ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE IN CRIMINAL JUSTICE DECISION-MAKING: IMPLICATIONS FOR BAIL, SENTENCING, AND PAROLE

Asst. Prof. Shivani Khanolkar, BCT College of Law, New Panvel

1. Introduction

The establishment of a criminal justice system is essential for both the preservation of individual rights and liberties as well as the maintenance of social order. Because decisions on parole, bond, and sentencing immediately influence the extent and duration of state intrusion on a person's liberty, they are at the centre of this system. Traditionally, human judgment, judicial discretion, statutory construction, and constitutional ideas including fairness, equality, and proportionality have guided such assessments.

Recently starting to affect criminal justice processes in several countries is the introduction of artificial intelligence and algorithms. AI-based solutions are increasingly employed to assess hazards, predict future behaviour, manage large caseloads, and help judicial or administrative bodies in decision-making. Particularly in systems hampered by delays, crowded jails, and limited institutional resources, these tools offer efficiency, consistency, and data-driven objectivity.

Though India has not formally implemented total automation in criminal justice decision-making, the growing attention on digitalization, e-courts, case management systems, and predictive analytics has brought artificial intelligence into legislative and judicial debates. Committees reviewing judicial change and governance have acknowledged the possibility that technology might improve access to justice. The inclusion of artificial intelligence in choices influencing liberty raises important institutional, ethical, and constitutional questions to be resolved at the same time.

Decisions on bail, sentencing, and parole call for a full evaluation of the individual's particular circumstances, social milieu, moral responsibility, and rehabilitation potential. Lowering such complex assessments to algorithmic estimates may be hazardous because it

might compromise the constitutional safeguards provided under Articles 14 and 21 of the Indian Constitution. Problems with algorithmic transparency, data bias, and a lack of explicit responsibility mechanisms further call into question the legitimacy of AI-driven decision-making in the criminal justice system.

Against this backdrop, this research looks at how Artificial Intelligence is used in criminal justice decision-making, especially in bail, parole, and sentencing. It examines modern academic literature, the constitutional and judicial underpinnings of India, legal opinions on algorithmic governance, comparative global techniques, as well as the problems and limitations connected to AI-based systems. Although it could serve as a supplementary decision-support aid, the paper argues that artificial intelligence cannot be seen as value-neutral or only technological. Constitutional limitations, transparency, and rigorous subordination to human decision, judicial discretion, and the rights-based ideas of the Indian criminal justice system must still control its use[1].

2. Conceptual Framework: Artificial Intelligence and Criminal Justice Decision-Making

2.1 Meaning and Nature of Artificial Intelligence

Artificial intelligence (AI) is a type of computer system that can perform tasks that would require human cognition, such as acquiring knowledge from experience, recognizing patterns, reasoning, and making predictions. Modern artificial intelligence algorithms mostly depend on machine learning methods, whereby big datasets are used to train algorithms to locate relationships, trends, and probabilities. Unlike traditional rule-based programs, machine learning models may make predictive and adaptive judgments since they continuously adjust their outcomes in reaction to data inputs.

Seldom employed in the criminal justice system as an independent decision-maker with final authority is artificial intelligence. Rather, it acts as a decision-support system that yields outcomes like risk ratings, recidivism chances, or suggested decision ranges. These results serve to assist magistrates, parole boards, or administrative authorities in making judgments regarding parole, sentencing, or bail. Advocates contend that such systems improve efficiency, shorten delays, and advance consistency in decision-making by lowering personal subjectivity. But algorithmic reasoning is totally different from legal reasoning. Legal decision-making rests

[1] http//spapers.ssrn.comsol3papers.cfmabstract_id=3284903

on normative ideals like fairness, proportionality, equality before the law, and individualised justice. It calls for context-based evaluation, interpretive reasoning, and moral judgment, guided by judicial precedent and constitutional concepts. Conversely, artificial intelligence systems rely mostly on statistical connections based on past data.

This difference has important ramifications for constitutional adjudication and rights-based decision-making. Probabilistic predictions may eclipse individualized assessments when artificial intelligence-generated opinions influence decisions affecting personal freedom. Therefore, the data-driven and correlation-based nature of artificial intelligence demands extensive legal scrutiny to guarantee that its implementation complies with constitutional protections and the fundamental ideas in criminal justice.

2.2 Scope of AI Use in Criminal Justice

Artificial intelligence is applied throughout the criminal justice system at multiple law enforcement, adjudication, and correctional management levels. Predictive policing—which uses AI-driven technologies to spot crime hotspots—as well as facial recognition systems for suspect identification and digital evidence analysis all depend more and more on them. These programs aim at increasing the efficiency, correctness, and resource allocation of legal systems. The growing application of these technologies, however, raises important legal and ethical issues, especially when they encroach upon fundamental human rights.

Among the most constitutionally sensitive applications of artificial intelligence are the risk assessment tools for bail, the algorithmic sentencing systems, and the parole prediction programs. While parole decisions influence the length of time spent in jail and the probability of re-integration, bail decisions define the quantum and character of penalty as well as whether an accused person is free during trial. Directly involving the rights to personal freedom, human dignity, and equality before the law as enshrined in Articles 14 and 21 of the Indian Constitution, each of these stages also relates directly with these rights. Usually employing predictive analytics to predict future conduct—such as the probability of absconding or reoffending—the AI technologies used at these levels. Though presented as data-driven and objective, these assessments often use past datasets that might mirror present institutional and social prejudices. Therefore, uncontrolled technological intervention at these sites presents a higher risk of constitutionally damaging effects.

