



Kenny S. Ramirez

KENNY RAMIREZ LAW FIRM

From case management to intelligence

WHAT FILEVINE'S LOIS SIGNALS ABOUT THE FUTURE OF PLAINTIFF PRACTICE

Everywhere you look, legal software is now “powered by AI.” Case-management systems, CRMs, document tools, and even PDF platforms are rolling out features that promise to draft faster, summarize quicker, and automate more. For us plaintiffs’ lawyers, many of these tools are already familiar – demand generators, medical chronologies, document summaries. They save time. They reduce administrative burden. They help teams move faster.

But an important question remains: Are these tools actually changing how we practice law – or just making us faster at doing the same things?

We are now entering a second phase of legal AI – one that moves beyond isolated tools and toward something more foundational. Filevine’s Legal Operating Intelligence System (LOIS) is one example of that shift. And whether or not LOIS becomes the dominant model, it signals a broader change in how law firms will operate in the years ahead.

The first wave: AI as a tool

The first wave of legal AI has largely been task-based. Tools like demand generators, document summarizers, and data-extraction systems have become increasingly common in plaintiffs’ firms. They are designed to perform specific functions:

- Draft a demand letter
- Summarize medical records
- Extract key facts from documents
- Assist with deposition preparation

These tools are valuable. In many firms, they have already reduced hours of manual work and improved turnaround times. A demand that once took days to assemble can now be generated in a fraction of the time. Medical chronologies that required significant staff effort can be produced quickly and consistently.

But these tools share a common

characteristic: they are *reactive*. They do what we ask them to do. They operate at a specific step in the case lifecycle. And they depend on the user to initiate the process. They improve efficiency – but they do not fundamentally change, improve or augment decision-making.

A different category: From tools to systems

What makes LOIS notable is not that it performs these tasks better. It is that it represents a different category of technology altogether. LOIS is designed as an *intelligence layer across the entire firm*, not just a collection of features within it. Instead of focusing on individual tasks, it connects data, workflows, documents, and communications into a unified system that can analyze, surface insights, and guide next steps. This distinction is easier to understand when framed in terms lawyers already know: *A case-management system tracks what has happened. An operating system helps determine what should happen next.*

Traditional case-management systems – even very good ones – are primarily organizational tools. They store documents, track deadlines, manage contacts, and create visibility across cases. They are essential, but they are largely passive.

An operating system, by contrast, is active. It evaluates the status of a case. It identifies gaps. It surfaces risks. It *suggests* actions. (Note: It does not *make* decisions – those remain the purview of the attorney, whose indispensable judgment ultimately drives the case). This is the conceptual shift LOIS represents.

What LOIS actually is (And what it does)

At a practical level, LOIS – Filevine’s *Legal Operating Intelligence System* – is an AI-powered layer built directly into the firm’s case-management environment. It is not a separate tool you log into or a feature you toggle on for a single task. It

operates across your cases, your data, and your workflows. A helpful way to think about it is this: *If traditional software stores your work, LOIS interacts with your work.* It reads, analyzes, and connects information across:

- Case files
- Documents
- Notes
- Communications
- Deadlines
- Data fields

And then it does something most systems don’t do: It thinks across all of it. In other words, after having read and connected from all sources, it provides insights, suggestions, and even automation. To make that more concrete, its core capabilities can be broken down into a few categories:

Context-aware AI across the entire case

Unlike standalone AI tools that work on a single document, LOIS has visibility into the full case file. That means it can:

- Answer questions about the case in plain language
- Summarize key facts across multiple documents
- Identify inconsistencies or gaps

For example, in addition to manually reviewing a file, an attorney can ask:

- What are the weaknesses in liability?
- Are there gaps in treatment?
- What is missing before making a demand?

The system responds based on the actual case data and information across the entire file – not just a single uploaded document or a compilation of uploaded documents. That is, the AI analysis is no longer dependent on whether you uploaded all of the necessary documents to the third-party platform; the analysis happens with *all* of the case file taken into account, including every note, email, document, etc.

“Chat with your case” functionality

LOIS includes an interface that allows attorneys and staff to interact with case data conversationally. Rather than digging through folders, notes, and records, for that one piece of information you know is in the file, but forgot where you placed it (or, as can sometime be the case, where someone misplaced it), you can interact with the case directly:

- Ask for summaries
- Request timelines
- Spot key issues
- Identify next steps
- Surface key facts quickly

This drastically reduces time spent locating information and increases visibility across the entire case. Rather than spending your time searching for information, attorneys can now spend more time synthesizing and strategizing.

