
ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE AND LEGAL PROFESSION

Alena Singh, B.B.A. LL.B., School of Law, Narsee Monjee Institute of Management Studies, Bengaluru

ABSTRACT

The application of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in the legal domain represents a paradigm shift in the supply, accessibility, and idea of legal services. The article delves into the expanding use of AI in legal practice, such as its potential to make legal work more efficient and consequences of AI on legal ethics, employment, and access to justice. By executing routine tasks such as document reading, legal research, contract review, and predictive analysis, AI platforms are reshaping conventional workflows and enabling law firms to deliver quicker and cheaper services. But these benefits come with huge hurdles in the form of data privacy, algorithmic bias, and the threat of excessive dependence on machine-based decisions in sectors demanding human judgment.

The paper examines current AI applications in the law in a critical manner, employing case studies and emerging technology. The paper examines the increasing application of AI in the practice of law, in relation to its ability to enhance efficiency as well as its implications on legal ethics, employment, and access to justice. By automating mundane tasks such as review of documents, legal research, contract analysis, and predictive analytics, AI systems are transforming conventional workflows and enabling law firms to deliver quicker and less expensive services. But these benefits come with huge challenges in the form of data privacy issues, algorithmic bias, and dangers of excessive machine judgment in matters requiring human judgment.

Employing case studies, emerging technology trends, and regulatory responses, this paper critically analyses the application of AI in the legal profession presently. It gazes on the adoption of AI tools into legal advisory, litigation, compliance, and due diligence procedures. The research also investigates how AI could influence legal education and professional responsibility, with a focus on the need for lawyers to acquire new skills in digital technologies.

The use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) into the legal profession marks a fundamental shift in how legal services are provided, accessible, and envisaged.

INTRODUCTION

Artificial Intelligence is not something out of a science fiction movie anymore, it is already changing industries, and law is not an exception. This technological change oversteps the classical confines of legal activity, asking fundamental questions about ethics, responsibility, and the future of human lawyers. As the distinction between code and counsel dissolves, the legal profession is at a fork in the road: evolve and change with AI, or face extinction in an increasingly digital world. This paper examines how AI is reshaping the practice of law—and what that means for lawyers, clients, and justice itself.

The legal profession these days is undergoing a huge transformation with regard to how the profession in its real sense is functioning. Earlier i.e. prior to the arrival of Artificial Intelligence (AI), in order to draft agreements, proof read legal documents, prepare briefs, construct arguments for the courts proceeding etc. we were dependent to a large extent upon human capabilities, AI has been around for nearly last 20 years now but it is only in the recent few years when the AI has entered into a formal or a professional environment like the legal industry. The application of AI in juridical domains poses serious ethical, regulatory, and pedagogical issues. Algorithmic bias, privacy breaches, and professional job redefinition are all matters to be explored with utmost care.

ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE IN THE LEGAL DOMAIN

The legal industry has witnessed a significant technological shift with the adoption of Artificial Intelligence tools tailored to enhance efficiency, accuracy, and decision-making. These tools are designed to automate routine legal tasks, reduce costs, and improve access to legal information. Among the most widely used AI applications are **legal research platforms** that use natural language processing to retrieve relevant case law and statutes in seconds. **Document review and e-discovery tools** leverage machine learning to sift through large volumes of data, identifying key information with high speed and precision. Some of the AI tools which are now being used by Lawyers and Attorneys globally are :

1. Diligen

Lawyers often spend hours and hours together to draft, proof read and finalise various kinds of agreements in their professional lives, from dealing with Service Provider Agreements,

Employments Contracts to Vendor Contracts, Lease Agreements etc. it can be a tedious task. With a tool like Diligen, the entire process of reviewing agreements and contracts becomes highly efficient. Diligen's machine learning-powered analysis allows the professionals to save time on due diligence by reviewing contracts for specific clauses, provisions or revisions and swiftly producing a useful summary.

