

---

# EFFECT OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE ON LEGAL PROCEDURES

---

Ayush Arjun Mishra, Greenwood High International School, Bangalore, Karnataka, India

## ABSTRACT

Artificial Intelligence (AI) has emerged as one of the most transformative technologies of the twenty-first century, reshaping industries ranging from healthcare and finance to education and governance. The legal sector, traditionally characterised by precedent, textual analysis, and human judgment, is increasingly becoming a significant site for AI integration. Modern AI systems are already capable of conducting legal research, reviewing contracts, predicting litigation outcomes, assisting with document discovery, and providing preliminary legal advice. Courts, governments, law firms, and corporate legal departments around the world have begun experimenting with AI-driven systems to improve efficiency, reduce costs, and increase access to justice. However, the growing reliance on AI raises profound questions regarding fairness, accountability, transparency, due process, and the future role of legal professionals. This paper examines the current state of AI in legal procedures, explores possible developments over the next decade, analyzes legal processes that may be transformed or replaced by AI, evaluates the advantages and disadvantages of these developments, and discusses how individuals may seek justice in a future legal ecosystem increasingly shaped by artificial intelligence. The paper argues that AI will fundamentally transform legal procedures but is unlikely to completely replace human judgment in matters involving discretion, morality, and constitutional values.

**Keywords:** Artificial Intelligence; Legal Procedures; Judicial Systems; Legal Automation; Access to Justice; Algorithmic Governance; Legal Ethics; Due Process; Rule of Law; Predictive Justice; Generative AI; Legal Research; E-Discovery; Online Dispute Resolution; Human-AI Collaboration; Future of Law.

## **Introduction**

Law has historically evolved alongside technological development. The printing press transformed the dissemination of legal knowledge, computers revolutionised legal research, and the internet democratised access to legal information. Artificial Intelligence represents the next major technological shift capable of altering not merely how legal information is accessed but how legal decisions are made, disputes are resolved, and justice is delivered.

The legal profession is particularly susceptible to AI-driven transformation because a substantial portion of legal work involves information processing, pattern recognition, document analysis, and predictive reasoning. Traditionally, legal professionals spend considerable time reviewing contracts, researching precedents, preparing documents, analysing evidence, and drafting legal opinions. Many of these activities are increasingly being performed with assistance from machine learning systems and large language models. Major law firms across the world have integrated AI into daily workflows, and governments are actively exploring AI applications within judicial administration. Research indicates that AI is already being used for contract review, due diligence, legal research, predictive analytics, litigation support, risk identification, document summarisation, and knowledge management. ([The Economic Times][1])

The rapid integration of AI into legal systems presents a paradox. On one hand, AI promises greater efficiency, lower legal costs, improved access to justice, and enhanced consistency in decision-making. On the other hand, concerns regarding algorithmic bias, lack of transparency, data privacy, accountability, and procedural fairness challenge foundational principles of the rule of law. As AI becomes increasingly capable of performing tasks that were traditionally reserved for lawyers and judges, society must confront fundamental questions regarding the nature of legal reasoning and the future of justice itself.

This paper investigates these issues by examining both the opportunities and challenges posed by AI in legal procedures.

## **The Current Situation of Artificial Intelligence in Law**

The adoption of AI within the legal sector has accelerated dramatically over the past decade. What began as simple legal databases and search engines has evolved into sophisticated

systems capable of generating legal documents, conducting research, analysing contracts, and predicting case outcomes.

