White Paper on Artificial Intelligence and Judiciary

Published by
Centre for Research and Planning
SUPREME COURT OF INDIA
November, 2025

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We are deeply grateful to Hon'ble the Chief Justice of India, Justice B.R. Gavai, for his invaluable support, guidance, and encouragement to the Centre for Research and Planning. We also extend our warm gratitude to Mr. Shekhar C. Munghate, Ld. Secretary General, Supreme Court of India, for his continued administrative support, which greatly facilitated the completion of this white paper. We further record our sincere appreciation to all those whose constructive deliberations and informed contributions enriched this work. We would also like to acknowledge the efforts of Mr. Rajesh Ranjan, former Consultant (Research), CRP, for his valuable assistance in preparing the initial draft of this research. We are also grateful to Ms. Basima P. for her editorial inputs.

Authors

Dr. Anurag Bhaskar, Director-cum-Additional Registrar, CRP

Shubham Kumar, Consultant (Research), CRP

Aman Uniyal, Consultant (Research), CRP

Ajayendra Nath Tripathi, Consultant (Technology), CRP

Raza Haider Zaidi, Law Clerk-cum-Research Associate, CRP

Aishwarya Gairola, Law Clerk-cum-Research Associate, CRP

Shaista Zahoor Qurashi, Research Associate, CRP

Aaina Mittal, Law Clerk-cum-Research Associate, CRP

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AI	Artificial Intelligence
ADJD	Abu Dhabi Judicial Department
AIDA	Artificial Intelligence and Data Act
AWS	Amazon Web Services
CIS	Case Information System
COMPAS	Correctional Offender Management Profiling for Alternative Sanctions
DIFC	Dubai International Financial Centre
Divorce AIDE	Divorce Assets Information Division Estimator
EIA	Ethical Impact Assessment
ECRIS-TCN	European Criminal Records Information System for Third Country Nationals
e-SCR	Electronic Supreme Court Report
EU	European Union
eu-LISA	European Union Agency for the Operational Management of Large-Scale IT Systems
GANs	Generative Adversarial Networks
GCGs	Generative Content Generators

Gen AI	Generative Artificial Intelligence
GDPR	General Data Protection Regulation
GPAI	General Purpose AI models
ICJS	Inter-Operable Criminal Justice System
ICT	Information and Communication Technology
IPR	Intellectual Property Rights
JITs	Joint Investigation Teams
LAN	Local Area Network
LSI-R	Level of Service Revised
LED	Law Enforcement Directive
LEIA	Legal Intelligent Advisor
LESA	Legal Services Assistant
LLMs	Large Language Models
LegRAA	Legal Research Analysis Assistant
MAS	Monetary Authority of Singapore
ML	Machine Learning
NAIS	National AI Strategy
NALSA	National Legal Services Authority

NCMS	National Court Management Systems
NCSC	National Centre for State Courts
NIC	National Informatics Centre
NJDG	National Judicial Data Grid
NLP	Natural Language Processing
OCR	Optical Character Recognition
OECD	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
ORAS-PAT	Ohio Risk Assessment System Pretrial Assessment Tool
PDPJ - Br	Digital Platform of the Brazilian Judicial Branch
POCSO	Prevention of Children from Sexual Offences
PSA	Public Safety Assessment
SAL	Singapore Academy of Law
SCT	Small Claims Tribunal
SPC	Supreme People's Court
STS	Speech Transcription System
SUPACE	Supreme Court Portal for Assistance in Court Efficiency
SUVAS	Supreme Court Vidhik Anuvaad Software
TERES	Technology Enabled RESolution

UAE	United Arab Emirates
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
VPRAI	Virginia Pretrial Risk Assessment Instrument
VPRAI-R	Virginia Pretrial Risk Assessment Instrument- Revised

INTRODUCTION TO THE WHITE PAPER

The infusion of technology into judicial institutions has become one of the defining developments of the twenty-first century. Courts, historically characterised by paper-intensive procedures and a measured approach to institutional change, now find themselves undergoing a significant technological reorientation.[1] Among the various innovations shaping this transition, Artificial Intelligence has emerged as a tool of considerable potential.[2]

Artificial Intelligence (AI) is best understood as a set of computational techniques that enable machines to perform tasks typically dependent on human cognitive faculties such as interpreting language, identifying patterns, drawing inferences from complex information, or generating text and analysis.[3] Rather than a single invention, AI encompasses a wide range of technologies, from narrow tools built for specific functions, to machine-learning systems that continually refine their performance using data, to large generative models capable of producing text, summaries, images, or speech that resemble human outputs.[4] Many of these systems already permeate everyday life, for example speech-recognition tools translate voice into accurate text, and generative models prepare summaries or textual drafts in a fraction of the time human effort would require. In the legal profession, these capabilities translate into functions such as automated document review, enhanced search tools, real-time transcription,

[1] Jane Donoghue, "*The Rise of Digital Justice: Courtroom Technology, Public Participation and Access to Justice" (2017) 80* Modern Law Review 995, *available at:* https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/1468-2230.12300 (last visited on November 18, 2025).
[2] Sara Zouhir, *"AI and the Judiciary: Balancing Innovation with Integrity"* (2 June 2025) UNESCO, available at: https://www.unesco.org/en/articles/ai-and-judiciary-balancing-innovation-integrity (last visited on November 19, 2025).
[3] Google Cloud, "What Is Artificial Intelligence (AI)?" (Google Cloud), *available at:* https://cloud.google.com/learn/what-is-artificial-intelligence (last visited on November 19, 2025).
[4] *Ibid.*

predictive analytics, and a range of applications that support both judicial and administrative tasks.[5]

The emergence of AI forms part of a series of technological reform that has progressively influenced judicial systems over several decades, each stage building upon earlier efforts to modernise and strengthen institutional processes.[6] The earliest phase of technological reform centred on streamlining procedures and improving docket management. Courts introduced basic digitisation, case registry software, updated filing systems, and structured databases that tracked the movement of a matter from institution to disposal.[7] These reforms focused on eliminating duplication, reducing clerical errors, and promoting coherence across registries and judicial sections. Even these modest steps produced tangible benefits, enabling faster coordination among registries, advocates, and judges.[8]

The second phase moved beyond administrative digitisation to embrace data as an instrument of governance. E-filing modules, digital cause lists, searchable repositories of judgements, and performance dashboards began to influence how courts monitored pendency and structured administrative strategies.[9] This infrastructure highlighted systemic bottlenecks revealing, for instance, where delays consistently arose and made it possible to devise targeted responses. For

[5] Ministry of Law & Justice, "Digital Transformation of Justice: Integrating AI in India's Judiciary and Law Enforcement", *Press Information Bureau,* Press Release ID 2106239, February 25, 2025,*available at:* https://www.pib.gov.in/PressReleasePage.aspx?PRID=2106239 (last visited on November 19, 2025).
[6] See E-Committee, Supreme Court of India, "National Policy and Action Plan for Implementation of Information and Communication Technology in the Indian Judiciary", August 01, 2005, *available at:* https://cdn.s3waas.gov.in/s3ec0490f1f4972d133619a60c30f3559e/uploads/2024/04/2024042478-4.pdf (last visited on November 19, 2025).
[7] See e-Courts Services, "About Us, e-Courts Project", *available at:* https://ecourts.gov.in/ecourts_home/static/about-us.php (last visited on November 19, 2025).
[8] *Ibid.*
[9] *Ibid.*

many litigants and lawyers, these reforms represented the access to information and judicial records on a national scale.[10]

Courts today find themselves on the threshold of a new technological era. Machine-learning systems and generative AI tools offer abilities far removed from earlier automated platforms. They can analyse patterns, categorise cases, prepare structured summaries, assist research and provide data-driven insights that inform both adjudication and administration. These tools promise to enhance speed, improve accuracy, and strengthen the judiciary's overall capacity to deliver timely justice. Potential applications include intelligent case-codifying to identify urgency or complexity, accelerated legal research through context-sensitive retrieval of precedents, automated transcription and translation enabling accessibility across languages, drafting assistance for structured templates and summaries, predictive modelling to anticipate caseloads, and internal analytics to guide administrative planning.[11]

Yet, the possibilities of AI must be approached with caution. The judicial process carries constitutional responsibilities that no technology can supplant. The very features that make AI attractive, i.e., speed, scale, and automation, also introduce risks that must be carefully managed. Ethical oversight becomes indispensable if the promise of AI is to be realised without compromising the integrity of justice delivery. Judges must remain the ultimate decision-makers, AI may assist, but it cannot substitute human judgement. This principle of human oversight is foundational.[12]

---

[10] e-Committee, Supreme Court of India, "Brief Overview of e-Courts Project", *available at:* https://ecommitteesci.gov.in/project/brief-overview-of-e-courts-project/ (last visited on November 20, 2025).

[11] Ministry of Law & Justice, "Digital Transformation of Justice: Integrating AI in India's Judiciary and Law Enforcement", *Press Information Bureau,* Press Release ID 2106239, February 25, 2025,*available at:* https://www.pib.gov.in/PressReleasePage.aspx?PRID=2106239 (last visited on November 19, 2025).

[12] OECD, "Governing with Artificial Intelligence: The State of Play and Way Forward in Core Government Functions", OECD Publishing, Paris, *available at:* https://doi.org/10.1787/795de142-en. (last visited on November 20, 2025).

This white paper examines the potential and the risks of use of AI in the judiciary. The first chapter lays the conceptual foundations by defining AI. The second chapter undertakes a global survey reviewing developments in various jurisdictions to understand how courts worldwide have adopted and regulated AI technologies. The third chapter studies the Indian experience, i.e., the Supreme Court and High Courts' initiatives, translation and transcription tools, pilots in AI-assisted research and drafting, and the institutional concerns that accompany them. The fourth chapter deals with the ethical and jurisdictional issues that arise from AI deployment, questions of accountability, algorithmic bias, due process, privacy, and the constitutional principles that must govern technological reform. The final chapter sets out a set of recommendations, including audit mechanisms, curated datasets, clear oversight protocols, training frameworks, and phased implementation models.

Objective and Scope

The objectives of this research are to analyse the introduction of AI in judiciary and to assess how AI-based tools such as translation and transcription systems, automated categorisation of filings, document-management platforms, etc. can strengthen research efficiency, improve case management, and expand access to justice for litigants facing linguistic, geographical, or technological barriers. The study further aims to evaluate the potential of AI to reduce procedural delays, mitigate systemic inefficiencies, and enhance the overall responsiveness of the justice system. At the same time, it seeks to identify and examine the risks associated with AI integration, including concerns of algorithmic transparency, accountability for AI-assisted material, data bias, and the preservation of judicial discretion. Ultimately, the research endeavours to determine how technological adoption can be aligned with core judicial values and to outline a principled framework to ensure that fairness, due process, and open justice remain uncompromised as courts move towards greater AI-enabled functioning.

Its scope is deliberately confined to the use of AI within courts, both judicial and administrative and does not extend to the application of AI in other domains or within the broader legal profession. By addressing the technological, institutional, and normative considerations that accompany AI adoption, this white paper aims to provide a coherent framework for evaluating how such tools may be integrated into the judiciary in a manner that safeguards integrity while enabling meaningful reform.

Methodology

This research employs a comparative and interdisciplinary methodological framework to examine the integration of AI within judicial systems. The analysis draws upon legislative and policy instruments, judicial decisions, administrative directions, institutional reports, and official guidelines issued by courts and rule-making bodies across multiple jurisdictions. In addition to doctrinal sources, the study incorporates empirical insights arising from pilot projects, digital-court initiatives, and technology-driven reforms implemented by judicial institutions worldwide, including those presently underway in India.

The research further engages with a substantial body of academic scholarship spanning law, public administration, and ethics, allowing for a multifaceted evaluation of AI's implications for judicial administration. By situating technological developments within their broader institutional and normative contexts, the methodology enables a nuanced assessment of how different legal systems structure the governance of AI tools, the safeguards they consider indispensable, and the conditions under which such technologies enhance, rather than compromise, judicial integrity. This cross-jurisdictional, doctrinal, and empirically informed approach provides a comprehensive basis for identifying both best practices and jurisdiction-specific constraints, thereby ensuring that the study's conclusions are grounded in comparative experience as well as constitutional principle.

CHAPTER 1: UNDERSTANDING ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE: DEFINITIONS AND KEY CONCEPTS

For conceptual clarity and consistency throughout this white paper, this chapter sets out the terminologies associated with AI as it relates to judicial and court-administrative functions. The integration of AI into legal research, registry operations, case management, translation services, and other judicial workflows necessitates a clear and context-specific vocabulary. Accordingly, this chapter defines the principal concepts related to contemporary AI systems such as machine learning, algorithms, generative models, hallucination, bias, and digital manipulation technologies and explains how each manifests within judicial processes. The subsequent sections of this chapter therefore provide detailed explanations of these key terms for establishing the conceptual framework for the normative, institutional, and technological analysis that follows in later chapters.

1. Artificial Intelligence (AI): AI refers to machine-based systems capable of performing functions that ordinarily require human cognitive abilities, such as reasoning, pattern recognition, language comprehension, and structured decision-making.[13] These systems analyse large volumes of information, identify underlying patterns, and generate outputs in the form of classifications, translations, legal summaries, recommendations, predictions, or other automated actions capable of influencing physical or digital environments.

In the judicial context, AI denotes a range of technological tools that support or augment judicial and administrative functions, including document classification, translation of

[13] Queensland Courts, "The Use of Generative AI: Guidelines for Judicial Officers" (2024), *available at:* https://cloud.google.com/learn/what-is-artificial-intelligence. (last visited on November 18, 2025).

pleadings, legal research, case scheduling, identification of filing defects, and information retrieval from extensive databases of precedents.[14]

Two broad categories of AI are central to its deployment in judicial systems: machine-learning-based AI and knowledge-representation or rule-based AI. Machine Learning (ML), in simple terms, refers to AI systems that learn patterns from data and improve performance over time. When applied to judicial workflows, ML tools can be trained on historical court data such as cause lists, orders, and case categories to make inferences or predictions. For instance, the Supreme Court of India's SUPACE (Supreme Court Portal for Assistance in Court Efficiency) uses ML techniques to retrieve relevant facts, documents, and precedents from large case records and assist judges in organising complex matters.[15] Similarly, an ML model trained on several years of cause list information may learn to automatically categorise new filings into subject groups such as criminal appeals, service matters, taxation, or land acquisition, thereby improving the efficiency of registry operations.

In contrast, knowledge-representation and rule-based AI systems do not learn from data but operate on predefined logical structures that encode legal norms, procedural rules, or statutory requirements. Such systems are designed to apply explicit rules in a consistent and systematic manner. In judicial administration, a rule-based system may be programmed to identify procedural defects in filings such as missing affidavits, incorrect court fees, or the absence of limitation applications before a matter is registered. The Supreme Court's SUVAS (Supreme Court Vidhik Anuvaad Software)[16] is a prominent example of rule-based AI, functioning as a

[14] Victorian Law Reform Commission, "Artificial Intelligence in Victoria's Courts and Tribunals: Consultation Paper" (2024), *available at:* https://www.lawreform.vic.gov.au/wp-content/uploads/2024/10/VLRC_AI_Courts_CP_web.pdf (last visited on November 18, 2025).

[15] Ministry of Law and Justice, "Use of AI in Supreme Court Case Management*"* (Press Information Bureau, 20 March 2025), *available at:* https://www.pib.gov.in/PressReleasePage.aspx?PRID=2113224. (last visited on November 18, 2025).

[16] Government of India, Ministry of Law and Justice (Department of Justice), "*Launch of SUVAS App", Rajya Sabha, Unstarred Question No. 587*, answered on 6 February 2020, *available at:* https://www.google.com/url?sa=t&source=web&rct=j&opi=89978449&url=https://sansad.in/getFile/annex/251/

translation tool that converts judgements and orders into regional languages by applying linguistic and syntactic rules in a structured format.

2. Algorithms: An algorithm is a finite, clearly defined sequence of logical steps or instructions that a computer system, including an AI model, follows to process information, solve problems, or convert inputs into meaningful outputs.[17] An algorithm provides a structured method for decision-making, it specifies *how* data should be analysed, *what* operations should be carried out, and *in what order*, so that the system produces consistent and predictable results.

In the judicial context, algorithms relate to a wide range of digital and AI-enabled court functions. For example, an algorithm embedded in an e-filing system may automatically check whether a petition includes all mandatory documents, whether court fees have been correctly calculated, or whether the filing falls within limitation. Such an algorithm may apply procedural rules step-by-step, e.g., "If affidavit is missing → flag defect", or "If appeal is filed beyond limitation → prompt for condonation application" thereby assisting registry staff and reducing clerical errors.

3. Generative AI: Generative AI refers to a class of artificial intelligence models designed to create new content such as text, images, audio, or code based on patterns learned from vast datasets. Unlike traditional AI systems that primarily classify, predict, or retrieve information, generative models can produce original outputs in response to user-provided 'prompts'.[18]

AU587.docxFsourceDpqars&ved=2ahUKEwi12uXis4CRAxUPSmwGHcQCKwQQFnoECBgQAQ&usg=AOvVaw1EVFaw_2I7xvJM9zrClDXV (last visited on November 18, 2025).

[17] Nishant R, Schneckenberg D and Ravishankar M, "The Formal Rationality of Artificial Intelligence-Based Algorithms and the Problem of Bias" 39 *Journal of Information Technology* 19 (2024), *available at:* https://doi.org/10.1177/02683962231176842 (last visited on November 18, 2025).

[18] Supreme Court of Victoria, *Guidelines for Litigants: Responsible Use of Artificial Intelligence in Litigation* (Guidelines, Supreme Court of Victoria, May 2024); see also Oracle, 'What Is Generative AI (GenAI)? How Does It Work?' (Oracle India, 11 February 2025), *available at:* https://www.oracle.com/in/artificial-intelligence/generative-ai/what-is-generative-ai. last visited on November 18, 2025).

These models use advanced architectures such as 'large language models' (LLMs) or 'diffusion models' to generate coherent writing, realistic visuals, or structured data that did not previously exist in the training material.

