

APPENDIX F: The Three-Platform Negligence Complaint Assignment A Faculty Guide

What This Assignment Does

This assignment grew out of a practical problem I wanted to address. Students using GenAI to draft legal documents without understanding its limitations in a concrete way. They were simply accepting output and not taking the time to evaluate it. When students produce the same document three different ways using three different tools and then have to explain in writing which version is better and why, they have to engage with what each platform got wrong.

The assignment rests on a complaint for negligence. It's familiar enough that first- or second-year students can evaluate it on the merits and procedurally specific enough that platform weaknesses surface quickly. The LLM draft will often be fluent and plausible while quietly getting facts wrong or missing jurisdiction-specific requirements. The document assembly platform will only produce what its template includes. The Westlaw or Lexis form might be written for a different state and will need adaptation. Students who work through all three will understand something about each platform that a lecture cannot teach them.

The assignment is GenAI-transparent: students are required to use a GenAI tool as one of their three platforms. They cannot reject it, and they cannot simply paste its output into a document and call it done. The comparative analysis is the evidence that they must read what the platforms produced.

The Fact Pattern

SANTOS v. FENWICK FOODS, LLC

State of Hartwell • Superior Court, Hartwell County

Plaintiff: Maria Santos, 44, a licensed practical nurse employed by Hartwell Home Health, Inc. She works thirty-two hours per week at an hourly rate of \$28.75.

Defendant: Fenwick Foods, LLC, a Hartwell limited liability company that operates a grocery store at 302 Alderman Street, Hartwell City, Hartwell. The LLC's registered agent is CT Corp., 67 Burnside Avenue, Hartwell City, Hartwell 06710.

The Incident: On November 9, 2023, at approximately 6:15 p.m., Santos was shopping in the produce section of the Fenwick Foods store at 302 Alderman Street. A refrigeration unit

above the leafy greens display had been leaking since that afternoon. No store employee had placed warning signs or cones near the wet area. Santos stepped into a puddle she could not see, slipped, and fell onto her right arm. A store employee witnessed the fall.

Injury and Treatment: Santos was taken by ambulance to Hartwell Regional Medical Center, where imaging confirmed a displaced fracture of the distal radius in her right wrist. She underwent outpatient surgery to insert a fixation plate on November 14, 2023. She was on medical leave from November 9 through December 20, 2023 (six weeks total). Physical therapy continued through February 2024.

Damages:

Damage Category	Amount
Ambulance transport	\$847.00
Emergency department	\$3,214.50
Surgery (fixation plate insertion)	\$18,640.00
Physical therapy (14 sessions)	\$2,940.00
Lost wages (6 wks × 32 hrs × \$28.75/hr)	\$5,520.00
Total Economic Damages	\$31,161.50

Santos also claims non-economic damages for pain and suffering and loss of enjoyment of life in an amount to be determined by the jury.

NOTE TO FACULTY — Why These Numbers Are Specific

The damage figures are non-round and itemized by category for a reason. GenAI will typically consolidate them into a vague “medical expenses” figure, approximate or drop the ambulance charge, and miscalculate lost wages by rounding the hourly rate or defaulting to a forty-hour work week. The correct lost wages figure is \$5,520.00 (6 × 32 × \$28.75). Common GenAI answers are \$5,400 (rounding to \$30/hr) or \$5,760 (rounding to 40 hrs/week). Any version that does not match the fact pattern exactly is an error.

Relevant Hartwell Rules

The State of Hartwell is a fictional jurisdiction. Give students the rules below. They should be enough to evaluate all three complaints without turning the assignment into a civil procedure exam.

Rules Students Need for This Assignment

Statute of Limitations (H.R.S. § 52-584): Personal injury actions must be filed within two years of the date of injury. The limitations deadline here is November 9, 2025.

Special Damages Must Be Itemized (H.R.C.P. Rule 9(g)): Medical expenses, lost wages, and similar economic losses must be pleaded by category and amount. A single consolidated figure does not satisfy the rule.

Defendant Must Be Identified by Full Legal Name: The complaint must name the defendant as "Fenwick Foods, LLC." Dropping the LLC designation or substituting Inc. creates a service of process problem.

Notice Pleading Standard (H.R.C.P. Rule 8(a)): A short and plain statement showing entitlement to relief. Students must plead duty, breach, causation, and damages.

