

# Pioneers and Pathfinders: Ross Guberman

(This transcript was generated through AI technology.)

## Steve Poor

Hi, this is Steve Poor, and you're listening to Pioneers and Pathfinders.

I recently sat down with Ross Guberman, founder and CEO of BriefCatch—the leading legal writing assistant designed to help lawyers draft clear, precise, and persuasive documents. A former attorney at a top law firm, Ross has conducted thousands of opinion writing workshops across the globe for prominent law firms, judges, agencies, corporations, and associations. Ross is also an award-winning journalist and best-selling author of *Point Made: How to Write Like the Nation's Top Advocates*, *Point Taken: How to Write Like the World's Best Judges*, and co-author of *Deal Struck: The World's Best Drafting Tips*.

In today's episode, Ross shares his journey into law, the framework he developed for evaluating legal writing, and lessons learned from building BriefCatch. We also explore how technology is transforming legal writing and what generative AI could mean for the future of the profession. It was great of Ross to share his insights. Let's take a listen.

Ross, it's so nice to meet you. Thanks for making the time to talk to me today.

## Ross Guberman

Of course, happy to be here.

## Steve Poor

You've built a career at the intersection of law and writing and now technology. How does that happen? Is that what you planned to do when you went to Yale for undergrad? Is this the career you envisioned?

## Ross Guberman

Absolutely not. It's a little bit of a twisted, twisted path. So I, I actually started a PhD at Yale, in fact, and I, I hated it, and I was looking for an off ramp. And I, at the time, I was hanging around a lot of Yale Law students, and they gave me the idea of law school, which would never have occurred to me. So I went to the University of Chicago Law School, which I happened to speak at yesterday, in fact, down there in Hyde Park.

## Steve Poor

Great school.

## Ross Guberman

Yeah, it was a fantastic school indeed. And actually planned, planned at that point, once I understood what the options were, to go to a big law firm, and, you know, for all I knew, become a partner. So I did do that. I did take that path for a couple of years after law school, but it was, it was around the time of the .com boom, and there was a lot of kind of excitement and restlessness. And although I didn't go to a .com as they were called at the time, I did stop being an associate and started down the entrepreneurial path instead.

## Steve Poor

Where does writing work into this origin story? You're one of the great teachers of legal writing. How did that come about?

**Ross Guberman**

So that actually was my focus. My PhD would have been in linguistics, Comparative Literature, and I had done some graduate work at the Sorbonne before as well. Although when I went to law school, I really, I literally knew nothing about the field. I had no idea there was such a thing as legal writing, let alone, you know, contracts, torts and property, but I did, you know, not surprisingly, love the legal writing class. But a lot of that was because I loved the professor. And given that that was my background, I of course gravitated toward paper classes. The exam classes were much harder for me. So writing, writing continued to be a strength, but I didn't really see it as a career path. I mean, after all, I'd left a PhD program for a reason. But that was certainly my both my strength and my greatest sort of social satisfaction as an associate writing and editing briefs. And I ended up kind of back where I started in writing, but in this case, legal writing and eventually judicial writing.

**Steve Poor**

How did your skills as a legal writer evolve? You've had all these experiences. You've been a journalist. You've been a musician. You've been to law school. You've been to Sorbonne. You were an associate. As you look back on it, how did you hone your craft?

**Ross Guberman**

Yeah, it's interesting, because even though I was doing graduate work, and on the literary side, I always had, I always had an affinity for kind of narrative nonfiction or even kind of long form journalism, so I preferred that to sagas and poems and even sometimes literary fiction. So legal writing actually came naturally to me. In that first year class, I found it intuitive, much more intuitive than the doctrinal classes, that's for sure. And I like the structure, but I especially liked the challenge of having really, really clear, crisp sentences. And that probably relates back to my my affinity for narrative nonfiction and journalistic prose.

**Steve Poor**

Yeah, I can recall University Chicago has an interesting history as it comes to legal writing. I recall, God, this must have been in the 80s or 90s. There was a program down there called clear lines that the firm hired to come in and work with all. I was an associative time, and it was, it was a miracle.

**Ross Guberman**

Were they associated with the undergraduate school or the law school?

**Steve Poor**

I recall them being associated with the law school, but it's been, it's been many decades.