2.Gideon

Another AI-driven chatbot to consider is Gideon, a client intake and document automation platform that utilizes AI to generate legal documents and streamline the intake process. It also has integrations with Clio. Gideon excels at qualifying leads correctly and answering prospect questions in a way that reduces friction and increases productivity. In Gideon, a simple conversation often replaces lengthy, friction-ridden intake forms.

3.ChatGPT

OpenAI's ChatGPT is an AI-powered chatbot that can write paragraph-long responses to openended text questions. It was educated using human feedback and reinforcement learning. In addition to conducting legal research, attorneys can use this generative AI tool to draft legal documents like wills, leases, and contracts. Using unique files, tools, and instructions, you may also make your own GPT, a customized version of ChatGPT suited for particular jobs, industries, or user requirements. No coding knowledge is needed. Take a look at our GPT for Lawyers AI.

4.Harvey AI

Touted as "unprecedented legal AI," Harvey AI is an AI-powered legal research tool that combines machine learning and natural language processing. Harvey AI is based on a version of Open.AI's GPT AI, just like the AI bot ChatGPT. It also uses case law and other general legal data, as well as templates and work products from a law practice to help legal work.

5.Darrow.ai

In order to identify possible legal infractions that could otherwise go overlooked, Darrow's Justice Intelligence Platform sorts and analyses publicly available data using generative AI,

natural language processing, and big language models. The company's in-house legal staff collaborates with lawyers to litigate class action, mass tort, and mass arbitration claims and employs its own technologies to identify legal risk.

Since Darrow uses its AI skills internally rather than selling them to legal teams, it differs slightly from other AI products on this list. But in 2025, Darrow will introduce an enterprise solution that will give businesses the tools they need to identify and resolve possible internal legal infractions before they become more serious.

THE BENEFITS OF AI INTEGRATION IN THE LEGAL INDUSTRY

1. Increased Efficiency and Speed

AI significantly reduces the time spent on routine and repetitive tasks such as legal research, document review, and contract analysis. What traditionally took hours or days can now be accomplished in minutes, enabling lawyers to focus on more strategic and analytical aspects of their work.

2. Cost Reduction

By automating labour-intensive tasks, AI lowers the cost of delivering legal services. This is especially beneficial for clients seeking affordable legal solutions and for firms aiming to optimize resource allocation and operational costs.

3. Data-Driven Decision Making

AI enables predictive analytics by analysing historical case data to forecast outcomes, assess litigation risks, and guide strategic decisions. This empowers lawyers and clients to make more informed, evidence-based choices.

4. Multilingual and Cross-Jurisdictional Support

AI tools equipped with translation and jurisdiction-specific legal databases allow lawyers to work seamlessly across borders. This is particularly useful in international law, arbitration, and global compliance cases.

5. Reduction of Cognitive Load and Burnout

By handling repetitive and mentally draining tasks, AI can reduce cognitive overload among legal professionals. This supports better mental well-being, allowing lawyers to focus on intellectually stimulating and meaningful legal work.

LIMITATIONS OF AI IN THE LEGAL INDUSTRY

While artificial intelligence can prove to be highly efficient in reducing the emotional, physical and mental exhaustion of those working in the legal sector, one shall not forget that everything that has a “Pro” also comes with some or the other “Cons”. Therefore some limitations which one can experience in the course of using AI in the legal sector are as follows:

1. Lack of Human Judgment and Contextual Understanding

AI cannot fully grasp the nuances, emotions, or ethical dimensions involved in many legal matters. It lacks human judgment, which is crucial for interpreting ambiguous laws, negotiating settlements, or advising clients in sensitive cases.

2. Bias in Algorithms and Data

AI systems learn from historical data, which may contain biases. This can lead to discriminatory or unfair outcomes, especially in areas like sentencing predictions or risk assessments, where past decisions may reflect systemic biases.

3. Accountability and Legal Liability

When an AI system makes a faulty recommendation or decision, it's unclear who is legally responsible — the developer, the lawyer using the tool, or the firm? This lack of clarity raises serious legal and ethical concerns.

