websites. So they'd move it to like a public domain citation system and you can actually get the final opinion on the website. That'd be true for Illinois and some other states like that.

Other states, the official publisher will be West and Lexis. The only way you're really going to be able to get that would be if you were to either triple key in it from a book. Well, you can't really get it from electronically because that there's licensing terms that you can't actually use their stuff, they actually get a copy of the case. But the courts don't actually give the final decision. It really tends to being getting things that you're doubled or triple keyed in overseas. [unclear 00:13:25] either by the Philippines or China where they're actually doing the typing of the cases which is really sort of a waste.

If you dug into it a bit, if you think about appellate case, the real work on it ... really, a lot of that takes place by the lawyers, right? You have to have litigation, you have the district court case, you're suing each other – or the child court case, you're having litigation there. And then it goes up to appellate level and still have the litigants fighting and you're filing more briefs. And then the judge tries the decision, right? It goes through that. You have bench opinion, maybe a slip opinion.

And then you would think that the final publish opinion should just also be put up by the court in some sort of organize way, but that's often not the case. Instead it goes off to West, they do a spell check, they'll do spell check, maybe a little grammar checking. They'll put the parallel citations in West decisions for sure. And then they send it back to judge who makes that decisional opinion and

then it's sitting on Westlaw in the West books. But you don't have access to that from the court side so you're not going to find that ... you're not going to be able to go to the court side. What they're going to have is the latest slip opinion but they're not going to have the final opinion.

That's a real problem still that's in place and that's in place for most of the court still. Including the federal appellate courts. You can get like a nice circuit final opinion on their website. You can get just the slip opinion. That's why I think there still needs to be work through a bit but that's sort of where we're at.

Other states again have put up the final opinions. Oklahoma, Illinois, there's a lot of states that have started moving to that and they're also using public domain citations. But I think that in an ideal world more courts will do it. From the court's standpoint, if I was the judge ...

I think the judges should think of it this way. It's not just trying to solve decision between two litigants, they should also think about what's best for the overall legal system. What's best for the overall legal system is that everybody has access to these final court opinions. And so they should do something by making them freely available to everybody. It will actually increase the overall practice of law and it will make everyone better off. So far that has not happened in many, many courts.

Jacob: And it seems to me there's just no a uniform way to do stuff. It's all kind of like we do it this way and this states do it this way. There's no procedure as to how it should be done as of now.

Tim: Everybody sort of does their own thing. I mean there's some few states they are using common software for it but it's really sort of a bunch of little [unclear 00:16:17] and different courts. Even within like California, if you look at through the California court. Orange County says it's different than Los Angeles counties. They're from the San Diego counties.

There hasn't been any sort of really good standardization and part of that is the decision process of courts. They're not focused on necessarily trying to work with the other courts outside their jurisdiction. They just focus on their own sort of little area. And so there's nothing that's really been standardized to sort of make this both cheaper and better. I think it could happen but it hasn't happened so far.

Jacob: Tim, before we start talking about Justia and things that are connected with building websites and things like that, what do you think is the bottom line for free law and what would you like to see happen in the next few years?

Tim: I think it's probably a few things.

One, I like to see some sort of standardization on the sort of the publishing systems especially for codes and regulations. I mean if you really start to dig into it, for most people, codes and regulations are much more important in the case law. That's for everyday people. You have things like that. So that's one item I'd like to sort of see.

With cases, I really like to see people move towards the public domain citation system and have the courts make that official approved. Part of that is working it into standards like the blue book and then getting that accepted. Once it sort of comes in by way of the blue book, then it starts getting picked up everywhere. So that would be one thing that's helpful. So the blue book and the courts can sort of work on that.

The other thing that I think that's big on the free law side is right now you have a lot of regulations that are owned by private industry. They get incorporated by reference. So if he had some sort of like certain types of safety regulations. We'll say you're trying to do like refrigerator repair or something like that, you'll read through the code of federal regulations and it will all slide off to a private industry standard and say, "You need to do this in order to sort of follow the law." The issue is a lot of these private regulations are owned and are copyrighted by private organizations and sort of membership organizations, and they want to charge you \$1,000 to read it. You don't really get free access to it.