**Ross Guberman**

Hey, I know the feeling, although it's funny going back to the law school. That particular law school never changes. It looks exactly the same as it did when I was in school. What the law school had, and I believe still has, is this Bigelow program where they take the first year class and divided, already divide into six sections for the doctrinal classes too, but they get kind of ambitious young academics who really take the class seriously, and it's a full time job for them, at least it was when I was there. So I think that also probably helped make it a really great experience for me, that first year legal writing class.

**Steve Poor**

Absolutely. So your most recent venture is BriefCatch. You founded in 2017 if I recall, thereabouts.

**Ross Guberman**

2018, 2019 but yep, basically.

**Steve Poor**

What's the problem you're trying to solve with BriefCatch?

**Ross Guberman**

So you know, before that I did, I did 2800 workshops all around the world. And one of the kind of recurring themes from the people who followed my work or attended my workshops or read my books, was that it's really hard when you're under the gun, when you're facing a deadline, when you have kind of client pressures and court pressures, it's hard to remember all the tips and tricks that you pick up, you know, from legal writing books and workshops and the like. It's hard to remember them and apply them efficiently, you know, in the heat of the moment. So I actually started with a simpler product than BriefCatch that was designed for contracts, and we made that internally with somebody who worked for me, who knew how to code. That was my first step into tech. But, you know, as with my legal writing consulting career, I absolutely never in a million years intended to be a tech founder, but I did. I did like the idea of consolidating all the teachings into something like code. And then, you know, obviously I went from that early, early prototype product to what became BriefCatch, which was much more ambitious, and then it kind of took off from there. And next thing you knew, I was the CEO of a tech startup.

**Steve Poor**

Look around, and weird things have happened, haven't they?

**Ross Guberman**

Yeah, yeah. I mean, that's it's been fun though. I mean, I've had a lot of different careers, and I do like the adaptation challenge. I mean, I had to learn many new skills to pull off being a startup founder, to put them on.

**Steve Poor**

Give me a couple of examples. What'd you have to learn?

**Ross Guberman**

Well, I never, although I had run a business the legal writing, Legal Writing Pro, which was my workshop. Business was a business, right? It was an LLC. We had a couple of employees, but it was a pretty simple business to run, and it was, frankly, a pretty low stress business startup founder, of course, is much more difficult. You have many, many difficult hiring needs that I was completely unqualified to make, right? I mean, how am I going to pick a CTO or a senior engineer? I just had to sort of wing it. So I had to learn how to run an actual complex business. And then, of course, we got investors, and things get more challenging in those regards. And then, obviously, I had to learn a lot about tech in the broadest possible sense. So a little bit like when I went to law school, I didn't know what contracts and torts were. I knew, like, if someone said Python, I knew that Python was some kind of code, but I didn't know what code really meant. So I had to learn, of course, those kinds of hardcore tech concepts. But I also had to really understand how technology is built and how you sort of interface with customers and clients and teams. So I had to learn all of that as well. And then probably the part that I liked the most, and I found probably the easiest, was learning how to take writing, you know, writing tips and tricks, and translate them into something that could be coded and productized.

**Steve Poor**

Yeah, I want to talk a little bit more about brief catch here in a second. But let me pick up on that point. You've written a couple of books, Point Made, Point Taken, where you sort of highlight techniques from advocates and judges. What separates great legal writing from just good enough?

**Ross Guberman**

So what I tried to do, beginning with the impetus for the first major book I wrote, which was Point Made. So what I tried to do is kind of novel at the time. So I started with writers who, at the time were universally considered great legal writers, and I just kind of trusted the market on that. So, for example, I wrote an article that eventually led to the book deal that was Point Made, on Chief Justice Roberts. But at the time, he had simply been nominated to be Chief Justice, and Ruth Bader Ginsburg had said it was, I think in the New York Times I read this, that this guy, John Roberts, a name I didn't even know, had just written the best brief anyone on the court had ever read. So I started with that. So I would take people like Scalia, Roberts, the Solicitor General, and I would try to try to deduce empirically, differences between their work in the aggregate, and, like you said, kind of pretty good or average, like perfectly competent legal writing. And what I found, you know, probably not surprisingly, is that they're very, very, very, very specific differences on the style front, kind of on the wording front, and then very specific differences on the structure organizational front that you could actually point to and I think one reason my methods resonated, succeeded is I wasn't getting up there and saying that this is what I think people should do in briefs or contracts or opinions. I was always kind of framing myself as more of a conduit, like I'm like a whisperer or an interpreter. I'm looking at greatness, and I'm the one who has an interest in figuring out what they're actually doing. So there are lots of different things on the style level, on the style side, and then a lot of things on the structural, organizational side.

