

LegalChainReasoner: A Legal Chain-guided Framework for Criminal Judicial Opinion Generation

Weizhe Shi^{1*}, Qiqi Wang^{2*†}, Yihong Pan¹, Qian Liu^{1†}, Kaiqi Zhao^{3†}

¹The University of Auckland, New Zealand

²Nankai University, China

³Harbin Institute of Technology, Shenzhen, China

{wshi590, ypan317}@aucklanduni.ac.nz qiqi.wang@nankai.edu.cn

liu.qian@auckland.ac.nz zhaokaiqi@hit.edu.cn

Abstract

A criminal judicial opinion represents the judge’s disposition of a case, including the decision rationale and sentencing. Automatically generating such opinions can assist in analyzing sentencing consistency and provide judges with references to similar past cases. However, current research typically approaches this task by dividing it into two isolated subtasks: legal reasoning and sentencing prediction. This separation often leads to inconsistency between the reasoning and predictions, failing to meet real-world judicial requirements. Furthermore, prior studies rely on manually curated knowledge to enhance applicability, yet such methods remain limited in practical deployment. To address these limitations and better align with legal practice, we propose a new LegalAI task: Judicial Opinion Generation, which simultaneously produces both legal reasoning and sentencing decisions. To achieve this, we introduce LegalChainReasoner, a framework that applies structured legal chains to guide the model through comprehensive case assessments. By integrating factual premises, composite legal conditions, and sentencing conclusions, our approach ensures flexible knowledge injection and end-to-end opinion generation. Experiments on two real-world and open-source Chinese legal case datasets demonstrate that our method outperforms baseline models¹.

1 Introduction

In criminal judicial systems, particularly within Civil Law jurisdictions, legal judgments inherently integrate two inseparable elements: structured legal reasoning and consequent sentencing decisions (Cui et al., 2023). This integration reflects the fundamental nature of judicial decision-making, where sentencing conclusions must be derived from

*Equal contribution.

†Corresponding author.

¹The code and data used in this paper will be released after paper acceptance.




Figure 1: Comparison between traditional approaches and the real-world practice. In traditional approach, legal reasoning and sentencing prediction are treated as separate tasks with independent models. In contrast, real-world judicial practice jointly consider these into a unified process, where sentencing decisions are derived from and justified by reasoning applied to case facts.

and justified by systematic application of statutory provisions to established facts. Despite this intrinsic connection, current LegalAI research artificially divides this coherent process into isolated tasks. The legal reasoning task (Ye et al., 2018; Wu et al., 2020; Li et al., 2024a; Yue et al., 2024) focuses exclusively on constructing plausible arguments without addressing sentencing implications, while the sentencing prediction task (Liu et al., 2022; Wu et al., 2023; Yue et al., 2021a; Sun et al., 2024) generates penalty terms without providing necessary legal justifications. This separation creates two critical problems: (1) reasoning models may produce analyses inconsistent with the possible sentencing outcome, and (2) prediction models generate sentences lacking transparent legal foundations. Such fragmentation fundamentally contradicts the judi-

cial principle that sentencing must be grounded in and justified by proper legal reasoning.

Beyond the task separation, two additional limitations have also occurred in existing approaches. First, most of the legal knowledge incorporated in current methods remains manually designed and relatively simplistic (Gan et al., 2021). Methods using such knowledge often rely on predefined rules or direct citations of legal provisions rather than abstracting essential reasoning patterns. This surface-level integration fails to capture the deeper logical structures underlying legal judgments, limiting models’ ability to generalize across cases with subtle yet legally significant distinctions. Besides, current approaches lack explainability in both tasks, particularly in sentence prediction. Some studies have attempted to introduce manually defined generation processes to improve explainability in reasoning generation (Xu et al., 2024). Nevertheless, most existing research on sentence prediction primarily focuses on extracting semantic features from factual information, often overlooking the underlying reasoning mechanisms and the interpretability of the predicted outcomes. This limits the transparency and trustworthiness of these models, especially in the criminal domains.

To address these fundamental limitations, a novel Criminal Judicial Opinion Generation task is proposed in this paper, wherein legal reasoning and sentencing prediction are integrated into one paradigm like human judges, as illustrated in Figure 1. This task offers two significant advantages: (1) sentencing predictions become explicitly grounded in legal reasoning, enhancing both interpretability and jurisprudential validity; and (2) the approach mirrors authentic judicial processes, where verdicts are derived through structured legal analysis rather than isolated numerical predictions.

To solve this task, we propose the LegalChainReasoner, a comprehensive framework comprising two principal components: the Structured Legal Chain and Chain-Aware encoding method. The Structured Legal Chains are developed by transforming statutory provisions into *premise-situation-conclusion* triplets, based on the Legal Norm theory (Keuth, 1975; Raz, 1980). These chains formalize implicit legal inference patterns into explicit structured representations, enabling the model to learn step-by-step judicial decision-making processes. The Chain-Aware encoding with multi-linear transformation layers is designed to capture complex relationships between legal elements

while applying crime-specific reasoning transformations, resulting in an effective jurisprudential alignment with established judicial reasoning patterns. The main contributions of this work are:

- We define a criminal judicial opinion generation task that produces legal reasoning and sentencing prediction in a single process. The task ensures the predictions are supported by judicial analyses.
- We reveal the importance of structured legal chains in supporting interpretable and reliable judicial opinion generation. By formalizing statutory provisions into premise-situation-conclusion triplets, we propose a chain-aware encoding method that effectively helps reasoning in the judicial decision-making process.
- We evaluate our proposed method on two open-source, real-world datasets and achieve improvements in both the quality of generated judicial opinions and sentencing prediction.

2 Methodology

Task Definition Given a set of criminal legal case factual descriptions $\mathcal{F} = \{F_1, F_2, \dots, F_i, \dots\}$, the Criminal Judicial Opinion Generation task is formulated as the process of generating judicial opinion O_i for each fact F_i , by jointly considering legal reasoning and sentencing determination. The task can then be defined as the function $f : F_i \rightarrow O_i$. The judicial opinion O_i includes the case reasoning and sentence prediction.

Overall Framework The fundamental principle of our method lies in mirroring authentic judicial processes, producing comprehensive judicial opinions that jointly consider both reasoning and sentencing in accordance with established legal principles. Figure 2 presents the overall framework of the proposed method, LegalChainReasoner. The framework consists of the Legal Chain construction and the Chain-Aware Encoding modules. The Legal Chain construction addresses the need for formalized legal knowledge representation. By transforming legal provisions into structured *premise-situation-conclusion* triplets, complex legal conditions and their relationships are explicitly formalized, enabling the model to learn step-by-step judicial decision-making processes. The Chain-Aware Encoding module leverages these structured chains




Figure 2: The overall architecture of LegalChainReasoner. In the first module (top), legal chains are constructed from statutory provisions. These chains are then processed in the Chain-Aware Encoding module (middle). Finally (bottom), the fused legal knowledge representations are integrated with case fact embeddings through the LLM to generate judicial opinions.

to guide the opinion generation process. This specialized mechanisms is integrated with case fact embeddings before being passed to the language model. Through this architecture, ensuring the criminal judicial opinion generation process is explicitly grounded in proper legal analysis.

2.1 Legal Chain

In criminal law practice, judges typically derive case outcomes through a structured reasoning process. This process traditionally follows a syllogistic pattern (Dai et al., 2025), where *major premises* (statutory provisions) and *minor premises* (factual descriptions) are combined to reach judicial decisions, encompassing both legal reasoning and sentencing. However, judges do not apply statutory provisions in their raw form, as these provisions often contain complex structures, including multiple conditional clauses and nested relationships. To navigate this complexity, legal norm theory (Keuth, 1975; Raz, 1980) offers a principle that decomposes each statutory provision into one or more triplets, each comprising a **premise**, a **situation**, and a **conclusion**. In the context of criminal law, these triplets capture the constitutive elements of a crime and the conditional factors affecting sentencing. Judges typically select and apply the most relevant triplet during the reasoning process to reach a legally sound and context-appropriate judgment.

To align with real-world judicial practice, we propose using the triplet structure, *premise-situation-conclusion*, as a means of integrating le-




Figure 3: Legal Chain construction process with the robbery provisions. The original statutory provision (top) is decomposed into structured premise-situation-conclusion triplets (bottom).

gal knowledge into language models for generating judicial opinions. We refer to this triplet as a **Legal Chain**, which aims to formalize the implicit reasoning patterns embedded within statutory provisions into explicit, structured representations, enabling models to learn the step-by-step judicial decision-making process. Figure 3 illustrates an example of the legal chains for robbery.

Formally, for each criminal charge C , all relevant statutory provisions defined within the legal domain are denoted as $\mathcal{SP} = \{SP_1, SP_2, \dots, SP_j, \dots\}$. They are systematically decomposed into a set of legal chains $\Phi_C = \{\phi_1, \phi_2, \dots\}$, where each legal chain $\phi \in \Phi_C$ is represented as a triplet $\langle p, s, c \rangle$. Here p (premise) represents a condition derived from legal facts, typically characterizing a legal element or prerequisite that must be satisfied; s (situation) captures the consequences and severity assessments, reflecting nuanced legal requirements where multiple factors must be considered simultaneously; and c (conclusion) specifies a sentencing recommendation directly grounded in statutory provisions.