If you're responsible for it, sometimes it's even, you know, some real penalties involved if you don't follow those regulations, those should also be open. That's a huge separate worlds, those regulation stuff. Outside of case law, outside of codes where you have so many different industry groups having set regulations of incorporated as probably the federal regulations or even on the state side, state regulations, that people just don't have access to at all. That really impacts a lot of people on their everyday life in terms of their work.

Jacob: Somebody probably should lead the effort to coordinate all this. It cannot be just ... maybe some non-profit or ...

Tim: Publicresource.org and I'm the board of trustees in there and also right now the general counsel. We've been involved with litigation with a number of these folks, both through in the United States and overseas. We'll sort of see where that goes.

What we've tried to do is grab the stuff that we feel ... the regulations relating to health and safety, we've sort of tested the waters to see what would happen there and put some stuff up and then we get sued. At some point, that should be a larger case and we really like to sort of get a final judicial opinion on that. As to whether a regulation that's sort of been posted to law more or less can be copyrighted and have forest charges or it's outside that should be open.

Especially with a lot of these private industry groups went to Congress or went to the different agencies and got them to incorporate the regulations. It's not like most of these agencies just sort of find these regulations by chance in this private industry group. The private industry groups really try to get their ... sort of their standards, incorporate it into the regulations because in a way it helps the private industry groups.

Jacob: I think it's going to be interesting to see what develops in the space in the next few years especially as more and more visa researches are going to become available.

Tim: Yeah. Oh, yeah.

Jacob: Exciting.

Tim, why don't you take me back before you start ... You sold FindLaw. Why Justia and why the space?

Tim: Well, yeah. FindLaw got purchased by West in 2001. That was sort of after, in a way, the whole dot com world sort of ended, I guess, in 2000 might be a good way to put it. While we had done quite well, it was very few us. We're actually quite profitable. We raised quite a bit of money in a certain point in time. We hired a lot of people. A certain point in time it just wasn't going. We had okay outcome at least from a monetary standpoint by selling to West.

My relationship with West when I left wasn't that great and so I started Justia shortly after. I think I waited a day, maybe 2 days. Then I got sued for a non-compete and then I got shut down for a little while. So it took us a little while before it really started going which is really very end of 2004, beginning of 2005.

We did things slightly different with Justia is that we've got probably 100+ people working with us directly or down [unclear 00:22:21] contractors in different ways. But we've really sort of just grown it out of the revenues. And as we do more stuff, we put up more free stuff. We've done it slightly different than FindLaw where we went out. But I think that gives us a bit more control of what we're doing, which is nice.

It allows us to do things which don't necessarily make economic sense like share out all the stuff, all the work we do in bulk. That's something that a lot of people ... If you were a pure business it wouldn't quite make sense and your investors might go, "What the hell are you doing?" That part's been okay.

The main thing, I think for us, on the website side is that we got ... Our engineers are really good and a lot of this is very mathematical in nature. Granted [unclear 00:23:08] optimization to a large extent has become more content focused I'd

say than even technically focused. But I think what we've done is we've ... by sort of having the building, the different types of tools, we can quickly look through sites, see what's good, what's not good. We're able to make things go well. So if people do write content they'll do extremely well if they can get good content up.

We have a separate platform now which is sort of tied into rDirectory where people can also participate and get additional exposure through participation. Whether it's just getting a full profile which is totally free. You get a full profile at no cost on our site. We got the key way stuff. We have annotation parts worked in. You can also tie into things like Cornell's Wex. You want to write on the Wikipedia page of the Legal Information Institute or Cornell, we can tie into that as well.

There's a lot of different sort of participation that we're using with the platform we developed which I think has been pretty helpful to the people who have chosen to participate. I mean the [unclear 00:24:18] are actually quite great. That's been an additional thing that that's nice.

In every single step, if you look at it, whether it's the lawyer's website or their blog, or even some of the social media accountants and things they set up. The real sort of key thing is that those that participate and provide good content and provide things of value, they get rewarded. They will do better. They'll do better in rDirectory, they should do better in Google, they should get more clients and they should be rewarded with clients. That's really, I think, really the sort of the big change.

If you look at things 20 years ago, it is hard for people to figure out who's good and who's not good in terms of the type of attorney they are. Now that it's much more focused on participation and when I would sort of call quality participation – not just participation, not just a numbers game – that's really been sort of the driving factor in terms of who does better in terms of doing a client development. It's something.

