

MIIS 2022

International Workshop On Mathematical Issues In Information Sciences 数据科学国际研讨会

17th-18th, Dec. 2022

Judicial Decision Data in China

110 million judgment documents
Covering civil, criminal, and administrative cases
In-depth data cleaning | A wide range of structured variables

China's Commercial Cases Database (CCCD)

Commercial Cases Database of China (2011 - 2018), basing on deep data analysis over millions of judicial adjudicative documents, is built and released by CourtData.

All Cases processing efficiency 2019



Region	Disclosure rate of trial period	Average trial period	Statutory trial period used
Jiangxi	87%	68 days	54%
Hunan	90%	72 days	58%
Inner Mongolia	87%	76 days	66%
Tibet	100%	77 days	59%
Henan	70%	80 days	66%
Jilin	84%	82 days	66%
Zhejiang	95%	83 days	76%
Fujian	92%	84 days	71%
Xinjiang PCC	97%	85 days	80%
Anhui	89%	87 days	73%
Shanxi	83%	88 days	79%
Hebei	86%	88 days	74%
Heilongjiang	87%	88 days	69%
Guizhou	85%	89 days	78%
Gansu	91%	95 days	77%
Qinghai	95%	95 days	75%
Xinjiang	93%	95 days	80%
Shanghai	95%	97 days	86%
Sichuan	80%	97 days	79%
Tianjin	96%	100 days	80%
Shaanxi	66%	100 days	80%
Shandong	82%	101 days	82%
Chongqing	84%	105 days	92%
Jiangsu	95%	105 days	89%
Hainan	97%	105 days	84%
Guangxi	93%	106 days	85%
Ningxia	98%	108 days	87%
Liaoning	74%	111 days	81%
Hubei	88%	112 days	86%
Yunnan	97%	122 days	84%
Guangdong	80%	123 days	90%
Beijing	37%	192 days	125%

China's Commercial Cases Database (CCCD)

Commercial Cases Database of China (2011 - 2018), basing on deep data analysis over millions of judicial adjudicative documents, is built and released by CourtData.

All Counsel for plaintiff 2019



Region	Winning rate of plaintiff	Rate of counsel involved	Winning rate if counseled
Shanghai	98.5%	75.3%	98.6% (+0.1%)
Hubei	97.9%	59.3%	97.7% (-0.2%)
Yunnan	97.2%	59.2%	97% (-0.2%)
Sichuan	97%	57.9%	95.9% (-1.1%)
Chongqing	98.7%	54.4%	98.5% (-0.2%)
Tianjin	96.6%	53.5%	96.5% (-0.1%)
Jiangsu	97.7%	53.2%	97.7% (+0.0%)
Hunan	98.4%	47.8%	97.8% (-0.6%)
Anhui	98.2%	47.6%	97.7% (-0.5%)
Hebei	97.6%	47.4%	97.1% (-0.5%)
Guangdong	98.4%	47%	98.3% (-0.1%)
Xinjiang	96.5%	46.8%	96.2% (-0.3%)
Shanxi	96.5%	45.5%	96.4% (-0.1%)
Shandong	97.8%	44.3%	97.2% (-0.6%)
Henan	97.7%	44.2%	97.3% (-0.4%)
Guangxi	98%	44.2%	97.4% (-0.6%)
Beijing	98.4%	42.1%	97.6% (-0.8%)
Zhejiang	98.7%	41.5%	98.2% (-0.5%)
Fujian	98.6%	41.2%	98.5% (-0.1%)
Liaoning	97.9%	39.9%	97.5% (-0.4%)
Jiangxi	98.8%	39.8%	98.3% (-0.5%)
Guizhou	97.8%	36.6%	97% (-0.8%)
Ningxia	98.1%	36.1%	97.5% (-0.6%)
Shaanxi	91.3%	35.4%	92.4% (+1.1%)
Xinjiang PCC	93%	31.9%	89.3% (-3.7%)
Gansu	96.4%	31.7%	95.7% (-0.7%)
Tibet	87.5%	31.2%	80% (-7.5%)
Jilin	97.2%	28.3%	96% (-1.2%)
Hainan	97.7%	25%	95.4% (-2.3%)
Inner Mongolia	98.3%	24.3%	97.5% (-0.8%)
Qinghai	94.9%	23.3%	92.2% (-2.7%)
Heilongjiang	98.8%	19.2%	97.8% (-1.0%)

China's Commercial Cases Database (CCCD)

Commercial Cases Database of China (2011 - 2018), basing on deep data analysis over millions of judicial adjudicative documents, is built and released by CourtData.