4. Data Privacy and Security Risks

AI tools often rely on large datasets, including confidential client information. This raises risks related to data breaches, unauthorized access, and non-compliance with privacy regulations such as GDPR or HIPAA.

5. Limited Transparency (Black Box Problem)

Many advanced AI models, particularly those using deep learning, operate as “black boxes,” meaning their decision-making process is not easily interpretable. This makes it difficult for lawyers to understand, challenge, or justify the AI's reasoning in court or to clients.

FROM BENCH TO BOT: CASE LAW PERSPECTIVES ON AI IN THE LEGAL DOMAIN

The use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) is not limited to jurisdiction, the extent to which AI is being used in India is the same to which it is being used in other countries like United States of America (USA), United Kingdom (UK) etc. Lawyers across the global are now being heavily dependent on using such machine learning tools, which to some extent is pretty apparent. However, no matter how easy AI makes our lives, it can never surpass the kind of human intellect, decision making ability and a rationale mind which is required in order to deal with cases in the legal setup. One never thought that AI would be able to enter a courtroom but in today's highly rapidly growing technological generation, it managed to minorly takeover this sector as well where, sometimes it was used to frame defense arguments, find the relevant section under the statutory act to hold one liable of civil or criminal offence(s) or even to assist the final judgment passing process.

Several recent cases illustrate how seamlessly AI has begun to integrate into courtrooms, serving as an effective assistant to both lawyers and judges.

1. Punjab & Haryana High Court (India) — Use of ChatGPT in bail plea

In 2023, the Punjab & Haryana High Court utilized ChatGPT to seek a larger international perspective regarding global bail jurisprudence in hearing an application for bail. The judge made it clear that only supplementary input was provided through the AI tool and not to determine the question of law.

2. Christian Louboutin SAS v The Shoe Boutique (CS(COMM)-583-2023

Lawyers had used ChatGPT-generated responses to show reputation of the “red sole” style. The court held that ChatGPT **cannot be used to decide “legal or factual issues in a court of law”** due to risk of “incorrect responses, fictional case laws, imaginative data etc.”

3. Mata v. Avianca, Inc. U.S. District Court (Southern District of New York), 2023

Lawyers (for the plaintiff) submitted legal briefs which cited legal precedents that were found to be **non-existent** (fabricated) after being suggested by ChatGPT. The Court dismissed the case and imposed a fine (USD 5,000) on the lawyers.

4. Case re: Mike Lindell's lawyers, US Federal Court

Lawyers were fined (USD 3,000 each) for using AI which produced fake citations in a defamation lawsuit.

5. Mid Central Operating Engineers Health & Welfare Fund v. HoosierVac LLC (S.D. Ind.) 2025

A lawyer submitted briefs which had references to fabricated cases (hallucinations) generated by generative AI; fined USD 6,000.

REGULATORY FRAMEWORKS IN INDIA AND ABROAD

In each country every big or small actions of the citizens are governed by the law. Various legislations are drafted and formulised to run a country and similar is in the case of “Artificial Intelligence” (AI). Earlier there were not any legislations specifically dealing with AI because of lack of awareness about such machine- learning tool(s) which could change the lives of people in no time however, even in today's time more than half of countries still do not have specific statutory frameworks to deal with AI but are on the drafting stage. If we first look into the Indian legal framework, various legislations like *Information Technology Act 2000 (IT Act)*, *Copyright Act 1957*, *Digital Personal Data Protection Act (DPDP) 2023*, they do not contain provisions specifically talking about how AI should be dealt with, per se but the main idea behind the aforementioned legislations are to cover subjects like cybersecurity, intermediaries liability, offences like deepfakes, identity theft, content moderation via intermediaries. The DPDP Act 2023, lays down certain important definitions which could be applied to cases pertaining to AI like *Section 2(b)* provides the definition of “automated” which means any digital process capable of operating automatically in response to instructions given or otherwise for the purpose of processing data; *Section 2(s)(vii)* defines “Artificial juristic person” which recognizes non-human entities like AI systems / models in some legal definitions. Similarly, Section 51 of

