

Available At?: The Tenuous Nature of Online Authority Cited in Arkansas Judicial Opinions

Steven R. Probst*

I. INTRODUCTION

For generations, law students have been taught the importance of citation and precedent. Citations are important, we teach, because they permit researchers to locate authorities that are found to be controlling or persuasive by the legal writer. When these citations are found within a case decided by an appellate court, they become part of that case's precedent, and locating the authorities relied on by a court in its opinion takes on increased importance as doing so permits lawyers and scholars to understand and assess the reasoning behind the court's opinion.¹ However, this reliable framework, built upon decades of citations to traditional print sources, is threatened by increased citation to online sources by American courts.²

In theory, citation to internet-based sources should increase access to cited sources as researchers around the world can potentially access the cited content through a single mouse click rather than a trip to the nearest law library.³ This web-based cited source, however, is most-often hosted by a third-party and will only be available if the third party preserves and continues to provide access to it.⁴ Likely everyone has had the frustrating

* Head of Public Services, Associate Librarian, Young Law Library, University of Arkansas School of Law. The author would like to thank Michael Whiteman, Associate Dean of Library Services, Robert S. Marx Law Library, University of Cincinnati College of Law for inspiring this article.

1. Adam Liptak, *In Supreme Court Opinions, Web Links to Nowhere*, N.Y. TIMES, (Sept. 23, 2013), <https://www.nytimes.com/2013/09/24/us/politics/in-supreme-court-opinions-clicks-that-lead-nowhere.html> [https://perma.cc/YU2B-SYGG].

2. See generally Arturo Torres, *Is Link Rot Destroying Stare Decisis As We Know It? The Internet-Citation Practice of the Texas Appellate Courts*, 13 J. APP. PRAC. & PROCESS 269 (2012).

3. Jonathan Zittrain et al., *Perma: Scoping and Addressing the Problem of Link and Reference Rot in Legal Citations*, 127 HARVARD L. REV. F. 176, 176 (2014).

4. *Id.*

experience of clicking on a broken link and receiving a “404 / Page Not Found!” message. With legal research, however, these broken links are not only frustrating, they threaten the integrity of the underlying opinion in which the link is cited.⁵

“Link rot”⁶ is a problem for everyone relying on the stability of a cited legal authority: for judges who want cited authorities to be available to support their decisions, for attorneys who need their cited authorities to remain available to support their arguments, and for researchers who are simply looking to find the cited authorities of either.

The link rot problem, while not new, is becoming increasingly worse as courts across the country increase the pace at which they are citing to web-based sources. And while solutions to this problem have become available, not every jurisdiction is making use of them. Research for this article examined the decisions of the Arkansas Supreme Court and Arkansas Court of Appeals containing citations to online sources. This research revealed that less than 40% of the links cited within them still connect to the sources cited by the courts.⁷ While the problem of link rot is not as extensive in Arkansas as it is in other states, the problem nevertheless still exists and is not being addressed as it is by other states. This article details the developing problem of link rot in court opinions nationwide. It then examines the extent of link rot in Arkansas court opinions. Solutions implemented by courts across the country are then explored before a recommended solution is proposed for the Arkansas judiciary.

II. BACKGROUND

Although the first court citations to web-based sources did not occur until the late 1990’s and grew slowly at first, the danger of link rot has been known for some time, with calls for action to

5. Victor Li, *Saving Links for Posterity*, A.B.A. J., Sept. 2015, at 41.

6. “Link rot” refers to a URL no longer returning content of any kind. Zittrain, *supra* note 3 at 177. “Reference rot,” a related concept, “happens when a link still works but the information referenced by the citation is no longer present, or has changed.” *Id.* For the sake of clarity, this article will refer only to link rot, though the discussion contained throughout the article is relevant to either problem.

7. *See infra* Section III.B

address the growing problem in both judicial opinions and legal scholarship being made as early as 2002.⁸ Despite the perceived differences in the types of resources cited by law reviews and those cited by courts, all web links are at risk of developing rot, and no one can predict which links will rot and which will remain accessible.⁹ One study of internet citations cited in the Harvard Law Review and two other Harvard journals between 1999 and 2012 found over 70% of them to be broken.¹⁰ Another study of internet citations in United States Supreme Court opinions issued between 1996 and 2010 found nearly a third of them to be inoperable, even though many of the citations were to .edu or .gov domains.¹¹ The problem of link rot across the web is so pervasive in fact that one group studying the problem in a longitudinal study has estimated the average lifespan of a single webpage to be

8. See Mary Rumsey, *Runaway Train: Problems of Permanence, Accessibility, and Stability in the Use of Web Sources in Law Review Citations*, 94 LAW LIBR. J. 27, 28 (2002); Coleen M. Barger, *On the Internet, Nobody Knows You're a Judge: Appellate Courts' Use of Internet Materials*, 4 J. APP. PRAC. & PROCESS 417, 438 (2002). The first citation to an internet-based source in a court opinion appears to be *U.S. v. Starzecpyzel*, 880 F. Supp. 1027, 1035 n. 7 (S.D.N.Y. 1995). The United States Supreme Court and State appellate courts followed suit the following year. See *Denver Area Educ. Telecomm. Consortium, Inc. v. FCC*, 518 U.S. 727, 777 n. 4 (1996) (Souter, J., concurring); *Wishnatsky v. Bergquist*, 550 N.W.2d 394, 404 (N.D. 1996) (Sandstrom, J., dissenting). For examples of how citations to internet-based sources increased from year to year in two representative states, see Tina S. Ching, *The Next Generation of Legal Citations: A Survey of Internet Citations in the Opinions of the Washington Supreme Court and Washington Appellate Courts, 1999-2005*, 9 J. APP. PRAC. & PROCESS 387 (2007) and Torres, *supra* note 2.

9. L. Jay Jackson, *Missing Links: 'Reference Rot' is Degrading Legal Research and Case Cites*, A.B.A. J., Dec. 2013, at 17.

10. Zittrain, *supra* note 3, at 177-78.

11. Raizel Liebler & June Liebert, *Something Rotten in the State of Legal Citation: The Life Span of a United States Supreme Court Citation Containing an Internet Link (1996-2010)*, 15 YALE J.L. & TECH. 273, 273, 298 (2013). In fact, more than 50% of .gov website links have been found to no longer work after five years. Jackson, *supra* note 9, at 17. The problem of link rot in U.S. Supreme Court opinions is highlighted nicely by Justice Alito's citation of <http://ssnat.com> in *Brown v. Entertainment Merchants Association*, 564 U.S. 786, 818 n. 14 (2011) (Alito, J., concurring). That URL, now the subject of link rot, currently links to the following text of a prankster:

404 Error – File Not Found. Aren't you glad you didn't cite to this webpage If you had, like Justice Alito did, the original content would long since have disappeared and someone else might have come along and purchased the domain in order to make a comment about the transience of linked information in the internet age.

