


Introducing CoCounsel **Legal**

CoCounsel Legal is a fiduciary-grade AI system designed specifically for legal professionals to streamline complex legal workflows.

It combines **generative and agentic AI** with the trusted legal content of **Westlaw and Practical Law**, enabling users to perform projects that include legal research, document review, analysis and drafting with greater speed and accuracy.



Meet Your Team

Your Dedicated Thomson Reuters CoCounsel CSM



Denny O'Connor, J.D.-M.I.P

Customer Success Manager, Government


Denny.OConnor@tr.com

763-202-5116

CoCounsel Support Representatives are available from 9:00am – 6:00pm, Monday to Friday

- Email: CoCounselSupport@thomsonreuters.com
- In-App Live Chat

Westlaw Advantage in CoCounsel Legal



Westlaw Core Content

- Cases
- Statutes/Graphical Statutes
- Regulations
- Legislative materials
- Administrative materials
- Select International materials


ANALYTICAL PLUS

- Am Jur®
- ALR®
- C.J.S.® (Corpus Juris Secundum®)
- Federal treatises
- Forms
- State analytical materials
- Causes of Action
- KeyRules
- Hundreds of topical analytical titles
- Law Reviews and Journals
- News
- Select International titles
- CCH

LITIGATION

- Briefs
- Pleadings, Motions, Memoranda
- Trial court orders
- Jury verdicts
- Expert materials
- Arbitration
- Dockets*
- Profiler
- Case Evaluator

Westlaw Advantage in CoCounsel Legal



THOMSON REUTERS
WESTLAW ADVANTAGE

MJB-42213

History

Folders

My links

Notifications

CoCounsel

?

☰

👤

Sign out

Enter terms, citations, databases, questions, anything...

All State & Federal



Search Tips >
Advanced >



GET STARTED:

Cases

Statutes and Court...

Practical Law

Secondary Sources

Regulations



Judiciary

AI Deep Research

Content types

Federal materials

State materials

Practice areas

My content

Tools



Legal research for judiciary

Generate detailed, fully cited research on any topic with advanced tools specialized for your needs.

Most requested by judges



Detect hallucinations

Use Judicial analysis to scan documents for fabricated citations and misapplied quotes.

[Judicial analysis](#)

Recommended



Conduct legal research

Ask complex legal questions to generate thorough research reports with AI-enhanced analysis.

[AI Deep Research](#)

Recommended




Find cases that say...

Explore cases containing conceptually similar language and reasoning.

[Parallel Search](#)

Westlaw Advantage includes Deep Research




AI Deep Research

What is the Oklahoma summary judgment standard under the rules? Identify the controlling cases and provide a bench checklist of required findings/analysis.

+ Start new research

Research steps



Performing research and generating your report... 5% complete

Jun 26, 11:40 AM • Expanded report • Oklahoma

- Researching the Oklahoma summary judgment standard under Oklahoma District Court Rule 13 and Oklahoma Statute Title 12, Section 2056, identifying the burden-shifting framework, evidentiary requirements, and procedural prerequisites for granting or denying summary judgment.
- Identifying controlling Oklahoma Supreme Court cases establishing the summary judgment standard, including the foundational holdings in *Weeks v. Wedgewood Village, Inc.*, *Carmichael v. Beller*, and their progeny, focusing on the "no substantial controversy as to any material fact" standard and the requirement that the moving party be entitled to judgment as a matter of law.
- Identifying controlling Oklahoma Court of Civil Appeals and Oklahoma Supreme Court cases addressing the burden of proof in summary judgment proceedings, specifically cases clarifying the moving party's initial burden to demonstrate the absence of a genuine issue of material fact and the non-moving party's burden to present competent evidence creating a triable issue.
- Researching Oklahoma case law addressing what constitutes competent summary judgment evidence, including affidavits, depositions, admissions, and documentary evidence, and identifying cases addressing the standard for evaluating inferences and credibility in the light most favorable to the non-moving party.
- Compiling a bench checklist of required findings and analytical steps for Oklahoma summary judgment rulings, synthesizing the procedural requirements, burden analysis, evidentiary standards, and legal conclusions required under Oklahoma law into a sequential framework for judicial decision-making.

AI Deep Research

What is the Oklahoma summary judgment standard under the rules? Identify the controlling cases and provide a bench checklist of required findings/analysis.