One of the most widespread uses of AI in contemporary legal practice is legal research. Legal research has traditionally required lawyers to spend hours or even days reviewing statutes, judicial decisions, regulations, and academic commentary. Modern AI systems can now search vast databases, identify relevant precedents, summarise judgments, and suggest legal arguments within minutes. Studies indicate that AI-assisted legal research can significantly reduce the time required to locate relevant legal authorities while allowing lawyers to focus on strategic analysis rather than information retrieval. ([Legal Tech Asia][2])

Another major application is contract analysis and document review. Corporate transactions often involve thousands of pages of contracts that must be reviewed for risks, inconsistencies, and compliance issues. AI systems can automatically identify problematic clauses, detect deviations from standard contractual language, and flag potential legal risks. Law firms increasingly use AI-driven contract review systems to improve efficiency and reduce human error. Electronic discovery, commonly known as e-discovery, represents another area where AI has become indispensable. Litigation frequently requires parties to review enormous quantities of digital evidence, including emails, messages, financial records, and internal documents. AI-powered systems can rapidly categorise and prioritise relevant documents, reducing the burden on legal teams. Recent surveys indicate growing adoption of AI among e-discovery professionals due to substantial time savings and efficiency gains. ([LawSites][3]) ([The Economic Times][1])

Predictive analytics has also emerged as a significant AI application. By analyzing historical judicial decisions, litigation outcomes, and legal trends, AI systems can estimate the probability of success in particular cases. Such predictions assist lawyers and clients in evaluating litigation risks, determining settlement strategies, and making informed decisions regarding dispute resolution. Governments and courts are similarly experimenting with AI technologies. According to the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), governments are using AI to streamline court procedures, manage caseloads, improve access to legal information, and enhance administrative efficiency within justice systems. ([OECD AI][4]) ([The Economic Times][1])

The integration of AI is also visible within legal education, regulatory compliance, and

corporate governance. Law firms increasingly rely on AI assistants that provide immediate access to case law, statutes, and firm-specific knowledge repositories. For example, leading legal organisations have begun deploying AI-powered legal assistants capable of providing on-demand legal information and regulatory updates. ([The Times of India][5])

Despite these advances, current AI systems remain largely assistive rather than autonomous. Human lawyers continue to exercise ultimate control over legal strategy, client counselling, advocacy, and judicial decision-making. This balance may change significantly during the coming decade.

### **Possible Developments of AI Affecting Legal Procedures in the Next Decade**

The next decade is likely to witness a transition from AI-assisted legal practice to AI-integrated legal ecosystems. Developments in large language models, agentic AI systems, reasoning architectures, and legal knowledge retrieval systems are expected to significantly expand AI capabilities.

One anticipated development is the emergence of autonomous legal agents capable of performing complex multi-step legal tasks. Recent advancements in agentic AI suggest that future systems will be able to independently conduct research, draft documents, analyze evidence, identify legal issues, and generate litigation strategies with minimal human supervision. Legal technology experts increasingly view agentic AI as the next major frontier in legal innovation. Future AI systems are also likely to become deeply integrated into judicial administration. Courts facing increasing caseloads may employ AI systems to classify disputes, schedule hearings, identify procedural defects, summarise evidence, and assist judges in drafting preliminary opinions. Governments have already begun piloting AI assistants within court systems to address procedural backlogs and improve efficiency. ([LawSites][6]) ([The Guardian][7])

Another significant development may involve AI-powered online dispute resolution platforms. Such systems could resolve routine disputes involving consumer transactions, employment conflicts, insurance claims, and contractual disagreements without requiring traditional courtroom proceedings. By combining automated negotiation, predictive analytics, and legal reasoning systems, these platforms may provide rapid and inexpensive dispute resolution.

Advances in natural language processing may further enable conversational legal systems capable of interacting directly with citizens. Rather than consulting a lawyer, individuals may engage with AI legal advisors that explain legal rights, prepare documents, assess claims, and guide users through procedural requirements. Research into AI-powered legal consultation systems suggests that future architectures may dramatically reduce the cost and time associated with preliminary legal assistance. ([arXiv][8])

Judicial decision support systems are also likely to become increasingly sophisticated. Future AI systems may analyze statutory provisions, precedents, evidentiary records, and procedural rules to generate recommendations for judges. However, scholars emphasize that significant challenges remain regarding legal interpretation, discretion, burden of proof assessments, and normative reasoning. The increasing digitization of legal systems may also facilitate real-time compliance monitoring. AI could continuously evaluate organizational conduct against evolving regulatory requirements, reducing legal violations before they occur. Regulatory enforcement may shift from reactive punishment to proactive prevention.([arXiv][9])

These developments suggest that AI will not merely improve existing legal procedures but may fundamentally redesign the structure of legal service delivery.