**Steve Poor**

Yeah, it's an interesting approach to it. I was wondering how you sort of dealt with, what does this guy know I'm the best legal writer I've ever, anybody's ever met. I know what I'm doing,

**Ross Guberman**

Yeah, and I mean, I was very, you know, I don't say very young, but I was quite young when I started. I was only two years out of law school when I went on the workshop circuit. So I was, I was at least, you know, I was a little bit naive about some things, but I was savvy enough to spot that problem ahead of time that, you know, there would be kind of ego, egos or resistance. So again, I think because I always framed it as, hey, this is how John Roberts does it, or this is how Scalia does it, I got better reception, because under that framework, the partners, or generally I was working with associates at first, not partners, they would have to actually think that they were better than Scalia as a writer, just better than me, right?

**Steve Poor**

I'm sure there were a few in there that did, but...

**Ross Guberman**

There were and, you know. Well, to be honest, that sometimes people would push back, and I thought, Oh, they're just being defensive. But sometimes I thought, okay, maybe I'm doing a little too much hero worshiping myself. And even, you know, a John Roberts brief isn't perfect. So yeah, I think that's the difference, though. And I think generally, what I've seen with other people who have entered the legal writing field is they either kind of just repeated things that they had learned when they were younger, or they just talked about what they like or what they think. And I think that's why the field has struggled. It's been a little bit too subjective and a little bit too like idiosyncratic. So that I would hear a lot of the associates I would meet would say, Well, I didn't like my legal writing class, but I just kissed the a\*\*es of the professor, like the professor had these little quirky, you know, idiosyncratic, wording preferences,

and I just mirrored them so I'd get a good grade. And I realized, well, that's, that's why the field has struggled. It shouldn't be so personal, right? We're not. We're not writing poems here. It's not supposed to be about self expression.

**Steve Poor**

Right, it's supposed to be about convincing and be clarity.

**Ross Guberman**

100%. It's more of a I always like that. There's more of a product, as opposed to something creative, and a vehicle for self expression.

**Steve Poor**

And how does BriefCatch sort of move this idea forward? What's the functionality I know? It's embedded in Word and outlook. What does it do?

**Ross Guberman**

If you sort of imagine all the things that you know you would teach, either in a formal legal writing workshop or like in a law firm, partners would try to impart to associates, so everything from proper citation format to having smoother transitions and crisper word choice and the like. So because it's code based, although we're moving into AI, or I should say, we've already moved into AI, because it's code based, you can take and in our case, we're up to about 14,000 different algorithms or rules that flag opportunities in all those regards. So you know, if you misuse a legal term, or you get the 33 and 34 act mixed up, or you have a wordy phrase, or you have convoluted sentence structure, it will flag, you know, the underlying language kind of as the way Grammarly does, and then give you some alternative ways to express the point more accurately, more clearly, or both. And then as the years have gone on, we've added more explanations. So we try to explain, you know, the reasoning behind the suggestions. And then we've also added a lot of examples. So it goes all the way back to when I was much younger than I am now. I've always thought, again, if you tell people they should write a certain way, you better back it up with proof. So we have a lot of those examples right. A lot of the prominent brief writers and opinion writers will have a little snippet we're right there in the user interface, so that people can see that whatever we're recommending is the kind of writing choice made by a lot of the revered legal writers. You mentioned AI. What is the impact it's had on BriefCatch, or what's the impact you think it will have on BriefCatch? Everything we've done to date is coded, as I suggested. So in other words, it doesn't understand the larger point you're trying to make. It doesn't understand the context. But it is very predictable and it's very versatile. That's why we can look for 14,000 things. What AI lets you do if you're if you have a product like BriefCatch, is actually consider the entire document, the structure, the flow, the context. You know, can pick up on things like the name of the judge and the jurisdiction, and it can make much broader suggestions. So in other words, you know, instead of just saying, make a decision you should write decide. It can say like, oh, this paragraph that you have, this fifth paragraph, is actually really, really strong. Maybe you should consider moving it up. It can give you insights into the way you're using case law to prove your points, back up your points. It can do all sorts of things, because you're marrying kind of legal writing principles with the unbelievable power, like the reasoning power of these LLMs, and it's really exciting to imagine, imagine everything we're going to be able to do.

**Steve Poor**

One of the things I read somewhere you talked about is getting rid of Blue Book.