4. Hallucination: AI hallucination refers to instances where an artificial intelligence system generates content that is factually incorrect, logically inconsistent, or entirely fabricated, even though it appears coherent and persuasive. This occurs because generative models predict likely sequences of words or patterns based on training data rather than verifying facts. Hallucinations often arise from gaps in training data, inherent biases in the datasets, or prompts that push the model beyond its knowledge boundaries, resulting in outputs that "sound right" but have no factual foundation. Courts across jurisdictions have already encountered filings containing invented case citations produced by AI tools, leading to penalties, adverse remarks, and strict directions requiring verification of all AI-assisted content.

5. LLMs: Large Language Models is a type of generative AI system which is capable of generating data in natural language, understandable by humans, by learning patterns from large amounts of text data with which it is trained. LLMs can do a range of natural language processing tasks ranging from searching, translating and summarising text to generating new content such as text, images and even computer codes. In judicial settings, these LLM based AI systems showcase strong ability to summarise the facts and issues and generate the reasoning supporting the judge's decision.[19]

6. Prompt: Prompt refers to an instruction or an input given by the user of the AI model to enable the AI model to generate corresponding response or output as per the user's requirement.

[19] John Zhuang Liu, Xueyao Li, *How do judges use large language models*? Evidence from Shenzhen, Journal of Legal Analysis, Volume 16, Issue 1, 2024, p.no. 235–262, *available at:* https://doi.org/10.1093/jla/laae009 (last visited on November 18, 2025).

A prompt is usually in the form of text, however, many AI models have been upgraded which allows users to give voice prompts.

Since AI systems are predictive models that generate responses based on statistical associations rather than true understanding, therefore, when prompts lack clarity or essential details, LLMs may misinterpret the user's intent or fill gaps with inaccurate assumptions making it necessary to use a well-structured prompt. A well-structured formula for a prompt would involve giving an input in three steps, namely, intent, context and instruction.[20] It begins by stating the intent, which conveys the purpose of the query and the type of information or result sought. This is followed by the context, which provides background details, relevant conditions, or any other information necessary to frame the issue properly for the AI. It concludes with the instruction, which specifies the exact task to be performed. When these three elements are integrated, the prompt becomes more precise, reduces ambiguity, and leads to more accurate, time efficient and quality outputs.[21]

7. Bias: Bias is defined as a systematic error in decision-making processes that results in unfair outcomes. In the context of AI, bias can arise from various sources, including data collection, algorithm design, and human interpretation.[22] The bias might occur due to the inherent societal and structural biases existing in the data with which an AI system has been trained. Through improvement and optimisation of the algorithmic patterns and positive intervention by humans, the issue of bias in AI systems can be addressed.[23]

---

[20] Introduction to writing effective AI legal prompts, *available at:* https://legal.thomsonreuters.com/blog/writing-effective-legal-ai-prompts/ (last visited on November 18, 2025).

[21] Samantha McKenna, "The role of AI and well-designed prompts in legal work", Thomson Reuters Legal (blog), 7 October 2024, *available at:* https://legal.thomsonreuters.com/blog/the-role-of-well-designed-prompts-in-applying-ai-to-legal-work/. (last visited on November 18, 2025).

[22] Emilio Ferrara, "Fairness And Bias in Artificial Intelligence: A Brief Survey of Sources, Impacts, And Mitigation Strategies", arXiv, 2023, *available at:* https://arxiv.org/pdf/2304.07683.pdf (last visited on November 16, 2025).

[23] Xuan Gong, "Reducing Judicial Bias by Using Artificial Intelligence," EAI Endorsed Transactions on Scalable Information Systems, November 17, 2023, *available at:* https://eudl.eu/pdf/10.4108/eai.17-11-2023.2342775 (last visited on November 17, 2025).

8. Deepfakes: A deepfake is an AI-generated image, audio, or video that appears authentic and closely resembles real persons, objects, places, entities, or events which it depicts but is in fact false and deliberately manipulated. It blurs the boundaries between genuine and fabricated material, raising significant concerns regarding misinformation, manipulation of public opinion, threats to democracy, fraud, identity theft, defamation, and other negative consequences.[24]

[24] Rebecca A. Delfino, "Deepfakes on Trial: A Call To Expand the Trial Judge's Gatekeeping Role to Protect Legal Proceedings from Technological Fakery", 74 *Hastings Law Journal* 293 (2023), *available at:* https://repository.uclawsf.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=4012&context=hastings_law_journal (last visited on November 18, 2025).

CHAPTER 2: GLOBAL OVERVIEW OF THE USE OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE IN JUDICIAL SYSTEMS

This chapter delves into how the judiciary worldwide has reported improvements through AI-enabled assistance tools. Predictive analytics and automated case categorisation have reduced administrative delays and enabled courts to manage large caseloads with greater precision. AI-assisted legal research and drafting tools have accelerated the preparation of reports, summaries, and draft decisions, thereby freeing judicial time for more complex deliberations. Enhanced capabilities in transcription, translation, and document management have improved courtroom efficiency and expanded access for linguistically or digitally marginalised communities. In several jurisdictions, AI-enabled platforms have also strengthened access to justice by providing litigants, especially the unrepresented, with easier, clearer, and more user-friendly pathways to navigate judicial processes. Collectively, these developments reflect a systemic shift toward data-informed, technology-enabled judicial administration. At the same time, the comparative experience reveals a set of recurring concerns relating to the opacity of algorithmic processes, the potential for discriminatory outputs, the risk of over-reliance on automated material that must be carefully mitigated with relevant safeguards before integrating AI within the judiciary.

This chapter provides a comparative examination of these developments, outlining the pathways through which nations have adopted AI tools, the principles guiding their deployment, and the institutional safeguards crafted to preserve judicial integrity. It highlights, in particular, how different jurisdictions have sought to balance technological innovation with fundamental constitutional and democratic values such as judicial independence, accountability, due process, and the protection of individual rights. This comparative study also brings into focus the various functional domains where AI has been incorporated ranging from

legal research, summarisation and precedent tracking, to evidence analysis, automated drafting, real-time transcription, translation services, case management, and litigant-facing support systems.

A. Global AI Frameworks and Tools

a) United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization

In 2021, UNESCO published its *Recommendation on the Ethics of Artificial Intelligence* which was the first global normative framework dedicated entirely to guiding the ethical development and use of AI. Adopted unanimously by 193 member states, it reflects an inclusive, multidisciplinary approach shaped by diverse cultural, social, and economic contexts. UNESCO's vision positions AI as a transformative force that must evolve in harmony with human rights, democratic values, and sustainable development.[25]

UNESCO's recommendations emphasises the primacy of human rights and human dignity, insisting that AI systems respect autonomy, agency, and fundamental freedoms. Fairness, equality, and non-discrimination form another central pillar, with the guidelines urging governments and developers to prevent the amplification of biases and to ensure equitable treatment across communities. It further highlights the importance of transparency and accountability, requiring that AI processes be understandable and open to scrutiny so individuals can meaningfully contest algorithmic decisions.[26] UNESCO has also published an extended instrument of the *Recommendation on the Ethics of Artificial Intelligence (2021)*

[25] UNESCO, "Recommendations on the Ethics of AI", (2021), *available at:* unesdoc.unesco.org/in/rest/annotationSVC/DownloadWatermarkedAttachment/attach_import_75c9fb6b-92a6-4982-b772-79f540c9fc39?_=381137eng.pdf&to=44&from=1 (last visited on November 13, 2025).
[26] *Ibid.*

which provides for a set of criteria for how to conduct an ethical impact assessment (EIA). These parameters can be altered according to the regulatory regime in each country.[27]

In 2022, UNESCO was requested by countries across the globe for guidance on capacity building support for their judicial systems on AI.[28] In response UNESCO after conducting various assessment surveys published the "*Global Toolkit on AI and the Rule of Law"*[29] for assisting judicial actors (judges, prosecutors, state attorneys, public lawyers, law universities and judicial training institutions) in mitigating the risks involved with AI. The toolkit responds to the *UNESCO's Recommendation on the Ethics of AI (2021)*[30] and provides a module based training programme on AI, human rights, and the rule of law for the judiciary.[31]

Further, as part of UNESCO's AI and Law programme, UNESCO has also developed the draft *Guidelines for the Use of AI Systems in Courts and Tribunals*.[32] These guidelines were prepared after a 2023 UNESCO survey on the use of AI systems by judicial operators (people having an active legal role in a judicial process such as judges, judicial support staff, prosecutors, and lawyers) wherein about 44 percent of the 563 judicial operators from 96 countries reported to had used AI tools in their work related activities. Interestingly, 71 percent of the judicial operators using AI tools reported that they were using 'free access' versions of the tools which raises serious concerns regarding data security.[33] The draft guidelines as a mitigating measure suggest 13 principles to the organisations to consider while adopting or using any type of AI

---

[27] UNESCO, "Ethical Impact Assessment: A Tool of the Recommendation on the Ethics of Artificial Intelligence" (2023), *available at:* https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000386276 (last visited on November 17, 2025).
[28] UNESCO, "Artificial Needs Assessment Survey in Africa" (2022), *available at:* https://www.unesco.org/en/articles/artificial-intelligence-needs-assessment-survey-africa (last visited on November 18, 2025).
[29] UNESCO, "Global Toolkin on AI and the Rule of Law for the Judiciary" (2023), *available at:* https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000387331 (last visited on November 18, 2025).
[30] *Id at 19.*
[31] *Id at 22, p. no. 17.*
[32] UNESCO, "Document for consultation: Guidelines for the Use of AI Systems in Courts and Tribunals" (2024), *available at:* https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000390781 (last visited on November 18, 2025).
[33] UNESCO, "Global Judges' Initiative: survey on the use of AI systems by judicial operators" (2024), *available at:* https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000389786 (Last visited on November 18, 2025).

tools. These principles include protection of human rights (including fairness, non-discrimination and personal data protection), awareness and informed use, transparency, accountability, accuracy, human oversight etc.

b) Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development

The OECD's *Principles on Artificial Intelligence*, adopted in 2019, constitute the first intergovernmental standard on trustworthy and responsible AI. Developed through a multistakeholder process involving governments, industry experts, academia, and civil society, the framework reflects a pragmatic yet principled approach to supporting innovation while safeguarding societal values. The OECD situates AI as a powerful driver of economic growth, productivity, and social progress, but emphasises that these benefits must be realised within a governance structure that protects human rights, democratic institutions, and public trust. The guidelines therefore focus not only on what AI can achieve, but how it should be designed, deployed, and monitored across its lifecycle.[34]

OECD framework consists of five principles that set the ethical and operational foundation for trustworthy AI. The first is the promotion of inclusive growth, sustainable development, and societal well-being, ensuring that AI technologies contribute positively to people and the planet. The second principle centres on human-centred values and fairness, requiring AI systems to operate in a manner consistent with the rule of law, human rights, and democratic norms. The OECD's recommendations also place significant emphasis on transparency and explainability, highlighting that individuals and organisations must have access to information

[34] OECD, "The Recommendation on Artificial Intelligence" (2019), *available at:* https://legalinstruments.oecd.org/en/instruments/OECD-LEGAL-0449 (last visited on November 13, 2025).

about AI systems and their functionality. The final principle is about accountability for those who design, develop, or deploy AI.[35]

c) European Union

In the European Union, the integration of AI into judicial and law enforcement cooperation has advanced significantly under the collective leadership of Eurojust, European Union Agency for the Operational Management of Large-Scale IT Systems in the Area of Freedom, Security and justice (eu-LISA), and the European Commission consistent with the goals outlined in the 2019–2023 and 2024-2028 e-Justice Action Plans.[36]

A major contributor to the EU's AI framework is eu-LISA, the agency responsible for developing and managing the Union's large-scale IT systems. Its role is particularly evident in the *European Criminal Records Information System for Third Country Nationals* (ECRIS-TCN), which consolidates criminal records of non-EU nationals and leverages AI to improve data accuracy, retrieval, and cross-checking.[37]

In 2024, *the European Union AI Act* adopted a risk based approach to regulation and categorisation of AI systems into four levels. At the strictest end, unacceptable risk of AI, such as social scoring systems and manipulative AI, is banned outright.[38] High risk AI systems face comprehensive regulation and form the core focus of the legislation. Limited risk AI, including chatbots and deepfakes, must meet transparency requirements to ensure users know they are interacting with AI. Meanwhile, minimal risk AI, which currently encompasses most

---

[35] *Ibid.*
[36] European Union, "2019-2024 Strategy on e-justice (2019/C 96/04)*"*, *available at:* https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=OJ:C_202500437; See also European Union, *"*European e-Justice Strategy 2024-2028 (C/2025/437*)"*, (January 16, 2025), *available at:* https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=OJ:C_202500437 (last visited on November 12, 2025).
[37] *Ibid.*
[38] European Union, "The Artificial Intelligence Act", (June 13, 2024) *available at:* https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:32024R1689 (last visited on November 12, 2025).

applications on the EU market like video games and spam filters, remains unregulated, though this discourse is evolving with the rise of generative AI.[39] The Act places primary obligations on providers (developers) of high-risk AI systems, whether they are based in the EU or third countries, as long as their systems are marketed in the EU or their outputs are used there. Users (deployers), who are professionals using AI systems in their work, face lighter but still significant compliance requirements, with the same geographic scope applying to both EU-based and third-country users whose AI outputs reach the EU market.[40]

General purpose AI models (GPAI) are subject to tiered requirements. All GPAI providers must provide technical documentation, comply with copyright law, and publish summaries of their training data. Open-source models benefit from reduced obligations unless they present systemic risks. Any GPAI model deemed to pose systemic risk, regardless of whether it is open or closed, must undergo model evaluations and adversarial testing, report serious incidents, and maintain robust cybersecurity protections.[41]

Moreover, in the EU, compliance with the *General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR*) and the *Law Enforcement Directive (LED)* remains paramount, particularly where AI applications involve biometric identification or sensitive personal data.[42] While the GDPR does not explicitly mention AI, its provisions are largely compatible with AI systems when interpreted flexibly.[43] Key areas needing clarification include where AI applications qualify as high-risk

[39] European Union, The Artificial Intelligence Act, Art.9 *available at:* https://artificialintelligenceact.eu/article/9/ (last visited on November 13, 2025).
[40] European Union, The Artificial Intelligence Act, 2024, Art. 8.
[41] *Ibid.*
[42] Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union, Art. 8(1) and Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU), Art.16(1) ; Also see European Union General Data Protection Regulation, *available at*: https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:32016R0679 (last visited on November 13, 2025).
[43] European Parliamentary Research Service, "The Impact of General Data Protection Regulation on Artificial Intelligence",(June, 2020) *available at:* https://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/STUD/2020/641530/EPRS_STU(2020)641530_EN.pdf (last visited on November 13, 2025).

and require data protection impact assessments, and when data protection authorities should be involved preventively.[44]

The technological architecture of the tools used in the EU relies mainly on Natural Language Processing (NLP) and Computer Vision. NLP enables automated translation, advanced text processing, document summarisation, extraction of key information from unstructured data, and protection of sensitive information in line with EU privacy standards, helping authorities efficiently handle multilingual evidence and legal documents. Computer Vision supports biometric identification from images and videos and facilitates video anonymisation through Generative Adversarial Networks (GANs), which replaces real faces with synthetic ones to preserve privacy without compromising evidentiary value.[45]

Among the most notable advancements in AI in the EU region is the evolution of the *Joint Investigation Teams (JITs)* collaboration platform, designed to facilitate secure communication, coordinated action, and evidence sharing among prosecutors, judges, and law enforcement agencies operating across multiple jurisdictions.[46] This platform supports real-time information exchange, helping Member States to respond effectively to any offence therein.[47]

Similarly, Eurojust's redesigned *Case Management System* now incorporates AI enhanced components aimed at improving case handling efficiency, supporting data-driven analysis, and

[44] *Ibid.*
[45] Joint Report prepared by Eu-LISA and Eurojust, "Artificial Intelligence System Supporting Cross Border Cooperation in Criminal Justice" *available at:* https://www.eurojust.europa.eu/sites/default/files/assets/artificial-intelligence-cross-border-cooperation-criminal-justice-report.pdf (last visited on November 12, 2025).
[46] Marco Fabri, "From Court Automation to e-Justice and Beyond in Europe" *International Journal for Court Administration* 7, available at https://iacajournal.org/articles/640/files/67174c47296c0.pdf (last visited on November 12, 2025).
[47] *Ibid.*

providing operational assistance to authorities working on complex cross-border investigations.[48]

d) Canada

Canada is among the list of earliest countries to adopt a national strategy for regulating the use of AI.[49] With over 20 public AI research labs, 850 startups and 75 incubators, Canada's AI ecosystem reflects a harmony between academic research, entrepreneurial energy, and public policy.[50] In 2022, *Artificial Intelligence and Data Act (AIDA)* was introduced in the Canadian Parliament which sought to govern AI systems through a risk sensitive approach. The Act aimed to ensure that high impact AI systems met rigorous standards of safety, fairness, transparency and accountability, while prohibiting the malicious uses of AI that had the potential of causing harm to its citizens.[51] Under AIDA, risk assessment criteria included the severity of potential harms and scale of use, human rights impact and availability of possible opt-outs from the system.[52]

In 2024, the Canadian Judicial Council, in order to raise awareness of the risks of using any form of AI in court administration and judicial decision making, published its *Guidelines for the Use of Artificial Intelligence in Canadian Courts.*[53] The guidelines aimed to prevent the

---

[48] Eu-LISA and Eurojust, "Artificial Intelligence System Supporting Cross Border Cooperation in Criminal Justice*",* (June, 2022) *available at:* https://www.eurojust.europa.eu/sites/default/files/assets/artificial-intelligence-cross-border-cooperation-criminal-justice-report.pdf (last visited November 12, 2025).

[49] Canada Institute for Advanced Research (CIFAR), "The Pan-Canadian AI Strategy", 2025, *available at: https://cifar.ca/ai/* (last visited on November 06, 2025).