Current works utilize various forms of legal knowledge, such as legal graphs (Zhong et al., 2020; Yang et al., 2021), prediction processes (Xu et al., 2024), and explanations of statutory provisions (Yue et al., 2021a). However, most of these approaches rely on manually designed structures or expert annotations (Chalkidis et al., 2019), which significantly increase the cost of incorporating legal knowledge and may result in unstable model performance when the knowledge is incorrect or of low quality. To address this, we propose an automatic extraction process for Legal Chains. This process transforms statutory provisions into structured triplets through a prompt-based extraction methodology using large language models. The extraction

prompts are carefully designed with constraints to ensure that the resulting chains maintain both legal accuracy and structural consistency. The complete prompt template and its constraints are provided in Appendix A. The generated Legal Chains are subsequently validated by legal experts to ensure their fidelity to the original statutory provisions.

Then, for a factual description F_i and its corresponding criminal charge C_i , a set of legal chains $\Phi_{C_i} = \{\phi_1, \phi_2, \dots, \phi_n\}$ is constructed, where each ϕ_j represents a distinct decision-making pathway. We did not focus on charge determination, because recent works demonstrate significant proficiency in determining applicable criminal charges, with accuracy rates more than 95% in criminal charge determination (Hu et al., 2018; Zhao et al., 2022; Le et al., 2020). Based on this established capability, we focus on more challenging task of generating cohesive judicial opinions that jointly consider both reasoning and sentencing. When applied to the Criminal Judicial Opinion Generation task, the criminal judicial opinion generation function can then be expressed as $f_{CJOG}(F_i, C_i, \Phi_{C_i})$.

2.2 Chain-Aware Encoding

To better make models understand legal chains Φ_{C_i} , we propose a Chain-Aware Encoding Module to leverage these chains for the Criminal Judicial Opinion Generation task.

For a given criminal charge C_i , each chain $\phi_j = \langle p_j, s_j, c_j \rangle$ in the set Φ_{C_i} is embedded by first tokenizing and then averaging the token embeddings for each component.

$$\mathbf{e}_{p_j} = \frac{1}{|p_j|} \sum_{t \in p_j} \mathbf{E}_{\text{base}}(t), \quad (1)$$

$$\mathbf{e}_{s_j} = \frac{1}{|s_j|} \sum_{t \in s_j} \mathbf{E}_{\text{base}}(t), \quad (2)$$

$$\mathbf{e}_{c_j} = \frac{1}{|c_j|} \sum_{t \in c_j} \mathbf{E}_{\text{base}}(t), \quad (3)$$

where, \mathbf{E}_{base} represents the token embedding function of language models. These component embeddings are then concatenated to form a chain representation $\mathbf{H}_{\phi_j} = [\mathbf{e}_{p_j}; \mathbf{e}_{s_j}; \mathbf{e}_{c_j}] \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times d}$, where d is the model’s hidden dimension.

To capture interactions between the elements of each legal chain, we apply self-attention mechanism:

$$\mathbf{A}_{\phi_j}, \mathbf{w}_{\phi_j} = \text{MultiHeadAttn}(\mathbf{H}_{\phi_j}), \quad (4)$$

$$\text{MultiHeadAttn}(\mathbf{H}_{\phi_j}^h) = \text{Attn}(\mathbf{H}_{\phi_j}^h, \mathbf{H}_{\phi_j}^h, \mathbf{H}_{\phi_j}^h), \quad (5)$$

where $\mathbf{A}_{\phi_j} \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times d}$ is the attended output representation, $\mathbf{w}_{\phi_j} \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}$ represents the attention

weights between chain components, and h means heads of multi-head Attention.

A residual connection preserves both the original and attention-weighted information: $\mathbf{A}'_{\phi_j} = \mathbf{H}_{\phi_j} + \mathbf{A}_{\phi_j}$. This attended representation is then pooled to obtain a single vector representation $\mathbf{r}_{\phi_j} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ for each chain.

After obtaining the processed chain representation \mathbf{r}_{ϕ_j} , as different types of criminal charges require distinct reasoning patterns based on their statutory provisions and jurisprudential traditions. Inspired by the Mixture-of-Experts (MoE) (Mansournia and Ebrahimpour, 2014; Cai et al., 2024), we design a crime-specific transformation layer to capture specific information. In addition, we introduce a general transformation layer to extract shared, generalizable features. We refer to this module as the crime transformation block, which processes the chain representations. The general transformation first applies to all criminal charges:

$$\mathbf{T}_G(\mathbf{r}_{\phi_j}) = \mathbf{W}_{G_2} \cdot \text{ReLU}(\mathbf{W}_{G_1} \cdot \mathbf{r}_{\phi_j} + \mathbf{b}_{G_1}) + \mathbf{b}_{G_2}, \quad (6)$$

where $\mathbf{W}_{G_1}, \mathbf{W}_{G_2} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ are weight matrices and $\mathbf{b}_{G_1}, \mathbf{b}_{G_2} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ are bias vectors. Then, for each criminal charge C_i , a dedicated transformation is applied to the generally transformed representation:

$$\mathbf{T}_{C_i}(\mathbf{T}_G(\mathbf{r}_{\phi_j})) = \mathbf{W}_{C_i} \cdot \mathbf{T}_G(\mathbf{r}_{\phi_j}) + \mathbf{b}_{C_i}, \quad (7)$$

where $\mathbf{W}_{C_i} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ and $\mathbf{b}_{C_i} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ are charge-specific parameters that encode reasoning patterns unique to each crime type.

These transformations are then combined through a gating mechanism to determine the appropriate balance between general and crime-specific reasoning:

$$\mathbf{G}(\mathbf{T}_G(\mathbf{r}_{\phi_j})) = \sigma(\mathbf{W}_g \cdot \mathbf{T}_G(\mathbf{r}_{\phi_j}) + \mathbf{b}_g), \quad (8)$$

$$\mathbf{t}_{\phi_j} = \mathbf{G}(\mathbf{T}_G(\mathbf{r}_{\phi_j})) \odot \mathbf{T}_{C_i}(\mathbf{T}_G(\mathbf{r}_{\phi_j})) + (1 - \mathbf{G}(\mathbf{T}_G(\mathbf{r}_{\phi_j}))) \odot \mathbf{T}_G(\mathbf{r}_{\phi_j}), \quad (9)$$

where σ is the sigmoid function that produces content-dependent interpolation weights.

After applying transformations and the gating mechanism, each chain representation is processed through a final fusion layer that combines the original and transformed representations:

$$\mathbf{f}_{\phi_j} = \mathbf{W}_{\text{fusion}} \cdot [\mathbf{r}_{\phi_j}; \mathbf{t}_{\phi_j}] + \mathbf{b}_{\text{fusion}}, \quad (10)$$

where $\mathbf{W}_{\text{fusion}} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times 2d}$ and $\mathbf{b}_{\text{fusion}} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ are learnable parameters.

The final chain representation for all chains is then constructed:

$$\mathbf{E}_{\text{Chain}} = [\mathbf{f}_{\phi_1}; \mathbf{f}_{\phi_2}; \dots; \mathbf{f}_{\phi_n}] \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}, \quad (11)$$

where n is the number of chains in Φ_{C_i} .

2.3 Judicial Opinion Generation

The factual description F_i is embedded using the same embedding layer of language model, and then integrated with the chain representations:

$$\mathbf{E}_{\text{Combined}} = [\mathbf{E}_{\text{Chain}}; \mathbf{H}_{F_i}] \in \mathbb{R}^{(n+l_{F_i}) \times d}, \quad (12)$$

where $\mathbf{H}_{F_i} \in \mathbb{R}^{l_{F_i} \times d}$ represents the embedded tokens of F_i and l_{F_i} is the sequence length. This integrated representation is processed by the language model to generate the judicial opinion \hat{O} :

$$\hat{O} = f_{\text{CJOG}}(F_i, C_i, \Phi_{C_i}) = \text{LLM}(\mathbf{E}_{\text{Combined}}). \quad (13)$$

The entire framework is optimized to jointly consider both sentencing prediction accuracy and reasoning quality. The loss function is defined as:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{\text{total}} &= \alpha \mathcal{L}_{\text{Reasoning}} + \beta \mathcal{L}_{\text{Sentencing}}, \\ \mathcal{L}_{\text{Reasoning}} &= -\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{c=1}^C O_{i,c} \log(\hat{O}_{i,c}), \\ \mathcal{L}_{\text{Sentencing}} &= -\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{c=1}^C S_{i,c} \log(\hat{S}_{i,c}), \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

where S and \hat{S} are the sentencing part of the judicial opinion. C represent the number of words, and α, β are weighting parameters.

3 Experiments

3.1 Experimental Setup

Datasets. In the legal AI domain, there is only one publicly accessible dataset that includes both judicial reasoning and final decisions. It is constructed based on Legal AI Challenge 2021 (LAIC-2021), which contains Chinese criminal cases featuring factual descriptions, court reasoning, and sentencing outcomes. To ensure a fair comparison during training, we select crime types with more than 500 cases, resulting in approximately 12 distinct crime categories. The detailed statistics of the datasets are provided in Appendix B. To further assess the effectiveness of our proposed approach, we collect a more complex and up-to-date set of cases of the same crime types from the People’s Court Case Database², denoted as PCCD. The new

²Cases on the People’s Court Case Database (<https://rmfyalk.court.gov.cn>) are selected and published by the Supreme People’s Court of China. These cases are intended to guide lower courts in adjudicating similar cases.

dataset includes 100 representative cases (balanced across the 12 crime types) and is used for zero-shot validation, meaning it serves solely to evaluate the models trained on the LAIC-2021.