<http://ssnat.com/> [<https://perma.cc/V2ZY-YUCX>].

between just 44 and 75 days.¹² And, as would be expected, this problem only gets worse over time.¹³

The reasons for link rot vary: domain changes, changes in organizational structure or ownership, defunct companies or servers, and reorganization of the website.¹⁴ The last of these reasons seems to account for many rotten links in Arkansas court opinions. Previously, the official state website for the Arkansas judiciary could be found at <https://courts.arkansas.gov>. This site, now defunct, currently leads only to a 404 “[t]his site can’t be reached” error message as the courts’ current official website is <https://www.arcourts.gov> and the former site was not archived. Any citations to uniform resource locators (URLs) housed under the Arkansas judiciary’s former website will no longer take a researcher to the cited content located on that now-defunct webpage.

So, what effect does a broken web link have on the court opinion in which it was cited? In large part this depends on the nature of the citation itself. Often, citations to the internet take the form of explanatory notes, sometimes placed in footnotes, meant to provide additional information, or to further illustrate a point being made by the court.¹⁵ Courts will also frequently turn to online dictionaries to provide definitions of terms relevant to

12. Jackson, *supra* note 9, at 17. For further detail of the work of the Chesapeake Digital Preservation Group in examining website stability including top-level domains, see Sarah Rhodes, *Breaking Down Link Rot: The Chesapeake Project Legal Information Archive’s Examination of URL Stability*, 102 LAW. LIBR. J. 581 (2010).

13. CHESAPEAKE DIG. PRES. GRP., “LINK ROT” AND LEGAL RESOURCES ON THE WEB: A 2013 ANALYSIS BY THE CHESAPEAKE DIGITAL PRESERVATION GROUP, 3 <https://library.law.uiowa.edu/sites/library.law.uiowa.edu/files/Link%20Rot%20and%20Legal%20Resources%20on%20the%20Web.pdf> [https://perma.cc/VY5M-RFA7] (reporting the results of a longitudinal study examining a large dataset of URLs over time which found a steady increase of broken links within the dataset with each passing year).

14. Zittrain, *supra* note 3, at 176; Jackson, *supra* note 9, at 18.

15. See, e.g., *Allen v. Allen*, 54 N.E.3d 344, 348 n. 2 (Ind. 2016) (citing <http://www.ncsl.org/research/human-services/termination-of-support-college-support.aspx> in a footnote for support that Indiana is one of very few states that has a statute requiring child support for education-related expenses for majority-aged children); *Ohio v. Moore*, 149 Ohio St. 3d 557, 564, 2016-Ohio-8288, ¶ 30, 76 N.E.3d 1127, 1134 (citing http://www.cdc.gov/nchs/data/nvsr/nvsr52/nvsr52_03.pdf in taking judicial notice of the life expectancy of a 15 year-old black male in evaluating the reasonableness of a 112 year sentence imposed for a non-homicide-related offense); *Crim ex rel. Crim v. Dietrich*, 2016 IL App 150843, ¶ 10, 67 N.E.3d 433, 435 (citing <http://www.mayoclinic.org/diseases-conditions/brachial-plexus-injury/home/ovc-20127336> for explanation of the “brachial plexus” network of nerves injured in a medical malpractice action).

the case before them or to provide helpful direction to an online resource.¹⁶ In these cases, when a link to the cited source is broken, relatively little is lost by the reader of the opinion other than the further illustration or helpful resource the court intended to provide them, particularly if the court has provided the substance of the cited content in its opinion.¹⁷

In other cases, however, a court's citation to an online source is more substantive. Sometimes this is as simple as providing a link to an online source for authority the court is citing.¹⁸ At other times, the court may signal that it is resting a portion of its reasoning in the opinion on the internet source it cites.¹⁹ When

16. See *Reed v. Lieurance*, 281 F. Supp. 3d 1058, 1062 n.1 (D. Mont. 2017) (citing <https://www.britannica.com/demystified/whats-the-difference-between-bison-and-buffalo> in a footnote defining the term bison and explaining the difference between buffalo and bison); *Hill v. Gephart*, 62 N.E.3d 408, 411 n.2 (Ind. Ct. App. 2016) (citing <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/vegetation> in defining the term "vegetation"); *Crews v. State*, 30 A.3d 120, 124 nn. 16-18 (Del. Fam. Ct. 2011) (Using Merriam-Webster's online dictionary to define the terms "harass," "annoy," and "alarm" that were not defined in the state's harassment statute); *Missouri ex. rel. Horenstein v. Eckelkamp*, 228 S.W.3d 56, 57 n.1 (Mo. Ct. App. 2007) (Providing a link to <http://www.irs.gov/pub/irs-pdf/i1099gi.pdf> in explaining the purpose for IRS form 1099).

17. It can be argued, however, that any information relied upon by the court, particularly citations to factual information, should be available for readers of a court's opinion to decide how much weight to give that information. Barger, *supra* note 8, at 429-30 ("When, however, a court purportedly bases its understanding of the law or the law's application to case facts upon a source that cannot subsequently be located or confirmed, the significance of the citation to that source becomes more ominous. If present readers of the opinion cannot determine how much persuasive weight was or should be accorded to the unavailable source, they have little reason to place much confidence in the opinion's authoritativeness.").

18. See, e.g., *In re Callam*, 150 Ohio St.3d 311, 314, 2017-Ohio-4361, ¶ 13, 81 N.E.3d 448, 451 (citing http://www.supremecourt.ohio.gov/AttySvcs/admissions/pdf/ESSENTIAL_ELIGIBILITY_REQUIREMENTS.pdf for certain requirements for practicing law in Ohio).