Intelligent drafting and document support

LOIS incorporates and enhances tools like demand generation, document drafting, and summarization. It can:

- Draft documents such as demand letters or correspondence
- Summarize records, depositions, and reports
- Assist with document review and editing

Importantly (and the key difference between this and other such tools), these drafting tools are no longer isolated – they are informed by the broader context of the case.

Workflow awareness and automation

LOIS is not limited to documents – it also understands *where a case is in its lifecycle*. It can:

- Identify when a case is ready for the next phase
- Flag missing steps or incomplete tasks
- Trigger or suggest follow-ups

This allows workflows to become more consistent and less dependent on manual tracking. Notably, it does not *substitute* human tracking and review; but it does *augment* and provide a reliable second set of eyes over your file, thereby reducing the possibility of error.

Case and firm-level intelligence

Beyond individual cases, LOIS can

analyze patterns across a firm's caseload. It can surface:

- Delays or bottlenecks
- Cases that are not progressing
- Trends in outcomes or timelines

This provides visibility not just into one case, but into how the practice is operating as a whole.

Verification and transparency

One of the larger concerns with AI systems is reliability. LOIS addresses this by tying outputs back to underlying data (the entire file itself) – allowing users to verify where information is coming from (by providing clear citations; whether it is a document, email, note, transcript, etc.), rather than relying on unsupported conclusions.

Integration with existing AI Tools

Tools like demand generators and medical chronology systems do not disappear. Instead, they function within the LOIS framework. In this structure:

- Individual tools handle execution
- LOIS provides oversight, context, and guidance

Taken together, these features represent a shift from isolated functionality to *connected intelligence*. The system is not just performing tasks – it is helping to evaluate, prioritize, and guide them.

From doing tasks to guiding cases

To understand the practical difference, consider a familiar workflow: preparing a demand. In a traditional model, even with AI tools:

- A team gathers records
- An attorney reviews the file
- A demand generator drafts the letter
- The attorney edits and sends

The AI tool improves the drafting process, but the structure of the workflow remains the same.

In a system like LOIS, the process changes:

- The system can identify whether the case is ready for a demand
- It flags issues such as treatment gaps, missing documentation, or liability concerns
- It suggests what should be addressed before proceeding

- It then uses tools like demand generators to execute the draft

The difference is subtle but significant. The system is no longer just helping you do the work – it is helping you *evaluate the work before it is done*. For plaintiffs' lawyers, that shift matters. Case value is often determined not by how quickly a task is completed, but by how thoroughly a case is developed before key decisions are made.

Practical implications in a plaintiff practice

While the concept may sound abstract, its applications are very concrete.

Intake and early case evaluation

An intelligence-driven system can identify missing information, highlight potential liability issues, and standardize intake quality across the firm. This improves case selection at the front end – arguably one of the most important drivers of outcomes.

Treatment and case development

During the life of a case, the system can flag treatment gaps, inconsistencies in records, or missing documentation. Instead of discovering these issues when preparing a demand or entering litigation, they can be addressed earlier.

Demand preparation

Rather than simply drafting a demand, the system can assess whether the case is fully developed and suggest strategic considerations before the demand is created. The result is not just faster drafting, but stronger positioning.

Case management and workflow

At the operational level, the system can identify stalled cases, missed steps, or delays in progression. This reduces the risk of cases falling through the cracks and improves overall case velocity.

Firm-level insights

Across the firm, patterns begin to emerge – timelines, bottlenecks, outcomes. This allows for more informed decision-making not just on individual cases, but on how the practice is run as a whole.

The real value: Consistency at scale

One of the ongoing challenges in growing plaintiffs' firms is maintaining

consistency. The quality of case handling can vary between attorneys, staff members, and/or cases. Even with strong processes, variability is difficult to eliminate.

An intelligence-based system offers a way to reduce that variability. By consistently identifying issues, prompting next steps, and reinforcing workflows, it helps firms deliver a more uniform level of work across all cases.

In practical terms, it helps ensure that more cases are handled with the same level of attention typically reserved for a firm's most significant matters. It also allows for solo practitioners and smaller firms to operate at a level typically reserved for larger firms.

A note of caution

As with any emerging technology, it is important to approach these tools with clarity. AI – whether in the form of task-based tools or broader systems – is not a substitute for legal judgment. It can assist, suggest, and surface insights, but it does not replace the role of the attorney in evaluating a case, making strategic decisions, or advocating for their client.