Baselines. Considering recent studies, we select two types of baselines for a fair comparison. First, we evaluate several natural language generation models, including AttS2S (Bahdanau et al., 2015), BART (Lewis et al., 2020), Llama-3.2-3B (Grattafiori et al., 2024), DeepSeek-R1-Distill-Qwen-7B (DeepSeek-AI et al., 2025), and LawyerLlama-13B-V2 (Huang et al., 2023), on the complete judicial opinion generation task. In addition, we include several widely used and representative methods in sentencing prediction as baselines, such as BERT (Devlin et al., 2019), fine-tuned BERT (BERT-FT), Electra (Clark et al., 2020), RFormer (Dong and Niu, 2021), NeurJudge (Yue et al., 2021a), and ML-LJP (Liu et al., 2023). Further details are provided in Appendix C.

Evaluation metrics. Since the Criminal Judicial Opinion Generation task primarily involves generating text, it can be evaluated using standard and widely adopted text generation metrics, such as ROUGE-1/2/L (Lin, 2004), BLEU-1/2/N (Papineni et al., 2002), BERTScore (Zhang et al., 2020a), and GPTScore-pairwise (Li et al., 2024b). Additionally, as sentencing prediction involves numerical outputs, we employ two commonly used regression evaluation metrics: Mean Absolute Error (MAE) and Root Mean Square Error (RMSE). Further details are provided in Appendix D.

Implementation. We apply our LegalChainReasoner to Llama-3.2-3B, DeepSeek-R1-Distill-Qwen-7B and LawyerLlama-13B-V2. We utilize the Low-Rank Adaptation (LoRA) (Hu et al., 2022) to fine-tune these LLMs. The setting of LoRA is the same as the previous LLM study in LegalAI (Xu et al., 2024). We set 8 heads for the multi-head attention mechanism and 0.1 dropout. As the $\mathcal{L}_{\text{Reasoning}}$ already include the sentence part, to enhance the sentencing part, we found $\alpha = \beta = 1$ is the best. We apply Adam optimizer with learning rates at 10^{-5} level. All the experiments were conducted on NVIDIA A100 GPUs with 80GB memory.

3.2 Comparison among Criminal Judicial Opinion Generation

Tables 1 and 2 present the performance comparisons between the proposed method and baseline

Table 1: Performance comparison on the LAIC-2021 dataset. GPTScore represents the GPTScore-pairwise. And the GPTScore-pairwise scores for AttS2S and BART reflect their average performance across all comparisons.

Model	MAE	RMSE	ROUGE-1	ROUGE-2	ROUGE-L	BLEU-1	BLEU-2	BLEU-N	BERTScore	GPTScore
AttS2S	20.86	30.96	42.93	25.24	39.04	28.25	20.34	19.12	72.72	0.00
BART	28.99	41.68	51.73	35.95	46.72	39.99	32.93	31.35	79.68	20.16
Llama-3.2-3B	17.29	28.22	45.38	27.59	40.39	33.05	25.31	23.81	78.14	4.10
+ Statutory provisions	18.88	30.99	50.56	32.25	45.05	35.52	28.28	26.75	79.63	14.90
+ LegalChainReasoner	15.41	25.33	52.82	34.91	48.00	37.50	30.42	28.85	80.42	52.05
DeepSeek-R1-Distill-Qwen-7B	22.47	32.06	47.64	29.44	42.61	35.91	27.90	26.16	78.87	6.61
+ Statutory provisions	18.01	28.92	50.34	31.68	44.71	37.52	29.52	27.87	79.26	20.75
+ LegalChainReasoner	15.74	26.17	53.39	34.59	47.71	42.35	33.77	31.94	80.48	50.96
Lawyer-Llama-13B-V2	16.98	27.14	52.53	34.30	47.93	40.05	32.07	30.06	80.53	13.97
+ Statutory provisions	14.73	25.11	54.96	36.07	49.95	42.30	34.03	32.03	81.19	25.27
+ LegalChainReasoner	13.54	24.05	55.99	37.28	50.65	44.31	35.89	33.89	81.35	50.88

Table 2: Zero-shot evaluation results on the PCCD dataset. GPTScore represents the GPTScore-pairwise. And the GPTScore-pairwise scores for AttS2S and BART reflect their average performance across all comparisons.

Model	MAE	RMSE	ROUGE-1	ROUGE-2	ROUGE-L	BLEU-1	BLEU-2	BLEU-N	BERTScore	GPTScore
AttS2S	39.13	52.96	27.20	12.54	22.85	19.28	12.17	11.88	67.02	1.33
BART	62.53	77.33	29.54	15.84	23.51	24.12	16.45	15.86	70.10	25.00
Llama-3.2-3B	38.85	52.13	28.45	12.89	21.93	21.16	13.28	12.69	68.50	1.00
+ Statutory provisions	26.53	37.24	32.76	16.13	25.88	24.04	16.22	15.50	70.17	31.00
+ LegalChainReasoner	24.96	36.59	32.96	16.56	26.23	24.25	16.39	15.70	70.18	32.00
DeepSeek-R1-Distill-Qwen-7B	40.71	56.41	28.13	11.91	20.60	21.75	13.06	12.47	68.11	8.00
+ Statutory provisions	37.08	50.12	31.26	13.71	22.44	25.97	16.01	15.34	69.37	17.00
+ LegalChainReasoner	33.43	46.52	33.95	16.45	25.68	29.09	18.99	18.19	70.24	45.00
Lawyer-Llama-13B-V2	30.57	43.84	31.34	14.97	24.40	26.25	16.86	15.79	69.35	17.00
+ Statutory provisions	27.51	39.50	33.33	16.43	26.01	26.67	17.61	16.57	69.95	27.00
+ LegalChainReasoner	24.96	38.03	33.90	16.84	26.03	27.71	19.39	17.40	70.07	43.00

methods on the LAIC-2021 and PCCD datasets for the Criminal Judicial Opinion Generation task.

The proposed LegalChainReasoner, when fused with LLMs, demonstrates superior performance not only in text generation but also in sentence prediction. Across both datasets, the Lawyer Llama variants consistently outperform others, likely due to their pretraining on legal-specific corpora. A performance gap is observed between LAIC-2021 and PCCD across all methods, characterized by higher prediction errors and lower generation quality scores. There are three reasons: (1) PCCD contains more complex cases, as it is published to guide judges; (2) it includes a higher proportion of appellate and final ruling cases involving multiple legal considerations; and (3) these cases need more complex legal reasoning.

When comparing different types of legal knowledge incorporated into LLMs, our proposed legal chain fusion method outperforms models using only statutory provisions or vanilla LLMs. Notably, while fine-tuning a legal-domain LLM can be beneficial, it is not always efficient. By integrating our legal chain approach with general-purpose LLMs such as Llama and DeepSeek, we achieve better performance than the entire fine-tuned Lawyer Llama.

Overall, these results demonstrate the robustness

Table 3: Comparison on sentencing prediction.

Method	MAE	RMSE
NeurJudge	17.37	25.57
R-Former	23.99	32.06
ML-LJP	20.53	30.85
Electra	23.90	32.02
Bert	21.75	31.25
Bert-FT	23.12	31.70
Llama-3.2-3B	17.29	28.22
+ Statutory provisions	18.88	30.99
+ LegalChainReasoner	15.41	25.33
DeepSeek-R1-Distill-Qwen-7B	22.47	32.06
+ Statutory provisions	18.01	28.92
+ LegalChainReasoner	15.97	26.80
Lawyer-Llama-13B-V2	16.98	27.14
+ Statutory provisions	14.73	25.11
+ LegalChainReasoner	13.54	24.05

of the proposed framework across diverse legal reasoning scenarios and highlight its effectiveness in formalizing judicial reasoning through premise-situation-conclusion triplets.

3.3 Comparison among Legal Sentencing Prediction

Table 3 presents a comparison between the outputs of the proposed method—based on the Criminal Judicial Opinion generation task—and baseline models focused solely on sentencing prediction.

Table 4: Ablation Study for LegalChainReasoner in Criminal Judicial Opinion Generation. GPTScore represents the GPTScore-pairwise.

Model	MAE	RMSE	ROUGE-1	ROUGE-2	ROUGE-L	BLEU-1	BLEU-2	BLEU-N	BERTScore	GPTScore
Llama-3.2-3B	17.29	28.22	45.38	27.59	40.39	33.05	25.31	23.81	78.14	8.79
+ Statutory provisions	18.88	30.99	50.56	32.25	45.05	35.52	28.28	26.75	79.63	17.49
+ LegalChain	16.96	29.01	48.14	29.66	42.44	34.49	26.74	25.27	78.53	9.46
+ LegalChainReasoner	15.41	25.33	52.82	34.91	48.00	37.50	30.42	28.85	80.42	64.26

The results indicate that methods based on the Criminal Judicial Opinion generation task generally achieve better average performance. This suggests that treating sentencing prediction in isolation is limited in effectiveness. The proposed LegalChainReasoner framework, when integrated with LLMs, achieves the best overall performance in terms of both MAE and RMSE. This performance gap highlights the importance of incorporating structured legal knowledge for accurate sentencing prediction. Moreover, it demonstrates that our approach not only provides good quality legal reasoning but also outperforms models specifically designed for sentencing prediction.

Among the sentencing prediction models, NeurJudge (Yue et al., 2021a) demonstrated the strongest performance, followed by ML-LJP (Liu et al., 2023), while the remaining models performed considerably worse. These results differ from those reported in the original papers. Since our formulation treats sentencing prediction as a regression task rather than a classification task, using discrete ranges to represent numerical outcomes may obscure finer-grained differences in model performance and limit the ability to fully assess each model’s predictive capability.