GenAI FUMBLE — The Defendant's Name

Most GenAI drafts will name the defendant as "*Fenwick Foods*" or "*Fenwick Foods, Inc.*" The correct name is Fenwick Foods, LLC. This is an easy catch for a student who reads carefully and an invisible error for one who doesn't. It is also the kind of mistake that causes real problems at the filing stage, which makes it a good one to build into a teaching exercise.

Student-Facing Assignment

Remove the faculty callout boxes before distributing.

Three-Platform Negligence Complaint Assignment

Overview. Using the *Santos v. Fenwick Foods, LLC* fact pattern, you will draft the same negligence complaint three different ways: using a GenAI tool, a document assembly program, and a standard form from Westlaw or Lexis. Then you will write a comparative analysis evaluating all three.

What You Submit:

Three completed complaints, one per platform, clearly labeled.

A comparative analysis (six to eight pages) evaluating all three complaints. For each one, address legal sufficiency, procedural compliance, factual accuracy, and strategic considerations. Be specific: name the error, explain why it matters, and explain what you did about it.

Platform 1: GenAI Tool

Use ChatGPT, Claude, Gemini, or a comparable large language model. Use the standard free or consumer version — not a specialized legal AI product.

Prompt the tool to draft a negligence complaint using the Santos fact pattern. You decide how to frame the prompt. When you get output back, **read every word of it against the fact pattern and the Hartwell rules**. Find the errors and correct them. The complaint you submit for Platform 1 is your corrected version, not the raw AI output. Your analysis should explain specifically what the tool got wrong and what you changed.

Platform 2: Document Assembly Program

Use a document assembly program such as Clio Draft, HotDocs, Business Advantage, or a comparable application. Your instructor will advise whether your institution provides access to a specific platform. Complete a negligence or personal injury complaint template using the Santos facts.

Notice what the program does not ask for. Most templates will not prompt you to include everything Hartwell's rules require. Add what is missing. Your analysis should describe what the platform left out and how you addressed it.

Platform 3: Westlaw or Lexis Form

Find a negligence complaint form in Westlaw Forms or Lexis Practice Advisor. Since Hartwell is a fictional jurisdiction, select a form from any notice-pleading state and adapt it. Complete the form using the Santos facts and modify it as needed for Hartwell's rules. Your analysis should identify which state's form you used, what Hartwell-specific modifications you made, and what the form assumed that did not apply here.

The Comparative Analysis

Evaluate all three complaints across these four dimensions:

Legal sufficiency. Does each complaint state a viable negligence claim? Are duty, breach, causation, and damages all pleaded?

Procedural compliance. Does each complaint satisfy Hartwell's rules? Are damages itemized by category? Is the defendant named correctly?

Factual accuracy. Does each complaint accurately reflect the fact pattern? Check every number, date, name, and amount. Identify any errors or information a platform invented.

Strategic considerations. Which complaint would you rather file? Which would be easiest for opposing counsel to attack? Explain your reasoning.

Conclusion: Which platform produced the most useful starting point, and which produced the most filing-ready document after your corrections? Those answers may not be the same platform. Explain why.

Grading Rubric

Adjust point values to your course's scale. Weights below reflect a 100-point assignment.

Component	Points	What Earns Full Credit
Three Completed Complaints	20	All three platforms used; complaints labeled; negligence elements pleaded; damages itemized by category.
GenAI Complaint (post-correction)	20	Defendant named as LLC; exact damage figures; lost wages correct; no factual errors remaining.
Document Assembly Complaint	10	Template gaps identified and filled; Rule 9(g) itemization satisfied; entity name correct.
Form-Based Complaint	10	Source form and state identified; Hartwell modifications explained; inapplicable provisions noted.
Comparative Analysis — Legal Sufficiency	10	All four negligence elements evaluated for each complaint; specific deficiencies named.
Comparative Analysis — Procedural Compliance	10	Rule 9(g) and entity-name issues addressed for all three platforms.
Comparative Analysis — Factual Accuracy	10	Specific factual errors documented for each platform; numbers and dates checked.
Comparative Analysis — Strategic Considerations	10	Reasoned conclusion about relative platform value; practitioner's perspective applied.