[50] Government of Canada, "Innovation, Science and Economic Development Canada. "Canada Concludes Inaugural Plenary of the Global Partnership on Artificial Intelligence With International Counterparts in Montreal," December 04, 2020, *available at:* www.canada.ca/en/innovation-science-economic-development/news/2020/12/canada-concludes-inaugural-plenary-of-the-global-partnership-on-artificial-intelligence-with-international-counterparts-in-montreal.html. (last Visited on November 06, 2025).

[51] Government of Canada, Artificial Intelligence and Data Act, *available at*: https://ised-isde.canada.ca/site/innovation-better-canada/en/artificial-intelligence-and-data-act (last Visited on November 07, 2025).

[52] *Ibid.*

[53] Canadian Judicial Council, "Guidelines For The Use Of AI Policy In Canadian Courts*,"* First Edition, September 2024, *available at*: https://cjc-ccm.ca/sites/default/files/documents/2024/GuidelinesFINAl2024-EN.pdf (last Visited on November 07, 2025).

delegation of decision-making authority to AI systems, while at the same time, promoting their safe, effective and responsible use within the judiciary.[54] The guidelines provide certain core principles such as (1) protection of judicial independence; (2) consistency with core values such as integrity, fairness and transparency; (3) compliance with information security standards; (4) explainability of the process; (5) regularly tracking the impact of AI deployment; and (6) providing education to the operating staff.[55]

e) Brazil

Brazil stands at the forefront of judicial innovation in Latin America, integrating AI across nearly half of its courts, including the Supreme Federal Court and the Superior Court of Justice.[56] With over 140 predictive AI systems in operation, the Brazilian judiciary has pursued both top-down national strategies and grassroots experimentation to enhance efficiency, consistency and access to justice while maintaining proactive human oversight.[57]

In December 2024, the Federal Senate of Brazil approved *Bill No. 2338/2023* which protects fundamental rights, promotes responsible innovation, ensures the implementation of secure and reliable AI systems that benefit people, democracy, and technological and economic development. The proposed bill follows a risk based model for AI system categorisation into 'excessive risk', 'high risk' and 'low risk' categories.[58] According to the proposed Bill, the AI systems used in the administration of justice have been classified under the high-risk category and therefore they will be subject to algorithmic impact assessments, governance measures,

---

[54] *Ibid*; See Preamble of the Guidelines for the Use of AI Policy in Canadian Courts, First Edition, September 2024 which notes that *"It is fundamental to the independence, impartiality and integrity of the judiciary for a judge to exercise the powers of office without undue or unauthorized reliance upon non-judges."*

[55] *Ibid.*

[56] See Training, Oxford Institute of Technology and Justice, Brazil, *available at:* https://www.techandjustice.bsg.ox.ac.uk/research/brazil#regulation-3 (last visited on November 07, 2025).

[57] *Ibid.*

[58] UNESCO, "Brazil, Readiness Assessment Report On Artificial Intelligence," (2025) *available at:* https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000393091 (last visited on November 07, 2025).

transparency, bias mitigation, human oversight etc. The Bill is presently pending before the Brazilian House of Representatives.

In March 2025, Brazil's National Council of Justice issued a resolution/guidelines for the development, use and governance of AI solutions within the judiciary. The resolution sets out principles for the development, deployment and use of AI solutions by the judiciary such as (1) respect for fundamental rights; (2) due process and right to a full defence; (3) human oversight and risk based supervision; (4) transparency, explainability, traceability and auditability; (5) bias prevention; and (6) data protection.[59]

In 2019, the Superior Court of Justice developed an AI based tool '*ATHOS System*' with the role of identifying, before case assignment, appeals that may fall under the 'repetitive resources' procedure, a mechanism used to resolve numerous cases involving the same legal issue efficiently.[60]

In 2022, Brazil's National Council of Justice launched *'Plataforma Codex'* a centralised digital case repository to serve as a 'data lake' for interoperable procedural data, consolidating contents from more than 386 million lawsuits.[61] Similarly, *POTI* was developed by the Rio Grande do Norte Court of Justice to automate bank accounts blocking procedures.[62] Brazil's Superior Court of Justice also developed an AI system '*Projeto Socrates*' to reduce the case

[59] Resolution No. 615/2025 of March 11, 2025, *available at:* https://rm.coe.int/resolution-6152025/1680b51b66 (last visited on November 07, 2025).
[60] Katie Brehm et al, '*The Future of AI in the Brazilian Judicial System: AI Mapping, Integration and Governance'* (2021) Instituto de-Tecnologia e Sociedade, Brasil; See also, Eduardo Villa Coimbra Campos "Artificial Intelligence, The Brazilian Judiciary and some Conundrums" (Science Po Blog 3 March 2023) *available at:* https://www.sciencespo.fr/public/chaire-numerique/en/2023/03/03/article-artificial-intelligence-the-brazilian-judiciary-and-some-conundrums/ (last visited on November 7,2025).
[61] See details regarding the Platforma Codex, *available at:* https://www.cnj.jus.br/sistemas/plataforma-codex/ (last visited on November 7, 2025).
[62] *Id at 13.*

adjudication time by 25 percent through systemic analysis of the pending cases and grouping of similar cases for adjudication.[63]

In the field of legal research, analysis and drafting support for the judges, an AI system, *'APOIA*', integrated generative AI tools such as ChatGPT and Gemini into the Digital Platform of the Brazilian Judiciary (PDPJ - Br) which supports tasks such as drafting of reports, summarising case files and identification of applicable law.[64] *APOIA* has been developed over secure institutional alternatives to ad-hoc private tools, emphasising responsible and ethically governed AI use and data protection. AI is also being integrated for generating drafts of judicial decisions, sentences and reports using GPT-4 based generative models with outputs personalised to the writing style of each judge based upon their prior decisions and reports over a secure network which does not reuse data for AI training.[65] Further, Legal Intelligent Advisor (*LEIA)* and *HORUS AI* systems have been developed for tracking legal precedents by identifying cases and matching them with similar disposed cases.[66] Another AI model *'VICTOR Project*' has been developed at the Supreme Federal Court to expedite admissibility analysis for constitutional cases, determining which matters reach the nation's highest tribunal.[67] Additionally, Brazilian judges also receive training on the use of AI with specific practical training on tools.[68]

---

[63] See 'Training' Oxford Institute of Technology and Justice, Brazil, *available at:* https://www.techandjustice.bsg.ox.ac.uk/research/brazil#regulation-3 (last visited on November 7, 2025).

[64] Da Costa Abreu, Marjory and Silva, Bruno "A critical analysis of 'Law 4.0': The use of Automation and Artificial Intelligence and their impact on the judicial landscape of Brazil" 1(3) *Revista de Direitos Fundamentais e Tributação*, 1-16 (2020), *available at:* https://shura.shu.ac.uk/27336/9/Costa-Abreu_CriticalAnalysisLaw%28AM%29.pdf (last visited on November 7, 2025).

[65] See 'Training' Oxford Institute of Technology and Justice, Brazil, *available at: https://www.techandjustice.bsg.ox.ac.uk/research/brazil#regulation-3* (last visited on November 7, 2025).

[66] *Ibid.*

[67] Eduardo Villa Coimbra Campos "Artificial Intelligence, The Brazilian Judiciary and some Conundrums" *Science Po (Blog)* (2023), *available at:* https://www.sciencespo.fr/public/chaire-numerique/en/2023/03/03/article-artificial-intelligence-the-brazilian-judiciary-and-some-conundrums/ (last visited on November 07,2025).

[68] See 'Training' Oxford Institute of Technology and Justice, Brazil, *available at: https://www.techandjustice.bsg.ox.ac.uk/research/brazil#regulation-3* (last visited on November 7, 2025).

f) Argentina

Argentina has also adopted a proactive approach to the integration of AI systems within the country's justice system.[69] In October 2024, the Superior Court of Justice of Río Negro adopted a *Protocol of Good Practices for Generative AI*[70] to guide the expanding AI ecosystem. The protocol emphasises responsible AI use, human oversight, safeguards against hallucinations and bias, data protection, and ongoing training. Subsequently, the Supreme Tribunal of San Juan approved the Acceptable Use Protocol for Generative AI (IAGen) through *General Agreement No. 102/2024,*[71] prioritising ethical safeguards and impartiality in judicial processes, protection of sensitive and confidential information, and ensuring compliance with laws and data protection regulations.[72] In April 2025, the Superior Tribunal of Santa Fe also adopted a *Protocol of Good Practices for Generative AI*, reiterating principles of responsible use, human supervision, and of judicial reasoning. The Superior Tribunal of Jujuy has also issued a comprehensive regulatory framework establishing the scope of permissible AI applications in the judiciary, including case management, legal information analysis, decision-support for judges, citizen assistance, and the drafting of legal documents.[73] The protocol emphasises protections for fundamental rights, privacy, and non-discrimination.

In October 2024, the Superior Tribunal of Justice of San Luis approved the generative AI

---

[69] See 'Training' Oxford Institute of Technology and Justice, Argentina, *available at:* https://www.techandjustice.bsg.ox.ac.uk/research/argentina#use-1 (last visited on November 07, 2025).

[70] Superior Court Of Justice, Viedma, Río Negro, *Good Practices Protocol for the use of Generative Artificial Intelligence in the judicial field*, Agreed 15/24 (October 1, 2024), *available at:* https://www.saij.gob.ar/NV44151 (last visited on November 8, 2025).

[71] Court Of Justice, San Juan, *Protocol of Acceptable Use of Generative Artificial Intelligence (lAGen),* Agreed 102/24 (October 15, 2024), *available at:* https://www.saij.gob.ar/NV44465 (last visited on November 8, 2025).

[72] *Ibid.*

[73] Judiciary Province of Santa Fe, *Guide to good practices for the use of Generative Artificial Intelligence*, Circular No.25 (April 4, 2025), *available at:* https://www.justiciasantafe.gov.ar/index.php/circulares/circular-nro-25-guia-de-buenas-practicas-para-el-uso-de-la-inteligencia-artificial-generativa/ (last visited on November 08, 2025).

programme through *Agreement No. 202-STJSL-202*.[74] It introduced two AI systems '*IURIX Mind'* and '*IURIX Cloud Native'*. *IURIX Mind* is a cognitive assistant built on advanced natural language models tailored to the legal context, enabling judges, officials, and lawyers to interact more efficiently with case files, and *IURIX Cloud Native,* a cloud based electronic case management platform, provides secure, reliable support for judicial operations.

Argentina has also pursued domain specific AI applications. *AymurAI,*[75] a pilot project deployed across seven provinces to analyse and publish judicial data relating to gender-based violence. Focusing on cases identified directly by judges, the tool aims to generate systematic insights into patterns of gender-based offences within criminal courts.[76] Several provinces have also developed proprietary systems tailored to their administrative needs. In addition to these, local courts now use AI systems to generate simplified versions of judgements. *Genaro*, an AI tool accessible via a standard ChatGPT login, assists judges and clerks by analysing draft judgments for style, coherence, and structural clarity. Similarly, another generative model named *Relmo*, provides summaries of court rulings. *DoctIA*, an AI-powered search tool for case law of the Supreme Court of Argentina has been developed to aid lawyers in legal research. Moreover, *DoctIA* has been updated to provide verifiable links to every referenced precedent as a measure to reduce hallucinations.[77]

g) Singapore

In 2019, Singapore published the first National AI Strategy (NAIS) and thereafter came up

[74] See 'Training' Oxford Institute of Technology and Justice, Argentina, *available at:* https://www.techandjustice.bsg.ox.ac.uk/research/argentina#use-1 (last visited on November 7, 2025).
[75] UN Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, *Global toolkit on AI and the rule of law for the judiciary,* CI/DIT/2023/AIRoL/01 (2023), *available at:* https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000387331 (last visited on November 07, 2025).
[76] *Ibid.*
[77] See 'Training' Oxford Institute of Technology and Justice, Argentina, *available at:* https://www.techandjustice.bsg.ox.ac.uk/research/argentina#use-1 (last visited on November 07, 2025).

with the Model AI Governance Framework.[78] Pursuant to this, Singapore Court also released a *Guide on the Use of Generative Artificial Intelligence Tools by Court Users*, which establishes that in case of using AI, the responsibility for accuracy and relevancy lie with the user.[79] The Guide establishes clear accountability measures as it provides that wherever the court suspects improper AI use, it may require explicit disclosure and proof of compliance. It further integrates AI usage with existing obligations under legislation, rules of court, professional codes and confidentiality laws. The Guide also identifies key risks arising from GenAI, including hallucination and fabrication, outdated legal information, lack of human judgement, inadequate verification, intellectual property infringement, and breaches of confidentiality.

Singapore's Courts have been progressively integrating AI as an aid in case summarisation, evidence review, improving the support for self represented litigants etc. GenAI-enabled automated case summarisation is now deployed across the courts through the LawNet platform, operated by the Singapore Academy of Law (SAL).[80] *LawNet AI,* which was launched in 2024 by SAL, produces summaries for more than 15,000 court judgements. AI is also being tested to support evidence review and pre-trial processes.[81] The Speech Transcription System (STS),[82] developed in 2020 by the State Courts with A*STAR's Institute for Infocomm Research, provides real-time transcription of oral testimony with approximately 90 percent accuracy and

---

[78] National AI Strategy, Smart Nation, Government of Singapore, *available at:* https://www.smartnation.gov.sg/initiatives/national-ai-strategy/(last visited on November 06, 2025).

[79] Supreme Court of Singapore, *Guide On The Use Of Generative Artificial Intelligence Tools By Court Users*, Registrar's Circular No. 1 of 2024 (September 23, 2024), *available at:* Https://Www.Judiciary.Gov.Sg/Docs/Default-Source/News-And-Resources-Docs/Guide-On-The-Use-Of-Generative-Ai-Tools-By-Court-Users.Pdf?Sfvrsn=3900c814_1, (last visited on November 06, 2025).

[80] See 'Training' Oxford Institute of Technology and Justice, Singapore, *available at: https://www.techandjustice.bsg.ox.ac.uk/research/singapore* (last visited on November 07, 2025).

[81] Singapore Courts, Media Release: New Generative AI-powered Case Summarisation Tool to Help Small Claims Tribunals Users, *available at:* https://www.judiciary.gov.sg/news-and-resources/news/news-details/media-release--new-generative-ai-powered-case-summarisation-tool-to-help-small-claims-tribunals-users (last visited on November 06, 2025).

[82] A*STAR Institute for Infocomm Research (I2R), State Court, *available at:* https://www.a-star.edu.sg/i2r/partnerships/government-agencies/state-court (last visited on November 06, 2025).

includes speaker recognition tailored to courtroom vocabulary.[83]

h) United Arab Emirates

In the UAE, the UAE Council for Artificial Intelligence and Blockchain coordinates cross-sector AI adoption and advises on ethical standards, data security and responsible innovation.[84] At the federal level, the UAE Strategy for Artificial Intelligence, launched in October 2017, provides for frameworks for the development of smart digital systems.[85] In July 2024, the UAE introduced the *Charter for the Development and Use of AI*, a non-binding framework designed to protect the rights of the UAE community in the creation and application of AI solutions.[86] It sets out twelve general principles to ensure AI technologies are implemented ethically and inclusively, and comply with 'international treaties' and local laws. These include safety, fairness, data privacy and human oversight among others as the guiding principles in the development and the use of AI across sectors.[87]

Within the justice sector, the Abu Dhabi Judicial Department (ADJD) has integrated AI into multiple judicial and administrative processes. In notarial and authentication services, AI-enabled platforms automate the processing of documents, retrieve party information directly from government registries, and provide standardised templates without the need for human

[83] Nydia Remolina, "AI in the Judiciary: The Singapore Case" *Singapore Management University School of Law Research Paper* (In Press, 2025), *available at:* https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=5367843 (last visited on November 05, 2025).
[84] UAE Government, Artificial Intelligence in Government Policies, *available at:* https://u.ae/en/about-the-uae/digital-uae/digital-technology/artificial-intelligence/artificial-intelligence-in-government-policies (last visited on November18, 2025).
[85] UAE Government, UAE Strategy for Artificial Intelligence, *available at:* https://u.ae/en/about-the-uae/strategies-initiatives-and-awards/strategies-plans-and-visions/government-services-and-digital-transformation/uae-strategy-for-artificial-intelligence (last visited November 18, 2025).
[86] UAE Government, The UAE Charter for the Development and Use of AI, *available at:* https://uaelegislation.gov.ae/en/policy/details/the-uae-charter-for-the-development-and-use-of-artificial-intelligence (last visited on November 18, 2025).
[87] *Ibid.*

intervention.[88] In the first half of 2025, these systems facilitated over 47,000 public notary transactions and 27,525 digital authentication services.[89] For case management, ADJD has deployed machine-learning tools in criminal courts to follow up cases, provide accurate statistics of pending cases, track custodial status and expedite urgent matters. ADJD is also developing AI-assisted drafting tools capable of producing electronic judgments in cases concluded through conciliation or waiver, and in matters for which the statute of limitations has expired.[90] Further, AI systems have also been deployed to enhance the language accessibility through Arabic-English translation with dialect recognition, speech-to-text conversion and multilingual legal dictionaries.[91] The Abu Dhabi Technology Innovation Institute's "NOOR" model, which as of now is the world's largest Arabic natural-language system, is capable of doing text summarisation and translation tasks.[92]

Alongside these developments, the Dubai International Financial Centre (DIFC) Courts have issued guidelines for large language models and generative content generators (GCGs) in dispute resolution cases. The Practical Guidance Note No. 2 of 2023, effective from December 2023, outlines the principles and best practices to uphold the core principles for responsible AI usage.[93] These principles include transparency, accuracy and reliability, adherence to professional and legal obligations, and avoidance of over-reliance on automated systems,

[88] Abdullah Rasheed, "Abu Dhabi Judiciary harnesses AI to process notarial and authentication transactions", *Gulf News,* October 20, 2025, *available at:* https://gulfnews.com/uae/crime/abu-dhabi-judiciary-harnesses-ai-to-process-notarial-and-authentication-transactions-1.500314843 (last visited November 13, 2025).
[89] *Ibid.*
[90]Training' Oxford Institute of Technology and Justice, United Arab Emirates*, available at:* https://www.techandjustice.bsg.ox.ac.uk/research/united-arab-emirates (last visited on November 08, 2025).
[91] Khaled Al-Khawaldeh, "UAE turns to AI to bridge legal language gaps", *Arab News* (October 17, 2025), *available at:* https://www.arabnews.com/node/2619203/business-economy (last visited on November 13, 2025).
[92] Technology Innovation Institute, Technology Innovation Institute Announces Launch of NOOR, the World's Largest Arabic NLP Model, *available at:* https://www.tii.ae/news/technology-innovation-institute-announces-launch-noor-worlds-largest-arabic-nlp-model (last visited on November 13, 2025).
[93] DIFC Courts, *Guidelines on the use of large language models and generative AI in proceedings before the DIFC Courts,* Practical Guidance Note 02 of 2023 (December 21, 2023), *available at:* https://www.difccourts.ae/rules-decisions/practice-directions/practical-guidance-note-no-2-2023-guidelines-use-large-language-models-and-generative-ai-proceedings-difc-courts (last visited on November 14, 2025).

affirming that AI may assist but not replace human judgement. The guidance also identifies several substantive risks associated with the use of AI in legal practice. These include the submission of misleading or inaccurate information, breaches of client confidentiality, infringement of intellectual property rights through improperly sourced content, and violations of data protection legislation. To mitigate procedural disruption, the guidelines also warn that delayed disclosure of AI use could result in adjournments and loss of trial dates.[94]

i) China

In 2022, the Supreme People's Court of China released *The Opinions on Regulating and Strengthening and Applications of Artificial Intelligence in Judicial Fields* as a framework governing AI use within the judicial system.[95] The framework prohibits the use of illegal AI technologies and mandates strict protections for national security and data security.[96]

China is also exploring the usability of AI assisted decision making tools by testing them at provincial levels. Recently, the Shenzhen province introduced a comprehensive AI assisted trial mechanism capable of providing assistance with case filing, document review, court hearings and document drafting.[97] In 2022, the Qinyang Qincheng District Procuratorate developed the *'Little Judge Bao'* AI system, which predicts sentencing based on legislative and judicial interpretations alongside precedent cases.[98] Similarly, in order to streamline the

---

[94] *Ibid.*

[95] The Supreme People's Court, China, *The Opinions on Regulating and Strengthening the Applications of Artificial Intelligence in the Judicial Fields* (December 08, 2022), *available at* https://www.chinajusticeobserver.com/law/x/the-supreme-people-s-court-the-opinions-on-regulating-and-strengthening-the-applications-of-artificial-intelligence-in-the-judicial-field-20221208 (last visited on November13, 2025).