**Ross Guberman**

We just launched that product a few days ago.

**Steve Poor**

Yeah, I don't write legal briefs anymore, but my God, I hated the blue book.

**Ross Guberman**

Well, actually, unfortunately, I don't have the power to get rid of the blue book, but we're just making it easy for people to get the blue book right, which I hope is almost as good. But there is talk, I still do some work with the courts, and there is talk that in a couple of years, all cases will be hyperlinked, in which case you won't really need citations. You won't need to have strict citation format, but that will be several years down the road.

**Steve Poor**

Well, that's something to look forward to.

**Ross Guberman**

That's right.

**Steve Poor**

You talked a little bit about training federal judges. That's sort of a remarkable component of your career. For a while, you're training every new federal judge in the US court system.

**Ross Guberman**

Yeah, I started, they started inviting me to do that in the Obama years. So that gives you, I think it was around 2010 and I've done every single new judge school, I believe, since then. There's actually one coming up in December. So it's, it's a, it's really an honor, and it's really, really fun, not just because I get to, it's, you know, I get to interact with all the nation's new federal judges. Is, but because there's always a dinner at the Supreme Court the same week, and I get to be invited, and that's an incredible perk. I'm very grateful for.

**Steve Poor**

What is the difference between a good judicial writer and just a good legal writer? What distinctions are you trying to draw for the new judges?

**Ross Guberman**

You know one thing that has really been a big deal in the last few years, and I'm not sure it's a good development, but that's above my pay grade. So one, one big issue is just the vast kind of media and social media coverage of opinions has really introduced a bunch of new challenges, because a lot of judges, especially nowadays, with so many things so polarized, a lot of judges feel like the way their opinions are discussed on social media in particular, it's just completely unfair and unreasonable. So I've actually in the last few cycles, spent quite a bit of time with them talking about how to craft introductions. That's generally what journalists and the social media types look at. They look at the opening right, whatever the first paragraph is, or first two paragraphs. And you want to really be very careful to not make your reasoning too facile, so it can be shot down as results oriented, or, I think, on social media generally, they say you're a political hack. So that's that's one big challenge that you don't necessarily have, as, let's say, a brief writer, you don't have very much media attention to briefs, right? Generally, maybe once in a while, super high profile case, but there are many, many people have lots of thoughts and opinions on the courts. So that's one big challenge. The other one is that, and maybe it's a little bit related. The other is that it's very, very hard, if you're a judge, to have a strong, credible, persuasive opinion that still makes it seem like you gave the losing party a fair shake. Now, in brief writing, you need to do that a little bit, but in opinion writing, I think it's, you know, the stakes are much

higher because of the power you hold as a judge. So that's, that's another, that's another focus often in that new judge school is, I'm like, Look, you know, I'll show them an example, like from Kagan. Kagan is very good at this. You can be very, very confident, not wishy washy at all in your overall approach to the issue the trial or appellate, but you can still respect the losing party, right, and not make it sound like everything they said was completely worthless, and that's the skill that people don't have. Now you're asking me earlier about the ego problem. It's funny, because people always assume that that must be the worst audience of all, like they must be so arrogant. Completely false. Federal judges, including the, you know, the circuit court judges, are the they're like, my favorite audience. They actually aren't arrogant in any way, shape or form. Most of them were law firm partners, right? Or during the Biden years, I noticed more of them were from like nonprofits or the ACLU and the like, but almost none of them have ever written an opinion, and they knew it. The only exceptions would be the Circuit Court nominees who had previously served on the district courts, but again, they hadn't written appellate opinions. So they're actually really, really fun. They're serious, but they're fun, and they're really open minded, and they're very grateful for any guidance I can give them, because, again, you don't really learn. Even if you're a 30-, 40-year litigator, you just don't learn how to write opinions. It's just not it's just not a skill that doesn't and it also just doesn't come naturally.

**Steve Poor**

You know, that's not the answer I would have expected you to have given. But as I'm listening to you talk, I guess I'm thinking, someone who's been successful now becomes a judge. That's uncharted territory for them. And here's somebody who's going to come in is going to help me? Yeah, no.

**Ross Guberman**

I mean, the first time I did it, I remember being nervous thinking the same thing we talked about before. I'm like, Who the hell is this guy? But most of them knew me, right? They knew me because they came from law firms. But no, opinion writing is brand new for them. And, you know, this is a week long program I participate in. A lot of them also don't know things like how to run a courtroom, or like how to push the button, you know, for the for the microphone. It's not easy to be a new judge. I especially felt sorry for the ones who became new judges during covid. They didn't have the training because it wasn't possible, and they had all the tech, you know, although, remember all those hearings with the CAT and CAT and all that. So, yeah, poor judges, there have been enough sympathy. It's not easy to be...