### **Legal Procedures That Could Be Replaced or Face Fundamental Transformations**

Several legal procedures currently performed by human professionals are particularly vulnerable to automation. Legal research is among the most likely candidates for near-complete automation. While human expertise will remain necessary for interpretation and strategy, the mechanical process of locating authorities, identifying precedents, and summarizing legal materials is increasingly being performed by AI systems. Future lawyers may spend less time researching and more time evaluating AI-generated insights. ([Legal Tech Asia][2])

Document drafting represents another area susceptible to transformation. Standard contracts, wills, corporate filings, pleadings, and compliance documents often follow predictable structures that AI can replicate with remarkable accuracy. Future legal practice may involve lawyers reviewing and customizing AI-generated drafts rather than preparing documents from scratch.

Discovery and evidence review are also likely to become highly automated. AI systems already

outperform human reviewers in identifying relevant documents within massive datasets. As machine learning models improve, the role of junior lawyers in document review may diminish substantially. ([LawSites][3])

Client intake and preliminary consultation may increasingly be handled by AI. Prospective clients could interact with AI systems that gather facts, identify legal issues, estimate claim viability, and recommend next steps. Human lawyers may become involved only after initial screening has been completed. Routine dispute resolution procedures may also be partially automated. Small claims disputes, consumer complaints, and low-value contractual disagreements may increasingly be resolved through AI-powered negotiation and mediation platforms.

Administrative court functions are similarly vulnerable to automation. Scheduling hearings, managing case files, monitoring deadlines, generating procedural notices, and organizing evidence can largely be performed by AI systems. However, certain legal activities are less likely to be replaced. Judicial interpretation of constitutional rights, complex statutory construction, assessment of witness credibility, moral reasoning, and the balancing of competing public interests involve forms of judgment that remain difficult for AI systems to replicate reliably. Current research suggests that while AI can assist with legal reasoning, substantial challenges persist regarding discretion, ambiguity, and normative evaluation. ([arXiv][9])

Consequently, AI is likely to transform the division of labor within legal institutions rather than eliminate human participation altogether.

### **Advantages of AI-Driven Legal Procedures**

The integration of AI into legal procedures offers numerous advantages.

Efficiency is perhaps the most significant benefit. Legal services are often slow and expensive due to the labor-intensive nature of legal work. AI can process vast quantities of information within seconds, dramatically reducing the time required for research, document review, and case analysis. Studies indicate substantial time savings for legal professionals using AI-assisted systems. ([LawSites][3])

Cost reduction is closely related to efficiency gains. By automating repetitive tasks, AI can

reduce legal expenses for both law firms and clients. Lower costs may increase access to legal services for individuals who cannot currently afford legal representation. Access to justice represents another important advantage. Millions of individuals worldwide face legal problems without obtaining professional assistance due to financial constraints. AI-powered legal advisors could provide affordable guidance, helping citizens understand their rights and navigate legal procedures. The OECD identifies improved accessibility and people-centered justice as key benefits of AI adoption within justice systems. ([OECD AI][4])

Consistency is another potential benefit. Human decision-makers may be influenced by fatigue, cognitive biases, emotional factors, or inconsistent reasoning. Properly designed AI systems could promote greater consistency in routine legal decisions by applying standardized analytical frameworks. AI may also improve legal accuracy in specific contexts. Advanced systems can review large bodies of legal information without overlooking relevant authorities or evidence. In areas involving extensive documentation, AI may reduce the likelihood of human oversight. Furthermore, AI may enable proactive legal compliance. Organizations could continuously monitor regulatory requirements and automatically identify potential violations before they result in litigation or enforcement actions.