I've looked through thousands of clients. We have a few thousand clients. Probably more than a few thousand clients right now that we have on our site, or we built sites for. It's not hard to figure out who was doing great and who's not. It's really by how focused are they and sort of providing information to the public, and what's the quality of it. It's really relatively simple.

Jacob: Tim, it's interesting that you mention that because when I ... take my personal example. When I decided to work with you, I think it was late 2005, and you were just 2 years into the launch of Justia, right?

Tim: It really, probably at that point just within a year of [crosstalk] website business because we were shut down for a year.

Jacob: Oh, yeah. That's true. I think a lot of attorneys who listen to the show can relate. I was looking for ... I changed I would say seven website providers within a span of 18 months. In my mind, it was always about ... you pay us and we'll build something and then we'll see what happens.

When I spoke to Stacy I think there was kind of the ... just like what you said. The premise is that here's what we do, we provide the platform, and then it's all about building content that will serve your clients. And from there, things will happen. I think that was the first time that I realized that if I do that then it's not ... SEO doesn't matter anymore. What is the information you give out and what's going to happen when people read that, how are they going to be reward you. In our case, of course, it was a beautiful progress over the years getting our side visible and getting the clients to like our content.

How do you think websites have changed over the years since you started and now?

Tim: Well, I think the core thing is still providing good content. The biggest stuff with websites, probably in the last decade or so, is everything moved to CSS, and now it's responsive design, and it's mobile devices. I think that most law firm websites right now probably have at least 30 to 40 percent other traffic coming from either phones or tablets. With probably about 30% from the phones and maybe there are 10% from tablets. Depending on sort of the practice area, some are more, some are less. That's been a big change.

Certainly if you look at something like the phone interface, that's a lot smaller than the core desktop website. If you look at the way ... We sort of approach it or certainly the way we set up for folks, if you have to figure out what leads to conversions, what gets clients to contact you. That's a very different sort of design on the phone versus a desktop. You have to work it all in together as website changes and size. They attribute. The browser size changes that you're presenting the correct thing for the client – or to the lawyer's potential client. But it's really sort of the conversion site. I think that's been the biggest thing.

As far as changes beyond that, I think particular, Google is still the primary place that people get their traffic from. Nothing's close to it. Bing, even when it started serving Yahoo, never really has taken off with that much traffic. Because Google does such a good job also of indexing all the internal pages and gain them to rank.

Google's algorithm has really gone much, much better in terms of the quality of content and really ... You need to have original content, you need to have it ... It

has to be certainly more words than in the past I guess is one way to look at it. It should be very legally focused. It can't just be sort of this mad libs or gibberish that some folks have written or some people still write but it doesn't rank anymore. That's been a big change. So really pushing on the content has been one of our big focuses.

Separately from that, social media has had some impact on traffic although that's not quite what you would expect it to be. I think there's certainly some areas, say, doing social security disability or something like that where like Facebook works out really well. But for the majority of folks, social media hasn't been sort of a huge traffic driver. It's been more how do you pick out select vertical markets.

So a LinkedIn might work very well for business lawyers. There's ways that sort of do things on the consumer side on Facebook. Twitter's a great way to reach out to the media or to different sort of ... either news folks or different sort of other social media people. If you want to you can use Twitter for that. Google+, that sort of changes as to what is ... It seems like every week. But, you know, it is what it is.

So it really ties in to the Google local which people care about a lot because the maps is a big thing for people. Especially law firms really focused on sort of getting a local business. Family law, state planning. Anyone who wants to hit their local market. So that's really why I think Google+ still is sort of aimed at although it's sort of slightly different than the Google Places or whatever the name is for the product of this ...

Jacob: What it used to be.

Tim: Yeah.

Jacob: Tim, if a new attorney or somebody wants to take their website to the next level, what would you tell them based on the analytics and the research and everything that you guys gather in Justia every day. What will be like maybe three or five tips that you will suggest somebody to take their site to the next level?

Tim: The first thing I would say is ... So someone's really starting out brand new and they don't know exactly what to do. And you have time because you don't have clients yet. The most important thing is the content that you write. If you really sort of dig into it, you really have to write very good About Us page, very good attorney profiles, and very good practice area pages. You really want to breakdown your practice area pages to every single type of case you want.