**Steve Poor**

Yeah, there you go. There you go. We talked a little bit about AI. How do you see AI intersecting with the development of skills by lawyers in the writing stage? I think I've heard you talk about it as augmented writing.

**Ross Guberman**

Yeah. I mean, I think there's going to be a, you know, a split. So what I worry about, and this is certainly not novel, I worry about, like, law students or even college students becoming sort of lazy, because it is so easy to have, you know, put something into ChatGPT and have it rewritten, or, frankly, put a prompt into ChatGPT and have the entire document written from scratch. So when I think that is an absolute concern, rightfully so, and I know the law schools are trying to figure it out. On the other hand, if you are either already a pretty good writer or are just very ambitious, AI can be a godsend, because you can actually you can learn a lot. You can experiment much more. Easily. You can get feedback on your writing if you know how to prompt correctly. So I think you're just going to see a broader or wider gap between the top legal writers and the ones who really struggle generally. Of course, in life, when you're not good at something, or you don't like it, or both, or you feel like you're not good, I should say you're going to take any shortcut you can find, right? I do the same thing with code. I'm not gonna learn how to code, but thank God now you can use Claude code or cursor, and I don't, and I don't have to, so I think

that's going to be interesting to watch. And what I don't know, and I don't think anyone knows, is is like the median brief, you know, the median opinion going to be better than it is. Now, I haven't seen any evidence yet of any discernible change, but I would like to think that that will be the case.

**Steve Poor**

There's an interesting debate that goes on with that as to whether it's going to improve legal writing or whether it's going to make it all more mediocre, because as people are using these tools, they're producing work that's drawn from others and mixed the same way.

**Ross Guberman**

Yeah. I mean, my own experience is that if you go to Claude or chat CPT and say, I need a motion for summary judgment in this jurisdiction, and you give it some undisputed facts, and you give it some of the legal arguments, the output is generally much better than the average motion in in the actual courts. So, and that's just the original output, right? As I told the students at Chicago Law yesterday, the real skill they should be focusing on law school now is how to improve. Well, I should say how to critique and improve AI output. So it already is pretty darn good. I think the profession knows, profession is a little defensive about AI. I think a lot of people in our profession are consciously or not thinking that AI output is worse than it is. They either focus on case hallucinations, or they find, you know, kind of anecdotal examples of poorly written paragraphs. The truth is, I always try to be honest and not, you know, not too biased. The truth is, the output is pretty darn good, even right right now in November 2025. Yeah, I mean, I think people focus on the articles they read about people who are filing briefs that are hallucinating cases, you know, to which my point is, if I got something from a junior associate I read the case, why would I do it differently, getting it from the computer? Yeah, and, I mean, well, I'd say two things. One is, you know, even at briefcat ourselves, we're about to launch a product that finds and fixes hallucinated cases so that problem is going to be solved. But number two, I've been around this for a while. People have been mis-citing cases for a long time before Gen AI was even a term. And also a bigger problem is people were citing the right case, but either it went the wrong way, or they were just kind of setting a sound bite and missing a lot of the nuances. We've had these problems for a long time, but for some reason, if you know some random, poor, random lawyer in America files a brief with a hallucinated case, it becomes like breaking news. People have been making those mistakes and briefs, you know, for much longer than I've been in the field.

**Steve Poor**

It's interesting that people tend to hold technology to a higher standard than they hold humans, you know? And I say it's not perfect. Okay, tell me the human who is perfect, and I'll give it to you.

**Ross Guberman**

That's one of my like, kind of standard lines is like, lawyers love to say that all the other lawyers aren't that good, unless there's a story about AI, and then suddenly every human lawyer is Antonin Scalia, and never makes a single mistake in writing. You're absolutely right. It's kind of it's almost amusing to watch.

**Steve Poor**

What excites you about where legal writing tools are headed in an age of AI.