+ Start new research

Report Verify Enhance Follow-ups Sources (25) Research steps

Report contents

- Summary
- Governing Rules
- The Controlling Standard: The "Single Inference" Test
- The Movant's Burden
- The Non-Movant's Burden
- Evidentiary Standards
- Viewing Evidence in the Light Most Favorable to the Non-Movant
- Partial Summary Judgment
- Continuance for Discovery
- Oklahoma Summary Judgment Bench Checklist
 - STEP 1 — PROCEDURAL COMPLIANCE
 - STEP 2 — DEEMED ADMISSIONS
 - STEP 3 — EVIDENTIARY ADMISSIBILITY (MOVANT'S MATERIALS)
 - STEP 4 — MOVANT'S BURDEN: HAS THE MOVANT ADDRESSED ALL MATERIAL FACTS?
 - STEP 5 — NON-MOVANT'S EVIDENTIARY MATERIALS
 - STEP 6 — VIEW EVIDENCE IN THE LIGHT MOST FAVORABLE TO THE NON-MOVANT
 - STEP 7 — THE SINGLE INFERENCE TEST

Summary

Under Oklahoma law, summary judgment is proper only when the evidentiary record shows that there is no substantial controversy as to any material fact and one of the parties is entitled to judgment as a matter of law [OK ST DIST CTS Rule 13](#) [OK ST T. 12 § 2056](#). Oklahoma's summary adjudication process is similar to, but distinctly different from, the federal standard: the focus is not on facts a plaintiff might be able to prove at trial, but rather on whether the evidentiary material, viewed as a whole, shows undisputed facts on all material issues and whether such facts support but a single inference that favors the movant's quest for relief [Jglehart v. Board of County Com'rs of Rogers County, 60 P.3d 497 \(2002\)](#) [Copeland v. Lodge Enterprises, Inc., 4 P.3d 695 \(2000\)](#). The court bears an affirmative, independent duty to test all evidentiary material for its legal sufficiency — even when the non-moving party has not filed a response [Spirgis v. Circle K Stores, Inc., 743 P.2d 682 \(1987\)](#).


Governing Rules

Two provisions govern summary judgment practice in Oklahoma district courts. The primary procedural rule is **Oklahoma District Court Rule 13** [OK ST DIST CTS Rule 13](#), which sets out the motion requirements, response deadlines, evidentiary standards, and the operative legal test. **Oklahoma Statutes Title 12, Section 2056** [OK ST T. 12 § 2056](#) provides a parallel statutory framework and is consistent with Rule 13 in requiring that the pleadings, discovery materials, and affidavits show no genuine issue as to any material fact and that the movant is entitled to judgment as a matter of law.

Under Rule 13(a), a party may move for summary judgment or summary disposition of any issue on the merits on the ground that the evidentiary material filed with the motion shows there is no substantial controversy as to any material fact [OK ST DIST CTS Rule 13](#). The motion must be accompanied by a concise written statement of the material facts as to which the movant contends no genuine issue exists, a statement of argument and authority, and references to the specific pages and paragraphs of the evidentiary materials relied upon [OK ST DIST CTS Rule 13](#). Any party opposing the motion must file a written response within fifteen days after service of the motion, but not earlier than forty-five days after service of the first summons upon that party [OK ST DIST CTS Rule 13](#). The adverse party's statement must specifically number each material fact claimed to be in controversy and reference the supporting evidentiary materials [OK ST DIST CTS Rule 13](#).

A critical procedural consequence flows from Rule 13(b): all material facts set forth in the movant's statement that are supported by acceptable evidentiary material are deemed admitted for purposes of summary judgment unless specifically controverted by the adverse party's statement supported by acceptable evidentiary material [OK ST DIST CTS Rule 13](#). If summary judgment is granted, the opposing party cannot on appeal rely on any fact not included in its response [U.S. Mortg. v. Laubach, 73 P.3d 887 \(2003\)](#). show that a substantial controversy exists [OK ST DIST CTS Rule 13](#) [U.S. Mortg. v. Laubach, 73 P.3d 887 \(2003\)](#).