If you're an injury lawyer, you might write about ... might have personal injury page which you need one like car accidents, you might need one on texting while driving, you might need one on teen driving accidents. You need to sort of break it down a bit. Immigration. You might write one on each of the types of visas if you want to get clients. If you want to do K1, K3 visas, or you're doing H1B's.

What are the different sort of verticals within your vertical that you're sort of focused on and then you need to write good, original content. Don't just copy some government documents. Don't make it ... just really superficial stuff that doesn't add a lot. To certain extent, I'd really try to add a little bit of legal ease into it. Make it something that's going to be different than everyone else's because if it's the same, you're not going to do that great. So that's the biggest thing is the content.

Beyond that, you like to have a responsive website so you like it so it works on across different platforms, and then you like to get your website out there. You need to have it submitted out to a number of the different directories with a certain of the backend providers. For Yellow Pages, you certainly want to get it into rDirectory, you want to get into Avvo. If you could get free listings on some of the other commercial directory, it's also the once to look for.

You don't want to do page directories but there's a number of directories and other ... what I call sort of social platforms for law right now. Where you can at least get a profile and something set up or you can setup on some of the generic – I don't want to say generic. That's probably not the right word – but some of the normal places to get social profiles. Certainly like LinkedIn and places like that but also like about.me. There's a bunch of ones like that that you could also set up profiles on that can help you. So that can sort of go.

I would recommend participating online in different ways. Whether that's answering questions like on Avvo or on our site, maybe doing some annotations. Things that get you seen and sort of mention so you can sort of drive your online presence in some different ways. And participation is a big win on that side.

As far as which we'd have to do really to pay for stuff. We offer free websites at justia.net because people want free ones. You can get a free blog at Blogger. You get free profiles on our site, in Avvo at least. That's not a bad place to start. And then if things go, you want more flexibility, also more branding and things, and you could always upgrade and hire somebody. But that's sort of one step at a time.

As much as everybody knows about it, including us and everyone else, the biggest thing here is getting good content. If you don't have good content, and you don't write original content, it doesn't matter who you're working with. It's not going to work. If you have good content or you hire us to write content or

other lawyers to write content, you could do quite well and the web can really, really work you.

Jacob: Absolutely. I think this is key: good content, consistent content, and providing value is what Google is looking for right now. There's no more game in the system, keywords and all that kind of back links. It's all about content right now, right?

Tim: Yeah. In terms of what you need, in terms of links and everything else, it's not really what it was. Yeah, it's not the sort of big ... with this links games like it was even 5 years ago.

Jacob: Right.

Tim: Google focus on content and being associated with websites. Like rDirectory or some of the others like Avvo. It's really of high importance. Because once Google realizes you're really a lawyer and you're sort of associated in this way, they will start ranking you. It's not better than having a bunch of old links on these crappy directories where there's 5,000 links for some of these places that you submit out for 50 bucks or something. Will submit you in 5,000 places.

Jacob: Like a travel agency or ...

Tim: Yeah. Those won't help you anymore. Those days are done. But you'd still want to be associated with sort of the larger legal portals that are out there because those can be quite helpful to you. All the major ones should have some sort of free profile that you can at least get a free profile on.

Jacob: Right. Excellent.

Thank you so much, Tim. This is great information. We can talk for hours about all these things and more but I think that was great snippet. I encourage people to check Justia, justia.com. Any other legal portals you would like to share with us that the audience can find you and what Justia is doing right now?

Tim: Well, Justia's our core one, we've also done work with Cornell. Beforehand, I used to be on the board at Nolo. They're now part of internet brands which also, I guess, is also running warriors.com now. They got that from Lexis. Those are other ones to check out.

Jacob: If you email them to me, Tim, I will make sure to link them in our show notes. The Justia website or any other links that you want to share with our listeners, we'll put them in the show notes.

Tim: Yeah, that'd be great. I'll send them on over to you.

Jacob: Perfect. Thank you so much, Tim, and have a beautiful day. My regards to Stacy as well.

Tim: Okay. Alright. [unclear 00:37:09].

Jacob: Thank you to our listeners for tuning in every week. If you have any questions, you can email me at jacob@enchantedlawyer.com. We'll see you at our next episode.

Closing: Thanks for listening. You can find even more resources, including the show notes for this episode, at enchantedlawyer.com. That's www.enchantedlawyer.com.