the Copyright Act 1957 deals with Penalties for infringing copyright which includes unauthorized use of works, deepfakes often involve using copyrighted images/audio. If without license, Section 51 infringement claims. As far as other countries are concerned, European Union (EU) is the only one which has a legislation which specifically deals with governing AI in this highly dynamic digital and technologically influenced environment i.e. *Artificial Intelligence Act (EU AI Act) 2024*, this act for the purpose of dealing with AI and considering how AI has now started to transit from a boon to a bane, categorizes the artificial intelligence systems into four main categories, those are

1. Prohibited Systems

2. High- Risk

3. Limited Risk

4. Minimal Risk

Recital 61 of the provision states that the use of AI for administration of justice and democratic processes shall be classified as “high-risk” in particular when AI is used by Judicial Officers/ authorities or on their behalf to assist in researching or interpreting the facts of the case and law and then finally applying law to those facts. Certain AI practices are categorically prohibited by the Act (i.e., “unacceptable risk”). These consist of “Predictive criminal risk assessments” that are based only on a person's or group's criminal history, personality traits, or profiling, remote biometric identification in real time in public areas (with few exclusions for law enforcement), biometric classification based on sensitive individual traits (e.g., sexual orientation, religion, race, etc.) Authorities use social scoring, which results in various treatment depending on behaviour, etc. Lastly in cases where AI-assisted tool are used for legal research (in case of nonbinding advice) vs. one that corrects reasoning in decisions, the former might have lower risk and therefore are categorised under the “limited” or “minimal” risk category. In other countries like United States of America there is currently no overarching federal AI law, but regulation is expanding through agencies, states, and specialist legislation, in Asian countries like China, Singapore etc. are developing AI ethical and regulatory frameworks, with some prioritizing ethics and standards, data protection, and justice, while others have already restricted some uses like facial recognition, social score, etc.

AI AND UNAUTHORIZED PRACTICE OF LAW (UPL)

The development of artificial intelligence (AI) tools that can perform traditionally human legal tasks, such as drafting contracts, analysing case law, or even generating legal advice, has raised serious concerns about the Unauthorized Practice of Law (UPL). In jurisdictions where the practice of law is regulated, only licensed professionals are allowed to provide legal advice in order to protect clients from harm caused by incompetence, negligence, or bias. As AI becomes more advanced and accessible, it will become more difficult to discern between legal information that is permitted and advice that is not, leading courts, regulators, and scholars to question when the technology will cross the line into "practicing law."

Although the definition is jurisdiction-dependent, common to the practice of law is:

1. Providing legal advice that is specific to a given client's case.
2. Preparing legal instruments having binding effect.
3. Appearing on behalf of clients in legal negotiations or in court.

AI technology such as ChatGPT or Ross Intelligence (defunct) can increasingly perform some or all of these tasks without being licensed, insured, or bound by legal ethics rules. This introduces an ambiguity space where unlicensed organizations can essentially "practice law" using technology, usually without users knowing the risks. An AI enters the realm of UPL when it gives personalized legal advice to an individual instead of general legal information. The output affects legal rights or obligations (for example, terms of a contract, resolving a dispute). It is used by non-lawyers to represent someone else or aid in some aspect of law (for example, paralegals or clients using AI-powered legal chatbots in court). This has already been attempted in courts. For instance, some U.S. state bar associations have cautioned or have brought suit against AI-powered legal tech firms for UPL offenses. In India, though the *Advocates Act, 1961* excludes the practice of law to enrolled advocates, it makes no mention of non-human actors like AI, thus introducing regulatory uncertainty.