[96] *Ibid.*

[97] Huaxia, "China's local judicial systems embrace AI to improve efficiency", *Xinhua Net,* January 01, 2025, *available at:* https://english.news.cn/20250101/94c58c6b4ae544f8b5840c835a2eff34/c.html (last visited on November 14, 2025).

[98] See 'Training' Oxford Institute of Technology and Justice, China, *available at:* https://www.techandjustice.bsg.ox.ac.uk/research/china (last visited on November 13, 2025).

management processes, Jiangxi Province's trial e-management platform employs AI to automatically categorise case files, perform initial case analysis.[99] Beijing Internet Court uses China's first AI virtual judge,[100] utilising voice and image synthesis to guide litigants through online platforms, promoting autonomous online dispute resolution. The "Rui Judge" system further supports automatic document generation, voice conversion, case searching, and prompt functions.[101]

Shanghai's "206" stands as China's leading AI-enhanced criminal case management platform, which processes all pending criminal cases in Shanghai and serves as a model for national integration.[102] Prosecutors in Anhui Province also leverage the *'Xiao Baogong Intelligent Sentencing Prediction System',* which proposes sentencing options based on big data analysis from prior judgments; however, the prosecutors have liberty to ignore or reject the suggestions for criminal punishments.[103]

At the national level, the Supreme People's Court's (SPC) National Judicial AI Platform[104] was built over data from a large number of court rulings, cases, and legal opinions and supports quick content generation.

---

[99] Straton Papagianneas, "Automating Intervention in Chinese Justice: Smart Courts and Supervision Reform" 10 *Asian Journal of Law and Society* 477 (2023), *available at:* https://www.cambridge.org/core/services/aop-cambridge-core/content/view/8658661A69458B43E1FD4933FAB4F039/S2052901523000050a.pdf/automating-intervention-in-chinese-justice-smart-courts-and-supervision-reform.pdf (last visited on November 15, 2025).

[100] The Supreme People's Court of China, Beijing Internet court launches AI Judge, *available at:* https://english.court.gov.cn/2019-06/28/c_766675.htm (last visited on November 14, 2025).

[101] Changqing Shi, Tania Sourdin et.al. "The Smart Court - A New Pathway to Justice in China", (12) International Journal for Court Administration (1) *available at:* https://doi.org/10.36745/ijca.367 | *https://iacajournal.org/articles/367/files/submission/proof/367-1-1754-2-10-20210311.pdf*

[102] See 'Training' Oxford Institute of Technology and Justice, China, *available at:* https://www.techandjustice.bsg.ox.ac.uk/research/china (last visited on November 13, 2025).

[103] *Ibid.*

[104] *Ibid.*

j) Australia

In Australia, the courts and legal bodies have introduced a series of guidelines for regulating AI usage within the judicial system. In 2024, the Supreme Court of Victoria issued guidelines containing principles to be followed by the legal practitioners and self represented litigants while conducting litigation before the court.[105] These principles include protection of privacy and confidentiality of the information, disclosure of any AI assistance undertaken, transparency, accuracy of the information provided etc. With respect to adjudication, the Austrailasian Institute of Judicial Administration has developed its guide "AI Decision Making and the Courts", to help judges, tribunal members and court administrators navigate the use of AI in decision making. The guidelines focus on the sanctity of core judicial values of impartiality, equality before the law, procedural fairness and access to justice while using AI tools/systems.[106] Although the guidelines encourage the use of AI in administrative tasks, it also cautions judges against the potential risks of using AI for decision making and also provides for corresponding safeguarding and mitigating measures. The Victorian Law Reform Commission has also issued a consultation paper on the use of AI in Victoria's courts and tribunals wherein a comprehensive AI assessment framework was suggested for the courts and tribunals.[107]

k) New Zealand

The Chief Justice of New Zealand, in March 2023, considered implementing AI as part of its *'Digital Strategy for Courts and Tribunals'* and observed that for the dispensation of justice, it

---

[105] County Court of Victoria, *Guidelines for Litigants: Responsible Use of Artificial Intelligence in Litigation*, (July 01, 2024), *available at:* https://www.countycourt.vic.gov.au/files/documents/2024-07/guidelines-litigants-use-ai.docx. (last visited on November 06, 2025).

[106] The Australasian Institute of Judicial Administration Incorporated, *AI Decision-making and the Courts,* ISBN: 978-1-875527-60-1 (June 2022), *available at:* https://aija.org.au/wp-content/uploads/2023/12/AIJA_AI-DecisionMakingReport_2023update.pdf (last visited on November 06, 2025).$

[107] *Ibid.*

was important that the judiciary must maintain supervision and control over the technology used in court proceedings. To ensure this objective, the strategy document recommended developing and maintaining a strategy for use of digital technology wherein the judiciary is well informed about the potential areas of use, challenges and the nature of technology for meeting those needs.[108]

Subsequently, in December 2023, the Courts of New Zealand addressed the issue of increasing number of hallucination incidents found in the lawyers' submissions before the courts by issuing *Comprehensive Guidelines on the Use of Generative AI by Judges, Judicial Officers, Tribunal Members, and Judicial Support Staff.*[109] The guidelines clearly defined key AI concepts such as LLMs and GenAI chatbots, emphasising the technological capabilities and limitations of these tools. The guidelines stressed that while AI can assist in legal tasks, all AI generated content must be carefully verified to ensure accuracy and maintain the integrity of judicial processes.[110]

l) United States of America

In order to guide the State Courts in formulating their AI policies, the National Centre for State Courts (NCSC) of the United States has published *'Principles and Practices for Using AI Responsibly and Effectively in State Courts'* which outlined values such as human oversight, accuracy, transparency, and bias prevention as uncompromisable 'core ethical principles' for AI usage.[111] The guidelines encouraged the courts to consider the relative level of risks

[108] Office of the Chief Justice of New Zealand, *Digital strategy for Courts and Tribunals* (March 29, 2023), *available at:* https://www.courtsofnz.govt.nz/publications/judicial-reports/digital-strategy-for-courts-and-tribunals (last visited on November 08, 2025).
[109] Courts of New Zealand, *Guidelines For Use Of Generative Artificial Intelligence In Courts And Tribunals-Judges, judicial officers, tribunal members and judicial support staff*, (December 07, 2023), *available at:* https://www.courtsofnz.govt.nz/assets/6-Going-to-Court/practice-directions/practice-guidelines/all-benches/20231207-GenAI-Guidelines-Judicial.pdf (last visited on November 06, 2025).
[110] *Ibid.*
[111] TRI/NCSC AI Policy Consortium for Law & Courts, *Principles & practices for AI use in courts*, *available at: https://www.ncsc.org/resources-courts/principles-practices-ai-use-courts* (last visited on November 13, 2025).

associated with AI before incorporating it within their systems. The guidelines also laid emphasis on the need for honest disclosure of AI usage by the administrators, judges and legal professionals.[112] The Federal Judicial Centre also came up with a guide, '*An Introduction to Artificial Intelligence for Federal Judges*', which identifies core concepts and issues to assist judges in asking questions and deciding, for instance, whether to admit AI applications into evidence or use AI in a judicial determination.[113]

In 2023, U.S Supreme Court's Chief Justice John Roberts, in his report, addressed the potential benefits and challenges that AI presents to the US federal court system in his year-end report.[114] The report highlighted AI's ability to transform judicial work but also cautioned the judges for being vigilant while using it.

In the US, the State Courts have already shown a pro-active approach in integrating AI tools/systems within its functioning. For instance, the State of Arizona recently introduced two AI generated avatars, i.e., *Victoria* and *Daniel,* to summarise court rulings for the public.[115] These tools are designed to improve judicial accessibility by narrating complex judgements in simple language.[116] The use of AI tools/systems in the US is most prevalent in the field of risk assessment systems wherein these tools help the judges, probation officers and parole boards

---

[112] *Ibid.*

[113] James E. Baker, Laurie N. Hobart and Matthew Mittelsteadt, Federal Judicial Centre, *An Introduction To Artificial Intelligence For Federal Judges*, (February 13, 2023), *available at:* https://www.fjc.gov/sites/default/files/materials/47/An_Introduction_to_Artificial_Intelligence_for_Federal_Judges.pdf (last visited on November 13, 2025).

[114] Supreme Court of the United States, *2023 Year- End Report on the Federal Judiciary* (December 31, 2023), *available at:* https://www.uscourts.gov/data-news/judiciary-news/2023/12/31/chief-justice-roberts-issues-2023-year-end-report (last visited on November 13, 2025).

[115] Supreme Court of Arizona, *Arizona Supreme Court Introduces AI-Generated Court News Reporters to Enhance Public Engagement*, (December 31, 2023), *available at:* https://www.azcourts.gov/Portals/0/201/News%20Release%20-%20Arizona%20Supreme%20Court%20Introduces%20AI-Generated%20Court%20News%20Reporters.pdf (last visited on November 06, 2025).

[116] Sejal Govindarao, "Arizona Supreme Court taps AI avatars to make judicial system more publicly accessible", *Press Trust of India,* March 18, 2025 *available at:* https://www.ptinews.com/story/international/arizona-supreme-court-taps-ai-avatars-to-make-judicial-system-more-publicly-accessible/2382303 (last visited on November 07, 2025).

by predicting whether a defendant might reoffend or fail to appear in court. For doing so, these tools take into account factors such as age, previous criminal record, employment and community ties, thereby converting human intuition into numeric probability.[117] Some of the widely used risk assessment systems in USA are Correctional Offender Management Profiling for Alternative Sanctions *(COMPAS)*,[118] Public Safety Assessment *(PSA)*[119], Virginia Pretrial Risk Assessment Instrument *(VPRAI)* and VPRAI Revised *(VPRAI-R),* Ohio Risk Assessment System Pretrial Assessment Tool *(ORAS-PAT),*[120] Level of Service Revised (LSI-R) etc.[121]

On the regulation part, there is currently no single federal statute to comprehensively govern AI in US courts but various courts, advisory committees and bar associations have issued reference guides for its responsible use. In November 2023, the District of Hawaii issued a 'General Order'[122] directing counsels to mandatory disclosure for any submission generated by an unverified source, emphasising on the "gatekeeping role" that attorneys must play to ensure

[117] Marie Vannostrand and Kenneth J. Rose, Luminosity Inc., *Pretrial Risk Assessment In Virginia, Virginia Pretrial Risk Assessment Instrument* (May 01, 2009) p. no. 3, *available at:* https://www.dcjs.virginia.gov/sites/dcjs.virginia.gov/files/publications/corrections/virginia-pretrial-risk-assessment-report.pdf; See also, Virginia Department of Criminal Justice Services, *Virginia Pretrial Risk Assessment Instrument - (Vprai): Instruction Manual – Version 4.5* (December 28, 2021), *available at:* https://www.dcjs.virginia.gov/sites/dcjs.virginia.gov/files/publications/corrections/virginia-pretrial-risk-assessmentinstrument-vprai_2.pdf; Kristin Bechtel (Arnold Ventures), Stanford Law School, *Risk Assessment Fact Sheet: Public Safety Assessment (PSA)*, (May 10, 2019), *available at: https://law.stanford.edu/wp-content/uploads/2019/05/PSA-Sheet-CC-Final-5.10-CC-Upload.pdf* (last visited on November 13, 2025).

[118] Northpointe, *Practitioner's Guide to COMPAS Core*, (March 19, 2015), *available at:* https://s3.documentcloud.org/documents/2840784/Practitioner-s-Guide-to-COMPAS-Core.pdf (last visited on November 13, 2025).

[119] Kristin Bechtel (Arnold Ventures), Stanford Law School, *Risk Assessment Fact Sheet: Public Safety Assessment (PSA)*, (May 10, 2019), *available at: https://law.stanford.edu/wp-content/uploads/2019/05/PSA-Sheet-CC-Final-5.10-CC-Upload.pdf* (last visited on November 13, 2025).

[120] Edward J. Latessa, Richard Lemke, et al, "The Creation and Validation of the Ohio Risk Assessment System (ORAS)", 74 *Federal Probation* 16 (2010), *available at:* https://www.uscourts.gov/sites/default/files/74_1_2_0.pdf (last visited on November 13, 2025).

[121] James Austin, Dana Coleman, et al.,3."Reliability and Validity Study of the LSI–R Risk Assessment Instrument, Final Report" 221277 *National Criminal Justice Reference Service* (2003), *available at*: https://www.ojp.gov/ncjrs/virtual-library/abstracts/reliability-and-validity-study-lsi-r-risk-assessment-instrument (last visited on November 13, 2025).

[122] United States District Court for the District of Hawaii, *In Re: Use of Unverified Sources*, General Order 23-1 (November 14, 2023), *available at:* https://www.hid.uscourts.gov/cms/assets/23a3ee72-c96c-42c4-b184-e8a748a00f64/GeneralOrderontheUseofUnverifiedSources.pdf (last visited on November 13, 2025).

accuracy of their filings. Similarly, Nebraska District in its 'Civil Rules' 2024[123] has made parties responsible for the accuracy of their legal briefings regardless of whether it used GenAI. At the State Level, the Delaware Supreme Court has issued an internal policy on AI use effective since October 2024[124] wherein the person using GenAI has been held as responsible for the accuracy of its output. It also prohibits the judges from delegating decision making functions to GenAI. Similarly, the Supreme Court of Illinois has also developed a reference guide[125] for the judges highlighting the concerns regarding AI generated content and caution against feeding confidential non-public information into public generative AI platforms. Additionally, many judges in the US also have their own standing orders on the AI use in their respective Courts, majorly requiring the attorneys to disclose AI use in documentation.[126]

m) United Kingdom

The United Kingdom is actively integrating the use of AI tools/systems in its judicial system. The UK's Ministry of Justice has outlined an official roadmap for deploying AI across the judicial system to deliver faster, fairer and more accessible justice.[127] The plan has three strategic priorities, i.e., strengthening the foundations by building frameworks for responsible AI use, embedding AI across the judicial system through a 'Scan > Pilot > Scale approach' for

[123] United States District Court for the District of Nebraska, *Nebraska Civil Rules*, (December 01, 2024), *available at:* https://www.ned.uscourts.gov/internetDocs/localrules/NECivR.2024.pdf (last visited on November 14, 2025).
[124] Supreme Court of the State of Delaware, *Interim Policy on the Use of GenAI by Judicial Officers and Court Personnel*, (October 21, 2024), *available at:* https://www.courts.delaware.gov/forms/download.aspx?id=266838 (last visited on November 14, 2025).
[125] Supreme Court of Illinois, *Policy on Artificial Intelligence- Judicial Reference Sheet*, (January 01, 2025), *available at:* https://ilcourtsaudio.blob.core.windows.net/antilles-resources/resources/cb3d6da3-66c7-469d-97f3-41568bdeee8c/ISC%20AI%20Policy%20Bench%20Card.pdf (last visited on November 14, 2025).
[126] United States District Court for Eastern State of Pennsylvania, *Standing Order Re: Artificial Intelligence ("AI") In Cases Assigned To Judge Baylson,* (June 06, 2023), *available at:* https://www.paed.uscourts.gov/sites/paed/files/documents/procedures/Standing%20Order%20Re%20Artificial%20Intelligence%206.6.pdf (last visited on November 14, 2025).
[127] Ministry of Justice, United Kingdom, *AI Action Plan for Justice*, (July 31, 2025), *available at:* https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/ai-action-plan-for-justice/ai-action-plan-for-justice (last visited on November 15, 2025).