19. See, e.g., *State v. Loomis*, 2016 WI 68, 371, ¶ 13, Wis. 2d 235, 245, 881 N.W.2d 749, 754 n.14 (citing http://www.northpointeinc.com/files/technical_documents/Practitioners-Guide-COMPAS-Core-_031915.pdf, a now-broken link, as a source to consult a risk assessment tool central to the court's decision on whether the use of this tool violated the defendant's due process rights); *Commonwealth v. Lopez*, 292 S.W.3d 878, 881 n.6 (Ky. 2009) (citing <http://www.cemml.colostate.edu/cultural/09476/pdf/GeneralOrderGO-1A.pdf>, a source no longer at the URL cited by the court, but ostensibly containing the text of an order the defendant had been accused of violating); *Albertson v. Apfel*, 247 F.3d 448, 449 n.1 (2nd Cir. 2001) (citing <http://www.encyclopedia.com/articles/02150MeasuresofTime.html>, a site that is no longer accessible, in rejecting appellant's argument that she had been married the requisite period of time to collect social security survivorship benefits under federal law); *Dean Witter Reynolds, Inc. v. Fleury*, 138 F.3d 1339, 1341 n.1 (11th Cir. 1998) (citing <http://www.nasdr.com/2820.htm>, a now-defunct link

this occurs, and the cited link is no longer available, a portion of the court's reasoning and explanation for reaching the decision that it did is lost forever, arguably undermining our system of *stare decisis* and ability to rely on precedent.²⁰ If these substantive citations to the internet were an isolated occurrence they would be less troubling. However, as it becomes more common for courts to cite to online sources, the nature of the links in court opinions seems to be changing. While it may have been more common several years ago for courts to cite web-based sources only in some superfluous manner, they may now be citing sources that only exist online.²¹

III. An Examination of Citations to the Internet by the Arkansas Supreme Court and Arkansas Court of Appeals

The scope of the link rot problem nationally, once recognized, should hopefully cause concern regarding the extent of the problem locally. So how bad is the problem of link rot in Arkansas court opinions? To answer this question, an extensive study was undertaken, examining every opinion in the State of Arkansas in which either the Arkansas Supreme Court or the Arkansas Court of Appeals has ever cited an internet-based source.

A. Methodology of the Study

To conduct this study, searches of the Westlaw Edge, Fastcase, and Lexis Advance case databases were run in order to compile the resulting database of Arkansas cases.²² The identical

containing the relevant provision of the National Association of Securities Dealers code that was central to determining a statute of limitations in that case).

20. Michael Whiteman & Jennifer Frazier, *Internet Citations in Appellate Court Opinions: Something's Rotting in the Commonwealth*, BENCH & B, Jan. 2012, at 22 (noting that "[t]he ability to look at the authority relied upon by a court in coming to its decision underlies the system of *Stare Decisis* which form the basis of the Common Law.").

21. Jackson, *supra* note 9, at 17-18.

22. Note that the results of this identical search are remarkably different. Westlaw Edge produced the fewest results with 55 cases returned. Lexis Advance produced 86 cases using the same search, including all the results from the Westlaw search. Fastcase produced 89 items but included duplicates in their results list and 18 unique court orders not returned by either Westlaw Edge or Lexis Advance. The hyperlinks in 12 of these Fastcase results

search query “http or https or www” (without the quotation marks) was executed in each of the service’s Arkansas state courts database and each search was restricted to exclude federal cases. For the purposes of this study, cases or orders returned in the searches but designated as “not for publication” by the issuing court were included in the final dataset as, presumably, the content cited in the court’s opinion or order is something the court still intends the reader to be able to access even though the opinion itself is not intended to serve as precedent.

Citation information from the result list from each database was recorded and combined into a single spreadsheet and any duplicates were removed.²³ The hyperlink or hyperlinks from each opinion were also copied from each opinion and pasted directly into the spreadsheet by the corresponding case citation. Each hyperlink was subsequently tested in the same internet browser, Google Chrome, to determine if the link still directly accessed the content intended by the citing court.

B. Results of the Study

This study determined that between May 24, 2002²⁴ and December 6, 2019, 92 opinions of the Arkansas Supreme Court and Arkansas Court of Appeals have made a total of 117 citations to internet sources. Fifty-six of these case opinions were written by the Arkansas Supreme Court, and thirty-six by the Arkansas Court of Appeals. Of the 117 internet citations, only forty-three links still function and direct the reader to the information the citing court intended, meaning that the rate of link rot in Arkansas court opinions is currently 63%.

C. Uses of Internet Citations by Arkansas Courts

were located in editorial enhancements, not in the court opinions themselves and thus were excluded from the dataset.

23. See *infra* app. at 49.

24. *In re Section 28 to the Supreme Court Procedures Regulating Prof'l Conduct of Attorneys at Law and Model Rule of Prof'l Conduct 1.15(d)(1)*, 347 Ark. 1085, 1085 (Ark. 2002) was found to be the first opinion in which an Arkansas court cited an internet-based source. The Court directed readers of this Per Curium opinion to a proposed new rule governing the automatic overdraft reporting of attorney IOLTA trust accounts. *Id.* The link included in the opinion is no longer operable. *Id.*

Perhaps most interesting in reading through these case opinions is observing how Arkansas' appellate courts make use of internet citations. Like the courts of many states, Arkansas courts find internet sources useful in defining terms central to their opinions. For instance, in *Parker v. Stant Manufacturing*,²⁵ the Arkansas Court of Appeals found it necessary to define two medical terms in evaluating an appeal from a denial of additional benefits by the Arkansas Workers' Compensation Commission. Similarly, in *Carter v. State*²⁶ and *Benton County Stone Company v. Benton County Planning Board*,²⁷ the Arkansas Supreme Court found it necessary to define one term critical to determining whether an appeal for postconviction relief was timely, and another term necessary to interpret a county ordinance challenged as being void for vagueness.

At other times, a link is included in an opinion only as it is either relevant to or included in the facts of a case. Examples of this type of citation include reference to a website contained in an arbitration agreement reproduced in the facts of the case,²⁸ a website that was the subject of a defamation suit,²⁹ or a website included to demonstrate that a disciplined judge was improperly using his office to benefit a private company.³⁰ In these cases, inclusion of the link may not amount to a citation to it, and the fact that these websites have disappeared is of no real consequence.

The Arkansas Supreme Court, in particular, uses citations to web-based sources in order to direct the attention of the Arkansas

25. 2009 Ark. App. 812, at *3, 2009 WL 4377543, at *1 (defining "radiculitis" and "sciatica").

26. 2010 Ark. 231, at *3, 364 S.W.3d 46, 50 (defining the term "within" in Ark. R. Crim. P. 37.2(c) (2009)). This online definition can no longer be retrieved through the URL provided by the Court. The Court's citation to this source, which included the Bluebook's requisite "last visited" language, perhaps anticipated the eventual disappearance of this information.

27. 374 Ark. 519, 525, 288 S.W.3d 653, 657 (defining the term "compatible" in a Benton County zoning ordinance requiring development to be "consistent and compatible with existing development and the environment."). Note here that the court cites only to the front page of the dictionary website and directs the reader to search for the term themselves on the website. *Id.* at 525, 288 S.W.3d at 657.

28. *Asbury Auto. Grp. Inc. v. McCain*, 2013 Ark. App. 338, at *2, 2013 WL 2285373, at *1.

29. *Steward v. Kuettel*, 2014 Ark. 499, at *1, 450 S.W.3d 672, 673.