It is noteworthy that the simple incorporation of statutory provisions without structured reasoning chains produced inconsistent results. In some cases, such as with Llama-3.2-3B (Grattafiori et al., 2024), direct addition of statutory provisions actually degraded sentencing accuracy. This observation underscores the insufficiency of merely exposing models to legal text without proper structuring of the reasoning process.

3.4 Ablation Study

Table 4 shows the comparison for different components in the proposed method, LegalChainReasoner, in Criminal Judicial Opinion Generation task based on the Llama-3.2-3B.

Overall, only using all components can achieve better results. Incorporating statutory provisions alone created "legal knowledge overload," improv-

Table 5: Case Study Evaluation Results for Criminal Judicial Opinion Generation

Model	Defendant Accuracy (%)	Situation Accuracy (%)	Sentencing Accuracy (%)	Combined Performance Score (%)
AttS2S	8.45	42.26	76.15	2.72
BART	99.50	65.27	12.22	7.93
Lawyer-Llama-13B-V2	99.08	56.82	71.30	40.12
+ Statutory provisions	99.41	63.18	74.39	46.66
+ LegalChainReasoner	99.41	67.20	78.49	52.39

ing text generation but degrading sentencing prediction due to lack of structured guidance. When fusing legal chains as plain text, more balanced performance was achieved as the premise-situation-conclusion structure provided effective reasoning pathways. When using the proposed legal chain-aware encoding method, performance can be further enhanced by capturing interdependencies between legal elements.

3.5 Case Study

Rule-based Screening. To evaluate the quality of generated judicial opinions, we design a rule-based screening method that assesses the content across three critical dimensions: defendant identification accuracy, situation description correctness, and sentencing range appropriateness. More details are provided in Appendix D.5. Table 5 shows that while most models achieve high accuracy in defendant identification, significant differences occur in situation description and sentencing accuracy. LegalChainReasoner demonstrates better performance in situation description while maintaining strong accuracy in sentencing, resulting in the highest overall combined performance score.

Case Demonstration. Figure 4 and Appendix E present several concise comparisons of outputs from different models in three types of crimes. Figure 4 only shows the summarization of the generated output; the full output is shown in Table 7. From these cases, we find the AttS2S generated opinion completely misclassifies the crime as fraud rather than robbery, incorrectly identifies the defendant as "Li XX," and fails to acknowledge key elements such as the use of violence or threats, de-

Model	Defendant	Reasoning	Sentencing
AttS2S	Incorrect Incorrectly identify	Misclassified Fraud instead of robbery	Inconsistent Sentencing inconsistent with reasoning
BART	Correct Correctly identify	Correct Used violence and threats to rob	Inconsistent Sentencing inconsistent with reasoning and actual sentencing range
Lawyer-Llama-13B-V2	Correct Correctly identify	Correct Used violence and threats to rob	Consistent Sentencing consistent with reasoning
+ Statutory Provisions	Correct Correctly identify	Correct Used violence and threats to rob	Inconsistent Sentencing inconsistent with reasoning and actual sentencing range
+ LegalChain Reasoner	Correct Correctly identify	Correct Used violence and threats to rob	Consistent Sentencing consistent with reasoning and most close
Case Facts: The court ascertained that on January 2, 2012, at approximately 22:30, defendant Fu XX, together with Cui Zhongyu and Ren Zhenguo (both already sentenced), drove a black Honda sedan to the Shell gas station in Tangerlizhen, Bazhou City. Wearing masks and armed with knives and pickaxe handles, they threatened [staff] and robbed over 300 yuan in cash from the station. At approximately 1:00 on January 3, the aforementioned individuals drove to the Shell gas station on East Ring Road in Bazhou City and used the same methods to rob over 1,000 yuan in cash. The stolen money has been spent.			

Figure 4: Case Study Concise Example of Generated Criminal Judicial Opinions.

spite recommending a sentence (36 months) that happens to be relatively close to the actual sentence (42 months). The BART (Lewis et al., 2020) generated opinion correctly identifies the defendant and crime type but recommends a significantly lower sentence (30 months) than the statutory minimum (36 months), as Chinese Criminal Law Article 263 explicitly stipulates that robbery offenses shall be punished by "fixed-term imprisonment of not less than three years and not more than ten years." This legal inconsistency demonstrates the critical limitations of approaches lacking legal reasoning for ensuring sentencing determinations comply with basic statutory requirements. In contrast, the LegalChainReasoner generated opinion demonstrates comprehensive coherence across all dimensions. It correctly identifies the defendant and crime type, acknowledges the use of violence and threats, and recommends a sentence (48 months) that, while slightly higher than the actual sentence, remains proportionate to the case severity and logically aligned with the presented reasoning.

These findings show that the proposed method enables the model to maintain consistent alignment between fact analysis, legal reasoning, and sentencing determination.

4 Related Work

Legal Reasoning Generation Several studies have formalized legal reasoning as a text-to-text natural language generation task, proposing various approaches to enhance performance. Early work applies sequence-to-sequence models to generate

legal reasoning (Ye et al., 2018). Subsequent research leveraged pre-trained language models such as BART (Lewis et al., 2020), including versions fine-tuned on legal datasets (Yue et al., 2021b), as well as large language models (Xu et al., 2024; Yue et al., 2024). Beyond language model applications, recent studies have incorporated different forms of legal knowledge, either implicitly or through explicit processing. This includes multi-step reasoning (Wu et al., 2022; Xu et al., 2024) and legal provisions understanding (Li et al., 2024a; Yue et al., 2024). However, integrating preprocessed legal knowledge presents several challenges. First, reliance on human experts for annotation and validation incurs high costs, limiting scalability. Then, preprocessing steps may introduce biases or oversimplifications, reducing the robustness of generated reasoning, especially using the LLMs.

Legal Sentencing Prediction Legal sentencing prediction in criminal domains targets predicting prison terms. Several types of models are used in this task, including word-to-embedding methods like the Word2Vec-based approach combined with legal corpora (Xia et al., 2019), RNN-variants (Xu et al., 2020), language models (Zhang et al., 2023; Sun et al., 2024) and LLMs (Deng et al., 2024). The knowledge used in this area can also be divided into explicit and processed categories. The processed knowledge includes explanatory statutory provision (Yue et al., 2021a) and statute embeddings (Meng et al., 2025), similar cases retrieved through Case Triple Modeling (Zhang et al., 2023).

5 Conclusion

This paper introduces the Criminal Judicial Opinion Generation task to bridge the gap between legal reasoning and sentencing in current works by aligning them with actual judicial workflows. To address this and flexibly fuse legal knowledge, the LegalChainReasoner framework is proposed, which models statutory provisions as structured legal chains and applies a chain-aware encoding method to capture legal logic and charge-specific reasoning. Experiments on two real-world and open-source Chinese criminal cases show that LegalChainReasoner improves both reasoning quality and sentencing accuracy, whether the complete judicial opinion generation task or a single task. This work marks a step forward in building models that generate judicial opinions with stronger legal coherence and real-world applicability.

Limitations

While LegalChainReasoner demonstrates significant improvements in criminal judicial opinion generation, there are two limitations in evaluation methodology and temporal considerations.

While our automated evaluation using LLMs provides scalability, it may not capture all nuances of legal reasoning that human judges would consider. The combined accuracy metric, though comprehensive, treats all three components (defendant identification, situation description, and sentencing range) as equally important, which may not reflect actual judicial priorities.

The dataset used in this study reflects legal practices and interpretations from a specific time period. Legal frameworks evolve over time through legislative amendments and changing judicial interpretations. The model’s ability to adapt to such temporal shifts in legal understanding without re-training remains unexplored.

Ethic Statements

Privacy Statement All cases used in this paper are publicly accessible and have been published through China Judgment Online or the People’s Court Case Database. All personally identifiable information has been anonymized, as demonstrated in the case studies.

Usage Statement This work is intended solely for research purposes. We have no intention of applying the current version in the real court to judge or influence people. While our proposed method outperforms baseline models, it still contains errors and requires further improvement.

References

- Dzmitry Bahdanau, Kyunghyun Cho, and Yoshua Bengio. 2015. [Neural machine translation by jointly learning to align and translate](#). In *3rd International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR*.
- Weilin Cai, Juyong Jiang, Fan Wang, Jing Tang, Sunghun Kim, and Jiayi Huang. 2024. A survey on mixture of experts. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.06204*.
- Ilias Chalkidis, Ion Androutsopoulos, and Nikolaos Aletras. 2019. [Neural legal judgment prediction in English](#). In *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 4317–4323. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Kevin Clark, Minh-Thang Luong, Quoc V. Le, and Christopher D. Manning. 2020. [ELECTRA: Pre-training text encoders as discriminators rather than generators](#). In *ICLR*.
- Junyun Cui, Xiaoyu Shen, and Shaochun Wen. 2023. A survey on legal judgment prediction: Datasets, metrics, models and challenges. *IEEE Access*, 11:102050–102071.
- Yongfu Dai, Duanyu Feng, Jimin Huang, Haochen Jia, Qianqian Xie, Yifang Zhang, Weiguang Han, Wei Tian, and Hao Wang. 2025. [Laiw: A chinese legal large language models benchmark](#). In *Proceedings of the 31st International Conference on Computational Linguistics*, pages 10738–10766.
- DeepSeek-AI, Daya Guo, Dejian Yang, Haowei Zhang, Junxiao Song, Ruoyu Zhang, Runxin Xu, Qihao Zhu, Shirong Ma, Peiyi Wang, Xiao Bi, Xiaokang Zhang, Xingkai Yu, Yu Wu, Z. F. Wu, Zhibin Gou, Zhihong Shao, Zhuoshu Li, Ziyi Gao, and 181 others. 2025. [Deepseek-r1: Incentivizing reasoning capability in llms via reinforcement learning](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2501.12948.
- Chenlong Deng, Kelong Mao, Yuyao Zhang, and Zhicheng Dou. 2024. [Enabling discriminative reasoning in LLMs for legal judgment prediction](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2024*, pages 784–796, Miami, Florida, USA. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. 2019. [BERT: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding](#). In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long and Short Papers)*, pages 4171–4186. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Qian Dong and Shuzi Niu. 2021. Legal judgment prediction via relational learning. In *Proceedings of the 44th international ACM SIGIR conference on research and development in information retrieval*, pages 983–992.
- Jinlan Fu, See-Kiong Ng, Zhengbao Jiang, and Pengfei Liu. 2024. [GPTScore: Evaluate as you desire](#). In *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 6556–6576, Mexico City, Mexico. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Leilei Gan, Kun Kuang, Yi Yang, and Fei Wu. 2021. Judgment prediction via injecting legal knowledge into neural networks. In *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, volume 35, pages 12866–12874.
- Aaron Grattafiori, Abhimanyu Dubey, Abhinav Jauhri, Abhinav Pandey, Abhishek Kadian, Ahmad Al-Dahle, Aiesha Letman, Akhil Mathur, Alan Schelten, Alex Vaughan, Amy Yang, Angela Fan, Anirudh

