

OpenCaseLaw: An Open Dataset and Search Platform for Swiss Court Decisions

Jonas Hertner

March 2026

Abstract

We present OpenCaseLaw, an open corpus and retrieval stack for Swiss case law. In the repository snapshot generated on March 20, 2026, the dataset contains 962,724 decisions from 102 federal, cantonal, and regulatory courts or public bodies, covering all 26 cantons and the period 1875-2026. The current snapshot contains 448,461 German decisions (46.6%), 434,663 French decisions (45.1%), and 79,600 Italian decisions (8.3%); the export schema also reserves a Romansh language code. OpenCaseLaw releases a 34-field Parquet export together with tooling to build a local SQLite FTS5 index and reference database; in the March 20, 2026 graph build, that database contains 8.76 million extracted case-citation references, 6.42 million resolved in-corpus decision links, and 11.23 million decision-statute links. We describe the collection, normalization, deduplication, export, and retrieval pipeline, and release a multilingual benchmark harness with 100 tagged evaluation queries plus a release-matched offline baseline report. The code is MIT-licensed, and each record links back to the decision as published by the originating court or public body.

1. Introduction

Swiss case law is published across a fragmented landscape of federal and cantonal court websites, publication portals, and administrative repositories. The result is a difficult retrieval environment: coverage varies by court, interfaces are heterogeneous, and cross-court search is poor. Commercial systems such as Swisslex and Weblaw partially solve this problem, but they are closed, subscription-based products. Open Swiss resources exist, but they typically emphasize either a subset of courts, a narrow NLP task, or raw publication access without a reusable retrieval stack.

OpenCaseLaw is intended as infrastructure rather than a single benchmark dataset. It combines corpus acquisition, normalization, searchable exports, reference extraction, and interfaces for both programmatic and LLM-mediated access. The project makes three main contributions:

1. **A broad open Swiss case-law corpus.** The March 20, 2026 snapshot contains 962,724 decisions from 102 courts or public bodies, including all 26 cantons, federal courts, and several regulatory or quasi-judicial bodies.
2. **Reusable retrieval artifacts.** The release includes Parquet exports plus reproducible tooling and interfaces for a local SQLite FTS5 database, a citation/reference database, REST endpoints, and an MCP server.
3. **Evaluation infrastructure.** The repository includes a multilingual search benchmark harness and a 100-query tagged gold set designed for retrieval regression testing and system comparison.

The paper focuses on what is versioned and inspectable in the repository. Where the implementation distinguishes between core data models, search indexes, and export schemas, we state that explicitly instead of collapsing them into a single “dataset” abstraction.

2. Related Work

Swiss legal datasets. Swiss-Judgment-Prediction (Niklaus et al., 2021) and the Swiss Federal Supreme Court Dataset (Geering and Merane, 2024) provide Federal Supreme Court-focused resources for downstream analysis. OpenCaseLaw differs primarily in court coverage: it spans 102 sources across all cantons and multiple federal and regulatory bodies.

Swiss legal benchmarks. SCALE (Rasiah et al., 2023) is a broader Swiss legal benchmark suite spanning tasks such as citation extraction, court-view generation, and summarization. It is complementary to OpenCaseLaw: SCALE focuses on benchmark construction, whereas OpenCaseLaw focuses on nationwide corpus and retrieval infrastructure.

Broader legal corpora. MultiLegalPile (Niklaus et al., 2023a) is a large multilingual legal corpus for language-model pretraining, and LexGLUE (Chalkidis et al., 2022) is a benchmark suite for legal NLP tasks. These resources are valuable for representation learning and evaluation, but they do not provide Swiss court-wide retrieval infrastructure, court-level normalization, or citation/statute reference databases for Swiss jurisprudence.

Open case law infrastructure. The Caselaw Access Project (Harvard Law School) provides 6.7 million US court decisions. Comparable open case-law infrastructure exists in other jurisdictions, but we are not aware of a Swiss-wide open corpus and retrieval stack with nationwide court coverage, structured metadata, and citation/statute reference databases.

Legal information retrieval. BM25 and Reciprocal Rank Fusion remain robust retrieval baselines (Robertson and Zaragoza, 2009; Cormack et al., 2009). Locke et al. (2024) survey legal text retrieval approaches. OpenCaseLaw uses BM25 and RRF as part of a practical search pipeline optimized for multilingual Swiss legal text rather than as the sole research contribution.

Re-identification risk. Pilan et al. (2024) assess re-identification capabilities of LLMs in court decisions, finding that aggregation and structured metadata increase privacy risk even when party names are redacted. This is directly relevant to large-scale case law corpora like ours.