30. *Arkansas Judicial Discipline and Disability Comm'n v. Proctor*, 2010 Ark. 38, at *23 360 S.W.3d 61, 78.

Bar to important new procedures,³¹ invite comment on proposed changes,³² provide links to helpful resources,³³ or provide notice of a newly-adopted rule.³⁴ Unfortunately as previously mentioned, many of these citations were made to the courts' former website that was abandoned, and so the reader can no longer view the information the Court intended them to see.

In other cases, though still not citing the internet in a substantive way, Arkansas courts have sometimes cited web-based sources in a way that will either be beneficial to the reader in understanding the court's opinion or that the court believes the reader will find interesting or useful.³⁵ Such cases include *Arkansas Plant Board v. Stephens*,³⁶ in which the court provides a helpful link that will help readers understand the concept of "drift" in regulations of pesticides, *Pakay v. Davis*,³⁷ in which the court cites a web resource that will assist readers in understanding the federal discount rate in a case involving usury, and *Kilgore v. Mullenax*,³⁸ in which the court cites a rule of the American Arbitration Association relevant to the facts of the case and

31. *In re Mandatory Elec. Filing of Appellate Briefs & Elec. Serv. of Court Orders & Op.*, 2017 Ark. 353, at *2, 2017 Ark. LEXIS 311, at *1 (announcing the mandatory e-filing of motions and petitions and directing attorneys to instructions to obtain an eFlex electronic filing account).

32. *In re Publ'n of the Ark. Reports*, 2003 Ark. LEXIS 208, at *1.

33. See, e.g., *In re Revised Income Withholding for Support Form*, 2015 Ark. 294, at *1, 2015 Ark. LEXIS 503, at *1 (providing now-broken link to form to be used for calculating withholding for support payments); *In re Amendments to the Rules of Civil Procedure*, 2014 Ark. 119 at *15, 2014 Ark. LEXIS 171, at *33-34 (providing now-broken link to newly-adopted probate forms); *In re Appellate Practice Concerning Defective Briefs*, 2007 Ark. LEXIS 187, at *3 (providing now-broken link where attorneys can find a model brief to follow when filing briefs with the Court).

34. See, e.g., *In re Adoption of Rules 6-9 & 6-10 of the Rules of the Supreme Court & Court of Appeals*, 2006 Ark. LEXIS 312, at *2 (providing link to forms related to the new rules that no longer functions); *In re Admin. Order No. 20 & Rules of the Supreme Court & Court of Appeals 4-1 & 4-4*, 2008 Ark. LEXIS 767, at *6 (announcing new rules governing process servers and providing a link to related forms that is now broken).

35. For a perfect example of a web-based citation included simply because its author felt that the reader would find it interesting, see *Smith v. Pavan*, 2016 Ark. 437, at *21-22 n.1, 505 S.W.3d 169, 183 (Brill, J. Dissenting) (citing, in a case concerning gay marriage, lyrics from the Bob Dylan song *The Times They Are A-Changin'* and noting, through a now-broken web link, that Dylan had won the Nobel Prize in Literature a few months before the case at bar was decided).

36. 2019 Ark. 182, at *3 n.2, 2019 WL 2383976, at *1.

37. 367 Ark. 421, 426 n.1, 241 S.W.3d 257, 261 (2006).

38. 2017 Ark. 204, at *4, 520 S.W.3d 670, 673 (citing American Arbitration Association Commercial Rule 7).

provides a link to the rule. These cited references all provide information that will aid the reader in fully understanding the court's opinion, and the fact that all these links still function means that this information is still available to the reader.

However, in *Graham v. State*³⁹ the Arkansas Supreme Court provides some extra detail in reciting the facts of this case by providing a link to breath-testing regulations of the Arkansas Department of Health implicated by quoted testimony in the court's opinion. Unlike the links just mentioned, this link no longer functions, and so the reader is left with a brief comment regarding the regulation in a footnote instead of the fuller explanation the Court intended to provide through its citation.

As previously mentioned, most problematic in terms of link rot are the cases in which a court cites to the internet in a more substantive fashion and the cited content then disappears. For instance, in *Holbrook v. Healthport, Inc.*,⁴⁰ the Arkansas Supreme Court cites to two opinions of the Arkansas Attorney General that can no longer be found at their cited locations. In *In re Arkansas Rules of Civil Procedure 4 & 26*⁴¹ the Court explains its rationale for adopting subdivision (f) of Arkansas Rule of Evidence 502 governing lawyer-client privilege. It reports that it adopted the position of the 8th Circuit Court of Appeals on this issue and provides a now-broken link to this rationale.⁴² Other opinions cite nationwide statistics on electronic recording in courtrooms that no longer appear,⁴³ an FDA manual that is no longer available,⁴⁴ an Arkansas State Plant Board regulation that cannot be retrieved,⁴⁵ and an Arkansas Department of Health list of controlled substances that has vanished.⁴⁶

39. 2012 Ark. App. 90, at *4 n.1, 389 S.W.3d 33, (referencing Section III, Part D, subpart 3.40 of the Arkansas Regulations for Alcohol Testing).

40. 2014 Ark. 146, at *8-9, 432 S.W.3d 593, 598.

41. 2008 Ark. LEXIS 435, at *2.

42. *Id.* at *15 (providing a broken link to a draft report of the Federal Advisory Committee on Evidence from which reflects the 8th Circuit's position).

43. *In re* 13th Judicial Circuit, 2014 Ark. 235, at *1 n.2, 2014 Ark. LEXIS 314, at *1.

44. *Ortho-McNeil-Janssen Pharm. v. State*, 2014 Ark. 124, at*4-5, 432 S.W.3d 563, 579.

45. *Arkansas State Plant Bd. v. Bell*, 2019 Ark. 164 at *4 n.2, 2019 WL 2223441, *2 n.2.

46. *Cave v. State*, 2017 Ark. App. 212, at *5, 518 S.W.3d 134, 137. For other cases citing broken links in a substantive fashion see *Walther v. FLIS Enter.*, 2018 Ark. 64, at *8-9 n.4, 540 S.W.3d 264, 269; *Gazaway v. State*, 2010 Ark. App. 776 at *5 n.2, 2010 WL

Despite these broken links, the extent of Arkansas' link rot problem is not nearly as bad as many other states. This seems to be primarily due to the sparing way in which the Arkansas appellate courts have approached citing web-based sources. One hundred seventeen citations to the internet in 17 years by Arkansas courts is the fewest of any states in this region. By way of comparison, Oklahoma courts have cited the internet 162 times, Missouri 286, Louisiana 261, Mississippi 242, Tennessee 399, and Texas 2,118. Federal courts have similar web-citation counts with the 8th Circuit Court of Appeals citing internet sources 310 times, the Eastern District of Arkansas 382 times, and the Western District of Arkansas 601 times. The difference between many of these jurisdictions and Arkansas is that many of them have recognized and begun to address the problem of link rot and Arkansas has not.