- Goyal, Anthony Hartshorn, Aobo Yang, Archi Mitra, Archie Sravankumar, Artem Korenev, Arthur Hinsvark, and 542 others. 2024. [The llama 3 herd of models](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2407.21783.
- Edward J Hu, Yelong Shen, Phillip Wallis, Zeyuan Allen-Zhu, Yuanzhi Li, Shean Wang, Lu Wang, Weizhu Chen, and 1 others. 2022. Lora: Low-rank adaptation of large language models. *ICLR*, 1(2):3.
- Zikun Hu, Xiang Li, Cunchao Tu, Zhiyuan Liu, and Maosong Sun. 2018. Few-shot charge prediction with discriminative legal attributes. In *Proceedings of the 27th international conference on computational linguistics*, pages 487–498.
- Quzhe Huang, Mingxu Tao, Chen Zhang, Zhenwei An, Cong Jiang, Zhibin Chen, Zirui Wu, and Yansong Feng. 2023. [Lawyer llama technical report](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2305.15062.
- Herbert Keuth. 1975. [On some logical characteristics of legal norms](#). *Jurimetrics Journal*, 15(3):160–170.
- Yuquan Le, Congqing He, Meng Chen, Youzheng Wu, Xiaodong He, and Bowen Zhou. 2020. Learning to predict charges for legal judgment via self-attentive capsule network. In *ECAI 2020*, pages 1802–1809. IOS Press.
- Mike Lewis, Yinhan Liu, Naman Goyal, Marjan Ghazvininejad, Abdelrahman Mohamed, Omer Levy, Veselin Stoyanov, and Luke Zettlemoyer. 2020. [BART: Denoising sequence-to-sequence pre-training for natural language generation, translation, and comprehension](#). In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 7871–7880, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Ang Li, Yiquan Wu, Yifei Liu, Fei Wu, Ming Cai, and Kun Kuang. 2024a. Enhancing court view generation with knowledge injection and guidance. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.04366*.
- Zhen Li, Xiaohan Xu, Tao Shen, Can Xu, Jia-Chen Gu, Yuxuan Lai, Chongyang Tao, and Shuai Ma. 2024b. [Leveraging large language models for NLG evaluation: Advances and challenges](#). In *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 16028–16045, Miami, Florida, USA. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Chin-Yew Lin. 2004. [ROUGE: A package for automatic evaluation of summaries](#). In *Text Summarization Branches Out*, pages 74–81. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Dugang Liu, Weihao Du, Lei Li, Weike Pan, and Zhong Ming. 2022. Augmenting legal judgment prediction with contrastive case relations. In *Proceedings of the 29th international conference on computational linguistics*, pages 2658–2667.
- Yifei Liu, Yiquan Wu, Yating Zhang, Changlong Sun, Weiming Lu, Fei Wu, and Kun Kuang. 2023. [MI-ljp: Multi-law aware legal judgment prediction](#). In *Proceedings of the 46th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval, SIGIR '23*, page 1023–1034. Association for Computing Machinery.
- Saeed Masoudnia and Reza Ebrahimpour. 2014. Mixture of experts: a literature survey. *Artificial Intelligence Review*, 42:275–293.
- Chunyun Meng, Yuki Todo, Cheng Tang, Li Luan, and Zheng Tang. 2025. Dpfsi: A legal judgment prediction method based on deontic logic prompt and fusion of law article statistical information. *Expert Systems with Applications*, page 126722.
- Kishore Papineni, Salim Roukos, Todd Ward, and Wei-Jing Zhu. 2002. [Bleu: a method for automatic evaluation of machine translation](#). In *Proceedings of the 40th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 311–318. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Joseph Raz. 1980. *The Concept of a Legal System: An Introduction to the Theory of a Legal System*. Oxford University Press.
- Jingyun Sun, Shaobin Huang, and Chi Wei. 2024. Chinese legal judgment prediction via knowledgeable prompt learning. *Expert Systems with Applications*, 238:122177.
- Yiquan Wu, Kun Kuang, Yating Zhang, Xiaozhong Liu, Changlong Sun, Jun Xiao, Yueting Zhuang, Luo Si, and Fei Wu. 2020. De-biased court’s view generation with causality. In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pages 763–780.
- Yiquan Wu, Yifei Liu, Weiming Lu, Yating Zhang, Jun Feng, Changlong Sun, Fei Wu, and Kun Kuang. 2022. [Towards interactivity and interpretability: A rationale-based legal judgment prediction framework](#). In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 4787–4799, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Yiquan Wu, Siying Zhou, Yifei Liu, Weiming Lu, Xiaozhong Liu, Yating Zhang, Changlong Sun, Fei Wu, and Kun Kuang. 2023. Precedent-enhanced legal judgment prediction with llm and domain-model collaboration. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.09241*.
- Chunyu Xia, Tieke He, Wenlong Li, Zemin Qin, and Zhipeng Zou. 2019. Similarity analysis of law documents based on word2vec. In *2019 IEEE 19th International Conference on Software Quality, Reliability and Security Companion (QRS-C)*, pages 354–357. IEEE.
- Nuo Xu, Pinghui Wang, Long Chen, Li Pan, Xiaoyan Wang, and Junzhou Zhao. 2020. [Distinguish confusing law articles for legal judgment prediction](#). In

Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics, pages 3086–3095, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Qi Xu, Xiao Wei, Hang Yu, Qian Liu, and Hao Fei. 2024. [Divide and conquer: Legal concept-guided criminal court view generation](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2024*, pages 3395–3410.

Jun Yang, Weizhi Ma, Min Zhang, Xin Zhou, Yiqun Liu, and Shaoping Ma. 2021. [Legalgnn: Legal information enhanced graph neural network for recommendation](#). *ACM Trans. Inf. Syst.*, 40(2).

Hai Ye, Xin Jiang, Zhunchen Luo, and Wenhan Chao. 2018. Interpretable charge predictions for criminal cases: Learning to generate court views from fact descriptions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1802.08504*.

Linan Yue, Qi Liu, Binbin Jin, Han Wu, Kai Zhang, Yanqing An, Mingyue Cheng, Biao Yin, and Dayong Wu. 2021a. [Neurjudge: A circumstance-aware neural framework for legal judgment prediction](#). In *Proceedings of the 44th international ACM SIGIR conference on research and development in information retrieval*, pages 973–982.

Linan Yue, Qi Liu, Han Wu, Yanqing An, Li Wang, Senchao Yuan, and Dayong Wu. 2021b. [Circumstances enhanced criminal court view generation](#). In *Proceedings of the 44th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval, SIGIR '21*, page 1855–1859, New York, NY, USA. Association for Computing Machinery.

Linan Yue, Qi Liu, Lili Zhao, Li Wang, Weibo Gao, and Yanqing An. 2024. [Event grounded criminal court view generation with cooperative \(large\) language models](#). In *Proceedings of the 47th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval*, pages 2221–2230.

Han Zhang, Zhicheng Dou, Yutao Zhu, and Ji-Rong Wen. 2023. Contrastive learning for legal judgment prediction. *ACM Transactions on Information Systems*, 41(4):1–25.

Tianyi Zhang, Varsha Kishore, Felix Wu, Kilian Q Weinberger, and Yoav Artzi. 2020a. [Bertscore: Evaluating text generation with bert](#). In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*.

Tianyi Zhang, Varsha Kishore, Felix Wu, Kilian Q. Weinberger, and Yoav Artzi. 2020b. [Bertscore: Evaluating text generation with BERT](#). In *8th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR*.

Jie Zhao, Ziyu Guan, Cai Xu, Wei Zhao, and Enze Chen. 2022. Charge prediction by constitutive elements matching of crimes. In *IJCAI*, pages 4517–4523.

Haoxi Zhong, Chaojun Xiao, Cunchao Tu, Tianyang Zhang, Zhiyuan Liu, and Maosong Sun. 2020. [Jecqa: a legal-domain question answering dataset](#). In *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, volume 34, pages 9701–9708.

A Legal Chain Extraction Prompt




Figure 5: Legal Chain Extraction Prompt.