**Ross Guberman**

Oh, I mean, I'm excited about, for example, the possibilities for better reasoning. So in other words, I did a webinar the other day on using AI responsibly, and for one of the things I showed is, if you don't want to use AI to write an edit, great, you should stick to that. But do your section, do your brief, and then ask AI, if I were opposing counsel, what are the first three things I would do to make your brief look

weak, right? Or what facts are you emitting, or what shortcuts are you taking logically? So there, there's so many possibilities when it comes to assigning a persona to AI, like your own. Like, do you think my client's gonna like this? Do you think opposing counsel is going to find weaknesses? You think Judge so and so is going to be receptive? I think that kind of goes back to we were talking about the happy part of AI, the good, the ambitious lawyers, the ambitious writers, are going to get better and better and better. So that's exciting. And then I think also exciting is, you know what I have done more manually over the years, which is really, really trying to figure out how the really successful writers practice their craft and take those insights and apply them to drafts. I mean, that's really promising as well.

**Steve Poor**

Yeah, you wrote an interesting blog post where it was interesting how you applied analytics to doing that. It's a great article. We'll link to it in the show notes.

**Ross Guberman**

Oh, thank you. Yeah. And again, it goes to my premise that the way to make legal writing better, but also to make the field of legal writing taken more seriously is to be empirical, more empirical.

**Steve Poor**

How did the law students yesterday react to your points? Are they intimidated by AI? Are they facile with it? Are they...?

**Ross Guberman**

It was a great you know, it's a great crowd. My actual topic was how to write like a textualist. But as soon as I was done and we did QA, everything they every question was about legal tech brief, catch AI. It's kind of a little bit of a sign of the times, I'd say. And I speak to law students in one way, shape or form, pretty regularly. I'd say most of them get it. Obviously they use AI in their personal life, and most of them are quite adept at that. I think a lot of law students are frustrated at their schools. I think they feel is, and I agree with them, even though I'm much older, that the schools are a little too worried about using AI to cheat and not worried enough about getting their students jobs in a couple of years, but they're going to need to have these skills. So it's fun. I mean, it's always fun to be around young people, especially the brilliant ones at Chicago. But no, I think they get it. I mean, of course, you know, they're a little anxious about what skills they're going to need when they come out of school, but that's the one thing I see in general, though it's different one school to the next. There's often some frustration at their own school for being a little bit behind on tech.

**Steve Poor**

Are there any schools that you see sort of leading the way in the utilization of technology and legal writing?

**Ross Guberman**

Yeah. I mean, I don't keep up as much as I used to. I think Suffolk law school.

**Steve Poor**

Andy does some good stuff out there.

**Ross Guberman**

Yeah. And also, there's this, I think her name is Cat moon, or I think she's a Vanderbilt?

**Steve Poor**

Vanderbilt, yeah, Cat.

**Ross Guberman**

Don't take my word for it. This is, I'm pretty far removed from academia these days, but I, I would say, without being confident that I'm naming the right schools, that you really have a gamut. You have schools that seem to be at the forefront. I think I've even read that some schools offer a certification in legal tech for their students, and then you have schools that the only thing they do with legal tech is ban it. That's it. That's the end of the story, which, by the way, is a joke, right? Because, right, we all know. I mean, I have kids in their 20s, we all know that people are going to use it anyway. Maybe they're not going to use it at the school issued laptop, they're not going to use it on that, but they're all using it.

**Steve Poor**

We used to get clients to say, oh, you can't use AI at the very beginning of, sort of the big bang of open AI. I was like, Really, and how do I make that happen? What are you talking about? People are going to use it on their personal computers, or they're going to they're going to use the tool.

**Ross Guberman**

I was talking to a law firm partner is like more of a real life friend the other day, and he was saying that the same the same client, in the course of one day, he talked to two executives at the client. One said, just want to remind you don't use AI. And the other one yelled at them, yelled at the firm for not using AI enough, at the same corporation. So I thought that was such a great story of the sort of

**Steve Poor**

That's fabulous. That's great. Well, Ross, we're out of time. I have could talk to you forever, but I know you've got other things to do. Thanks so much for making time, and we're looking forward to the continued growth of BriefCatch.

**Ross Guberman**

Thank you for the kind words for BriefCatch. Go check it out: [BriefCatch.com](https://BriefCatch.com).

**Steve Poor**

It'll be in the show notes the link.

**Ross Guberman**

Thank you. I really enjoyed it, and appreciate all the questions you.

**Steve Poor**

Thanks for listening to Pioneers and Pathfinders. Be sure to visit [thepioneerpodcast.com](https://thepioneerpodcast.com) for show notes and more episodes, and don't forget to subscribe to our podcast on your favorite platform.