IV. COMBATTING THE LINK ROT PROBLEM

Several different solutions to the problem of link rot have been implemented since 2003. In the start of its October term that year, the United States Supreme Court attempted to first address this problem by requiring its Clerk of Court to include a hard copy of the cited material in the clerk's case file.⁴⁷ Each hyperlink cited by the Court was also accompanied by language noting the date the Court accessed the website and noting this arrangement with the clerk's office.⁴⁸ Of course, this system was not ideal given the lack of ready accessibility to this print resource.⁴⁹

Other federal courts' libraries also soon began tracking citations to online sources cited by their courts and preserving the cited web pages as .pdf files.⁵⁰ The 9th Circuit Court of Appeals,

4638327, at *2; *Tilson v. Dir., Ark. Emp't Sec. Dep't*, 91 Ark. App. 111, 112 n.1, 208 S.W.3d 819, 820 n.1 (2005).

47. See William R. Wilkerson, *The Emergence of Internet Citations in U.S. Supreme Court Opinions*, 27 JUST. SYS. J. 323, 334 (2006).

48. *Id.* For examples of this procedure as implemented by the Court see, e.g., *Gratz v. Bollinger*, 539 U.S. 244, 299 n.4 (2003) (Ginsburg, J., dissenting); *Grutter v. Bollinger*, 539 U.S. 306, 359 (2003) (Thomas, J., concurring).

49. Wilkerson, *supra* note 47, at 334 (noting also that disclaiming the date of accessing a website does little to preserve its content).

50. Gretchen Van Dam, *Federal Court Libraries Preserving Internet Citations in Opinions*, CALL BULL., (May 17, 2016), <http://bulletin.chicagolawlib.org/2016/05/federal->

an early leader in preserving cited web content, soon began archiving these .pdf files on their library's website, along with the original URL cited by the court.⁵¹ Other circuit court libraries began archiving the links their courts were citing in the court's case management system and the federal judiciary's PACER system.⁵² Most often, this content is accessible through the court's electronic docket for the case.⁵³ Perhaps recognizing the accessibility problem posed by having cited content only available through a paid database such as PACER, the United States Supreme Court has revised its system of preserving cited web content and now hosts its own webpage of links cited in their opinions.⁵⁴ Each case citing a web link is available through this site as is a preserved .pdf copy of the cited content.

State courts have also begun to fight link rot in their own jurisdictions. The Florida Supreme Court, through their law library, currently provides access to all web-based sources cited by the court since 2013.⁵⁵ Each opinion containing a link is available by year, along with the original link cited by the court and a .pdf archive of the cited webpage.

Several other states appear to be taking advantage of Perma.cc, a website caching tool developed by Harvard Law Library Vice Dean Jonathan Zittrain and the Harvard Library Innovation Lab specifically to address the link rot problem in legal journals, briefs, and court opinions.⁵⁶ Users of Perma.cc can

court-libraries-preserving-internet-citations-in-opinions/#more-4264
[<https://perma.cc/YR34-GP9U>].

51. For an example of the way the 9th Circuit preserved cited web content in this manner, see *Websites Cited in Ninth Circuit Opinions*, U.S. CTS. FOR THE NINTH CIR., <https://www.ca9.uscourts.gov/library/webcites/> [<https://perma.cc/T4T6-VBJQ>] (last visited Jan. 2, 2020). Since 2015, the 9th Circuit has preserved this content and made it available through the court's docket on PACER rather than through their website. *Id.*

52. See Van Dam, *supra* note 50.

53. U.S. Ct. of Appeals for the D.C. Cir., *News Release: The D.C. Circuit Fights Internet Link Rot* (July 30, 2015), [https://www.cadc.uscourts.gov/internet/home.nsf/Content/Announcement+-+News+Release+-+D.C.+Circuit+Fights+Internet+Link+Rot/\\$FILE/internet%20rot%20news%20release.pdf](https://www.cadc.uscourts.gov/internet/home.nsf/Content/Announcement+-+News+Release+-+D.C.+Circuit+Fights+Internet+Link+Rot/$FILE/internet%20rot%20news%20release.pdf) [<https://perma.cc/FX7X-XAS3>].

54. *Online Sources Cited in Opinions*, SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES, https://www.supremecourt.gov/opinions/cited_urls/19 [<https://perma.cc/H3BC-BRCL>] (last visited Jan. 2, 2020).

55. *Websites Cited in Florida Supreme Court Opinions*, FLORIDA SUPREME COURT, <https://www.floridasupremecourt.org/Law-Library/Websites-Cited-in-Opinions> [<https://perma.cc/YMF8-FAGR>] (last visited Jan. 2, 2020).

56. Zittrain, *supra* note 3, at 178.

input any URL from the internet into Perma.cc, which then retrieves and downloads the material at the URL provided and generates a new permanent link that can be inserted into the court opinion.⁵⁷ When a reader encounters a Perma.cc link, it functions like an ordinary URL and, when selected or input into an internet browser, takes them to the archived site that also contains a link to the original, live web page.⁵⁸ The cached web pages saved on Perma.cc are stored not only on Perma.cc's servers, but also on those of its library partners around the world, ensuring the future of the information stored by preventing it from being tied to the survival of any single organization.⁵⁹

Searching for Perma.cc links on Westlaw Edge reveals that it has been employed in over 1,400 cases authored by numerous federal and state courts. State courts who have partnered with Perma.cc include the supreme courts of Tennessee,⁶⁰ Arizona,⁶¹ Wisconsin,⁶² Vermont,⁶³ Washington,⁶⁴ Massachusetts,⁶⁵ Montana,⁶⁶ Indiana,⁶⁷ and Michigan⁶⁸ among many other state appellate level courts.

Given that Perma.cc is easy to use, stable, and free of charge for courts and academic institutions to use to preserve web-related content, it is easy to see why so many courts have begun to see it as the answer to the problem of link rot in their opinions. This solution appears to be less time and labor intensive than the manual creation of archived .pdfs occurring in some federal courts, and likely more stable. It is also far superior to the accessibility problems created by keeping only print copies or attaching archived .pdfs to a docket only accessible to attorneys

57. *See id.* at 191-92

58. *See id.* at 192.

59. *See id.*

60. *State v. Davis*, 466 S.W.3d 49, 79 n.4 (Tenn. 2015) (Lee, J., concurring).

61. *Conklin v. Medtronic, Inc.*, 431 P.3d 571, 577 (Ariz. 2018).