Figure 5 illustrates the prompt structure used for extracting legal chains from statutory provisions. While the extraction prompts are designed to enforce five essential constraints:

- **Exhaustiveness:** All distinct behaviors and conditions specified in the statutory provision must be represented in the extracted chains.
- **Semantic separation:** Premises must capture behavioral elements, while situations must focus exclusively on consequential states or circumstances.
- **Logical coherence:** Complex conditions are represented through explicit logical operators (AND/OR), ensuring preservation of the original provision’s inferential structure.
- **Referential specificity:** Any pronouns or indirect references in the statutory text must be replaced with their specific content to eliminate ambiguity.
- **Sentencing specificity:** Conclusions must directly correspond to legally prescribed sentencing ranges without logical decomposition.

We asked legal experts to evaluate the generated legal chains using the prompt shown in Figure 5. Across all 12 crime categories, the generated legal chains achieved an accuracy of 97.68%. This high accuracy indicates that the proposed prompt effectively generates accurate legal chains. Moreover, our construction method allows legal knowledge

Table 6: Statistics of the Datasets

	LAIC-Train	LAIC-Test	PCCD
Total Cases	33,841	1,200	100
Text Length (Characters)			
Fact Description			
Average	548.6	509.6	394.0
Median	321.0	306.5	321.5
Court Opinion			
Average	343.6	366.1	394.0
Median	280.0	299.0	332.0

to be represented more easily and systematically than in previous studies, which relied on manually designed rules.

B Datasets

We utilize two open-source, real-world datasets: the Legal AI Challenge 2021 (LAIC-2021) and the People’s Court Case Database (PCCD). Both datasets contain cases published by courts in China. The key difference is that the PCCD dataset was curated by the Supreme People’s Court of China in 2023 and is intended to guide judges in handling similar cases. Therefore, the cases of PCCD are much more complex, and the number of cases is much smaller than LAIC-2021. Statistics for the two datasets are shown in Table 6.

C Baselines

We selected two types of baselines to compare with our method: Criminal Judicial Opinion Generation and Sentencing Prediction. Since the legal reasoning generation task is a text generation task, the models used are primarily language models, which can also be applied to the Criminal Judicial Opinion Generation task.

Criminal Judicial Opinion Generation task. Based on prior work in legal reasoning generation, we selected several recent and influential natural language generation models as baselines, including AttS2S (Bahdanau et al., 2015), BART (Lewis et al., 2020), Llama-3.2-3B (Grattafiori et al., 2024), DeepSeek-R1-Distill-Qwen-7B (DeepSeek-AI et al., 2025), and Lawyer-Llama-13B-V2 (Huang et al., 2023).

Sentencing Prediction We selected language models such as BERT (Devlin et al., 2019), fine-tuned BERT (BERT-FT), and ELECTRA (Clark et al., 2020); manually designed knowledge-based methods like NeurJudge (Yue et al., 2021a) and ML-LJP (Liu et al., 2023); and case-based methods

such as R-Former (Dong and Niu, 2021).

D Evaluation Metrics

We select several types of evaluation metrics to assess the quality of the generated judicial opinions.

D.1 Numerical Evaluation

For sentencing prediction, we do not set the task as a classification problem. Although prior work has often formulated sentence length prediction as a classification task by discretizing prison terms into predefined categories, we argue that this approach introduces several limitations. First, discretization can result in the loss of fine-grained information, especially when sentence lengths vary continuously across a wide range. This may obscure meaningful differences between cases with similar but not identical sentence durations. Second, the boundaries between categories are often arbitrary and may not reflect real-world sentencing practices or legal standards, potentially introducing bias or reducing interpretability. Finally, treating the task as regression allows for a more precise, data-driven estimation of sentence length, which aligns better with the inherently continuous nature of the sentencing variable. Therefore, we adopt a regression-based formulation and evaluate performance using Mean Absolute Error (MAE) and Root Mean Square Error (RMSE).

D.2 Lexical Evaluation

To assess the quality of legal reasoning generation from a lexical perspective, we utilize standard n-gram overlap-based metrics. Specifically, we use ROUGE-1, ROUGE-2, and ROUGE-L to measure unigram, bigram, and longest common subsequence overlaps, respectively. Additionally, we report BLEU-1, BLEU-2, and BLEU-N scores to evaluate n-gram precision at different levels. These metrics capture surface-level similarity between the generated and reference texts.

D.3 Embedding Evaluation

To assess semantic similarity beyond surface-level lexical overlap, we utilize BERTScore (Zhang et al., 2020b), which leverages contextualized embeddings from pre-trained transformer models to compare generated and reference judicial opinions. This metric captures deeper semantic alignment and is particularly effective in identifying meaning-preserving variations that traditional n-gram-based metrics may overlook.




Figure 6: GPTScore-pairwise Prompt.

D.4 LLM-based Evaluation

To evaluate the logical consistency and legal soundness of the generated content, we adopt an LLM-based assessment method known as GPTScore (Fu et al., 2024). This approach leverages large language models to assess the overall quality of generated judicial opinions. Following recent research, we employ the GPTScore-pairwise (Li et al., 2024b) variant, which has been shown to be more effective. This method compares multiple generated texts and selects the best output. Figure 6 illustrates the prompt used for pairwise comparison, based on prior work.

Table 1 and 2 show the scores of each model on GPTScore-pairwise. Due to the page limit, we report the average scores of AttS2S and BART. The AttS2S and BART scores of Table 1 are 0.0/0.0/0.0 and 9.87/21.68/28.97, respectively. The AttS2S and BART scores of Table 2 are 2.0/1.0/1.0 and 11/29/35, respectively.

D.5 Rule-based Evaluation

We design a rule-based method to evaluate the information consistency between the reference and generated judicial opinions.

This method focuses on three key aspects: defendant, situation, and sentencing. First, we compare the defendant’s name (e.g., "Li XX") to ensure it is consistently represented in both the reference and generated opinions. Second, we assess whether both opinions describe the same situation, based on structured legal chains extracted from the statutory provisions. Finally, given the situation mentioned in the generated opinion, we verify whether the predicted sentence aligns with the expected sentencing level for that situation.

The final consistency score is computed by multiplying the individual accuracies of the defendant, situation, and sentencing components.

E Case Study

Table 7: Case Demonstration Example 1

Component	Content
Case Information	
Type	Robbery
Facts	<p>经审理查明，2012年1月2日22时30分许，被告人A伙同B、C（二人已判刑）驾驶一辆黑色轿车至X市Y镇1号加油站，蒙面持刀、工具，并以言语相威胁，抢走该站现金300余元。1月3日凌晨1时许，上述几人又驾车至X市Z路2号加油站，以同样手段抢走现金1000余元。赃款已挥霍。</p> <p>The court ascertained that on January 2, 2012, at approximately 22:30, Defendant A, together with B and C (both already sentenced), drove a black sedan to Gas Station 1 in Town Y, City X. Wearing masks and armed with knives and tools, they threatened the staff and robbed over 300 yuan in cash from the station. At approximately 1:00 on January 3, the aforementioned individuals drove to Gas Station 2 on Road Z in City X and used the same methods to rob over 1,000 yuan in cash. The stolen money has been spent.</p>
Opinion	<p>本院认为，被告人A以非法占有为目的，以暴力威胁手段抢劫他人财物，其行为已构成抢劫罪。公诉机关指控的罪名成立，本院依法予以支持。被告人A持械抢劫，酌情从重处罚。被告人A当庭自愿认罪，酌情从轻处罚。依照《中华人民共和国刑法》第二百六十三条，第二十五条第一款，第五十二条，第五十三条之规定，判决如下：判处有期徒刑42个月。</p> <p>This court holds that Defendant A, with the purpose of illegal possession, used violence and threats to rob others' property. His actions constitute the crime of robbery. The prosecution's charge is established and is supported by this court. Defendant A committed armed robbery, which warrants a heavier punishment. Defendant A voluntarily admitted guilt in court, which warrants a lenient punishment. In accordance with Articles 263, 25(1), 52, and 53 of the Criminal Law of the People's Republic of China, the judgment is as follows: 42 months of fixed-term imprisonment.</p>
Evaluation Metrics	
Defendant	Defendant A
Reasoning	Robbery (with knives and tools); Multiple instances (two gas stations)
Sentencing	42 months of imprisonment
Generated Opinions	
AttS2S	<p>Opinion: This court holds that Defendant D, with the purpose of illegal possession, used methods of fabricating facts and concealing the truth to defraud others' property, with the amount being huge. These actions constitute the crime of fraud. The prosecution's charge is established. The defendant truthfully confessed his crimes, which warrants a lenient punishment. Based on the defendant's criminal facts, circumstances, and remorseful attitude, a lenient punishment is appropriate. In accordance with Articles 266, 67(1), and 62 of the Criminal Law of the People's Republic of China, the judgment is as follows: 36 months of fixed-term imprisonment.</p> <p>Evaluation: × Incorrectly identifies defendant as "Defendant D"; × Completely mischaracterizes the crime as fraud and fails to mention used violence and threats as premise; × Sentencing inconsistent with reasoning</p>
BART	<p>Opinion: This court holds that Defendant A, with the purpose of illegal possession, together with others used violence and threats to forcibly rob others' property. These actions constitute the crime of robbery. The prosecution's charge is established. The Defendant A played a minor role in the joint crime and is an accomplice who should receive reduced punishment according to law. The Defendant A truthfully confessed his crimes after being arrested, which warrants a lenient punishment according to law. In accordance with Articles 263, 25(1), 27, 67(3), and 64 of the Criminal Law of the People's Republic of China, the judgment is as follows: 30 months of fixed-term imprisonment.</p> <p>Evaluation: ✓ Correctly identifies defendant; ✓ Correctly identifies crime as robbery and mention used violence and threats as premise; × Sentencing inconsistent with reasoning and actual sentencing range</p>
Lawyer-Llama-13B-V2	<p>Opinion: This court holds that Defendant A, together with others, with the purpose of illegal possession, used violence and threats to rob public and private property. His actions constitute the crime of robbery. The prosecution's charge is supported by clear facts and sufficient evidence. The Defendant A voluntarily admitted guilt in court, which warrants consideration for leniency. In accordance with Articles 263(1) and 55(1) of the Criminal Law of the People's Republic of China, the judgment is as follows: 60 months of fixed-term imprisonment.</p> <p>Evaluation: ✓ Correctly identifies defendant; ✓ Correctly identifies crime as robbery and mention used violence and threats as premise; ✓ Sentencing consistent with reasoning though higher than actual sentence</p>
Lawyer-Llama-13B-V2 + Statutory Provisions	<p>Opinion: This court holds that Defendant A, together with others, with the purpose of illegal possession, used violence and threats to rob public and private property. His actions constitute the crime of robbery. The prosecution's charge is supported by clear facts and sufficient evidence. The Defendant A voluntarily admitted guilt in court, which warrants consideration for leniency. In accordance with Article 263(4) of the Criminal Law of the People's Republic of China, the judgment is as follows: 120 months of fixed-term imprisonment.</p> <p>Evaluation: ✓ Correctly identifies defendant; ✓ Correctly identifies crime as robbery and mention used violence and threats as premise; × Sentencing inconsistent with reasoning and actual sentencing range</p>