building more effective citizen services and investing in talent, training and proactive workforce planning to accelerate AI adoption within the judicial system.[128]

For regulating this large scale integration of AI tools/systems, several guidelines and reference guides have been issued for the users to understand the concerns associated with their uses. The UK's Law Commission recently released its discussion paper on AI and the Law.[129] The Commission emphasised on the need for exercising caution while using AI tools/systems and underlined the legal issues associated with them. On 31 October 2025, the Courts and Tribunals Judiciary refreshed its guidance to assist judicial office holders in relation to the use of AI.[130] The document sets out key risks and issues associated with AI and contains some suggestions for minimising them. For responsible AI usage, the document urges the judiciary to understand AI and its application, to further uphold confidentiality and privacy and ensure accountability and accuracy of the information provided by AI tools.[131]

The Ministry has already provided a secure version of *Copilot Chat, Pilot ChatGPT Enterprise* for helping with drafting, summarising and analysis to its staff members.[132] Similarly, to help its staff with locating case details quickly, the Ministry of Justice has also introduced semantic search in the Probation Digital System through LLMs.[133] This AI driven tool reduces search time, enhances decision making and allows probation officers to spend more time focusing on offender rehabilitation. A GenAI Knowledge Retrieval Assistant has also been deployed for

---

[128] *Ibid.*
[129] Law Commission of United Kingdom, *Artificial Intelligence and the Law: a discussion paper* (July 31, 2025), *available at:* https://lawcom.gov.uk/news/artificial-intelligence-and-the-law-a-discussion-paper/ (last visited on November 15, 2025).
[130] Courts and Tribunals Judiciary, United Kingdom, *Artificial Intelligence Guidance for Judicial Office Holders* (October 31, 2025), *available at:* https://www.judiciary.uk/wp-content/uploads/2025/10/Artificial-Intelligence-AI-Guidance-for-Judicial-Office-Holders-2.pdf (last visited on November 15, 2025).
[131] *Ibid.*
[132] Ministry of Justice, United Kingdom, *AI Action Plan for Justice*, (July 31, 2025), *available at:* https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/ai-action-plan-for-justice/ai-action-plan-for-justice (last visited on November 15, 2025).
[133] *Ibid.*

assisting Ministry of Justice's staff members to access relevant information from over 300 guideline documents on administrative procedures.[134] AI powered transcription and summarisation tools are also being piloted across probation services in Kent, Surrey, Sussex and Wales for helping them in analysis of complex conversations with people on probation.[135] The Ministry of Justice also plans to use AI tools for improving scheduling cases to avoid rescheduling and wastage of precious judicial time. Among the other regulating authorities, the Solicitors Regulation Authority has approved Garfield AI, the world's first AI-driven law firm, which assists businesses in recovering small debts of up to € 10,000 through automated county court claims that comply with existing digital data standards.[136] The UK's Ministry of Justice has also proposed to appoint a Chief AI Officer for providing strategic leadership in AI adoption across the courts along with the Justice AI Unit, an interdisciplinary team comprising experts in AI, ethics, policy and design.

B. Summary of AI Tools in the Judiciary

The following table briefly summarises how different jurisdictions have integrated specific AI tools into their judiciaries:

Domain	**Tools across countries[137]**
Legal research and precedent	**Brazil** ● APOIA: tracks cases; drafting and summaries. ● VICTOR AI: admissibility screening at the Supreme Court. ● Projeto Sócrates: finds relevant precedents. ● LEIA: links active cases to precedents. ● HORUS: links active cases to precedents. **India** ● SUPACE: extracts facts and case law for judges.

[134] *Ibid.*
[135] *Ibid.*
[136] Solicitors Regulatory Authority, SRA approves first AI-driven law firm, *available at:* https://www.sra.org.uk/news/news/press/garfield-ai-authorised/ (last visited on November 16, 2025).
[137] *Note: Several AI based systems perform multiple functions across the judicial workflow and could reasonably be placed in more than one domain. For clarity, each tool is listed under a primary domain based on available descriptions, but this categorisation is indicative rather than definitive and may evolve in future.*

	Singapore ● LawNet AI: semantic precedent search. **Argentina** ● DoctIA: provides legal research. **UK** ● Semantic search (Probation Digital System), Knowledge Retrieval Assistant.
Summarisation and drafting aids	**Brazil** ● ASSIS: GPT-based drafting and summarisation **India** ● SUPACE: issue lists and editable drafts. ● AI Saransh: concise précis of pleadings for quick issue grasp. ● LegRAA: briefs, issue-based summaries, and precedent lists **Argentina** ● Relmo: judgement summaries. ● Genaro: judgement drafting ● IURIX Mind: summarisation of case files **UAE** ● ADJD e-judgment drafting. ● NOOR Model for text summarisation and translation. **EU** ● NLP-based summarisation in Eurojust CMS. **USA** ● Arizona avatars (Victoria/Daniel): spoken summaries of rulings. **China** ● Rui Judge
Transcription	**Singapore** ● Court speech transcription, multilingual outputs. **EU** ● NLP-powered transcription in a cross border system. **China** ● Automatic speech recognition in Internet courts. **UAE** ● Arabic speech-to-text converter. **UK** ● Court transcription pilots in services. **India** ● ADALAT AI: transcribes depositions. ● TERES: Live transcription in the Constitution Benches.
Translation	**India** ● SUVAS/e-SCR: translation of SC Judgements into various Indian languages. **UAE** ● Arabic-English translation, speech-to-text, dialect recognition.

Case Categorisation, Management, Administrative Caseflow and Listings	**Brazil** ● ATHOS: flags similar legal issues; listing aid. ● Plataforma Codex: Repository and data extraction. ● MANDUS of warrant enforcement. ● POTI for blocking the bank account. **Argentina** ● IURIX Cloud Native: AWS-hosted CMS. **India** ● e-filing defect detection and metadata extraction. **China** ● Jiangxi management (auto categorisation). **UK** ● AI-enabled scheduling and workflow tools.
Predictive Analysis	**USA** ● COMPAS for predicting risk levels for bail/parole. ● Public Safety Assessment (PSA). ● Virginia Pretrial Risk Assessment Instrument (VPRAI) and VPRAI Revised (VPRAI-R). ● Ohio Risk Assessment System (ORAS-PAT). ● Level of Service Revised (LSI-R). **China** ● Smart Court Predictive Tool.
Litigant support and legal aid	**Singapore** ● Harvey AI (SCT). ● Divorce Assets Information Division Estimator (Divorce AIDE): providing estimates regarding matrimonial disputes. **India** ● Legal aid chatbot LESA by NALSA.

CHAPTER 3: USE OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE IN INDIA'S JUDICIAL SYSTEM

For much of its institutional history, the Indian judiciary functioned within an administrative framework which fundamentally operated on paper. Every stage of a case's lifecycle depended on manual oversight and the physical circulation of documents across the registry.[138] This model had several structural limitations such as delays arising from file movement, clerical inconsistencies, logistical burdens, and persistent risks of misplacement or deterioration of records.[139] These limitations also imposed substantial costs on all participants in the justice system, particularly in a system adjudicating millions of cases monthly.

A. Information and Communication Technology Initiatives in the Indian Judiciary

As pendency, backlogs and arrears grew, the traditional workflow revealed its difficulty to scale with rising caseloads.[140] In response, the Ministry of Law and Justice and e-Committee, Supreme Court of India initiated a long-term reform blueprint that culminated in the National Policy and Action Plan for Implementation of Information and Communication Technology (ICT) in the Indian Judiciary, 2005.[141] This initiative materialised in 2007 with the launch of the e-Courts Mission Mode Project. This project sought to re-engineer workflows, standardise

[138] NCMS Sub-Committee, "Baseline Report on Case Management in the High Court and the District Judiciary" (2024), *available at:* https://cdnbbsr.s3waas.gov.in/s3ec0490f1f4972d133619a60c30f3559e/uploads/2024/11/2024111326.pdf (last visited on November 15, 2025).

[139] NCMS Sub-Committee, "Baseline Report on Case Management System" (2016), *available at:* https://cdnbbsr.s3waas.gov.in/s3ec0490f1f4972d133619a60c30f3559e/documents/misc/case_management_system-3.pdf (last visited on November 15, 2025).

[140] e-Committee, Supreme Court of India, E-Courts Mission Mode Project, *available at:* https://ecommitteesci.gov.in/project/brief-overview-of-e-courts-project/ (last visited on November 17, 2025).

[141] e-Committee, Supreme Court of India, "National Policy and Action Plan for Implementation of Information and Communication Technology (ICT)" (August, 2005), *available at:* https://cdnbbsr.s3waas.gov.in/s388ef51f0bf911e452e8dbb1d807a81ab/uploads/2020/05/2020053162.pdf (last visited on November 17, 2025).

data systems, and introduce technological practices aligned with international norms of judicial administration.[142]

Phase I of the e-Courts Project (2007–2015) laid the technological foundation upon which subsequent stages of digitisation initiatives were based. The primary emphasis during this phase was on establishing the digital infrastructure required for even the most basic technological integration. Court complexes across the country were equipped with computers, LAN connectivity, and server rooms.[143] Registry staff and court personnel underwent structured training programmes to familiarise themselves with digital workflows, data entry practices, and the use of new software tools.[144] Although the initial software platforms introduced during this period were limited in scope, they nevertheless catalysed important functional changes. Basic modules for generating daily cause lists, tracking case statuses, and recording judicial outputs began to gradually replace the earlier paper-based system.

Phase II of the e-Courts Project (2015–2023) marked a leap from foundational digitisation to system-wide technological maturity. This phase was characterised by rapid innovation and the mainstreaming of digital judicial processes.[145] The implementation of the Case Information System (CIS 3.0) established a uniform, interoperable software architecture across district courts, enabling standardised data entry, automated case tracking, and seamless information flow among judicial actors.[146] One of the most consequential developments of this phase was

---

[142] e-Committee, Supreme Court of India, E-Courts Mission Mode Project, *available at:* https://ecommitteesci.gov.in/project/brief-overview-of-e-courts-project/ (last visited on November 17, 2025).

[143] Ministry of Law and Justice, "Video Conferencing Facilities in District Courts", *Press Information Bureau, Delhi,* August 05, 2022, *available at:* https://www.pib.gov.in/PressReleasePage.aspx?PRID=2078398 (last visited on November 15, 2025).

[144] e-Committee, Supreme Court of India, E-Courts Mission Mode Project, *available at:* https://ecommitteesci.gov.in/project/brief-overview-of-e-courts-project/ (last visited on November 17, 2025).

[145] e-Courts Services, e-Courts*, available at:* https://ecourts.gov.in/ecourts_home/static/about-us.php (last visited on November 16, 2025).

[146] Calcutta High Court, "CIS 3.0: Core & periphery modules", *available at:* https://calcuttahighcourt.gov.in/downloads/ecourt_files/cis3/core_and_periphery_module/CIS_3.0_Core_&_Periphery_Modules.pdf (last visited on November 16, 2025).

the National Judicial Data Grid[147] (NJDG).[148] By providing real-time dashboards on pendency, disposal patterns, case-type analytics, and congestion ratios, the NJDG empowered High Courts, State Court Management Systems Authorities, and policymakers to identify bottlenecks, rationalise resource allocation, and formulate targeted strategies for arrears reduction. The rollout of e-Filing, e-Payment of court fees and fines, and the e-Courts Services mobile application brought the justice system directly into the hands of citizens.[149]

Phase III of the e-Courts Project (2023-present) seeks to institutionalise the principle of "maximum ease of justice" through a fully integrated technological platform.[150] Its main objectives include end-to-end digitisation of court records, universal adoption of e-Filing and e-Payments through e-Sewa Kendras, and the development of intelligent systems capable of enabling data-driven scheduling, case prioritisation, and workflow optimisation.[151] With an outlay of ₹7,210 crore, Phase III encompasses large-scale record digitisation,[152] expansion of virtual courts, enhancement of video-conferencing systems, cloud infrastructure, disabled-friendly ICT facilities, integration with the Inter-Operable Criminal Justice System (ICJS),[153] and the deployment of advanced technologies such as AI, ML, OCR, and NLP.[154]

---

[147] National Judicial Data Grid District Court of India, *available at:* https://njdg.ecourts.gov.in/njdg_v3/ (last visited on November 17, 2025).

[148] Ministry of Law and Justice, "All three tiers of Indian judiciary now on NJDG portal", *Press Information Bureau, Delhi,* September 14, 2023, *available at:* https://www.pib.gov.in/PressReleasePage.aspx?PRID=1957318 (last visited on November 15, 2025).

[149] Ministry of Law and Justice, Government of India, "Rajya Sabha Unstarred Question No. 2031: e-Courts Mission Mode Project" (December, 2024), *available at:* https://sansad.in/getFile/annex/266/AU2031_qwBfjA.pdf?source=pqars (last visited on November 17, 2025).

[150] e-Committee, Supreme Court of India, "Digital Courts: Vision & Roadmap – e-Courts Project Phase III" (2022), *available at:* https://cdnbbsr.s3waas.gov.in/s388ef51f0bf911e452e8dbb1d807a81ab/uploads/2023/04/2023042088.pdf (last visited on November 17, 2025).

[151] *Ibid.*

[152] e-Committee, Supreme Court of India, Digital Courts: Vision & Roadmap – e-Courts Project Phase III (2022), *available at:* https://cdnbbsr.s3waas.gov.in/s388ef51f0bf911e452e8dbb1d807a81ab/uploads/2023/04/2023042088.pdf (last visited on November 17, 2025).

[153] Ministry of Home Affairs, Government of India, Inter-operable Criminal Justice System (ICJS), *available at:* https://icjs.gov.in/ICJS/ (last visited on November 17, 2025).

[154] Department of Justice, Ministry of Law and Justice, Government of India, e-Courts Project Phase-III, *available at:* https://doj.gov.in/phase-iii/ (last visited on November 18, 2025).

B. Use of AI by the Supreme Court

Phase III of e-Courts places significant emphasis on developing AI tools tailored specifically to the institutional needs of the Indian judiciary. The deployment of AI is aimed at addressing core challenges of backlogs, uneven access, linguistic barriers, and the heavy administrative load that diverts judicial time from adjudication. By integrating advanced natural language processing, machine learning, and data-analytic capabilities, Phase III argues for an evidence-driven, efficiency-enhancing transformation of judicial workflows.

The tools being developed are intentionally directed at high-volume, labour-intensive domains such as case management, legal research, and translation of judicial texts.

a) SUPACE

The Supreme Court introduced the *Supreme Court Portal for Assistance in Court Efficiency* (SUPACE), an AI-driven platform developed to support judges in managing complex caseloads. SUPACE is designed to analyse vast quantities of case records, identify legally relevant material, and extract key precedents with remarkable speed.[155] By generating concise case summaries, spotlighting pertinent issues, and organising documents in an accessible manner, it reduces the time judges must spend on routine research and document review.

b) SUVAS

A persistent structural challenge within the Indian judiciary arises from the country's extraordinary linguistic diversity. Although the Constitution recognises 22 scheduled languages, judicial discourse at the appellate level continues to be dominated by English, and on the other hand, trial-court proceedings take place in regional languages. This linguistic

[155] Action Plan for Simple, Accessible, Affordable and Speedy Justice, *available at*: https://www.pib.gov.in/PressReleseDetail.aspx?PRID=1947490 (last Visited on November 17, 2025).

asymmetry generates a systemic disconnect as the judgments that shape rights and obligations remain inaccessible to the citizens they affect.

SUVAS (Supreme Court Vidhik Anuvaad Software) was conceived precisely to address this linguistic deficit. Developed as an AI and machine-learning driven translation platform trained on domain-specific legal corpora, *SUVAS* institutionalises multilingual accessibility to Supreme Court judgments. It was initially launched with capability in nine Indian languages including Hindi, Kannada, Tamil, Telugu, Marathi, Punjabi, and Gujarati.[156]

In 2023 alone, *SUVAS* enabled the translation of approximately 36,000 Supreme Court judgments into 19 Indian languages (including Assamese, Bengali, Gujarati, Hindi, Kannada, Kashmiri, Khasi, Konkani, Malayali, Marathi, Nepali, Odia, Punjabi, Santali, Tamil, Telugu, and Urdu).

c) AI-based transcription (*TERES*)

AI-based transcription tools are being used in the Supreme Court to automatically capture and convert oral arguments, particularly before Constitution Benches, into real-time text displayed on courtroom screens.[157] These live transcripts are then uploaded to the Court's website, enabling lawyers, litigants, researchers, and the wider public to access an authoritative and contemporaneous record of hearings that were previously accessible only through personal attendance or handwritten notes.

