

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

Jonas Hertner

March 2026

Abstract

We present OpenCaseLaw, an open corpus and search system for Swiss case law. The March 20, 2026 snapshot contains 962,724 decisions from 102 federal, cantonal, and quasi-judicial sources, covering all 26 cantons and the period 1875–2026. The corpus includes 448,461 German (46.6%), 434,663 French (45.1%), and 79,600 Italian (8.3%) decisions. OpenCaseLaw releases a 34-field Parquet export and reproducible tooling to build a local search index and reference database. The reference database contains 8.76 million extracted case-citation references (6.42 million resolved in-corpora, 73.3% resolution rate) and 11.23 million decision-to-statute links. We describe the collection, deduplication, and retrieval pipeline, and release a 100-query multilingual benchmark with a release-matched baseline report. The code is MIT-licensed; each record links back to the decision as published by its originating court.

1. Introduction

Swiss case law is published across a fragmented landscape of federal and cantonal court websites. Each of the 26 cantons runs its own portal, and cross-court search does not exist in the open ecosystem. Commercial systems such as Swisslex and Weblaw aggregate this data but require paid subscriptions. Existing open resources cover either a single court, a narrow NLP task, or raw publication access without retrieval tooling.

OpenCaseLaw provides infrastructure rather than a single benchmark. It combines corpus acquisition, normalization, searchable exports, reference extraction, and interfaces for both programmatic and LLM-mediated access. The project contributes:

1. **A broad open corpus.** The March 20, 2026 snapshot contains 962,724 decisions from 102 sources—all 26 cantons, federal courts, and several regulatory bodies.
2. **Retrieval artifacts.** The release includes Parquet exports plus tooling for a local FTS5 search database, a citation and statute reference database, REST endpoints, and an MCP server.
3. **Evaluation infrastructure.** A 100-query tagged benchmark and a release-matched offline baseline.

The paper reports what is versioned and inspectable in the repository. Where the implementation distinguishes between data models, search indexes, and export schemas, we state that explicitly.

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 resources for downstream analysis. OpenCaseLaw differs in court coverage: it spans 102 sources across all cantons and multiple federal and regulatory bodies.

Swiss legal benchmarks. SCALE (Rasiah et al., 2023) benchmarks citation extraction, court-view generation, and summarization on Swiss legal text. It is complementary: SCALE focuses on task evaluation, OpenCaseLaw on corpus and retrieval infrastructure.

Broader legal corpora. MultiLegalPile (Niklaus et al., 2023a) provides a 689 GB multilingual legal corpus for pretraining; LexGLUE (Chalkidis et al., 2022) benchmarks legal NLP tasks. Neither provides Swiss court-wide retrieval infrastructure or citation databases.

Open case law infrastructure. The Caselaw Access Project (Harvard Law School) provides 6.7 million US court decisions. We are not aware of a comparable Swiss-wide open corpus with nationwide coverage, structured metadata, and citation 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. OpenCaseLaw uses BM25 and RRF as part of a practical multilingual search pipeline.

Re-identification risk. Pilan et al. (2024) find that aggregation and structured metadata increase re-identification risk in court decisions even when party names are redacted. This applies directly to corpora like ours.

3. Dataset and Processing Pipeline

3.1 Snapshot Statistics

Table 1 reports the frozen release snapshot (March 20, 2026). All corpus-wide counts in this paper come from this snapshot. Retrieval metrics in Section 5.3 come from the bundled benchmark artifact.

Metric	Value
Snapshot timestamp	2026-03-20
Decisions	962,724
Courts and public bodies	102
Federal sources	20
Cantonal sources	82
Federal decisions	344,141
Cantonal decisions	618,583
Earliest decision	1875-01-01
Latest decision	2026-03-19
German	448,461 (46.6%)
French	434,663 (45.1%)
Italian	79,600 (8.3%)

The four largest sources are the Federal Supreme Court (174,270), Geneva (167,003), the Federal Administrative Court (91,613), and Vaud (74,819).

3.2 Collection

54 scrapers run nightly, each targeting one court website or publication portal. Each decision is normalized into a 28-field data model covering court identity, docket number, dates, language, legal area, regeste, full text, and source URLs.

3.3 Deduplication

Deduplication uses a canonical key that normalizes court code, docket number, and date to collapse formatting variants. Within-court deduplication keeps the version with the richest content. Cross-court deduplication operates within hand-maintained overlap groups for cantons where decisions appear on multiple portals (e.g., Zürich: 17 court codes).

A BGE leading case and its underlying Federal Supreme Court ruling are *not* deduplicated—they have different courts, different docket numbers, and different content scope. Similarly, a cantonal decision and its federal appeal remain as distinct records.

This is an engineering heuristic, not a curated legal identity model. The repository does not ship a manual audit of false merges or missed duplicates.

3.4 Schemas

The repository uses three related schemas:

1. **Core model** (`models.py`): 28 fields, used by scrapers.
2. **Search database** (`db_schema.py`): 24-column SQLite table with FTS5 index.
3. **Parquet export** (`export_parquet.py`): 34-field Arrow schema with provenance fields.

The project does not have a single monolithic schema; it has a layered data contract for scraping, retrieval, and export.

4. Reference Database

A second SQLite database stores case citations and statute references extracted from decision text.

4.1 Extraction

Regular expressions extract BGE references (BGE 131 III 115), docket numbers (4A_372/2019), and statute provisions (Art. 41 OR). Each reference is resolved against the corpus using normalized docket matching with confidence scoring.