There is also a risk of over-reliance. Outputs may be directionally helpful but incomplete or misaligned with the nuances of a particular case. Verification and oversight remain essential. The goal is not to delegate judgment to a system, but to *augment judgment with better information and visibility*.

Where this is headed

Whether it is LOIS or another platform, the broader trend is clear: *Legal technology is moving from tools that complete tasks to systems that guide work*. For plaintiffs' firms, this shift has meaningful implications. Firms that adopt integrated, intelligence-driven systems will likely see improvements in efficiency, consistency, case development, and operational decision-making.

Those that rely solely on isolated tools will of course still benefit from increased speed, but certain gains in outcomes may be left on the table.

A practical starting point

For firms evaluating these develop-

ments, the takeaway is not to adopt every new tool that enters the market. Instead, consider:

- Whether your systems are connected or fragmented
- Whether your data is structured and usable
- Whether your workflows are consistent and scalable

And most importantly: *Does the technology you are using improve decision-making – or just speed?*

A practical example from practice

To illustrate this further, consider a recent matter where these capabilities proved useful. I was recently referred a case shortly before trial – a workplace injury involving multiple parties, including potentially negligent third parties. The file was substantial. Depositions had already been taken, law and motion was extensive, and the liability picture was not straightforward. As is often the case when stepping into a file midstream, the challenge was not just understanding the facts but quickly developing a clear view of the strengths and weaknesses of the case.

Traditionally, this would require hours of review: pleadings, deposition transcripts, document productions, emails, and internal notes. And while that process is still necessary, the question was how quickly I could get to a working understanding of the case.

Because the entire file was already contained within the system – pleadings, transcripts, communications, and notes – I was able to engage directly with the case through LOIS. Rather than reviewing everything linearly, I began by asking targeted questions:

- What is the overall liability picture?
- What are the strongest arguments in our favor?
- Where are the weaknesses?
- What are the best- and worst-case scenarios on liability?

The system generated a comprehensive analysis, identifying key issues and organizing them in a way that would typically take significant time to assemble

manually. Importantly, it did not simply provide conclusions – it tied those conclusions back to specific portions of the file, citing deposition testimony, documents, and other materials already within the case.

This distinction matters.

While similar questions could be posed to a general-purpose AI system, doing so would require manually gathering, organizing, and uploading large portions of the file – often across multiple formats – before any meaningful analysis could begin. Even then, the system would only be working from the subset of information provided, without the broader context of the case as it exists in practice.

Here, the analysis was grounded in the full record as it already existed within the case management system – emails, notes, transcripts, and filings – without the need to re-create the file elsewhere or risk working from incomplete inputs. The system was not just analyzing documents; it was analyzing the case as a whole. LOIS also suggested areas for further attention, highlighting where additional review or development might be necessary. This allowed me to prioritize my time more effectively, focusing on the issues that mattered most.

To be clear, this did not replace the need for a full review of the file. It did, however, accelerate the process of getting oriented. What might have taken 10-12 hours to reach a baseline understanding was reduced significantly – allowing me to arrive at a similar level of preparedness in a fraction of the time.

In that sense, the value was not that the system provided final answers. It was that it provided a structured, context-aware starting point – one grounded in the actual record – that allowed me to move more quickly into meaningful analysis and strategy.

This is the broader shift: Not simply using AI to complete tasks, but using integrated systems to surface insight earlier – so that attorneys can focus sooner on judgment, strategy, and advocacy.

Conclusion

The conversation around AI in law often focuses on what tasks can be auto-

mated. But the more important question is how these technologies can improve the way we evaluate, develop, and resolve cases.

The firms that benefit most in the coming years will not necessarily be those that adopt the most tools. They will be the ones that build systems – intentionally – that enhance judgment, reinforce consistency, and ultimately improve outcomes for their clients.

AI may begin as a tool. But its long-term impact will be determined by how we choose to use it. 

Kenny Ramirez is the founder and principal trial attorney of the Kenny Ramirez Law Firm, a catastrophic-personal-injury and wrongful-death practice based in the Inland Empire. He is the current president of the Consumer Attorneys of Inland Empire, and is an active board member and officer in various bar associations, including CAOC, HBAIE, WSBCBA, CAALA, and AAJ. In 2023, he received the CAOC Presidential Award of Merit for his expertise in negotiations on Senate Bill 235. kramirez@ramirezlaw.com