AI-based transcription is also being used at the district level. The Tis Hazari Courts in Delhi have introduced a pilot Hybrid Court where speech-to-text systems streamline the recording of

[156] *Ibid.*

[157] Ministry of Law and Justice, *Use of AI in Supreme Court Case Management, available at:* https://www.pib.gov.in/PressReleasePage.aspx?PRID=2113224 (last visited on November 16, 2025).

witness depositions and evidentiary statements.[158] Additionally, the Government of India's *Bhashini* platform is being used to convert speech into text and to generate audio versions of documents, creating a multilingual digital infrastructure capable of supporting courts across diverse linguistic contexts.[159]

d) Legal Research Analysis Assistant (LegRAA)

The Legal Research Analysis Assistant (*LegRAA*) is a Generative AI–based system designed under the e-Courts framework to transform how judicial actors conduct research and prepare case materials. *LegRAA* is being used to rapidly analyse large volumes of legal documents including pleadings, judgements, and statutory materials to generate structured outputs such as briefs, issue-based summaries, and precedent lists. Drawing on a corpus of over 36,000 Supreme Court judgments, the tool can identify key facts, isolate legal questions, trace doctrinal developments, and surface relevant authorities within seconds.

e) e-Filing and AI

The Supreme Court of India has initiated a significant pilot programme in collaboration with the Indian Institute of Technology, Madras to test the use of AI and machine learning for automated defect detection in filings. Traditionally, the scrutiny of petitions, identifying missing annexures, incorrect formatting, incomplete affidavits, or procedural non-compliance has been undertaken by registry officials. The pilot project seeks to address this structural bottleneck by training AI models on thousands of past filings to recognise recurring patterns of defects and extract relevant metadata automatically. By enabling the system to flag inconsistencies or omissions at the time of e-filing, the Supreme Court aims to significantly

[158] District Court Delhi-Events,*Inauguration of Pilot Hybrid Court with Speech to Text Facility for Evidence Recording,* 2024, *available at:* Inauguration Of Pilot Hybrid Court With Speech To Text Facility For Evidence Recording (last visited on November 17, 2025).
[159] Ministry of Electronics and Information Technology, *National Language Translation Mission , available at:* https://bhashini.gov.in/ (last visited on November 18, 2025).

reduce scrutiny time, minimise human error, and bring greater consistency to registry-level processes. Although still in the testing phase, this collaboration represents a major institutional step toward integrating AI-driven quality control into India's judicial workflow.[160]

f) Use of AI in Other Judicial Institutions

India's courts and institutions are also developing their guidelines and frameworks for mitigation of challenges associated with the growing use of AI. The Kerala High Court issued its policy regarding the responsible and restricted use of AI tools in the District Judiciary.[161] The policy outlines core principles such as transparency, accountability and protection of confidentiality as integral aspects of judicial administration. The policy further obligates the judges and supporting staff to ensure that any AI tool/system used by them must adhere to these core principles. The guidelines underline the importance of human intervention and supervision while using AI tools.[162]

Recently, the Kerala High Court has also mandated the use of *Adalat AI* for all the courts in its jurisdiction for recording witness depositions. Adalat AI is a transcription tool used for converting speech to text in real time, thereby reducing delays caused by manual typing.[163]

AI Saransh, developed by the National Informatics Centre, is currently being used to generate concise précis of pleadings, enabling judges to quickly understand contentious issues.[164]

---

[160] Anmol Kaur Bawa, "CJI B.R. Gavai Announces Launch of New Version of E-Filing Portal", *LiveLaw* (November 20, 2025), *available at:* https://www.livelaw.in/top-stories/cji-br-gavai-announces-launch-of-new-version-of-e-filing-portal-310612?fromIpLogin=87667.15286406505 (last visited on November 21, 2025).

[161] The High Court of Kerala, "The Policy Regarding Use of Artificial Intelligence Tools in District Judiciary, HCKL/7490/2025-DI-3-HC KERALA",(October 21, 2025), *available at:* https://images.assettype.com/theleaflet/2025-07-22/mt4bw6n7/Kerala_HC_AI_Guidelines.pdf (last visited on November 13, 2025).

[162] *Ibid.*

[163] The High Court of Kerala, *Official Memorandum HCKL/6035/2024-IT-TC2-HC KERALA*, (October 21, 2025), *available at:* https://cdnbbsr.s3waas.gov.in/s3ec01dc6a7e655d7e5840e66733e9ee67/uploads/2025/10/2025102791.pdf (last visited on November 15, 2025).

[164] *Id at 105.*

TERES, deployed in the Supreme Court and the Delhi High Court, offers multilingual transcription and translation of courtroom proceedings, promoting inclusivity in India's linguistically diverse environment. NyayKaushal, the country's first e-Resource Centre and Virtual Court, integrates AI-based features for virtual hearings, remote filings and streamlined case management, supporting the judiciary's transition toward increased digitalisation.[165] National Legal Service Authority has also launched an AI chatbot 'LESA' for assisting the litigants with application tracking facilities.[166]

Additionally, a judge of the Punjab and Haryana High Court used ChatGPT to obtain background information on bail jurisprudence.[167] In a separate instance, in January 2025, another judge used ChatGPT to gain a preliminary understanding of the operation of Differential Global Positioning System (DGPS) technology in the context of a property dispute.[168] These instances reflect the limited and cautious, yet exploratory, use of generative AI tools by members of the judiciary for supplementary research. They also illustrate the broader trend of courts experimenting with such technologies in a controlled manner, without relying on them for substantive decision-making.[169]

---

[165] *Ibid.*

[166] National Legal Services Authority, Press Release (April 24, 2025) *available at:* https://www.livelaw.in/pdf_upload/press-release-597177.pdf (Last visited on November 18, 2025)

[167] Indian Express, *The Cautious Case of AI Use in Judiciary* (May 4, 2024), The Indian Express, https://indianexpress.com/article/legal-news/the-cautious-case-of-ai-use-in-judiciary-10290754/.

[168] LiveLaw, *Punjab & Haryana High Court Takes Assistance of ChatGPT* (Jan. 22, 2024), LiveLaw, https://www.livelaw.in/high-court/punjab-and-haryana-high-court/punjab-haryana-high-court-takes-assistance-of-chat-gpt-280222

[169] LiveLaw, *Manipur High Court Uses ChatGPT to Conduct Research on Service-Law Matter, Pass Order* (Oct. 20, 2022), LiveLaw, https://www.livelaw.in/high-court/manipur-high-court/artificial-intelligence-manipur-high-court-uses-chat-gpt-to-conduct-research-on-service-law-matter-pass-order-258742

CHAPTER 4: RISKS ASSOCIATED WITH THE USE OF AI IN JUDICIARY

The benefits of using AI in a judicial system can be gauged by its successful implementation across various jurisdictions for purposes ranging from case management, to risk assessment.[170] However, the risks associated with the use of AI such as overreliance on unverified AI outputs, biases, confidentiality concerns among others still pose certain challenges.[171]

A. Overreliance on Unverified Outputs and Diminished Human Judgement

Overreliance on AI entails users exhibiting behaviours where they accept suggestions and outputs provided by AI that may be incorrect or hallucinated, without validation,[172] for instance, when AI is used to compile precedents on a specific issue. Due to the limitation associated with any GenAI system, including but not limited to hallucination, the list may contain some cases that do not exist. In such cases, overreliance on AI without proper verification would lead to these cases becoming part of the legal discourse until flagged or reported.

AI models, especially GenAI, that can create new content based on the patterns learned from the training data, often function as 'black-boxes'. This means that the process undertaken by an AI to generate an output often remains elusive, or too complex to be easily understood.[173] The process of LLM used in AI is a result of statistical inference based on correlation observed

[170] OECD (2019), Artificial Intelligence in Society, OECD Publishing, Paris, *available at :* https://www.oecd.org/en/publications/artificial-intelligence-in-society_eedfee77-en.html (last visited on November 12, 2025).

[171] Rowena Rodrigues, Legal and human rights issues of AI: Gaps, challenges and vulnerabilities, Journal of Responsible Technology, Volume 4, 2020, *available at:* https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2666659620300056 (last visited on November 12, 2025); Aleš Završnik, Criminal justice, *Artificial Intelligence Systems, And Human Rights.* ERA Forum. 20, 567-583, 2020, *available at:* https://doi.org/10.1007/s12027-020-00602-0 (last visited on November 12, 2025).

[172] Zhai, C., Wibowo, S. & Li, L.D. *The effects of over-reliance on AI dialogue systems on students' cognitive abilities: a systematic review. Smart Learn. Environ. 11, 28 (2024)*, *available at: https://slejournal.springeropen.com/articles/10.1186/s40561-024-00316-7* (last visited on November 12, 2025).

[173] Cheng, L and Liu, X *Unravelling power of the unseen: Towards an interdisciplinary synthesis of Generative AI regulation,* International Journal of Digital Law and Governance, 2024.

within the training data set,[174] which means that the learning does not imply a semantic understanding of the content.[175] Readily available GenAI tools use open training models available on the internet and therefore, may be trained on data consisting of unreliable or inaccurate information and potential biases that may inevitably influence critical judicial decisions.[176]

For judicial decision-making, this lack of transparency in AI-supported judicial processes undermines accountability and due process, as judges, legal researchers, and parties involved may find it difficult to understand or challenge how specific decisions were reached, or whether biases and errors influenced the final rationale.

Fair and ethical legal judgments require an understanding of complex human circumstances and context that the AI systems may struggle to understand. In order to ensure the fairness of the outcome and the public perception of fairness, human oversight or involvement may remain crucial.[177] Complete reliance on AI systems in the judiciary in the absence of proper safeguards could reduce such human articulable intervention in the legal process, potentially reducing the transparency of justice served.[178]

B. Fabrication of Cases and Hallucination: Fake Citation incidents

---

[174] Debunking LLM Intelligence Under The Hood, *available at:* https://dzone.com/articles/debunking-llm-intelligence-under-the-hood (last visited on November 12, 2025).

[175] Victor Habib Lantyer, "The Phantom Menace: Generative AI Hallucinations and Their Legal Implications" *SSRN* (2025), *available at:* https://ssrn.com/abstract=5167036 (last visited on November 13, 2025).

[176] D. U Socol de la Osa and N. Remolina, "Artificial intelligence at the bench: Legal and ethical challenges of informing—or misinforming—judicial decision-making through generative AI" 6 Data & Policy (2024), *available at:* https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/data-and-policy/article/artificial-intelligence-at-the-bench-legal-and-ethical-challenges-of-informingor-misinformingjudicial-decisionmaking-through-generative-ai/D1989AC5C81FB67A5FABB552D3831E46 (last visited on November 12, 2025).

[177] Anna Fine, R Emily, et. al. "Public Perceptions of Judges' Use of AI Tools in Courtroom Decision-Making: An Examination of Legitimacy, Fairness, Trust, and Procedural Justice" 15 *Behavioral Sciences* (2025), *available at: https://www.mdpi.com/2076-328X/15/4/476* (last visited on November 12, 2025).

[178] D. U Socol de la Osa and N. Remolina, "Artificial intelligence at the bench: Legal and ethical challenges of informing—or misinforming—judicial decision-making through generative AI" 6 *Data & Policy* (2024), *available at:* https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/data-and-policy/article/artificial-intelligence-at-the-bench-legal-and-ethical-challenges-of-informingor-misinformingjudicial-decisionmaking-through-generative-ai/D1989AC5C81FB67A5FABB552D3831E46 (last visited on November 12, 2025).

For any computable LLM, hallucination is found to be inevitable.[179] In the legal field, the most serious instance of AI-hallucination involves fabrication of citation and fake case laws. Research by Stanford RegLab[180] revealed that AI tools hallucinate at an alarming rate. According to their study, Lexis+ AI and Ask Practical Law AI systems produced incorrect information more than 17 percent of the time, while WestLaw's AI-assisted Research hallucinated more than 34 percent of the time.[181]

Recently, a trial court judge from Karnataka relied on a GenAI tool to draft portions of a judgment. However, it was later discovered that the AI had produced fabricated case citations and non-existent precedents.[182] Similarly, the Income Tax Appellate Tribunal (ITAT) was compelled to recall an order after it was discovered that the decision relied on "fictitious" judicial precedents.[183] In another instance, a lawyer used ChatGPT for drafting the pleadings and it was found by the court that the AI tool had generated fabricated quotations attributed to non-existent cases.[184] These incidents underscore the significant risks posed by unverified AI-generated material and reinforce the imperative of maintaining rigorous human oversight whenever such tools are employed in legal or judicial work.

---

[179] Xu, Ziwei, Sanjay Jain, *et. al. (eds.)* "Hallucination Is Inevitable: An Innate Limitation of Large Language Models" (2024), *available at: https://arxiv.org/abs/2401.11817* f (last visited on November 10, 2025).

[180] Varun Magesh, Faiz Surani, *et. al. (eds.)* "Hallucination-Free? Assessing the Reliability of Leading AI Legal Research Tools", *Journal of Empirical Legal Studies,* (2024), *available at:* https://dho.stanford.edu/wp-content/uploads/Legal_RAG_Hallucinations.pdf (last visited on November10, 2025).

[181] Ibid.

[182] *Hindustan Times*, *Karnataka HC Proposes Action Against Judge for Citing Non-Existent Rulings* (Mar. 27, 2025), https://www.hindustantimes.com/india-news/karnataka-hc-proposes-action-against-judge-for-citing-non-existent-rulings-101743045790685.html

[183] Moneycontrol, *The Citation That Wasn't! Now-Withdrawn Tax Tribunal Order Triggers AI Misuse Concerns* (Feb. 27, 2025), Moneycontrol, https://www.moneycontrol.com/news/business/the-citation-that-wasn-t-now-withdrawn-tax-tribunal-order-triggers-ai-misuse-concerns-12951761.html.

[184] The Print, *Delhi HC Junks Plea Crafted by ChatGPT with Fake Quotes, Cases—What It Said After Pulling Up Lawyer* (Aug. 27, 2023), The Print, https://theprint.in/judiciary/delhi-hc-junks-plea-crafted-by-chatgpt-with-fake-quotes-cases-what-it-said-pulling-up-erring-lawyer/2751518/

Another instance from the United States District Court for the District of Colorado was in the case of *Coomer v. Lindell*,[185] where the judge issued a show cause notice to the lead counsel for the defendant after the Court identified *nearly thirty defective citations* in the opposition submitted by the defendant's counsel, including the completely fabricated case *Perkins v. Fed. Fruit & Produce Co., 945 F.3d 1242 1251 (10th Cir. 2019).* The court noted that:

> *'defects include but are not limited to misquotes of cited cases; misrepresentations of principles of law associated with cited cases, including discussions of legal principles that simply do not appear within such decisions; misstatements regarding whether case law originated from a binding authority such as the United States Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit; misattributions of case law to this District; and most egregiously, citation of cases that do not exist*'.

Similarly, in *Roberto Mata v. Avianca, Inc.,*[186] a US District Court for the Southern District of New York case, fake legal precedents were cited and the Court went on to the extent of imposing a penalty of USD 5,000, observing that the respondent continued to stand by the fake opinions after judicial orders called their existence into question.[187]

It is also important to understand that these hallucinations are not limited to generating fake citations. Hallucinations occur with different typologies. A model may hallucinate by giving

---

[185] *Coomer v. Lindell,* Case No. 22-cv-01129-NYW-SBP, pending in the United States District Court for the District of Colorado, *available at:* https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/USCOURTS-cod-1_22-cv-01129/pdf/USCOURTS-cod-1_22-cv-01129-10.pdf (last visited on November 11, 2025).

[186] Case 1:22-cv-01461-PKC, *available at:* https://cases.justia.com/federal/district-courts/new-york/nysdce/1:2022cv01461/575368/54/0.pdf?ts=1687525481 (last visited on November 10, 2025).

[187] *Ibid.*

an output that is either unfaithful or in conflict with the input prompt or intrinsic hallucination.[188] It may also hallucinate by producing a response that either contradicts or does not directly derive from its training resource.[189] This means that even when the model is trained on a limited data, it may still make a mistake in generating an output intended to be based on that limited data, which will invariably require human-intervention to check the accuracy and the veracity of the output.

Case citation hallucination by AI-System occurs because GenAI is built to replicate writing styles, not to find veracity of information and their process is limited to predict the pattern and the sequence of words based on the training.[190] Therefore, when asked to find case laws, AI-Systems often mix real legal cases with fake ones because they are trying to sound like a lawyer, and not actually check if something is true. These mistakes, or case hallucinations, happen when the AI is guessing what words should come next based on patterns, not searching for facts.[191]

For the judiciary, these hallucinations may prove to be problematic in summarising judicial opinions, drafting summary of case laws, or extracting key points from a counsel's submissions.[192]

---

[188] Weijia Xu, "Understanding and Detecting Hallucinations in Neural Machine Translation via Model Introspection" *11 Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics 546 (2023), available at:* https://arxiv.org/abs/2301.07779 (last visited on November 10, 2025).

[189] Ayush Agrawal, Mirac Suzgun, et. at., "Do Language Models Know When They're Hallucinating References?" *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics, St. Julian's, Malta: Association for Computational Linguistics,* (2023), *available at:* https://aclanthology.org/2024.findings-eacl.62/ (last visited on November 10, 2025).

[190] Victor Habib Lantyer, "The Phantom Menace: Generative AI Hallucinations and Their Legal Implications" *SSRN* (2025), *available at:* https://ssrn.com/abstract=5167036 (last visited on November 13, 2025).

[191] Maura R. Grossman, Paul W. Grimm, et. al., Is disclosure and certification of the use of generative AI really necessary?, *Bolch Institute at Duke University,* (2023) *available at:* https://scholarship.law.duke.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=6969&context=faculty_scholarship (last visited on November 09, 2025).

[192] Matthew Dahl, Varun Magesh,et.al. "Large Legal Fictions: Profiling Legal Hallucinations in Large Language Models", 16 *Journal of Legal Analysis* 64 (2024), *available at*: https://academic.oup.com/jla/article/16/1/64/7699227 (last visited on November 11, 2025).

While AI is designed and used for the purpose of generating data, it remains the responsibility of the user to exercise due diligence and refrain from placing blind trust in such tools. Without proper verification, hallucination will lead to inaccurate data forming part of the legal discourse.

C. Evidence Tampering and Deepfakes

Photographs and videos make up an important part of contemporary electronic evidence in modern times. While the prevalence of electronic evidence cannot be understated, highlighting associated risks also become pertinent. One such challenge is the rise in AI modified images and videos or deepfakes.

Deepfakes are termed as digitally manipulated synthetic media content (e.g., videos, images, sound clips) where people are shown to do or say something that never existed or happened in the real world.[193] These technologies, including face swapping videos, lip syncing, voice-only cloning and full-body re-enactment are increasingly being used to misguide courts.

Courts traditionally authenticate evidence by requiring parties to prove it through external resources. However, with the increased use of deepfake technology, there is a possibility that the judges may mistakenly accept fabricated evidence. In the *Washington v. Puloka,*[194] the Court refused to admit the AI enhanced video as evidence stating the video does not show with integrity what actually happened. The Court further stated that admitting AI- enhanced video would lead to confusion and muzzling of eye-witness testimony.

---

[193] UNESCO, *Global Toolkit On AI And The Rule Of Law For The Judiciary* (2023), *available at:* https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000387331 (last visited on November 15, 2025).