62. *State v. Braunschweig*, 2018 Wis. 113, ¶ 15, 384 Wis. 2d 742, 752, 921 N.W.2d 199, 204 n.8.

63. *In re N. E. Materials Grp., LLC/Rock of Ages Corp. Act 250 Permit*, 2019 VT 55, ¶ 29, 217 A.3d 541, 554.

64. *State v. Muhammad*, 451 P.3d 1060, 1072 n.3 (Wash. 2019).

65. *Butcher v. Univ. of Massachusetts*, 136 N.E.3d 719, 754 n.19 (Mass. 2019).

66. *Wiegele v. W. Dry Creek Ranch, LLC*, 2019 MT 254, ¶ 2 n.2, 397 Mont. 414, 416, 450 P.3d 879, 881 n.2.

67. *State v. Timbs*, 134 N.E.3d 12, 31 (Ind. 2019).

68. *Wigfall v. City of Detroit*, 934 N.W.2d 760, 767 n.22 (Mich. 2019).

with electronic filing capability. For these reasons, Perma.cc is likely the best solution to the link rot problem for states such as Arkansas who have yet to address it.

V. CONCLUSION

Despite an attempt to make cited information more widely available to readers of their opinions, courts nationwide, including those in Arkansas, have sometimes made it less so by their citation of online sources. The problem of link rot, expanding as court citations of online sources become more and more common, threatens the integrity of judicial opinions by removing portions of cited content included within them.

As we've seen, the effect of a broken link depends on the nature of a court's citation to it, and different courts cite online sources in a variety of ways with varying frequency. Fortunately, Arkansas' courts have shown restraint in their citation of online content. They have cited the internet infrequently compared to other states and their citations tend to be informative rather than substantive. Nevertheless, there are a growing number of citations to the web by Arkansas' courts and over 60% of the links cited to this point no longer direct the reader to the intended content.

Fortunately, there is some benefit in having delayed in responding to the problem of link rot. This delay has allowed a variety of solutions to be developed and tested by other jurisdictions. Solutions that limit access to cited content or are ultimately unwieldy or unreliable can be set aside in favor of simple, cost-free, and dependable ones such as Perma.cc. Although the content cited by Arkansas' courts in broken web links to this point can never be recovered, adoption of a web archival program at the start of this new decade by the Arkansas judiciary would preserve future web content cited by our courts and ensure that those future links are available in perpetuity to readers and researchers of their opinions.

APPENDIX

Case Name	Ark Cite	SW Cite	Year	Court	Link	Link Good?
Mahoney v. Arkansas Department of Human Services	2019 Ark. App. 453	None	2019	App.	https://aspe.hhs.gov/2018-poverty-guidelines	Yes
Arkansas State Plant Board v. Stephens	2019 Ark. 182	None	2019	Ark.	https://www.uaex.edu/publications/pdf/FSA-2181.pdf	Yes
IN RE ACCEPTANCE OF RECORDS ON APPEAL IN ELECTRONIC FORMAT AND ELIMINATION OF THE ABSTRACTING AND ADDENDUM REQUIREMENTS	2019 Ark. 213	None	2019	Ark.	https://www.arcourts.gov/administration/acap/efile	Yes
Arkansas State Plant Board v. Bell	2019 Ark. 164	None	2019	Ark.	https://www.agriculture.arkansas.gov/Websites/aad/files/Content/5942664/Arkansas_Regulation_on_Pesticide_Classification_(Acts_389__410)_Orange(Rev.4-19)_Emergency_Rule.pdf	No
Board of Trustees of Arkansas Public Employees Retirement System v. Garrison	2019 Ark. App. 245	576 S.W.3d 485	2019	App.	http://www.apeprs.org/images/PDFs/Contributory-Handbook.pdf https://www.irs.gov/pub/irs-pdf/p4078	Yes No
Damron v. Damron	2019 Ark. App. 160	574 S.W.3d 166	2019	App.	http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/contemporary	Yes

					http://www.dictionary.com/browse/contemplate	Yes
					https://premium.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/english/contemplate	Yes
					https://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/contemplate	Yes
Rivers v. Deboer	2019 Ark. App. 132	572 S.W.3d 887	2019	App.	www.oed.com/view/Entry/64530	Yes
					http://ambar.org/2003Guidelines	Yes
Lacy v. State	2018 Ark. 174	545 S.W.3d 746	2018	Ark.	https://www.americanbar.org/content/dam/aba/migrated/2011_build/death_penalty_representation/2008_july_c1_guidelines.athcheckdam.pdf	Yes
City of Jacksonville v. Smith	2018 Ark. 87	540 S.W.3d 661	2018	Ark.	https://works.bepress.com/michael_mcnorney/2/download	No
	2018 Ark. App. 207	547 S.W.3d 697	2018	App.	www.att.com/servicepublications	Yes
AT&T Corp. v. Clark Cty.					www.att.com/servicepublications	Yes
Walther v. FLIS Enterprises, Inc.	2018 Ark. 64	540 S.W.3d 264	2018	Ark.	http://www.foodinsight.org/sites/default/files/what-is-a-processed-food.pdf	No
In re Mandatory Elec. Filing of Appellate Briefs & Elec. Serv. of Court Orders & Opinions	2017 Ark. 353	None	2017	Ark.	https://courts.arkansas.gov/administration/acap/efile/efile-instructions	No

Ark. Dep't of Human Servs. v. Ledgerwood	2017 Ark. 308	530 S.W.3d 336	2017	Ark.	www.medicaid.state.ar.us	No
Kilgore v. Mullenax	2017 Ark. 204	520 S.W.3d 670	2017	Ark.	http://www.adr.org/commercial	Yes
Cave v. State	2017 Ark. App. 212	518 S.W.3d 134	2017	App.	http://www.health.arkansas.gov/aboutADH/RulesRegs/controlled_substances_list.pdf	No
Madison Cos.. LLC v. Williams	2016 Ark. App. 610	None	2016	App.	www.pipelineproductions.com	Yes
Smith v. Pavan	2016 Ark. 437	505 S.W.3d 169	2016	Ark.	https://nobelprize.org/nobelprizes/literature/laureates/2016/press/html	No
In re Appellate-Motion Elec.-Filing Pilot Project & Appellate-Brief Elec.-Filing Pilot Project	2016 Ark. 314	None	2016	Ark.	https://courts.arkansas.gov/administration/acap/efile	No
Hadder v. Heritage Hill Manor, Inc.	2016 Ark. App. 303	None	2016	App.	www.assistedliving.com	Yes
					www.assistedliving.com	Yes
					www.assistedliving.com	Yes
					www.assistedliving.com	Yes
In re Arkansas Bar Association Petition to Amend Rules 1.2, 4.2, and 4.3 of the Arkansas Rules of Professional Conduct	2016 Ark. 132	None	2016	Ark.	https://contexte.aoc.arkansas.gov/imaging/IMAGES/DMS/CK_Image.Present2?DMS_ID=2UJB04XMKFF08D9L5QZJ2X4UKK70AR	No
Courtyard Gardens Health and	2016 Ark. 62	485 S.W.3d 669	2016	Ark.	http://www.arbforum.com	Yes