Finally, AI has the potential to democratize legal knowledge. Legal information that was once accessible primarily to trained professionals may become available to ordinary citizens through user-friendly AI interfaces.

### **Disadvantages and Risks of AI-Driven Legal Procedures**

Despite its potential benefits, AI introduces significant risks that challenge foundational principles of legal systems.

Algorithmic bias is among the most serious concerns. AI systems learn from historical data, which may reflect existing social inequalities and discriminatory practices. If biased data is used to train legal AI systems, the resulting decisions may perpetuate or even amplify injustices. The OECD warns that improperly designed AI systems can reinforce societal disparities and justice gaps. ([OECD AI][4])

Lack of transparency presents another major challenge. Many advanced AI models operate as "black boxes," making it difficult to explain how particular outputs were generated. Legal

systems traditionally require reasoned decision-making and accountability. Decisions affecting fundamental rights cannot easily be justified if their underlying logic remains opaque. Hallucinations and factual inaccuracies pose substantial risks. Numerous cases have emerged in which AI systems generated nonexistent legal authorities or fabricated legal analyses. Courts and regulators have expressed increasing concern regarding reliance on inaccurate AI-generated information. ([The Guardian][7]) ([OECD][10])

Data privacy and confidentiality issues also arise. Legal practice depends heavily upon confidential communications. The use of AI systems raises concerns regarding attorney-client privilege, discoverability, data retention, and unauthorized disclosure of sensitive information. Recent legal developments highlight growing uncertainty regarding the treatment of AI-generated records and communications. Automation bias presents an additional danger. Human decision-makers may become excessively reliant on AI recommendations, accepting machine-generated outputs without adequate scrutiny. Such overreliance could undermine independent legal judgment and reduce accountability. ([OECD AI][12]) ([Reuters][11])

Employment displacement is another concern. Junior lawyers, paralegals, legal researchers, and administrative staff perform many tasks that are susceptible to automation. While new roles may emerge, the transition could significantly alter traditional legal career pathways. There are also broader constitutional concerns. Legal decisions often involve competing values, ethical considerations, and social judgments that cannot easily be reduced to data-driven optimization. Excessive reliance on AI may undermine democratic accountability and public trust in legal institutions. Determining responsibility for AI-generated errors remains problematic. If an AI system produces a harmful legal recommendation or contributes to an unjust outcome, questions arise regarding whether responsibility should rest with developers, users, institutions, or governments.

### **The Future of Law in an AI-Driven Society**

The future of law will likely be characterised by human-AI collaboration rather than complete automation. While technological advances will continue to expand AI capabilities, law remains fundamentally connected to social values, democratic legitimacy, and human judgment. The effects across different sectors are depicted below:

- Legal education will undergo substantial transformation. Future lawyers will require

technological literacy alongside traditional legal knowledge. Understanding AI systems, algorithmic governance, data protection, and digital ethics will become essential professional competencies.

- Law firms may evolve into technology-enabled organizations where AI performs routine analytical tasks while lawyers focus on strategic counseling, advocacy, negotiation, and ethical judgment. The lawyer of the future may resemble a legal architect who supervises AI-generated work rather than a professional who manually performs every task.
- Judicial institutions are also likely to change. Courts may become increasingly digital, utilizing AI to manage procedural matters and assist with legal analysis. However, final decisions involving fundamental rights, constitutional interpretation, and complex factual disputes will likely remain under human judicial authority.
- Regulation of AI itself will become a major area of legal development. Governments worldwide are already debating how to regulate algorithmic systems, protect privacy, ensure transparency, and allocate liability for AI-related harms. As AI becomes more pervasive, legal frameworks governing AI will expand significantly.
- The legal profession may experience structural reorganisation. Traditional billing models based on hours worked may become less viable as AI dramatically reduces the time required to complete legal tasks. Some scholars and practitioners suggest that AI could fundamentally alter the economics of legal practice. ([Financial Times][13])

Importantly, law will continue to serve functions that extend beyond efficiency. Legal institutions embody societal commitments to fairness, accountability, dignity, and democratic governance. AI may enhance legal processes, but it cannot independently determine the values that legal systems should pursue.