There has been an ongoing debate as to whether or not should AI tools be licensed as far as their role in the legal industry is concerned, many experts propose a tiered regulatory architecture such as:

1. Certification regimes for legal tech technologies (such as medical devices).
2. "Lawyer-in-the-loop" requirements, with AI allowed to support but not substitute licensed professionals.
3. Disclaimers and transparency requirements for consumer-facing AI (e.g., "This is not legal advice") etc.

The EU AI Act, for instance, does this by categorizing legal AI tools as "high-risk" and applying strict standards of documentation, human oversight, and accountability. This approach could similarly be applied in common law jurisdictions.

JUDGMENT BY ALGORITHM: A TRI-CONTINENTAL ANALYSIS OF AI REGULATION IN LEGAL PRACTICE

A comparative examination of how various jurisdictions engage with AI and Unauthorized Practice of Law (UPL) reveals both convergence and divergence in legal thought. In the United States, UPL is considered serious business, and each state bar association strictly enforces rules prohibiting anyone but a licensed attorney from providing legal advice. This has created regulatory conflicts with AI-powered legal technology firms like DoNotPay, which was sued and investigated for purportedly providing legal services without a license. American courts have been clear that even AI-based legal support cannot cross the threshold into tailored legal counsel unless there is a licensed attorney involved.

Conversely, the Indian legal system namely the Advocates Act, 1961 limits the practice of law to persons enrolled in a Bar Council. The Act, however, does not include non-human entities such as AI tools, thereby leaving a gap in regulation. Although AI platforms are being increasingly utilized by law firms for research in law, contract analysis, and document automation, there is no legislative clarity on whether these amount to UPL. This vagueness threatens both legal professionals and clients, particularly when AI applications start making decisions independently without monitoring.

In a more active and systemic fashion, the EU had enacted the EU *Artificial Intelligence Act* (2024/1689). To the administration of justice, AI systems are "high-risk," and therefore are subject to the highest demands of transparency, human oversight, and documentation. Whilst the EU separates its approach from that of UPL, it does so implicitly address the

issue by effectively barring AI from taking legally binding decisions on its own whilst limiting human accountability at its centre. This therefore lends itself well to a risk-based approach to regulation based on function and effect rather than licensing per se.

Hence, whereas the U.S. has a prohibition-first policy, India is in a regulatory grey area, and the EU has a compliance-based system. All three models capture divergent legal traditions and policy priorities, but all are premised on a common tension: as AI becomes increasingly able within the legal sphere, long-standing definitions of legal practice must adapt to avoid innovation for the sake of justice, competence, or public confidence.

AI, LEGAL LIABILITY & INSURANCE

Under the Indian Insurance Act, 1938, Insurance is a legal relationship between the insured and the insurer wherein the insured pays certain amount of money as premium to safeguard itself against certain risks and uncertainties of life. The main grounds on which the concept of insurance is devised is to indemnify for any loss or damage suffered by a person, in simple words. The main goal of this concept is to restore the position of a person to its original as if the loss or damage never occurred. Under this act there are various kinds of insurance which are covered like, Life Insurance provides compensation to the person mentioned as the “Nominee” in the insurance policy post the death of the policyholder or in legal words the “insured”, as well as it provides certain different kinds of policies which caters the needs of parents who wish to secure funds for their children’s future, while also providing policies for aged people to secure their old-age. Second is the Fire Insurance which covers any loss or damage occurred due to a non-intentional fire like accidental fires damaging goods of a person etc. and lastly Marine Insurance which covers any loss or damage due to any peril of sea or marine adventure. Now, while all these insurances play a major role of restoration in cases of any harm suffered by a person, the fundamental question is, what happens when lawyers utilize artificial intelligence to design contracts, provide legal advice, or simply evaluate important legal papers, resulting in harm to their clients. This questions further leads to the concept of Professional Indemnity Insurance (PII).