4.2 Scale

Table 2 summarizes the reference database from the March 20, 2026 build.

Metric	Value
Case-citation references	8.76 million
Resolved in-corpus links	6.42 million
Resolution rate	73.3%
Decision-to-statute links	11.23 million

These are distinct quantities: 8.76 million refers to case-citation references; 11.23 million refers to statute links. They should not be added. The repository does not ship a manual precision/recall study; Table 2 reports artifact scale, not validated extraction quality.

4.3 Uses

The reference database supports citation lookup, leading-case discovery, appeal-chain tracing, trend analysis, and statute-aware search enrichment.

5. Retrieval and Interfaces

5.1 Search Pipeline

The search pipeline has five stages:

1. **Query parsing.** Multiple lexical query variants, legal synonym expansion, umlaut normalization, and optional LLM-based structured parsing.
2. **Candidate retrieval.** Several FTS5 strategies fused with Reciprocal Rank Fusion.
3. **Signal scoring.** Lexical features, metadata, citation counts, and statute signals.
4. **Optional reranking.** Confidence-gated LLM reranking for ambiguous cases.
5. **Result enrichment.** Court metadata, citation counts, and statute references.

5.2 Distribution

The corpus is available as Parquet files, a local SQLite FTS5 index, a REST API, and an MCP server supporting Claude, ChatGPT, and Gemini. The MCP tool surface is deployment-dependent (up to 21 tools; remote mode omits update tools).

5.3 Evaluation

The repository includes a 100-query benchmark spanning 74 German, 16 French, 7 Italian, and 3 untagged queries across 15 legal domains. Each query has 1–6 graded relevant decisions (mean 3.04). The judgments were created by the author; no multi-annotator agreement is reported.

The release bundle includes a benchmark run matched to the 962,724-decision snapshot:

Metric	Value
MRR@10	0.6042
Recall@10	0.5835
nDCG@10	0.6062
Hit@1	0.52

This result uses the local search database with the reference graph but without vector search, statute databases, or LLM-based expansion and reranking. It is dominated by German queries; concept-match and statute-oriented retrieval remain the hardest slices.

6. Ethics, Legal Basis, and Limitations

6.1 Legal Basis

Published Swiss court decisions are excluded from copyright under Art. 5 para. 1 lit. c URG. Federal publication duties are governed by Art. 27 BGG; cantonal duties vary. Code is MIT-licensed; dataset packaging is CC0-1.0.

OpenCaseLaw preserves decisions as published by the originating courts and links back to source URLs. It does not perform anonymization. Cantonal anonymization practices vary.

Large-scale aggregation changes the privacy risk profile. Structured metadata combined with full text may enable re-identification even when names are redacted (Pilan et al., 2024). The repository includes a governance and removal policy.

6.2 Limitations

- **Coverage is broad, not audited.** Publication depth varies by court and era.
- **Historical quality varies.** Older material may contain OCR artifacts.
- **Reference extraction is rule-based** and misses non-standard references.
- **Identity is operational, not jurisprudential.** Identifiers are engineering heuristics, not curated case identities.
- **No manual evaluation.** Neither citation extraction nor deduplication is evaluated against human annotations in this paper.
- **The benchmark is author-judged.** No inter-annotator agreement or held-out test split is provided.

7. Availability

All release artifacts are in the GitHub release tagged `opencaselaw-paper-2026-03-20`.

Resource	Location
Dataset (Parquet)	huggingface.co/datasets/voilaj/swiss-caselaw
Source code	github.com/jonashertner/caselaw-repo-1
Release bundle	GitHub release <code>opencaselaw-paper-2026-03-20</code>
Governance policy	docs/governance-and-removal-policy.md
MCP server	mcp.opencaselaw.ch
REST API docs	mcp.opencaselaw.ch/api/docs
Dashboard	opencaselaw.ch

References

- Caselaw Access Project. Harvard Law School. <https://case.law>
- Chalkidis, I. et al. (2022). LexGLUE: A Benchmark Dataset for Legal Language Understanding in English. *ACL 2022*.
- Cormack, G., Clarke, C., and Buettcher, S. (2009). Reciprocal Rank Fusion outperforms Condorcet and individual Rank Learning Methods. *SIGIR 2009*.
- Geering, F. and Merane, J. (2024). Swiss Federal Supreme Court Dataset. Zenodo. doi:10.5281/zenodo.11092977.
- Kano, Y. et al. (2024). COLIEE 2024. *JSAI 2024*.

- Locke, S., Zhai, Z., and Kohlmeier, J. (2024). A Survey on Legal Text Retrieval. *ACL 2024*.
- Model Context Protocol. Anthropic, 2024. <https://modelcontextprotocol.io>
- Niklaus, J. et al. (2021). Swiss-Judgment-Prediction. *NLP4PositiveImpact, EMNLP 2021*.
- Niklaus, J. et al. (2023a). MultiLegalPile: A 689 GB Multilingual Legal Corpus. *arXiv:2306.02069*.
- Pilan, I. et al. (2024). Anonymity at Risk? Re-Identification in Court Decisions. *Findings of NAACL 2024*.
- Rasiah, V. et al. (2023). SCALE: Scaling up Evaluation of Swiss Court Rulings. *arXiv:2306.09237*.
- Robertson, S. and Zaragoza, H. (2009). The Probabilistic Relevance Framework: BM25 and Beyond. *FTIR*.