3. Dataset and Processing Pipeline

3.1 Snapshot Statistics

Table 1 reports the frozen paper-release snapshot in `artifacts/paper_release_2026-03-20/stats_snapshot.json` generated on March 20, 2026 and indexed in `artifacts/paper_release_2026-03-20/manifest.json`.

Metric	Value
Snapshot timestamp	2026-03-20T08:54:27Z
Decisions	962,724
Courts / public bodies	102
Federal sources	20
Cantonal sources	82
Federal decisions	344,141
Cantonal decisions	618,583
Earliest decision date	1875-01-01
Latest decision date	2026-03-19
German	448,461 (46.58%)
French	434,663 (45.15%)

Metric	Value
Italian	79,600 (8.27%)

Unless otherwise noted, corpus-wide counts in this paper come from that frozen snapshot file. Retrieval metrics in Section 5.3 come from the bundled benchmark artifact named there.

The largest single sources in the current snapshot are `bger` (174,270 decisions), `ge_gerichte` (167,003 decisions), `bvger` (91,613 decisions), and `vd_findinfo` (74,819 decisions).

3.2 Collection

The canonical scraper registry in `run_scraper.py` currently contains 54 scraper or ingest jobs. These jobs target official court websites, cantonal publication portals, and auxiliary public repositories. The codebase includes direct scrapers for many courts as well as ingestion paths for bulk sources such as `entscheidsuche.ch` and Fedlex-derived statute material.

Each decision is normalized into a shared `Decision` model (`models.py`). The model captures 28 core fields, including court identity, docket information, dates, language, title, legal area, regeste, full text, selected metadata, and source URLs.

3.3 Normalization and Deduplication

OpenCaseLaw uses deterministic identifiers and a more aggressive canonical key for deduplication:

- `decision_id` is typically `{court}_{normalized_docket}`.
- `canonical_key` normalizes court, docket, and date more aggressively to collapse formatting variants.
- `build_fts5.py` applies within-court deduplication first, keeping the version with the richest content, then performs explicit cross-court deduplication within hand-maintained overlap groups such as Zurich, Vaud, Basel-Stadt, Bern, and Aargau.

This is an engineering compromise rather than a perfect legal identity model. It is strong enough for operational search and export, but it should not be confused with a fully curated jurisprudential ontology of proceedings, appeals, and republications. The repository does not currently ship a formal manual error audit of false merges or missed duplicates, so this layer should be read as an operational heuristic rather than a benchmarked identity resource.

3.4 Schemas and Access Artifacts

The repository intentionally uses three related but distinct schemas:

1. **Core model.** `models.py` defines a 28-field `Decision` object used by scrapers.
2. **Search database.** `db_schema.py` defines a 24-column SQLite table optimized for local search plus a JSON blob for full record preservation.
3. **Parquet export.** `export_parquet.py` defines a 34-field Arrow schema, adding export-oriented provenance and computed fields such as `has_full_text` and `text_length`.

For a paper, this distinction matters. The project does not have a single monolithic “34-field model”; it has a layered data contract designed for scraping, retrieval, and export.

4. Reference Databases

OpenCaseLaw builds a second SQLite artifact, `reference_graph.db`, from decision text. The current implementation stores case citations and statute references in related but separate tables, rather than as one homogeneous graph.

4.1 Extraction

The reference builder (`search_stack/build_reference_graph.py`) extracts:

- BGE references such as BGE 131 III 115
- federal docket references such as 4A_372/2019
- BVGer and BStGer docket formats
- statute references such as Art. 41 OR

Case-reference resolution is then attempted against the in-corpus decision database using normalized dockets and confidence scoring based on court compatibility, canton compatibility, temporal plausibility, and ambiguity among candidate matches.

4.2 Scale

Table 2 summarizes the currently documented reference-database scale.

Metric	Value
Extracted case-citation references	8.76 million
Resolved source-reference pairs	6.42 million
Resolution rate	73.3%
Decision-statute links	11.23 million

The important distinction is that `8.76 million` refers to extracted case-citation references, whereas `11.23 million` refers to decision-statute mention links. These should not be merged into one undifferentiated edge count. The repository currently exposes these numbers as build-scale statistics; it does not yet ship a manual precision/recall study of citation extraction or resolution, so Table 2 should be read as coverage of the released artifact rather than as a validated extraction benchmark.