The use of AI in legal practice poses some deep questions regarding legal liability and professional indemnity insurance, especially when AI-based advice results in errors, losses, or breaches of duty. Historically, lawyers remain personally liable for the advice they give on the law, and professional indemnity insurance (PII) exists to cover them against claims

of negligence or misconduct but when AI technologies are at play particularly in legal research, contract examination, or client counsel, the distinct line of responsibility here gets diffused. When a lawyer relies on AI-generated material and it is subsequently found to be faulty, the question remains: Who is at fault- the lawyer for using the material, the AI programmer for coding the technology, or the customer who employed the tool without realizing its limitations?

In most modern legal systems, lawyers are still liable even when AI is employed as a tool. Courts and regulatory agencies expect legal professionals to make independent judgments, audit AI output, and confirm that advice delivered is professional. Not doing so can still amount to negligence. Consequently, PII policies can have to broaden their coverage to cover risks of AI use such as faults resulting from excessive dependence on AI or inadequate supervision of its output. Concurrently, technology creators are also likely to be held liable under product liability law or contract law if their AI programs are found to be defective, deceptive, or inappropriate for legal purposes. But unless there is a contractual arrangement between the attorney and the AI provider that shifts risk, seeking claims against developers may be complicated. On the other hand, clients who utilize AI tools independently, without professional legal representation, are not necessarily backed by any type of insurance or protection under the law. If they proceed on defective AI-provided legal advice (e.g., from a chatbot or an unlicensed app), then they might have limited recourse unless consumer protection regulations or platform liability guidelines come into play. This division of responsibility underlines the importance of clear contractual language, disclaimers, and perhaps even of industry-wide insurance formats that reflect the common risk faced by AI developers, legal experts, and clients.

In the future, we might witness the development of AI-specific regimes of liability, like "strict liability" for specific autonomous legal instruments, or compulsory insurance programs for AI-driven legal platforms. Insurance regulators and legal ethics bodies can also make lawyers disclose when AI instruments are utilized, or ensure due diligence in examining AI-generated outputs. In the absence of such structures, the advent of AI in the legal profession may create a liability void, where liability is shifted between parties, with the injured clients having no adequate recourse. Thus, it is not only wise to transform the legal rules and the mechanism of insurance to suit AI but also necessary to maintain trust and accountability within the legal profession.

One of the classic case highlighting the above subject matter is the California's DoNotPay case of 2024. DoNotPay is an American company which was the first to introduce a "Robot Lawyer." This company provides legal services and chatbot by charging just USD 36 as a subscription fee for a three month subscription plan. Now, no matter how appealing does the low subscription fee actually looks but as they say "you get what you pay for" and this is exactly what happened in this case. DoNotPay first started as an application to dispute parking tickets in 2015. It provides services which create documents on legal issues ranging from consumer protection to immigration rights; that these are created through automation and artificial intelligence. The company claims that its application is driven by the IBM Watson AI. It currently operates in the United Kingdom and United States. However, the success of this company was very short lived, in 2024 DoNotPay was threatened with a contemplated class-action lawsuit in California, claiming that it was engaging in the practice of law without a license (UPL) and offering "inferior quality" legal documents. The matter was settled. The complaint did raise legitimate questions regarding whether AI computer program algorithms that produce legal documents are responsible for the quality of the document, and whether or not customers can recover damages.

FUTURE IMPLICATION OF AI: A CRITICAL ANALYSIS

The future of AI in the legal ecosystem is set to be disruptive, with emerging technologies like natural language processing (NLP), machine learning, and blockchain integration radically altering how legal services are given and judicial systems function. Advanced natural language processing (NLP) models are increasingly capable of accurately interpreting and creating legal text, allowing AI to handle difficult tasks such as legal drafting, contract analysis, due diligence, and even judicial outcome prediction. While current models still require human oversight to avoid ethical and factual errors, their evolution points to a future in which AI may handle regular legal activities automatically, greatly increasing efficiency and lowering costs.