Lawyer-Llama-13B-V2 + Legal-Chain-Reasoner	<p>Opinion: This court holds that Defendant A, together with others, with the purpose of illegal possession, used violence and threats to rob public and private property. His actions constitute the crime of robbery. The prosecution’s charge is supported by clear facts and sufficient evidence. The Defendant A voluntarily admitted guilt in court, which warrants consideration for leniency. In accordance with Article 263 of the Criminal Law of the People’s Republic of China, the judgment is as follows: 48 months of fixed-term imprisonment.</p> <p>Evaluation: ✓ Correctly identifies defendant; ✓ Correctly identifies crime as robbery and mention used violence and threats as premise; ✓ Sentencing consistent with reasoning though higher than actual sentence but most closed</p>
--	--

Table 8: Case Demonstration Example 2

Component	Content
Case Information	
Type	Fraud
Facts	<p>经审理查明，被告人A于2013年1月至4月，以能为被害人B办理工厂上班为名，两次骗取被害人B人民币16万元。被告人A于2014年11月份，以给C的儿子办理工作为由，骗取C人民币24万元。被告人A于2017年2月份，以帮助D办事为由先后三次骗取D人民币22万元。综上，被告人A共诈骗三起，诈骗金额计人民币62万元。</p> <p>The court ascertained that from January to April 2013, Defendant A defrauded Victim B by claiming he could arrange employment at Factory X for Victim B’s son, receiving 160,000 CNY on two occasions. In November 2014, the defendant defrauded Victim C of 240,000 CNY by claiming he could arrange employment for Victim C’s son. In February 2017, the defendant defrauded Victim D of 220,000 CNY on three occasions by claiming he could help with certain matters. In total, Defendant A committed three instances of fraud amounting to 620,000 CNY.</p>
Opinion	<p>本院认为，公诉机关指控被告人A以非法占有为目的，虚构事实，隐瞒真相，多次骗取他人财物，数额特别巨大的事实，有经过庭审查实的证据予以证实，A的行为构成诈骗罪，公诉机关指控的犯罪事实和罪名成立。关于A辩称，其没有承诺为C儿子办工作，收到C24万元系借款，其行为不构成诈骗罪的意见，经审理认为，被害人C、证人E、证人F证言均证实A谎称能为C儿子办工作，C共给付A24万元，书证收据（欠条），载明为出款人孩子办工作；短信截图证实A谎称为C儿子办理工作，让C拿钱的事实，上述证据能够形成完整证据链条，足以证实A谎称能为C儿子办工作，诈骗C24万元的事实，故A的辩解不成立；关于A辩称，其在D处分三次拿22万元后让G拿走了，钱没花着，不能认定其构成诈骗罪的辩护意见，经审理认为，被害人D的陈述、证人G的证言均证实将22万元交付给A，且G对A称其将22万元借走一事予以否认亦无证据证实，故A的辩解不成立。被告人A诈骗被害人B案系刑满释放后五年内重新犯罪，是累犯，应当从重处罚；被告人A如实供述诈骗被害人B的罪行，可以从轻处罚。依照《中华人民共和国刑法》第二百六十六条、第六十五条第一款、第六十七条第三款、第五十二条、第五十三条、第六十四条之规定，判决如下：判处有期徒刑138个月。</p> <p>This court holds that the prosecution’s charges against Defendant A—that with the purpose of illegal possession, he fabricated facts, concealed the truth, and repeatedly defrauded others of property in an especially large amount—are supported by evidence verified during the trial. Defendant A’s actions constitute the crime of fraud, and the prosecution’s charges regarding the criminal facts and offense are established. Regarding Defendant A’s defense that he did not promise to arrange employment for Victim C’s son and that the 240,000 CNY received from Victim C was a loan rather than fraud, the court finds that testimonies from Victim C, Witness E, and Witness F all confirm that Defendant A falsely claimed he could arrange employment for Victim C’s son, and Victim C paid Defendant A 240,000 CNY in total. Documentary evidence including receipts (IOUs) indicate the money was for arranging employment for the payer’s child. Text message screenshots confirm Defendant A’s false claims about arranging employment and requesting money from Victim C. This evidence forms a complete chain sufficient to prove that Defendant A defrauded Victim C of 240,000 CNY by falsely claiming he could arrange employment for Victim C’s son. Therefore, Defendant A’s defense is not established. Regarding Defendant A’s defense that after receiving 220,000 CNY from Victim D in three installments, he let Witness G take it away and did not spend the money himself, thereby not constituting fraud, the court finds that testimonies from Victim D and Witness G confirm that 220,000 CNY was given to Defendant A, and Witness G denies Defendant A’s claim that he borrowed the 220,000 CNY. There is no evidence to support Defendant A’s claim, so his defense is not established. The defendant committed the fraud against Victim B after being released from prison for less than five years, making him a recidivist, which warrants a heavier punishment. The defendant truthfully confessed to defrauding Victim B, which warrants a lenient punishment. In accordance with Articles 266, 65(1), 67(3), 52, 53, and 64 of the Criminal Law of the People’s Republic of China, the judgment is as follows: 138 months of fixed-term imprisonment.</p>

Component	Content
Evaluation Metrics	
Defendant	Defendant A
Reasoning	Multiple defrauded others of property (three separate victims); Especially large amount (620,000 CNY)
Sentencing	138 months of imprisonment
Generated Opinions	
AttS2S	<p>Opinion: The Court holds that Defendant Z, with the purpose of illegal possession, used methods of fabricating facts and concealing the truth to defraud others' property, with the amount being large. These actions constitute the crime of fraud. The prosecution's charge is established. The defendant truthfully confessed his crimes after committing them, which warrants lenient punishment according to law. Based on the defendant's criminal facts, circumstances, and remorseful attitude, a lenient punishment is appropriate. In accordance with Articles 266, 67(1), and 62 of the Criminal Law of the People's Republic of China, the judgment is as follows: 36 months of fixed-term imprisonment.</p> <p>Evaluation: × Incorrectly identifies defendant; × Correctly classifies premise as defraud others' property but mischaracterizes amount as "large" rather than "especially large"; × Sentencing inconsistent with reasoning and actual sentencing range</p>
BART	<p>Opinion: The Court holds that Defendant A, with the purpose of illegal possession, used methods of fabricating facts and concealing the truth to defraud others' property, with the amount being especially large. These actions constitute the crime of fraud. The prosecution's charge against the defendant for the crime of fraud is supported by clear facts and sufficient evidence. The charge is established and supported by this court. The defendant truthfully confessed his crimes after being arrested, which warrants lenient punishment according to law. In accordance with Articles 266, 67(3), 52, 53, and 64 of the Criminal Law of the People's Republic of China, the judgment is as follows: 120 months of fixed-term imprisonment.</p> <p>Evaluation: ✓ Correctly identifies defendant; ✓ Correctly classifies premise as defraud others' property and correctly characterizes amount as "especially large"; ✓ Sentencing consistent with reasoning though lower than actual sentence</p>
Lawyer-Llama-13B-V2	<p>Opinion: The Court holds that Defendant A, with the purpose of illegal possession, fabricated facts and concealed the truth, to repeatedly defraud others' property, with the amount being especially large. These actions constitute the crime of fraud. The prosecution's charge is supported by evidence and is established. The defendant truthfully confessed his crimes after being arrested, which constitutes a confession and warrants lenient punishment according to law. The defendant has actively returned the defrauded property and obtained forgiveness from the victims, which may warrant lenient punishment. In accordance with Articles 266 and 67(3) of the Criminal Law of the People's Republic of China, the judgment is as follows: 96 months of fixed-term imprisonment.</p> <p>Evaluation: ✓ Correctly identifies defendant; ✓ Correctly classifies premise as defraud others' property and correctly characterizes amount as "especially large"; × Sentencing inconsistent with reasoning and actual sentencing range</p>
Lawyer-Llama-13B-V2 + Statutory Provisions	<p>Opinion: The Court holds that Defendant A, with the purpose of illegal possession, fabricated facts and concealed the truth to defraud others' property, with the amount being especially large. These actions constitute the crime of fraud. The prosecution's charge is supported by clear facts and sufficient evidence, and is established. The defendant voluntarily admitted guilt in court, which warrants lenient punishment. After the case occurred, the defendant's family actively compensated the victims for economic losses and obtained forgiveness, which warrants lenient punishment. The defense counsel's relevant defense opinions are consistent with the established facts and are adopted. In accordance with Articles 266, 52, and 64 of the Criminal Law of the People's Republic of China, the judgment is as follows: 120 months of fixed-term imprisonment.</p> <p>Evaluation: ✓ Correctly identifies defendant; ✓ Correctly classifies premise as defraud others' property and correctly characterizes amount as "especially large"; ✓ Sentencing consistent with reasoning though lower than actual sentence</p>
Lawyer-Llama-13B-V2 + Legal-Chain-Reasoner	<p>Opinion: The Court holds that Defendant A, with the purpose of illegal possession, fabricated facts and concealed the truth to defraud others' property, with the amount being especially large. These actions constitute the crime of fraud. The prosecution's charge is supported by clear facts, sufficient evidence, and is established. Given that the defendant voluntarily admitted guilt in court, a relatively lenient punishment may be considered. In accordance with Articles 266, 52, and 53 of the Criminal Law of the People's Republic of China, the judgment is as follows: 120 months of fixed-term imprisonment.</p> <p>Evaluation: ✓ Correctly identifies defendant; ✓ Correctly classifies premise as defraud others' property and correctly characterizes amount as "especially large"; ✓ Sentencing consistent with reasoning though lower than actual sentence</p>