### **Seeking Justice in a Future Sculpted by AI**

The most profound question concerns how ordinary individuals will seek justice in a future shaped by artificial intelligence.

In many respects, access to justice may improve dramatically. Citizens may be able to consult

AI legal advisors twenty-four hours a day at minimal cost. These systems could explain legal rights, prepare legal documents, estimate case outcomes, and guide users through procedural requirements. Legal assistance that is currently inaccessible to millions may become widely available. Future dispute resolution may occur largely through digital platforms. Individuals involved in consumer disputes, employment conflicts, insurance claims, or contractual disagreements may resolve matters online through AI-assisted negotiation and mediation systems. Court appearances may become less common for routine disputes.

AI could also reduce information asymmetries. Historically, individuals with greater financial resources enjoyed superior access to legal expertise. AI-driven legal services may narrow this gap by making sophisticated legal analysis available to broader segments of society. However, new inequalities may emerge. Access to advanced AI systems may depend on technological literacy, digital infrastructure, and economic resources. Individuals lacking digital skills may face disadvantages within increasingly automated legal environments.

There are also concerns regarding procedural legitimacy. Justice is not merely a matter of obtaining accurate outcomes. Legal processes provide opportunities for participation, explanation, and recognition. Many individuals seek not only favorable decisions but also acknowledgment of their experiences and grievances. Fully automated systems may struggle to satisfy these human dimensions of justice.

Future legal systems will therefore need to preserve meaningful opportunities for human engagement. Individuals should retain the right to challenge automated decisions, request human review, and receive understandable explanations regarding legal outcomes.

A balanced model may emerge in which AI handles routine matters while human judges, lawyers, and mediators remain responsible for complex disputes involving significant rights, moral questions, or societal interests. Such a system could combine the efficiency of AI with the legitimacy and accountability of human decision-making.

## **Conclusion**

Artificial Intelligence represents one of the most consequential technological developments in the history of legal systems. AI is already transforming legal research, contract analysis, document review, litigation support, compliance monitoring, and judicial administration. Over

the next decade, advances in generative AI, agentic systems, and legal reasoning technologies are likely to further reshape legal procedures, creating new opportunities for efficiency, accessibility, and innovation.

Many routine legal tasks including research, drafting, discovery, administrative processing, and preliminary consultation are likely to become increasingly automated. These developments promise substantial benefits, including reduced costs, improved access to justice, greater consistency, and enhanced efficiency. However, they also introduce significant risks involving bias, opacity, privacy, accountability, and employment displacement.

The future of law will not be defined by the replacement of human lawyers and judges but by evolving forms of collaboration between humans and intelligent machines. While AI can process information, identify patterns, and generate recommendations, it remains limited in its ability to exercise moral judgment, interpret social values, and uphold democratic legitimacy. Consequently, human oversight will remain essential, particularly in matters involving constitutional rights, ethical dilemmas, and complex legal reasoning.

Ultimately, the challenge facing legal systems is not whether AI should be used, but how it should be governed. The pursuit of justice requires more than efficiency; it requires fairness, transparency, accountability, and respect for human dignity. As societies increasingly integrate AI into legal procedures, the central objective must be to ensure that technological innovation strengthens rather than undermines these foundational principles. If properly regulated and thoughtfully implemented, AI has the potential not only to transform legal procedures but also to expand access to justice and improve the administration of law for future generations.