Simultaneously, blockchain integration enables safe, transparent, and tamper-proof legal papers, paving the way for smart contracts that self-execute based on specified criteria, as well as immutable court filings or digital identities within legal institutions. These developments threaten traditional legal practice by reducing the need on centralized institutions and human verification. However, they raise severe concerns about the

opaqueness of AI decision-making (the black-box problem), data privacy, algorithmic bias, and the potential erosion of human judgment in the legal system. As AI systems gain control over legal outcomes, notably sentence, bail, and legal counsel, the legal profession must address questions of responsibility, explainability and fairness.

AI's future roles may include real-time legal assistants, automated conflict resolution platforms, predictive justice systems, and even AI judges in low-stakes cases. However, these enhancements must be properly reviewed within the ethical, constitutional, and legal frameworks. Efficiency may jeopardize justice, openness, and trust in the absence of deliberate human-centred governance. Thus, the future of AI in law is more than just a scientific problem; it is a legal and moral imperative to ensure that innovation reinforces, rather than undermines, the legal system's essential objectives.

SUGGESTIONS

The legal industry has always been a skilled based industry, ever since law as a profession came into existence, lawyers have been spending days and nights together to manually prepare for matters ranging from drafting legal documents to reviewing them and finally appearing and representing their clients before the courts. In my opinion, the legal sector should be kept away from the interference of artificial intelligence. No matter how convenient or a time saver can this tool be but no technological advancement can replace human lawyers. There has to go some concrete reasons as to why the entire journey to become a lawyer can be so mentally, physically and emotionally overburdening at times, considering the educational perspective. Even if today AI is able to provide case laws which are true and actually exists, relevant provisions to the subject matter in hand, results of reviewing a legal paper or even an opinion to a judge as to what course of action shall be taken on a given matter, in the legal ecosystem, it can never provide the emotional aspect which is yet another fundamental principle in deciding a legal matter because at the end of the day AI tools are also just another programmed application. For instance, if a lawyer feeds certain command like “what are the essentials of a crime?” now the chatbot may lay down multiple essentials of a crime but in reality as per the Indian legal framework there are only 4 main essentials for an act to be considered as a crime, which if presented before the court without verifying with the actual law in existence can raise questions on the integrity of the lawyer as well as the quality of services thus provided by him/her. Similarly,

if a judge recourses to AI or considering how aggressively AI is now being used in this sector, if delivering judgement is left to AI, then justice will be compromised to an extent which will surpass the human race comprehension.

Therefore, Instead of emphasising on "Should Artificial Intelligence be applied in the legal ecosystem?" emphasis should be made on "How can Artificial Intelligence can ethically, efficiently, and responsibly be applied in legal systems without compromising human judgment, justice, or professional standards?"

A hybrid model where AI supplements but does not substitute human legal professionals, represents the most pragmatic way forward.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the incorporation of AI into the legal area signifies a substantial shift in how legal services are planned, delivered, and governed. Unquestionably, AI enhances efficiency, lowers costs, and increases access to justice, but it also raises concerns about ethics, responsibility, data privacy, and human judgment. Clear legislative frameworks and professional rules that strike a balance between innovation and accountability are critical, as legal institutions increasingly rely on AI for activities such as document screening, predictive analysis, and judicial decision assistance. Finally, the growth of AI in the legal area must be affected by both technological advancement and a strong commitment to upholding the fundamental values of justice, equity, and the rule of law.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

<https://www.clio.com/resources/ai-for-lawyers/ai-tools-for-lawyers/>

<https://indiaai.gov.in/news/for-the-first-time-hc-in-punjab-and-haryana-uses-chatgpt-to-decidebail-for-an-assault>

https://www.indiacode.nic.in/bitstream/123456789/13116/1/it_act_2000_updated.pdf

<https://copyright.gov.in/documents/copyrightrules1957.pdf>

<https://www.meity.gov.in/static/uploads/2024/06/2bf1f0e9f04e6fb4f8fef35e82c42aa5.pdf>

<https://www.indiacode.nic.in/bitstream/123456789/2304/1/a1938-04.pdf>