Rehabilitation, LLC v. Arnold						
In re Revised Income Withholding for Support Form	2015 Ark. 294	None	2015	Ark.	https://courts.arkansas.gov	No
In re Appellate Motion Elec.- Filing Pilot Project	2015 Ark. 282	None	2015	Ark.	https://courts.arkansas.gov/administration/acap/efile	No
In re Ninth E. Judicial Circuit- Approval for Digital Elec. Recording					https://www.ncsc.org/services-and-experts/court-reengineering/~media/files/pdf/services%20and%20experts/court%20reengineering/09012013-making-digital-record.ashx	No
	2015 Ark. 14	None	2015	Ark.	https://courts.arkansas.gov/sites/default/files/tree/guidelines.pdf	No
Steward v. Kuettel	2014 Ark. 499	450 S.W.3d 672	2014	Ark.	http://justice4sarah.wordpress.com/	No
King v. State	2014 Ark. App. 554	447 S.W.3d 126	2014	App.	http://www.healthy.arkansas.gov/aboutADH/RulesRegs/controlled_substances_list.pdf	No
Alltel Corp. v. Rosenow	2014 Ark. 375	None	2014	Ark.	www.adr.org	Yes
Judicial Discipline and Disability Com'n v. Maggio	2014 Ark. 366	440 S.W.3d 333	2014	Ark.	www.tigerdroppings.com/	Yes
Ark. State Bd. of Election Comm'rs v. Pulaski County Election Comm'n	2014 Ark. 236	437 S.W.3d 80	2014	Ark.	www.arkansas.gov/sbec	Yes
					www.arkansas.gov/sbec	Yes

					http://www.ncsc.Org/services-and-experts/court-reengineering/?media/files/pdf/services%20and%20experts/court%20reengineering/09012013-making-the-digital-record.ashx	No
In re 13th Judicial Circuit, Div. 4	2014 Ark. 235	None	2014	Ark.	https://courts.arkansas.gov/sites/default/files/tree/guidelines.pdf	No
Ark. State Bd. of Election Comm'rs v. Pulaski County Election 2014 Ark. 215	2014 Ark. 215	None	2014	Ark.	www.arkansas.gov/sbec	Yes
					www.arkansas.gov/sbec	Yes
					http://ag.arkansas.gov/opinions/docs/2010-095.pdf	No
Holbrook v. Healthport, Inc.	2014 Ark. 146	432 S.W.3d 593	2014	Ark.	http://ag.arkansas.gov/opinions/docs/2010-095A.html	No
					https://www.fda.gov/iceci/compliance/manuals/regulatoryprocedures%20manual/ucm176870.%20htm#%20SUB4%E2%80%931%E2%80%9310	No
Ortho-McNeil-Janssen Pharmaceuticals, Inc. v. State	2014 Ark. 124	432 S.W.3d 563	2014	Ark.	http://www.fda.gov/AboutFDA/CentersOffices/OfficeofMedicalProductsandTobacco/CDER/ucm090142.htm	No
In re: Amendments to Rules of Civ. Procedure	2014 Ark. 119	None	2014	Ark.	https://courts.arkansas.gov	No

In re Special Task Force on Practice & Procedure in Civ. Cases	2014 Ark. 5	None	2014	Ark.	https://www.tncourts.gov/node/431	Yes
Coulter v. Griffin	2013 Ark. App. 635	None	2013	App.	https://courts.arkansas.gov/system/files/Arkansas_Model_Appellants_Brief_March_2010_Update_0.pdf	No
In re Recommendations of the Comm. on Civ. Practice	2013 Ark. 278	None	2013	Ark.	https://courts.arkansas.gov	No
Asbury Auto. Group, Inc. v. McCain	2013 Ark. App. 338	None	2013	App.	www.arbforum.com https://www.adr.org/	Yes Yes
Morris v. Christopher	2013 Ark. App. 312		2013	App.	www.merchantcircle.com	Yes
Parkerson v. Brown	2013 Ark. App. 297	None	2013	App.	http://courts.arkansas.gov/aoc/forms.cfm	No
Midyett v. Midyett	2013 Ark. App. 291	None	2013	App.	http://courts.arkansas.gov/aoc/forms.cfm	No
Mahomes v. State	2013 Ark. App. 215	427 S.W.3d 123	2013	App.	https://courts.arkansas.gov/court-forms/criminal-division(Sentencing Order Form Instructions—.pdf)	No
Judd v. Martin	2013 Ark. 136	None	2013	Ark.	http://results.enr.clarityelections.com/AR/39376/83979/en/summary.html	Yes
Gawenis v. Alta Resources, LLC	2013 Ark. App. 85	None	2013	App.	http://courts.arkansas.gov/aoc/forms.cfm	No

Boykin v. Crockett Adjustment Ins.	2012 Ark. App. 685	None	2012	App.	http://courts.arkansas.gov/aoc/forms.cfm	No
McArty v. Hobbs	2012 Ark. 257	None	2012	Ark.	http://adc.arkansas.gov/resources/Documents/Friends_and_Family_Guide.pdf	No
Green v. State	2012 Ark. App. 315	416 S.W.3d 765	2012	App.	http://www.urbandictionary.com/define.php?term=Sherm	No
Graham v. State	2012 Ark. App. 90	389 S.W.3d 33	2012	App.	www.healthy.arkansas.gov/aboutADH/RulesRegs/AlcoholTesting	No
Dimas-Martinez v. State	2011 Ark. 515	385 S.W.3d 238	2011	Ark.	http://twitter.com/about	Yes
Floerchinger v. University of Arkansas for Medical Sciences	2011 Ark. App. 134	None	2011	App.	http://courts.arkansas.gov/aoc/forms.cfm	No
Gazaway v. State	2010 Ark. App. 776	None	2010	App.	https://www.healthy.arkansas.gov/about%20ADH/Pages/RulesRegulations	No
In re Official Forms	2010 Ark. 442	None	2010	Ark.	http://courts.arkansas.gov	No
Baber v. Arkansas State Medical Bd	2010 Ark. 243	368 S.W.3d 897	2010	Ark.	http://www.arkmedfoundation.org/PHC.htm	No
Carter v. State	2010 Ark. 231	364 S.W.3d 46	2010	Ark.	http://dictionary.oed.com/cgi/entry/50286345	No
Arkansas Judicial Discipline and Disability Com'n v. Proctor	2010 Ark. 38	360 S.W.3d 61	2010	Ark.	www.co.pulaski.ar.us/fifthdivisioncircuit	No
Johnson v. U.S. Food Service, Inc.	2010 Ark. App. 14	None	2010	App.	http://www.merriam-webster.com/me	No