4.3 Uses

The reference database supports several retrieval and analysis tasks implemented in `mcp_server.py`:

- incoming and outgoing citation lookup for a decision
- leading-case discovery by topic or statute article
- appeal-chain tracing through prior-instance references
- year-by-year topic trend analysis
- statute-aware enrichment of search results

5. Retrieval Stack and Interfaces

5.1 Search Pipeline

The main search implementation lives in `mcp_server.py`. Its retrieval pipeline is staged:

1. **Query parsing and expansion.** The system builds multiple lexical query variants, applies hand-maintained legal synonym expansions, handles umlaut normalization, and can optionally call a small LLM for structured parsing and multilingual expansion.
2. **Candidate retrieval.** Several FTS5 strategies are executed and fused with Reciprocal Rank Fusion.
3. **Signal scoring.** Candidates are reweighted using lexical match features, metadata, docket cues, court priors, and citation/statute-reference signals when the graph database is available.
4. **Optional reranking.** The implementation can invoke confidence-gated LLM reranking for ambiguous cases and can also incorporate optional vector or cross-encoder signals depending on deployment settings.
5. **Result enrichment.** Returned hits are enriched with court metadata, citation counts, statute mentions, and related research signals.

This design is pragmatic rather than theoretically pure: it prioritizes recoverable legal search behavior over a single learned ranker.

5.2 Distribution Interfaces

OpenCaseLaw is available in several forms:

- **Parquet dataset** for bulk analysis and offline ML workflows
- **local SQLite FTS5 index** for offline search
- **REST API** for conventional HTTP clients
- **MCP server** for tool use from Claude, ChatGPT, Gemini, and similar systems

The tool surface is deployment-dependent. The repository defines up to 21 MCP tools. Remote mode omits local update-management tools, and legislation-search tools depend on optional LexFind-backed deployment configuration.

5.3 Evaluation Assets

The repository includes:

- `benchmarks/run_search_benchmark.py`
- `artifacts/paper_release_2026-03-20/benchmark_golden.json`
- `artifacts/paper_release_2026-03-20/manifest.json`

The current gold set contains 100 tagged queries. Language tags mark 74 German-tagged queries, 16 French-tagged queries, 7 Italian-tagged queries, and 3 queries without a language tag. By query type, the set includes 46 natural-language queries, 11 statute-oriented queries, 8 concept-match queries, and 2 explicitly cross-lingual queries, plus smaller slices for docket lookup, short queries, and other robustness cases. The released JSON stores graded relevance judgments (**grade** 1-3); across the 100 queries, each query has 1-6 judged relevant decisions (mean 3.04). The current judgments were created by the author as a regression-testing artifact rather than through a multi-annotator annotation campaign.

This benchmark infrastructure is one of the more important research artifacts in the repository because it makes retrieval changes testable on fixed inputs instead of anecdotal examples. The benchmark should be read as a curated regression set shipped with the system, not as a multi-annotator shared-task dataset: the repository does not currently provide inter-annotator agreement, adjudication logs, or a held-out test split.

To anchor the current paper to a versioned result, the repository now includes `artifacts/paper_release_2026-03` a release-matched run on the 100-query set against the same 962,724-decision corpus snapshot summarized in Table 1. On that artifact, the benchmark achieved $\text{MRR@10} = 0.6042$, $\text{Recall@10} = 0.5835$, $\text{nDCG@10} = 0.6062$, and $\text{Hit@1} = 0.52$.

This baseline should be interpreted carefully. It is deterministic and inspectable, but not a full hosted-system score: the reported run used the local release-matched search database together with the sibling reference-graph database; vector search was not available; statute/commentary side databases were not available; and Anthropic-backed query expansion and reranking were not available. It is also not yet a balanced benchmark for strong multilingual claims: it is still dominated by German natural-language queries, and its hardest slices remain concept-match and statute-oriented retrieval.

6. Ethics, Legal Basis, and Limitations

6.1 Legal Basis and Governance

Published Swiss court decisions are excluded from copyright protection under Art. 5 para. 1 lit. c URG (Federal Act on Copyright), which exempts official works including judicial decisions. The duty to publish Federal Supreme Court decisions is established by Art. 27 BGG. Cantonal publication duties vary by jurisdiction.

Repository code is released under MIT. Dataset packaging and added metadata are released under CC0-1.0 to the extent rights exist, while the underlying decision texts remain official publications of the originating courts or public bodies.

OpenCaseLaw indexes decisions in the form published by the originating courts. The project does not itself perform anonymization; it preserves the published form of the source material and links back to the original URLs. That makes court publication policy a first-order dependency of the dataset, especially for cantonal courts whose anonymization practices vary.

Large-scale aggregation changes the privacy risk profile compared to individual court-website publication. Structured metadata combined with full text may enable re-identification even when party names are redacted (Pilan et al., 2024). The repository therefore ships `docs/governance-and-removal-policy.md`, covering source withdrawals, re-anonymization, and verified correction/removal requests.

