Using civil appeals data on Taiwan’s Supreme Court (TSC), this article revisits the well-known question of whether the “haves” come out ahead in litigations. Our study finds that the higher-status litigants indeed tended to mobilize more sizeable and experienced legal representation than the lower-status litigants, a fact only implicitly assumed in the past literature. The “haves” were also more likely to prevail before the TSC than the “have-nots.” More significantly, the advantage of the “haves” over the “have-nots” in TSC litigation holds even after the disparity of legal representation is controlled for. Further analysis reveals that the higher win rate enjoyed by the “haves” is mainly a consequence of the TSC’s decision of whether to hear the case on the merits. In contrast to the past literature which shows that the court tries to balance the disadvantage of the “have-nots” in its ruling, we show that in exercising its discretionary jurisdiction, the TSC strongly favored the “haves.” Once the TSC decided to adjudicate the appeal on the merits, neither the type of litigant nor the status of legal representation affected the final outcome. Our results thus show that both party capability and court preference contribute to influence the outcomes of appeals.