[194] Case No. 21-1-04851-2 KNT *available at:* https://fingfx.thomsonreuters.com/gfx/legaldocs/zgvokxekavd/04192024ai_wash.pdf (last visited on November 11, 2025).

These technologies when put to malicious use may severely affect the dispensation of justice, necessitating specialised forensic verification and human oversight to thoroughly evaluate audio-visual evidence.

D. Algorithmic Bias and Discrimination

As earlier expressed, AI is increasingly inheriting the biases prevalent in the training data.[195] For example, training an AI on historical data from an organisation that hired one specific gender of applicants may lead to biased hiring against a different gender.[196]

AI systems invariably inherit biases embedded in representations of reality encoded in raw training data,[197] whether trained from publicly available internet content or proprietary institutional records. These biases in AI-systems can manifest in the form of racial, gender, ethnic, or cultural leanings, and can extend to other biases concerning socioeconomic status, religion, and more.[198] The biases can be pre-existing (originating in the data), technical (found in the design of AI algorithms and systems) or in the organisational processes using AI models.[199]

In *State v. Loomis*,[200] the Wisconsin Supreme Court issued explicit warnings about COMPAS, which is a proprietary risk assessment algorithm used to predict recidivism likelihood and inform sentencing decisions. The Court highlighted COMPAS may unfairly classify minority

---

[195] Nima Shahbazi, Yin Lin, et al. "Representation bias in data: A survey on identification and resolution techniques" *ACM Computing Surveys* (2023), *available at*: https://arxiv.org/pdf/2203.11852 (last visited on November 12, 2025).
[196] Xinyu Chang, "Gender Bias in Hiring: An Analysis of the Impact of Amazon's Recruiting Algorithm" 23 *Advances in Economics Management and Political Sciences* 134 (September, 2023).
[197] Nima Shahbazi, Yin Lin, et al. "Representation bias in data: A survey on identification and resolution techniques" *ACM Computing Surveys* (2023), *available at*: https://arxiv.org/pdf/2203.11852 (last visited on November 12, 2025).
[198] Jose M. Alvarez, Alejandra Bringas Colmenarejo, et al. "Policy advice and best practices on bias and fairness in AI" 26 *Ethics and Information Technology* (2025),
available at: https://oro.open.ac.uk/97318/1/10676_2024_Article_9746.pdf (last visited on November 12, 2025).
[199] *Ibid.*
[200] 881 N.W.2d 749 (Wis. 2016).

offenders as higher risk. In this instance, Eric Loomis was charged in Wisconsin with several offences related to a drive-by shooting. He denied the shooting but pleaded guilty to attempting to flee a traffic officer and operating a vehicle without the owner's consent. At sentencing, a COMPAS risk assessment was included in his pre-sentencing report and suggested Loomis was at high risk of reoffending. Loomis argued this use violated his right to an individualised and accurate sentence and challenged COMPAS's lack of transparency.

When judicial officers use AI tools to make decisions or other legal documents, AI-systems may disproportionately harm or benefit certain social groups at the expense of others.[201] This will lead to deepening inequities that require the AI systems to uphold standards of fairness and accountability, especially in legal adjudication areas.[202]

E. Intellectual Property Infringement

In 2023, New York Times sued OpenAI and Microsoft claiming that many of its copyrighted articles were used by them to train the AI-System which ended up competing with the newspaper by reproducing its content.[203] The advent of AI raises the questions of authorship, originality and protection of intellectual property (IP) rights. These concerns are based on the IPRs of data sets these AI-systems are trained on as well as the outputs they generate.

AI models need to learn from works that already exist, many of which could be protected by copyright owned by another party. Various open source language models use the internet as a

[201] Harry Surden, *"Ethics of AI in Law: Basic Questions",* in Markus D. Dubber, Frank Pasquale, Sunit Das, *et. al.* (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Ethics of AI* 719-736 (Oxford University Press, 2020).
[202] Eirini Ntoutsi et al., "Bias in data-driven artificial intelligence systems—An introductory survey" 10(3) *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Data Mining and Knowledge Discovery* e1356 (2020), *available at: Bias in data-driven artificial intelligence systems—An ...Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviewshttps://wires.onlinelibrary.wiley.com › 10.1002 › widm* (last visited on November 11, 2025).
[203] Michael M. Grynbaum and Ryan Mac, "The Times Sues Open AI and Microsoft over A.I. use of Copyrighted Work*"*, *The New York Times* (December 27, 2023), *available at:* https://www.nytimes.com/2023/12/27/business/media/new-york-times-open-ai-microsoft-lawsuit.html (last visited on November 11, 2025).

dataset. This training operation raises ethical and legal concerns of unlicensed, licensed data and human-created sources as input.[204]

In the first instance, when AI systems are trained on an individual's licensed data that is publicly available on the internet the aspect of user consent and compensation to the individual for their work is absent.[205] This acquisition of training data and the use derogates another person's IPR, which is an important legal consideration.[206] For example, if AI is used by judicial officers to draft a legal opinion on contract law, and the AI system reproduces an analysis from a copyrighted source without proper attribution, along with the liability of plagiarism, the question on who would bear the responsibility for inaccuracy in the output, including the judge who uses it, the AI-developer who process the information or the original author, remains unresolved.[207]

F. Breach of Confidentiality and Privacy

The use of AI has also given rise to the challenges of breach of confidentiality and violation of privacy.[208] In 2023, a corporation discovered that its employee had inadvertently leaked sensitive internal source code by uploading it to a GenAI platform while seeking assistance with software development tasks.[209] The incident led to the discovery that the data transmitted

---

[204] Enrico Bonadio, Plamen Dinev et.al. (edus.) "Can Artificial Intelligence Infringe Copyright? Some Reflections" in Ryan Abbott (ed.), *Research Handbook on Intellectual Property and Artificial Intelligence* 245 (Edward Elgar Publishing, Cheltenham, 2022); Benjamin Sobel, "Artificial Intelligence's Fair Use Crisis", 41 *Colum. J.L. & Arts* 45 (2017).

[205] Ziv Epstein, Aaron Hertzmann and the Investigators of Human Creativity, *Art and the science of generative AI.* (June 16, 2023) *available at:* https://ide.mit.edu/wp-content/uploads/2023/07/science.adh4451-1.pdf (last visited on November 11, 2025).

[206] Enrico Bonadio, and Luke McDonagh. *"Artificial intelligence as producer and consumer of copyright works: evaluating the consequences of algorithmic creativity"* 2 *Intellectual Property Quarterly* 112 (2020).

[207] Kacper Szkalej, "Copyright Liability and Generative AI: What's the Way Forward?" *Nordic Intellectual Property Law Review* 92 (2025), *available at*: https://ssrn.com/abstract=5117603 or http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.5117603 (last visited on November 11, 2025).

[208] Stanford HAI, *Privacy in an AI Era: How Do We Protect Our Personal Information?* (Mar. 18, 2024), Stanford Human-Centered Artificial Intelligence, *available at:* https://hai.stanford.edu/news/privacy-ai-era-how-do-we-protect-our-personal-information (last visited on November 11, 2025).

[209] Mark Gautam, "Samsung Bans employees from using AI after spotting ChatGPT data leak" *Business Standard, (*May 2, 2023), *available at:* https://www.business-standard.com/technology/tech-news/samsung-bans-

to external AI platforms was stored on servers beyond the control of the organisation, making it difficult for them to retrieve and delete the data and thus prompted the company to ban employee use of such tools across all devices and networks.[210]

These privacy risks in an AI-system arise from the way in which these systems operate. AI systems require access to large quantities of data for training. Concerns arise when the usage of this data evolves, especially with the opacity of how AI processes information, making it difficult to detect when privacy violations occur.[211] Providers of private generative AI tools as well as providers' staff may retain the information to store and monitor the prompts to check for inappropriate use.[212]

When a user enters a prompt on an AI system, some of that content may be used to train the AI models.[213] While the user can typically opt out of having their data used to train these models, otherwise, the AI-model may retain this data. In such cases, where the input or the prompt is retained by AI, it may unintentionally *'regurgitate'* the training data in future interactions, resulting in an output that is a *'near exact copy'* of a piece of its training dataset.[214] In addition to individual users, organisations training generative AI tools from scratch or fine-tuning existing tools using their confidential information creates a risk of the information becoming

---

employees-from-using-ai-after-spotting-chatgpt-data-leak-123050200197_1.html (last visited on November 9, 2025).

[210] *Ibid.*

[211] Feder A. Cooper and James Grimmelmann, "*T*he Files are in the Computer: On Copyright, Memorization, and Generative AI" 100 *Chicago-Kent Law Review* 141 (2025), *available at* : https://ssrn.com/abstract=4803118 (last visited on November 11, 2025).

[212] WIPO, Generative AI: Navigating intellectual property, *available at:* https://www.wipo.int/edocs/pubdocs/en/wipo-pub-rn2024-8-en-generative-ai-navigating-intellectual-property.pdf (last visited on November 12, 2025)

[213] OpenAI Policy Website, *available at:* https://openai.com/policies/how-your-data-is-used-to-improve-model-performance/ (last visited on November 12, 2025)
:"*When you use our services for individuals such as ChatGPT, Sora, or Operator, we may use your content to train our models", "We retain certain data from your interactions with us, but we take steps to reduce the amount of personal information in our training datasets before they are used to improve and train our models. This data helps us better understand user needs and preferences, allowing our model to become more efficient over time."*

[214] WIPO, "Generative AI: Navigating Intellectual Property" (2024), *available at:* https://www.wipo.int/edocs/pubdocs/en/wipo-pub-rn2024-8-en-generative-ai-navigating-intellectual-property.pdf (last visited on November 12, 2025)

available to the public as LLMs might retain and accidentally disclose specific data or confidential information they were trained on despite mitigating techniques.[215]

If confidential information pertaining to a case is entered into an AI system trained on Court documents, these details may be retained within the model, and regurgitated in responses to other users' queries, leading to inadvertent data leaks from confidential case files, agreements, or privileged communications.[216] For institutions such as the judiciary which has to uphold the principles of privacy and confidentiality as laid down in laws, especially when dealing with child victims under POCSO Act, child in conflict with law as described under Juvenile Justice Act, and rape victims, these risks may hinder the proper dispensation of justice.

[215] Biwei Yan, Kun Li, et.al., "On protecting the data privacy of Large Language Models (LLMs) and LLM agents: A literature review", *5 High-Confidence Computing* (2025), *available at:* https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2667295225000042 (last visited on November 12, 2025).

[216] WIPO, "Generative AI: Navigating Intellectual Property" (2024), *available at:* https://www.wipo.int/edocs/pubdocs/en/wipo-pub-rn2024-8-en-generative-ai-navigating-intellectual-property.pdf (last visited on November 12, 2025); see also National Centre for States Court, "Principles and Practices for Using AI Responsibly and Effectively in State Courts, A Guide for Court Administrators, Judges, and Legal Professionals" (2025), *available at:* https://nationalcenterforstatecourts.app.box.com/v/AI-principles-and-practices (last visited on November 13, 2025).

CHAPTER 5: CORE ETHICAL PRINCIPLES FOR THE RESPONSIBLE USE OF AI IN JUDICIARY

Despite the concerns surrounding the use of AI, it has the potential of digitally transforming the judicial functioning.[217] Its use seeks to improve both the efficiency and the quality of justice. At the same time, in the light of the associated risks, the use of AI should be carried out responsibly, with due regard to the fundamental rights of individuals. Throughout the globe, countries have formulated ethical principles to regulate the use of AI in Judiciary. These principles are necessary because of the possible risks associated with the use of AI. Following are some of the principles that may guide the use of AI in the judiciary:

A. Human in the Loop

The ultimate responsibility and accountability associated with using AI shall be attributed to humans.[218] Human in the loop in the context of the judiciary means putting the final responsibility, accountability, action or outcomes in the judicial process to the judges and lawyers.

The judiciary is personally responsible for the material that is produced in their name, and thus it is important to ensure the authenticity and credibility of the document. AI may assist the judges, but cannot replace them.[219] Many countries including UK[220], China, Canada,

[217] UNESCO, "Global Judges' Initiative: Survey on the Use of AI Systems by Judicial Operators" (2023), *available at:* https://unesdoc.unesco.org/in/documentViewer.xhtml?v=2.1.196&id=p::usmarcdef_ (last visited on November 18, 2025).
[218] Ministry of Electronics and Information Technology, "India AI Governance Guidelines" (November, 2025), *available at:* https://static.pib.gov.in/WriteReadData/specificdocs/documents/2025/nov/doc2025115685601.pdf (last visited on November 13, 2025).
[219] Courts and Tribunals Judiciary, "Artificial Intelligence (AI) Guidance for Judicial Office Holders" (October 31, 2025), *available at:* https://www.judiciary.uk/wp-content/uploads/2025/10/Artificial-Intelligence-AI-Guidance-for-Judicial-Office-Holders-2.pdf (last visited on November 13, 2025).
[220] Courts and Tribunals Judiciary, "Artificial Intelligence (AI) Guidance for Judicial Office Holders" (October 31, 2025), *available at:* https://www.judiciary.uk/wp-content/uploads/2025/10/Artificial-Intelligence-AI-Guidance-for-Judicial-Office-Holders-2.pdf (last visited on November 13, 2025).

Singapore, Brazil, South Korea, and Australia[221] have formulated various principles for the ethical use of AI in judiciary which include human oversight, understanding the need for human intervention in the proper dispensation of justice.

In the case of AI that is trained on preexisting data, which may be biased at times, the need for human oversight in judicial decisions becomes even more necessary as it may replicate systemic prejudices.[222]

B. Accuracy and Verification

AI systems are capable of generating inaccurate, incomplete, misleading and even out of date information,[223] and even creating an illusion of accuracy and hallucinated sources, therefore, verification of any information that is provided by AI is necessary. It is advisable for users of AI tools to ensure that the data they have generated is accurate, with the user bearing personal responsibility for discrepancy present in the work bearing their names.

AI tools may hallucinate judgments, citations, quotes, or refer to any legislation that may not be in existence, and can also make factual errors. In order to minimise the risks of inaccurate output associated with the use of AI, establishing a systematic verification process is advisable to maintain the high standards of accuracy that are required in legal proceedings.[224]

Another method that may prove to be helpful in verifying the output generated is the *red flag approach*. This entails identifying AI usage by taking note of certain indications like the use

---

[221] Department of Industry, Science and Reasearch, "Australia's AI Ethics Principles", *available at:*https://www.industry.gov.au/publications/australias-artificial-intelligence-ethics-principles/australias-ai-ethics-principles (last visited on November 13, 2025).

[222] Solon Barocas , Andrew D. Selbst, Big Data's Disparate Impact*,* 104 *California Law Review 671,* (2016), *available at:* https://www.cs.yale.edu/homes/jf/BarocasSelbst.pdf (last visited on November 13, 2025).

[223] Courts and Tribunals Judiciary, "Artificial Intelligence (AI) Guidance for Judicial Office Holders" (October 31, 2025), *available at:* https://www.judiciary.uk/wp-content/uploads/2025/10/Artificial-Intelligence-AI-Guidance-for-Judicial-Office-Holders-2.pdf (last visited on November 13, 2025).

[224] National Centre for States Court, "Principles and Practices for Using AI Responsibly and Effectively in State Courts, A Guide for Court Administrators, Judges, and Legal Professionals" (2025), *available at:* https://nationalcenterforstatecourts.app.box.com/v/AI-principles-and-practices (last visited on November 13, 2025).

of submissions using a specific type of spellings, referring to the overseas cases or the cases that do not sound familiar, appearance of content as error free but containing errors, when examined closely and submissions not in accordance with the law in an area.[225]

C. Confidentiality and Privacy

In order to uphold the principles of confidentiality and privacy, the judicial institutions should make sure that sensitive data shall not be entered into the AI tools as any data entered in the AI chatbot may become public, and the data may be used to train AI.[226] Any unintentional disclosure of the sensitive information shall be brought to the attention of the judge or the judicial office.[227] It is recommended for the users of AI to disable the chat history on public AI chatbots wherever possible to prevent the sensitive information entered into Gen AI tools from being used to train AI.[228] But even though this feature is enabled, it should be kept in mind that any data entered can be disclosed to the public at large. Development of institutional protocols for the usage of AI in courtrooms can mitigate privacy risks.[229]

---

[225] Court of New Zealand, "Guidelines For Use Of Generative Artificial Intelligence In Courts And Tribunals" (December 7, 2023), *available at:* https://www.courtsofnz.govt.nz/assets/6-Going-to-Court/practice-directions/practice-guidelines/all-benches/20231207-GenAI-Guidelines-Judicial.pdf (last visited on November 13, 2025).

[226] National Centre for State Court, "Guidance for Use of Generative AI and AI in Courts" (November 7, 2025) *available at:* https://www.ncsc.org/sites/default/files/media/document/AI-Courts-NCSC-AI-guidelines-for-courts.pdf (last visited on November 13, 2025).

[227] Courts and Tribunals Judiciary, "Artificial Intelligence (AI) Guidance for Judicial Office Holders" (October 31, 2025), *available at:* https://www.judiciary.uk/wp-content/uploads/2025/10/Artificial-Intelligence-AI-Guidance-for-Judicial-Office-Holders-2.pdf (last visited on November 13, 2025).

[228] National Centre for States Court, "Principles and Practices for Using AI Responsibly and Effectively in State Courts, A Guide for Court Administrators, Judges, and Legal Professionals" (2025), *available at:* https://nationalcenterforstatecourts.app.box.com/v/AI-principles-and-practices; also see Ministry of Electronics and Information Technology, "Report Of Committee – D On Cyber Security, Safety, Legal And Ethical Issues" (2019), *available at:* https://www.meity.gov.in/static/uploads/2024/02/Committes_D-Cyber-n-Legal-and-Ethical.pdf (last visited on November 13, 2025).

[229] National Centre for States Court, "Principles and Practices for Using AI Responsibly and Effectively in State Courts, A Guide for Court Administrators, Judges, and Legal Professionals" (2025), *available at:* https://nationalcenterforstatecourts.app.box.com/v/AI-principles-and-practices (last visited on November 13, 2025).