Westlaw Advantage includes Litigation Document Analyzer



Omitted authority Cited authority Language analysis Select report ▾

Result type ⓘ

- View all 48
- Paraphrases 18**
- Matched quotations 4
- Unmatched quotations 26
- All quotations 30

Filter

Clear

Mischaracterization Identification +

Content type +

Party 1 documents +

Noland

▾ Noland PLAINTIFF-APPELLANT'S OPENING BRIEF.pdf 7

Citation from uploaded document	Citation on Westlaw
1 Caldwell v. Unified Capital Group, 204 Cal. App. 4th 222, 229 (2012)	Bates v. Presbyterian Intercommunity Hospital, Inc., 204 Cal.App.4th 210 (2nd Dist. 2012)
2 Doe v. Superior Court (2022) 87 Cal.App.5th 84	Cole v. Superior Court, 87 Cal.App.5th 84 (4th Dist. 2022)
3 Kumar v. Ramsey, 83 Cal. App. 4th 654, 661 (2000)	Estate of McGuigan, 83 Cal.App.4th 639 (3rd Dist. 2000)
4 Scheidler v. Mission Valley Resort, Inc. (2011) 201 Cal.App.4th 362	People v. Rivera, 201 Cal.App.4th 353 (1st Dist. 2011)
5 Valdez v. Kismet Acquisition, LLC, 474 F. App'x 778, 780 (2d Cir. 2012)	Voorhis v. Department of Homeland Sec., 474 Fed.Appx. 778 (Federal Cir. 2012)
6 19, 41 Section 437c(a) ----- ----- 38 Labor Code	No citation found
7 Goldstine v. Liberty Mut. Ins. Co., 2020 WL 6216738 (W.D. Wash. 2020)	No citation found

Paraphrases (18)

Sort: Potential severity ▾ [Icons]

Indicates content generated by AI. Not legal advice. A qualified professional must verify accuracy and legal compliance.


1 - 18


Select all items 0 items selected Key: differences Highlights

Document 1: Noland PLAINTIFF-APPELLANT'S OPENING BRIEF.pdf ↑ Back to top

1. Potential mischaracterization CoCounsel [Icons]

CoCounsel Ai Legal Assistant in CoCounsel Legal





Enter terms, citations, databases, questions, anything ...

7th Circuit

Get Started:

[Cases](#)

[Statutes](#)

[Practical Law](#)

[Secondary Sources](#)

Legal research for judiciary

Generate detailed, fully cited research on any topic with advanced tools specialized for your needs.

Most requested by judges



Detect hallucinations

Use Judicial analysis to scan documents for fabricated citations and misapplied quotes.

[Judicial analysis](#)

Recommended



Conduct legal research

Ask complex legal questions to generate thorough research reports with AI-enhanced analysis.

[AI Deep Research](#)



Find cases

Explore cases of language and r

[Parallel Search](#)

Judicial toolkit

Uncover deeper legal insights.



Hello, Kim

Ask CoCounsel to perform any legal task...


Attach

Library

CoCounsel 2.0



CoCounsel uses AI and can make mistakes.



Navigation and action bar with icons for New, Ignore, Block, Delete, Archive, Report, Reply, Reply all, Forward, Schedule with Meeting Copilot, Chat, Share to Teams, Move, Rules, Quick steps, Read/Unread, Flag, Pin, Snooze, Policy, Print, More apps, CoCounsel for Microsoft, Report Phish, and Copilot.

- Left sidebar showing email list with senders like Charles.Grange@thomsonr..., Lagadamane Nagaraj, Moorehead, Shana, Abadir, Nadia, Microsoft, Thomson Reuters News, Thomson Reuters Technology, and Grange, Charles.

Filters: All Mail Files Teams People Has attachments Unread To me Mentions me Flagged High importance

Exciting News: Join Thomson Reuters' Trial of ChatGPT Enterprise!
Summary by Copilot
Abadir, Nadia (TR Product)
Hi Everyone,
Exciting news! You've been selected to participate in Thomson Reuters' 6-week limited ChatGPT Enterprise trial, launching this week.
What is ChatGPT Enterprise?
Why are you included in this trial?
Trial Details
Important Security Reminder
How to Get Started
1. Accept Invitation: Watch for your ChatGPT Thomson Reuters Enterprise Workspace invite (coming soon).
2. Once you log in through the email invite, confirm you are in the Thomson Reuters workspace.
3. Explore Resources including Intro to ChatGPT, OpenAI Academy for Work and ChatGPT for Any Role.

Reply details

Note: Review and modify the AI-generated draft as needed.

I'm happy to participate in the ChatGPT Enterprise trial - it sounds like a great initiative.
Could you please confirm when the kickoff call is scheduled? Also, would it be possible to invite a few colleagues from my team who are working on similar AI use cases?

AI editing menu with options: Write in plain English, Simplify, Add more details, Make more creative, Clarify purpose or intent, Fix grammar or spelling, Suggested prompts, Edit options.

Come to our

11:10 – breakout session in
OK J

to learn more about

CoCounsel **Legal**