## **Bibliography**

Deloitte Legal. \*The Future of Legal Work? The Use of Generative AI by Legal Departments\*. ([Deloitte][14])

OECD. \*AI in Government: Justice\*. ([OECD AI][4])

OECD. \*AI in Justice Administration and Access to Justice: Governing with Artificial Intelligence\*. ([OECD][10])

Thomson Reuters. \*The 3 Emerging Waves of Generative AI in the Legal Industry\*. ([TR - Legal Insight Australia][15])

LawSites. \*The 10 Legal Tech Trends that Defined 2025\*. ([LawSites][6])

Economic Times. \*GenAI, Legally: Law Firms Take Up New Tech's Case\*. ([The Economic Times][1])

LawSites. \*Report Shows 37% of E-Discovery Professionals Now Using AI\*. ([LawSites][3])

Reuters. \*When Your AI Tool Becomes a Witness: AI Tools, Privilege Waiver, and the Hidden Risks of Generative AI Technology\*. ([Reuters][11])

The Guardian. \*Plan for AI Legal Assistants in England and Wales Cannot Replace Funding and Staff\*. ([The Guardian][7])

Thompson, Henry A. \*AI and the Law\*. arXiv, 2024. ([arXiv][16])

Linna, Eljas & Linna, Tuula. \*Judicial Requirements for Generative AI in Legal Reasoning\*. arXiv, 2025. ([arXiv][9])

Kalaycioglu, Sean et al. \*AI-Powered Legal Intelligence System Architecture: A Comprehensive Framework for Automated Legal Consultation and Analysis\*. arXiv, 2025. ([arXiv][8])

Wired. \*A German Court Has Ruled That Google Is Liable for False Statements Generated by AI Overviews\*. ([wired.com][17])

[1]: <https://economictimes.indiatimes.com/tech/artificial-intelligence/genai-legally-law-firms-take-up-new-techs-case/articleshow/118125576.cms?>

[2]: <https://legaltech.asia/legal-research-stack-the-rise-generative-ai/>

[3]: <https://www.lawnext.com/2025/07/report-shows-37-of-e-discovery-professionals-now-using-ai-with-cloud-adopters-leading-the-charge.html?>

[4]: <https://oecd.ai/en/gov-issues-justice?>

[5]: <https://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/technology/tech-news/dell-technologies-announces-lakshmikumaran-sridharan-attorneys-to-use-its-ai-legal-assistant-built-using-dell-ai-factory/articleshow/131581655.cms?>

[6]: <https://www.lawnext.com/2026/01/the-10-legal-tech-trends-that-defined-2025.html?>

[7]: <https://www.theguardian.com/technology/2026/jun/09/ai-legal-assistants-england-wales-cannot-replace-funding-staff?>

[8]: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2508.17499?>

[9]: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2508.18880?>

[10]: [https://www.oecd.org/en/publications/governing-with-artificial-intelligence\\_795de142-en/full-report/ai-in-justice-administration-and-access-to-justice\\_f0cbe651.html?](https://www.oecd.org/en/publications/governing-with-artificial-intelligence_795de142-en/full-report/ai-in-justice-administration-and-access-to-justice_f0cbe651.html?)

[11]: <https://www.reuters.com/legal/legalindustry/when-your-ai-tool-becomes-witness-ai-tools-privilege-waiver-hidden-risks--pracin-2026-06-08/?>

[12]: <https://oecd.ai/en/gov/issues/overview/?>

[13]: <https://www.ft.com/content/c354fb5a-7548-44f7-851f-18615b75d3ae?>

[14]: <https://www.deloitte.com/in/en/services/legal/research/the-future-of-legal-work.html?>

[15]: <https://insight.thomsonreuters.com/sea/legal/posts/thomson-reuters-predicts-the-3-emerging-waves-of-generative-ai-in-the-legal-industry?>

[16]: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2412.05090?>

[17]: <https://www.wired.com/story/a-court-has-ruled-that-google-is-liable-for-false-statements-generated-by-ai-overviews?>