D. Fairness and Bias Prevention

In India, the principle of fairness and equity suggests[230] that "*AI systems should be designed and tested to ensure the outcomes are fair, unbiased, and do not discriminate against anyone, including those from marginalised communities".* The courts shall actively monitor the outputs produced by AI for biased patterns and language, ensuring that use of AI does not disadvantage any group of individuals. This requires the courts to establish oversight committees to review GenAI implementations and assess their impacts on various stakeholder groups, ensuring ongoing evaluation of AI systems' effects on equal access to justice.[231] Where the AI is used to predict the risk or recidivism in pre-trial release, sentencing, or other legal decisions, it constitutes high risk and must be used with caution, particularly because the underlying algorithms may have been trained on biased data.[232]

E. Specialised Verification of the Translated Texts

AI is increasingly being used for translating the texts promptly with good accuracy. However, at times it may generate translations of the words on the basis of the algorithms on which it was trained, which may often result in incorrect or misleading translation results. Whenever any AI tool is used to generate the translation of the legal texts or case laws, it may be the duty of the concerned person to verify the output provided through qualified translators or by themselves.[233]

---

[230] Ministry of Electronic and Information Technology, "India AI Governance Guidelines" (November, 2025) *available at:* https://static.pib.gov.in/WriteReadData/specificdocs/documents/2025/nov/doc2025115685601.pdf (last visited on November 13, 2025).

[231] National Centre for States Court, "Principles and Practices for Using AI Responsibly and Effectively in State Courts, A Guide for Court Administrators, Judges, and Legal Professionals" (2025), *available at:* https://nationalcenterforstatecourts.app.box.com/v/AI-principles-and-practices (last visited on November 13, 2025).

[232] Ministry of Law & Justice, "Digital Transformation of Justice: Integrating AI in India's Judiciary and Law Enforcement", *Press Information Bureau,* Press Release ID 2106239, February 25, 2025*, available at:* https://www.pib.gov.in/PressReleasePage.aspx?PRID=2106239 (last visited on November 19, 2025).

[233] The High Court of Kerala, "The Policy Regarding Use of Artificial Intelligence Tools in District Judiciary, HCKL/7490/2025-DI-3-HC KERALA" (October 21, 2025), *available at:*

F. Restricted Use in Administrative and Routine Functions

AI may be deployed for routine, non-adjudicatory administrative functions that support but do not influence substantive judicial decision-making. These include tasks such as scheduling and rescheduling of cases, managing court calendars, organising and maintaining administrative records, generating standard notices, and assisting with workflow coordination within the registry. Automating these high-volume, repetitive processes can free human resources for more complex responsibilities. However, such deployment must operate under continuous human supervision to ensure accuracy, prevent over-reliance on automated outputs, and maintain institutional accountability. AI should function with final control and verification resting firmly with authorised personnel.[234]

https://images.assettype.com/theleaflet/2025-07-22/mt4bw6n7/Kerala_HC_AI_Guidelines.pdf (last visited on November 13, 2025).

[234] *Ibid.*

CHAPTER 6: RECOMMENDATIONS FOR USE OF AI IN JUDICIARY: INSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORKS AND GUIDELINES

Having examined the risks associated with the use of AI and the ethical principles required to mitigate them, it becomes necessary to translate these insights into concrete institutional frameworks and operational guidelines, particularly in the context of judicial integration. Developments across jurisdictions illustrate both the potential of AI and the risks of unregulated adoption, highlighting the importance of deliberate, principle-driven approaches within judicial systems. The recommendations in this section therefore aim to bridge the gap between high-level ethical commitments and their practical implementation. They outline governance structures, procedural safeguards, and domain-specific standards that draw from established ethical norms and also offer actionable, context-sensitive guidance for courts at different stages of technological maturity.

A. Institutional Safeguards for Ethical Use of AI

a) AI Ethics Committee within Courts

The establishment of dedicated AI Ethics Committees within the judiciary has become essential in light of increasing use of AI. Such committees can serve as specialised bodies responsible for overseeing the ethical, technical, and procedural implications of AI deployment in judiciary. Their role would include formulating regulatory mechanisms, setting standards for responsible use, reviewing proposed AI systems before adoption, and ensuring that these tools comply with principles of transparency, accountability, fairness, and data protection. The Committee must have a member having technical expertise in the field of AI. The Committee can also identify and ‘low risk tasks’ to be performed with the AI tool that utilises non-confidential information and their accuracy can be easily verified. By providing continuous oversight and structured

guidance, AI Ethics Committees can help the judiciary navigate emerging challenges, prevent misuse or overreliance on automated systems.

b) In-House AI Tools

Judiciary handles confidential, privileged, and highly sensitive information, making data security a non-negotiable requirement. Hence, the use of open-source or publicly accessible AI systems, where user data may be stored, analysed, or repurposed by external entities, poses significant risks including data leaks, unauthorised access, and inadvertent disclosure of protected material. To safeguard judicial integrity and prevent compromise of sensitive records, it is suggested that courts prioritise the development and deployment of secure, in-house AI tools built specifically for judicial use. Such systems can be designed to operate within controlled environments, ensuring compliance with confidentiality obligations, data-minimisation norms, and strict access protocols. Until such institutional solutions are fully operational, judicial officers must adopt rigorous security practices at the individual level.

c) Policy for Ethical Use of AI

It is further suggested that the judiciary should establish a comprehensive Ethical Use of AI Policy to ensure consistent, principled, and accountable deployment. Such a policy should clearly define its scope of applicability, identifying the individuals, roles, and institutional units governed by it, as well as the categories of AI technologies covered. It should articulate the duties and responsibilities of users in alignment with core ethical principles such as transparency, fairness, accountability, confidentiality, and human oversight so that AI tools are used in a manner consistent with judicial values. The policy must also specify consequences for misuse or deviation from prescribed guidelines and establish mechanisms for monitoring compliance, reviewing emerging risks, and periodically updating the framework.

d) Disclosure Requirements

The judiciary remains fully accountable for all material issued in its name. Therefore, to ensure the accuracy and integrity of any AI-generated content, members of the institution must maintain full transparency. Any AI-generated material that is relied upon should be properly cited, including details of the tool, provider, version or year, and, where relevant, the prompt used. Every use of AI should be recorded through an audit trail that notes the task performed and the human oversight applied.

e) Training on Ethical Use of the AI Tools

Judicial institutions must actively promote public understanding of AI through open and accessible education, civic engagement, digital skills programmes, AI-ethics training, and media-and-information literacy. Building AI literacy equips individuals and institutions with the knowledge and skills needed to use AI safely, transparently, and responsibly. A sound understanding of AI systems, their capabilities, limitations, risks, and implications is essential to ensuring their ethical, trustworthy, and accountable use within the justice system.[235]

LIKELY INDICATORS FOR AI GENERATED WORK

- Contradictory writing prevalent in the text with one thing in one paragraph and the opposite in the later can indicate AI-generated content.
- Using non-existent references that may look real in the first instance but do not exist on reliable databases.
- References to cases that sound unfamiliar, or have unfamiliar citation style.
- Parties citing different bodies of case law in relation to the same legal issues.

[235] World Economic Forum, Why AI literacy is crucial for safe, inclusive and strategic AI transformation, (2025), *available at:* https://www.weforum.org/stories/2025/07/ai-literacy-and-strategic-transformation/ (last visited on November 11, 2025).

- Using jargon or any technical terms incorrectly.
- Over usage of keywords without integration into the narrative.
- Submissions that are not in line with the general understanding of the law in the area.
- Content that (superficially at least) appears to be highly persuasive and well written, but on closer inspection contains obvious substantive errors.
- Inclusion of an AI prompt, or 'prompt rejection', or other elements present in the interface of AI-Tool.
- Overly generic or homogenised writing, lacking contextual specificity, nuance, or any reference to the factual matrix of the case.
- Sudden shifts in tone, formality, or writing style that do not align with the author's known writing patterns.
- Unusual structural patterns, including unnecessary summaries, repetitive transitions, or formulaic paragraph structures characteristic of AI-generated text.
- Use of improbable or exaggerated statistics, facts, or quotations, often without pinpoint citation or verifiable source.

B. Possible Uses of AI in the Courts[236]

1. AI systems process information through structured, step-by-step methods that enable them to scan, organise, and compress large volumes of data. These capabilities make them useful for tasks such as summarising texts or adjusting the tone of written material. As with any technological assistance, such use must be accompanied by appropriate human oversight.

[236] National Centre for State Courts, "Guidance for Use of AI and Generative AI in Courts" (August 7, 2024), *available at:* https://www.ncsc.org/sites/default/files/media/document/AI-Courts-NCSC-AI-guidelines-for-courts.pdf (last visited on November 18, 2025).

2. AI tools may be employed to assist in the computation of interest, damages, and other financial components in complex commercial disputes.

3. AI may be used for transcription of court proceedings and for translation of documents, records, orders, and judgments, provided that the outputs are manually reviewed and verified for accuracy.

4. AI's ability to detect patterns and anticipate data-access requirements can make it an effective tool for organising and managing large sets of information in accordance with judicial or administrative directions.

5. AI tools may be used to retrieve specific information from extensive datasets, especially where manual extraction would be time-consuming or resource-intensive.

6. AI may be utilised to generate basic templates for documents, speeches, presentations, and similar materials, as well as to create images wherever appropriate.

7. AI tools can support efficient case management, including scheduling, categorisation of matters, identification of defects, and other administrative functions within the court system.

8. AI may be integrated into online dispute resolution platforms. For instance, it may assist in identifying suitable mediators by matching case requirements with factors such as location, subject-matter expertise, experience, and language proficiency. AI can also facilitate the management of calendars, meetings, and procedural timelines.

9. AI-driven analytics can be used in the National Judicial Data Grid (NJDG). Such analytics can be used to monitor performance and identify structural bottlenecks. Pattern-recognition tools can highlight stages at which cases tend to stagnate, reveal workload variations across districts, assess disposal trends, and flag procedural

inefficiencies that consume disproportionate judicial time. When used with appropriate safeguards, these tools can also assist in analysing the performance of judicial officers in a structured and objective manner, thereby enabling targeted administrative interventions where necessary.

10. AI can assist court registries in identifying long-pending matters, points of stagnation, and procedural chokepoints. Using natural-language search, semantic clustering, and automated docket analysis, AI can examine thousands of case records to detect trends that may not be readily apparent through manual review such as recurring delays linked to specific procedural steps, repeated defects in certain classes of matters, or systemic issues like delays in service or translation.

11. AI-based queue-management models can simulate alternative listing strategies and predict their potential effect on disposal rates. When combined with judicial and administrative dashboards, such tools can support proactive decision-making by enabling the registry to prioritise specific stages, reallocate staff, improve the workflows of process servers, or re-design listing practices in order to enhance efficiency.

C. Guidelines for the Responsible Use of AI in Judicial Institutions

1. Courts and judicial institutions shall strive to develop and maintain in-house systems that securely protect confidential, suppressed, and legally privileged information.

2. Institutions shall consider consulting diverse stakeholders throughout the lifecycle of any AI system from conception to deployment to ensure transparent and effective functioning.

3. When using or incorporating open-source AI systems, institutions shall obtain adequate information from developers and providers to ensure appropriate use, maintain optimal operation, and limit risks associated with adoption.

4. Institutions shall adopt technical, managerial, and human safeguards to prevent, control, and mitigate cybersecurity risks and incidents.

5. Institutions shall follow recognised best practices for ensuring data security and integrity.

6. Regular capacity-building programmes shall be conducted for judges, judicial officers, and court staff to enable early identification of any undisclosed or unauthorised use of AI systems or tools.

7. A detailed audit shall be maintained for all instances in which AI tools are used within the institution, including the identity of the tool and the human-verification process adopted.

8. Institutions shall develop an accessible mechanism for reporting complaints or concerns regarding the use of AI systems or tools to the competent authority.

9. Education and training programmes shall be provided on the specific risks associated with general-purpose AI tools, including their tendency to produce inaccurate legal information and fabricate citations.

10. Users shall familiarise themselves with the terms and conditions governing any AI system or tool before agreeing to use it.

11. Users shall ensure a basic understanding of the capabilities and limitations of AI tools prior to its use.

12. Users shall not input any private, confidential, or legally privileged information unless already in the public domain into any AI tool.

13. Large Language Models and similar tools shall not be used as substitutes for reliable legal research sources due to concerns regarding accuracy, transparency, and the unknown nature of underlying training data.

14. All information obtained through AI tools shall be independently verified for accuracy before reliance or incorporation into any judicial or administrative process.

15. Users shall not employ one generative AI tool to verify or authenticate the content generated by another generative AI tool.

16. Users shall remain cautious and critical of AI-generated outputs, recognising that such outputs may contain inaccuracies or reflect underlying biases, and shall take appropriate steps to mitigate such risks.

17. Proper source attribution shall be ensured at all times, with due respect for intellectual property rights, including accurate citation of authors, titles, and publication years for all referenced materials.

18. Users shall acknowledge that ultimate responsibility for the content of any document rests with the individual generating or submitting it, irrespective of whether AI tools were used.

19. A proactive approach shall be adopted in disclosing the use of AI systems or tools wherever relevant and appropriate.

20. Users shall presume that AI-generated outputs may contain errors or embedded biases and shall refrain from relying on such outputs unless they have undergone thorough review by a qualified human subject-matter expert.

D. Suggestive Guidelines for the Responsible Use of AI for Lawyers

1. Lawyers must independently verify every case citation, statutory provision, rule, or quotation generated by an AI system against an authoritative primary source before relying on it in any filing or submission.
2. Lawyers must ensure that no AI-generated text containing fabricated authorities, invented precedents, or inaccurate paraphrasing is included in pleadings, affidavits, written submissions, or oral arguments.
3. Lawyers must maintain full professional independence and may not delegate legal reasoning, case strategy, or interpretive judgment to an AI system.
4. Lawyers must preserve the confidentiality and privilege of client information and ensure that no sensitive materials are input into AI tools unless confidentiality safeguards, data-handling practices, and privilege protections are adequate.
5. Lawyers must ensure that staff, juniors, interns, or clerks using AI on case files are properly supervised, trained, and aware of both the capabilities and limitations of such tools.
6. Lawyers must avoid uploading documents containing personal data, confidential evidence, or strategic insights into AI systems that allow external data retention or model training without express consent and robust contractual protections.
7. Lawyers must be prepared to explain, if asked by the court, whether the AI tool played a role in the preparation of a submission, what steps were taken to verify the output, and why reliance on the tool was considered appropriate.

8. Lawyers must not use AI tools to attempt to predict judicial behaviour, inclinations, or future judgments in a manner that may compromise ethical boundaries or violate any applicable norms of professional conduct.
9. Lawyers must apply strong access controls within the office or chambers to ensure that only authorised individuals may use AI tools for case-related work.
10. Lawyers must promptly correct the record if any AI-derived error has been submitted to court, including fabricated authorities, inaccurate facts, or misquoted passages, and must notify the client where such correction occurs.
11. Lawyers must understand that responsibility for all AI-assisted work ultimately rests with the human lawyer, and no AI-enabled efficiency can reduce this professional accountability.
12. Lawyers must ensure that AI tools used for translation, transcription, or summarisation do not distort the meaning of legal arguments, witness statements, or judicial directions.
13. Lawyers may implement a standardised internal AI-use checklist before finalising filings to ensure all verification, documentation, and confidentiality safeguards have been completed.

E. Guidelines for the Responsible Use of AI for Law Clerks[237]

1. Law clerks shall not engage in any unethical or inappropriate use of Generative AI tools.

2. A law clerk shall ensure that all research drafts or material prepared by them contain accurate content and do not infringe any intellectual property rights.

3. A law clerk must verify that all references to case law, legislation, textbooks, or articles

[237] Handbook on Law Clerks cum Research Associate, Supreme Court of India.

generated through AI tools actually exist and correctly represent the legal positions attributed to them.

4. If the content includes extracts or quotations, the law clerk must confirm that these are reproduced accurately and attributed to the correct source.

5. When verifying materials in a research draft, a law clerk shall rely only on authentic and authoritative sources. Generative AI tools shall not be used to confirm the existence or accuracy of any cited material.

6. A law clerk shall not use Generative AI tools to rephrase or paraphrase an article without providing full and accurate citation of the original source, including the author's name, title of the article, and year of publication. Rephrasing or reproducing AI-generated content without proper referencing may amount to plagiarism and ethical misconduct.

7. A law clerk must not disclose any confidential or sensitive information to Generative AI tools, as any data shared with such platforms may become publicly accessible.

8. Any use of AI in preparing drafts or summaries must be accompanied by due intellectual diligence and human review. The ultimate responsibility for the accuracy, integrity, and propriety of the research rests with the law clerk.

9. If a law clerk is found to have used AI tools in the preparation of research documents unethically, they shall be deemed to have committed professional misconduct, and the judge/registry may take appropriate disciplinary action against them.

F. Conclusion

The Indian judiciary has, at every stage of its development, shown a willingness to adapt when institutional reform has been required. Whether through procedural innovations, adoption of digital infrastructure, or internal restructuring, the courts have continued to evolve in order to meet the demands placed upon them by society. This process of adaptation must guide us as we confront the questions raised by the growing use of AI in judicial work.

In years to come, technology will continue to advance, and its impact will be felt across all public institutions. The more meaningful question is how the judiciary can make use of these tools in a manner that is safe, secure, and accountable, and that ultimately strengthens the efficiency and functioning of the courts. The aim is to use technology carefully so that judicial time and attention can be better directed to matters that require them most. However, to move in this direction, it is important that existing institutional safeguards remain firmly in place.

The judiciary must take note from its earlier reforms and from the best practices adopted by other jurisdictions, ensuring that any use of AI operates within a framework that protects confidentiality, independence, and the integrity of adjudication. Developing clear guidelines, oversight mechanisms, and ethical boundaries is going to be critical in preventing misuse and maintaining public confidence in the system. This White Paper is intended to assist in that process. It lays out the potential benefits of AI, the risks that must be taken seriously, and the limits that cannot be compromised.