All Counsel for defendant 2019



Region	Winning rate of defendant	Rate of counsel involved	Winning rate if counseled
Tibet	12.5%	18.8%	0% (-12.5%)
Xinjiang	3.5%	15%	10.2% (+6.7%)
Henan	2.3%	13.4%	6.1% (+3.8%)
Guangxi	2%	13.3%	7.7% (+5.7%)
Yunnan	2.8%	13.2%	8% (+5.2%)
Hebei	2.4%	13.1%	8.2% (+5.8%)
Shandong	2.2%	12.7%	6.8% (+4.6%)
Sichuan	3%	12.4%	8.4% (+5.4%)
Hubei	2.1%	12.4%	6.8% (+4.7%)
Xinjiang PCC	7%	11.9%	12.6% (+5.6%)
Tianjin	3.4%	11.1%	15.3% (+11.9%)
Anhui	1.8%	10.5%	6.4% (+4.6%)
Jiangsu	2.3%	10.4%	7.1% (+4.8%)
Shanxi	3.5%	10.3%	9.7% (+6.2%)
Hunan	1.6%	9.9%	7.4% (+5.8%)
Chongqing	1.3%	9.8%	6.2% (+4.9%)
Ningxia	1.9%	9.8%	6% (+4.1%)
Liaoning	2.1%	9.5%	8% (+5.9%)
Qinghai	5.1%	9.2%	15.9% (+10.8%)
Jilin	2.8%	8.9%	11.4% (+8.6%)
Gansu	3.6%	8.9%	8.3% (+4.7%)
Guizhou	2.2%	8.1%	8.4% (+6.2%)
Beijing	1.6%	8%	10.8% (+9.2%)
Shanghai	1.5%	7.6%	10.1% (+8.6%)
Jiangxi	1.2%	7.4%	6.3% (+5.1%)
Inner Mongolia	1.7%	6.7%	7.2% (+5.5%)
Zhejiang	1.3%	6.4%	9.1% (+7.8%)
Guangdong	1.6%	6.4%	7.6% (+6.0%)
Shaanxi	8.7%	6.1%	10.8% (+2.1%)
Fujian	1.4%	5.4%	8.2% (+6.8%)
Heilongjiang	1.2%	5.2%	8.1% (+6.9%)
Hainan	2.3%	4.8%	12.9% (+10.6%)

Judicial Transparency Database (Maps)

CourtData analyzed the disclosure of judicial documents from various provinces, cities and counties to analyze judicial transparency.

China Overall transparency 2019



Region	Disclosure rate	Court decided not to public
Hunan	94.8%	8.9%
Jilin	93.4%	2.6%
Sichuan	92.7%	2.8%
Shanghai	91.9%	95.8%
Jiangxi	91.5%	15.7%
Qinghai	90.3%	1.3%
Hebei	88.4%	14.6%
Henan	88.3%	14.1%
Shaanxi	87.5%	11.4%
Yunnan	86.8%	11.6%
Anhui	85.7%	7.2%
Hubei	85.6%	11.5%
Beijing	83.3%	49.4%
Fujian	83.1%	1.4%
Zhejiang	81.7%	3.2%
Chongqing	81.7%	4.9%
Shanxi	81.4%	12.7%
Liaoning	81.2%	22.7%
Ningxia	80.9%	2.3%
Jiangsu	79.5%	6.3%
Heilongjiang	78.9%	20.3%
Xinjiang PCC	75.6%	24.6%
Guangxi	75.5%	3.6%
Shandong	75.4%	5.5%
Tianjin	71.1%	11.5%
Inner Mongolia	68.7%	6.8%
Gansu	68.6%	8.9%
Xinjiang	68.6%	26.7%
Guangdong	60.2%	30.1%
Guizhou	57.3%	6.1%
Tibet	53.1%	1.5%
Hainan	26.4%	17.8%