Table 9: Case Demonstration Example 3

Component	Content
Case Information	
Type	Misappropriation of Funds
Facts	<p>经审理查明：2017年3月5日，被告人A与B某签定股权债权转让协议书，在2017年3月10日至3月13日，B某分三次通过银行转账转入被告人A账户150万元的合同应付款，被告人A将150万元挪用还银行贷款。2017年4月21日至5月9日，B某将X公司Y分公司的售房款分6次转入被告人A账户106万元，被告人A将其中85万元售房款用于还自己的贷款和个人使用。案发前已归还。另查明，被害人X公司及X公司Y分公司均表示对被告人A谅解。</p> <p>Facts as determined by the court: On March 5, 2017, Defendant A signed an equity and debt transfer agreement with Person B. Between March 10-13, 2017, Person B transferred contractual payments totaling 1.5 million yuan to Defendant A's account in three separate bank transfers, which Defendant A misappropriated to repay bank loans. From April 21 to May 9, 2017, Person B transferred housing sales proceeds totaling 1.06 million yuan from Branch Y of Company X to Defendant A's account in six installments. Defendant A used 850,000 yuan of these funds to repay personal loans and for personal expenses. The funds were returned before the case was filed. Further investigation revealed that the victims, Company X and its Branch Y, have both expressed understanding toward Defendant A</p>
Opinion	<p>本院认为，被告人A利用职务之便挪用资金，数额较大，犯罪事实清楚，证据确实、充分，其行为构成挪用资金罪。公诉机关指控的罪名及事实成立，本院予以确认。被告人A到案后如实供述自己的罪行，可从轻处罚。被告人A获得被害人谅解，可酌情从轻处罚。公诉机关的量刑建议符合法律规定，本院予以确认。辩护人关于被告人如实供述、获得被害人谅解、认罪认罚可从轻处罚的辩护意见予以采纳。辩护人关于起诉书指控第一起被告人挪用150万元不应认定及第二起犯罪数额应为45万元的辩护意见，经查与事实不符，不予采纳。根据被告人犯罪的事实、犯罪的性质、情节和对于社会的危害程度，依照《中华人民共和国刑法》第二百七十二条、第六十四条、第六十七条第三款之规定，判决如下：判处有期徒刑7个月。</p> <p>This court holds that Defendant A took advantage of his position to misappropriate funds in a relatively large amount. The facts of the crime are clear and the evidence is reliable and sufficient. His behavior constitutes the crime of misappropriation of funds. The prosecution's charge and alleged facts are established and confirmed by this court. The defendant truthfully confessed his crimes after being arrested, which warrants a lenient punishment. The defendant obtained the forgiveness of the victims, which also warrants consideration for leniency. The sentencing recommendation of the prosecution complies with the law and is confirmed by the court. The defense's opinion that the defendant truthfully confessed, obtained the victims' understanding, and admitted guilt and accepted punishment warranting leniency is adopted. The defense's opinion regarding the prosecution's allegations about the first misappropriation of 1.5 million yuan and that the amount in the second crime should be 450,000 yuan is not consistent with the facts and is not adopted. Based on the facts, nature, circumstances, and social harm of the defendant's crime, in accordance with Articles 272, 64, and 67(3) of the Criminal Law of the People's Republic of China, the judgment is as follows: 7 months of fixed-term imprisonment.</p>
Component	
Content	
Evaluation Metrics	
Defendant	Defendant A
Reasoning	Misappropriated funds; Relatively large amounts
Sentencing	7 months of imprisonment
Generated Opinions	
AttS2S	<p>Opinion: This court holds that Defendant Z, with the purpose of illegal possession, used methods of fabricating facts and concealing the truth to defraud others' property, with the amount being large. These actions constitute the crime of fraud. The prosecution's charge is established. The defendant's criminal facts and circumstances warrant lenient punishment according to law. Based on the defendant's criminal facts, circumstances, and the degree of social harm, in accordance with Articles 266, 67(1), and 60 of the Criminal Law of the People's Republic of China, the judgment is as follows: 36 months of fixed-term imprisonment.</p> <p>Evaluation: × Incorrectly identifies defendant; × Mischaracterizes crime as fraud rather than misappropriation of funds and incorrectly characterizes amount as "large" rather than "relatively large"; × Sentencing inconsistent with reasoning and actual sentencing range</p>
BART	<p>Opinion: This court holds that Defendant A, as a company employee, took advantage of his position to misappropriate company funds for personal use, with the amount being large, and not returned for over three months. His actions constitute the crime of misappropriation of funds. The prosecution's charge is established and supported by this court. The defendant truthfully confessed his crimes after being arrested, which warrants lenient punishment according to law. The defendant has obtained the understanding of the victims, which warrants consideration for leniency. In accordance with Articles 272(1), 67(3), and 64 of the Criminal Law of the People's Republic of China, the judgment is as follows: 36 months of fixed-term imprisonment.</p> <p>Evaluation: ✓ Correctly identifies defendant; × Correctly identifies premise as misappropriate company funds but incorrectly characterizes amount as "large" rather than "relatively large"; × Sentencing inconsistent with reasoning and actual sentencing range</p>

Lawyer-Llama-13B-V2	<p>Opinion: This court holds that Defendant A took advantage of his position to misappropriate public funds for profit-making activities, with the amount being large. His actions constitute the crime of misappropriation of funds. The prosecution's charge is established with clear facts and sufficient evidence. The defendant voluntarily surrendered himself after the crime and truthfully confessed, constituting voluntary surrender, which warrants lenient punishment. The defendant voluntarily admitted guilt and obtained the victims' understanding, which also warrants consideration for leniency. In accordance with Articles 272(1), 67(1), 72(1), 72(3), 73(2), and 73(3) of the Criminal Law of the People's Republic of China, the judgment is as follows: 36 months of fixed-term imprisonment.</p> <p>Evaluation: ✓ Correctly identifies defendant; ✗ Incorrectly characterizes as "misappropriation of public funds" rather than "misappropriation of company funds" and incorrectly describes amount as "large" rather than "relatively large"; ✗ Sentencing inconsistent with reasoning and actual sentencing range</p>
Lawyer-Llama-13B-V2 + Statutory Provisions	<p>Opinion: This court holds that Defendant A took advantage of his position to misappropriate company funds for personal use, with the amount being relatively large and not returned for over three months. His actions constitute the crime of misappropriation of funds. The prosecution's charge is established with clear facts and sufficient evidence. Before the case was filed, the defendant returned most of the misappropriated funds to the victim company and obtained their understanding, which warrants consideration for leniency. The defendant voluntarily admitted guilt during the trial, which also warrants leniency. The defense counsel's opinion that the defendant is a first-time offender who has actively compensated for the victims' losses and obtained their understanding, requesting a suspended sentence, is verified and adopted. In accordance with Articles 272(1), 67(3), 72(1), 73(2), and 73(3) of the Criminal Law of the People's Republic of China, the judgment is as follows: 12 months of fixed-term imprisonment.</p> <p>Evaluation: ✓ Correctly identifies defendant; ✓ Correctly identifies premise as misappropriation of funds and correctly characterizes amount as "relatively large"; ✓ Sentencing consistent with reasoning though higher than actual sentence</p>
Lawyer-Llama-13B-V2 + Legal-Chain-Reasoner	<p>Opinion: This court holds that Defendant A took advantage of his position to misappropriate company funds for personal use, with the amount being relatively large and not returned for over three months. His actions constitute the crime of misappropriation of funds. The prosecution's charge and alleged facts are established and legally supported. Given that the defendant actively returned all misappropriated funds before the case was filed, voluntarily admitted guilt in court, and obtained the understanding of the victims, a lenient punishment is warranted. In accordance with Articles 272(1) and 64 of the Criminal Law of the People's Republic of China, the judgment is as follows: 12 months of fixed-term imprisonment.</p> <p>Evaluation: ✓ Correctly identifies defendant; ✓ Correctly identifies premise as misappropriation of funds and correctly characterizes amount as "relatively large"; ✓ Sentencing consistent with reasoning though higher than actual sentence</p>