6.2 Limitations

- **Coverage is broad, not perfect.** The corpus spans all cantons and federal courts, but publication depth still varies by court and era.
- **Historical quality varies.** Older BGE material and scanned PDFs can contain OCR artifacts or short extracted text.
- **Reference extraction is rule-based.** Citation and statute extraction are regex-driven and therefore miss non-standard, implicit, or stylistically unusual references.
- **Identity is operational, not jurisprudential.** `decision_id` and `canonical_key` are strong engineering identifiers, but they are not the same thing as a fully curated canonical case identity across republications and appeal stages.
- **Extraction and deduplication are not manually evaluated here.** This paper reports the released implementation and its scale, not a formal precision/recall study for citation extraction or a manual false-merge audit for deduplication.

- **Schema layering increases complexity.** The distinction between the core model, search schema, and export schema is useful in code but easy to misstate in documentation or papers.
- **Published artifacts are generated by multiple pipelines.** The corpus, search index, reference database, and dashboard statistics are closely related but operationally distinct build products; papers should state clearly which artifact a reported number comes from.
- **The benchmark is release-matched, but still not a shared-task evaluation set.** The current report is reproducible and aligned to the frozen corpus snapshot, but the repository still does not provide multi-annotator labeling, agreement estimates, or a held-out test split.

7. Availability

Repository-path entries below refer to files inside the frozen paper-release bundle `artifacts/paper_release_2026-03-20`.

Resource	Location
Dataset (Parquet)	huggingface.co/datasets/voilaj/swiss-caselaw
Source code	github.com/jonashertner/caselaw-repo-1
Paper release manifest	<code>artifacts/paper_release_2026-03-20/manifest.json</code>
Paper release stats snapshot	<code>artifacts/paper_release_2026-03-20/stats_snapshot.json</code>
Paper release benchmark gold set	<code>artifacts/paper_release_2026-03-20/benchmark_golden.json</code>
Paper release benchmark report	<code>artifacts/paper_release_2026-03-20/benchmark_report.pdf</code>
Governance policy	<code>docs/governance-and-removal-policy.md</code>
MCP server	https://mcp.opencaselaw.ch
REST API docs	mcp.opencaselaw.ch/api/docs
Public stats snapshot	opencaselaw.ch

References

- Caselaw Access Project. Harvard Law School Library Innovation Lab. <https://case.law>
- Chalkidis, I., Jana, A., Hartung, D., Bommarito, M., Androustopoulos, I., Katz, D., and Aletras, N. (2022). LexGLUE: A Benchmark Dataset for Legal Language Understanding in English. In *Proceedings of ACL 2022*.
- Cormack, G., Clarke, C., and Buettcher, S. (2009). Reciprocal Rank Fusion outperforms Condorcet and individual Rank Learning Methods. In *Proceedings of SIGIR 2009*.
- Geering, F., and Merane, J. (2024). Swiss Federal Supreme Court Dataset (SCD). Zenodo. doi:10.5281/zenodo.11092977.
- Kano, Y., Soh, J., Ngo, L., Rabelo, J., and Satoh, K. (2024). COLIEE 2024: Competition on Legal Information Extraction/Entailment. In *JSAI 2024*.
- Locke, S., Zhai, Z., and Kohlmeier, J. (2024). A Survey on Legal Text Retrieval. In *Proceedings of ACL 2024*.
- Model Context Protocol Specification. Anthropic, 2024. <https://modelcontextprotocol.io>
- Niklaus, J., Chalkidis, I., and Stürmer, M. (2021). Swiss-Judgment-Prediction: A Multilingual Legal Judgment Prediction Benchmark. In *NLP4PositiveImpact Workshop, EMNLP 2021*.
- Niklaus, J., Matoshi, V., Stürmer, M., Chalkidis, I., and Ho, D. (2023a). MultiLegalPile: A 689GB Multilingual Legal Corpus. *arXiv:2306.02069*.
- Pilan, I., Lognoul, T., Niklaus, J., Stürmer, M., and Chalkidis, I. (2024). Anonymity at Risk? Assessing Re-Identification Capabilities of Large Language Models in Court Decisions. In *Findings of NAACL 2024*.

- Rasiah, V., Stern, R., Matoshi, V., Stürmer, M., Chalkidis, I., Ho, D. E., and Niklaus, J. (2023). SCALE: Scaling up the Complexity for Advanced Language Model Evaluation. *arXiv:2306.09237*.
- Robertson, S. and Zaragoza, H. (2009). The Probabilistic Relevance Framework: BM25 and Beyond. *Foundations and Trends in Information Retrieval*.