					dical/phencyclid ine	
Parker v. Stant Mfg.	2009 Ark. App. 812	None	2009	App.	http://www.merriam-webster.com/medical/radiculitis	Yes
					http://www.merriam-webster.com/medical/sciatica	Yes
In re Access to Justice Comm'n	2009 Ark. 183	None	2009	Ark.	www.arkansasjustice.org	Yes
					http://www.arkansasjustice.org/about.htm	No
In re Admin. Order No. 20 & Rules of the Supreme Court & Court of Appeals 4-1 & 4-4	None - 2008 Ark. LEXIS 767	None	2008	Ark.	http://courts.state.ar.us	No
Fields v. Arkansas Dept. of Human Services	104 Ark. App. 37	289 S.W.3 d 134	2008	App.	http://www.nhi.org/online/issuess/125/independence.html	No
Benton County Stone Co., Inc. v. Benton County Planning Bd.	374 Ark. 519	288 S.W.3 d 653	2008	Ark.	http://dictionary.oed.com/	Yes
In re Ark. Rules of Civ. Procedure 4 & 26	None - 2008 Ark. LEXIS 435	None	2008	Ark.	http://courts.state.ar.us	No
					http://www.uscourts.gov/rules/Excerpt_EV_Report_Public.pdf#page=4	No
Waldrip v. Graco Corp	101 Ark. App. 101	270 S.W.3 d 891	2008	App.	http://dictionary.oed.com/	Yes
Lackey v. Mays	100 Ark. App. 386	269 S.W.3 d 397	2007	App.	http://courts.state.ar.us/	No
In re Establishment of a Voluntary Pilot Program	370 Ark. 618	None	2007	Ark.	http://courts.state.ar.us	No

					http://courts.state.ar.us	No
In re Ark. Rules of Civil Procedure	None - 2007 Ark. LEXIS 332	None	2007	Ark.	www.courts.state.ar.us	No
In re Rules Governing Waiver of Attorney-Client Privilege	None - 2007 Ark. LEXIS 318	None	2007	Ark.	http://www.uscourts.gov/rules/Excerpt_EV_Report_Pub.pdf#page=4	No
Johnson v. State	2007 WL 1277790	None	2007	App.	http://courts.state.ar.us/clerk/model20030724.pdf	No
McMickle v. Griffin	369 Ark. 318	254 S.W.3d 729	2007	Ark.	http://www.m-w.com/dictionary/tow	Yes
Bradford v. State	2007 WL 842080	None	2007	App.	http://courts.state.ar.us/clerk/model20030724.pdf	No
In re Appellate Practice Concerning Defective Briefs	None - 2007 Ark. LEXIS 187	None	2007	Ark.	http://courts.state.ar.us	No
Parker v. Parker	97 Ark. App. 298	248 S.W.3d 523	2007	App.	http://conservatree.org/learn/EnviroIssues/TreeStats.shtml	Yes
In re Report of the Legislative Task Force	None - 2006 Ark. LEXIS 533	None	2006	Ark.	http://courts.state.ar.us/courts/district.html	No
Pakay v. Davis	367 Ark. 421	241 S.W.3d 257	2006	Ark.	http://www.federalreserve.gov/monetarypolicy/discountrate.htm	Yes
Byars v. Baywood Colony Horizontal Property Regime	2006 WL 2879434	None	2006	App.	http://www.glossary.oilfield.slb.com/Display.cfm?Term=suckerrod	No
In re Adoption of Rules 6-9 & 6-10 of the Rules of the Supreme Court & Court of Appeals	None - 2006 Ark. LEXIS 312	None	2006	Ark.	http://www.courts.state.ar.us	No

Clairday v. The Lilly Co.	95 Ark. App. 94	234 S.W.3d 347	2006	App.	http://podiatrynetwork.com	No
Estacuy v. State	2005 WL 2160659	None	2005	App.	http://courts.state.ar.us/	No
Tilson v. Director, Arkansas Employment Sec. Dept.	91 Ark. App. 111	208 S.W.3d 819	2005	App.	https://www.census.gov/hhes/poverty/threshld/thresh04.%20html	No
Pippin v. Houston General Ins. Co.	2005 WL 477851	None	2005	App.	http://my.webmd.com/hw/back-pain/tn9268.asp	No
Small v. Kulesa	90 Ark. App. 108	204 S.W.3d 99	2005	App.	www.anywho.com	Yes
Polston v. State	360 Ark. 317	201 S.W.3d 406	2005	Ark.	http://www.fbi.gov/hq/lab/codis/index1.htm	No
Hogrobrooks v. Board of Law Examiners	359 Ark. 247	None	2004	Ark.	http://courts.state.ar.us	No
In re Ark. Bar Ass'n	None - 2003 Ark. LEXIS 671	None	2003	Ark.	http://www.arkbar.com	Yes
Bradford v. Dir. Empl. Sec. Dep't.	83 Ark. App. 332	128 S.W.3d 20	2003	App.	www.cio.state.ar.us	No
In re : Publ'n of the Ark. Reports	None - 2003 Ark. LEXIS 208	None	2003	Ark.	http://courts.state.ar.us/	No
Fastcase cases						
In re Revised Income Withholding for Support Form	2012 Ark. 232	None	2012	Ark.	https://courts.arkansas.gov	No
In re Arkansas Bar Ass'n Petition to Revise Procedural Rules of the Arkansas Judicial Discipline & Disability Comm'n	None	None	2007	Ark.	http://www.state.ar.us/jdd	No
					http://courts.state.ar.us	No
					http://courts.state.ar.us	No

In Re: Arkansas Bar Association Petition to Revise Procedural Rules of the Arkansas Judicial Discipline, 07-444	None	None	2007	Ark.	http://www.state.ar.us/jdd	No
					http://courts.state.ar.us	No
					http://courts.state.ar.us	No
In re Adoption of Supreme Court Rule 4-7	None	None	2006	Ark.	http://www.courts.state.ar.us	No
In re Arkansas Bar Association	None	None	2004	Ark.	http://www.arkbar.com	Yes
Section 28 to Supreme Court Procedures	347 Ark. Appx. 1085	None	2002	Ark.	http://courts.state.ar.us/courts/cpc.html	No