Given the major impact these decisions have on individual rights, this study emphasizes on artificial intelligence (AI) approaches affecting the three stages of the criminal process: bail, sentencing, and parole. These phases are vital sites where technological aid can either foster constitutional ideals by increasing equality and consistency or considerably harm them by diminishing openness, due process, and personalized justice.

3. Review of Literature

The present literature on the employment of artificial intelligence in criminal justice decision-making offers a range of, and occasionally contradictory, perspectives. With a focus on parole, sentencing, and bail decisions, researchers have examined artificial intelligence from a number of viewpoints: constitutional, feminist, socio-legal, critical, and efficiency-based ones. First, the material is examined thematically to provide a summary of major scholarly developments; then, under specific subtopics, it is carefully covered for analytical clarity.

Generally, the literature reveals three major themes. According to this perspective, artificial intelligence can enhance the efficacy, consistency, and fairness of decisions made in the criminal justice system. In a critical manner, the second strand looks at assertions of algorithmic neutrality and exposes concerns about prejudice, inequality, and democratic accountability. Viewing the third strand—especially clear in the Indian context—through a constitutional lens, one evaluates artificial intelligence by emphasizing personal freedom, fair process, and judicial discretion. The next part examines these points of view.

3.1 Scholarly Arguments Supporting AI Integration

A substantial body of scholarly research indicates that the use of AI in criminal justice decision-making should be done cautiously and in accordance with legislation. Advocates of algorithmic tools claim that they can increase productivity, reduce systematic delays, and promote uniformity in results, particularly in regions where courts have a high caseload and little resources. Scholars have noted that human decision-makers, regardless of their knowledge, are susceptible to cognitive biases, emotional affects, fatigue, and inconsistency in high-pressure situations such as bail hearings and sentencing courts.

Empirical studies in behavioural science and criminology show that structured risk assessment techniques may be more successful at predicting recidivism than unsupported

human judgment when merely based on statistical correctness. These studies show that computers can identify trends that judges or parole boards might not be able to recognize immediately, and they are more effective than humans at processing large datasets. According to this perspective, AI is presented as a corrective mechanism that can reduce arbitrary or excessive outcomes brought on by individual decision-making.

The literature also highlights the potential application of AI to identify low-risk offenders who could otherwise be unfairly detained during the pretrial phase. By enabling more informed bail decisions, AI technologies are perceived as a way to save public spending, solve jail congestion, and lessen the negative social effects of pretrial confinement, such as job loss and family disturbance.

Crucially, it is not advised that supportive scholarship take the role of judicial authority. Rather, it emphasizes that AI should function just as a decision-support system, supplying extra information while preserving judicial authority. Human oversight, explainability, and transparency are often emphasized as requirements for the legal use of AI in criminal justice.

3.2 Critical, Socio-Legal, and Feminist Perspectives

Critical legal scholarship vigorously disputes the notion that AI systems are impartial or objective, in contrast to efficiency-oriented arguments. Researchers show how algorithmic tools are moulded by the data they are trained on, and when that data reveals historical discrimination, the results are likely to replicate and legitimize current disparities. Algorithms may exacerbate systemic bias rather than address it in criminal justice systems that are marked by selective policing and socioeconomic inequality.

According to socio-legal studies, crime statistics frequently show enforcement tactics rather than true criminal trends. As a result, AI systems may disproportionately identify populations that are already overpoliced as high-risk. This perpetuates injustice under the pretence of technological neutrality by creating a feedback loop in which marginalized groups are frequently the focus of monitoring, incarceration, and punishment.

Algorithmic decision-making is also criticized by feminist researchers for failing to take into consideration gendered paths to crime, lived experiences, trauma, and caring obligations. Risk assessment methods frequently focus on variables that disproportionately

disfavour women, minorities, and people from economically disadvantaged backgrounds, such as housing security, work stability, or past criminal records. These academics contend that risk management is given priority by AI and authority over restorative justice, care, and rehabilitation.

Furthermore, algorithmic governance transfers decision-making authority from public institutions to private technology suppliers, whose systems function with little transparency, according to critical literature. Constitutional criminal justice systems are seriously threatened by this deterioration of democratic accountability and procedural justice.

3.3 Indian Scholarly Discourse

The use of AI in criminal justice by Indian academics is cautious, based on the constitution, and constantly changing. Academics always stress that any technology intervention that impacts personal liberty must be closely examined in light of India's constitutional framework, especially Articles 14 and 21. Algorithmic standardization is seen with particular concern in India, where judicial discretion and individualized justice are crucial. Indian academics point out important issues with data dependability and quality.

Underreporting, selective enforcement, and sociopolitical influence frequently plague Indian crime statistics, casting doubt on its viability for AI system training. Implementation is made more difficult by the digital divide, a lack of technology infrastructure, and unequal institutional competence.

The lack of a thorough legal framework governing the application of AI in criminal justice is another significant issue noted in Indian literature. Accountability, transparency, and remedies for rights abuses become unclear as a result. Additionally, academics caution against automation bias, which occurs when judges or parole authorities show undue deference to algorithmic results without conducting sufficient critical analysis.

There is widespread agreement that constitutional courts must serve as gatekeepers, guaranteeing that AI stays subservient to human judgment, constitutional morality, and individual fundamental rights. In the end, Indian scholarship advocates for a cautious and rights-focused approach to AI, where technology advances justice rather than changes it.

4. Constitutional and Judicial Foundations in India

The Indian constitution, which prioritizes judicial accountability, fairness, and individual liberty, must be taken into consideration while analyzing the application of AI in criminal justice decision-making. Decisions like bail, sentence, and parole directly affect fundamental rights, therefore constitutional review is inevitable. Indian constitutional law has always emphasized that substantive justice cannot be subordinated to procedural efficiency. This section examines how the constitutional bounds of AI-driven decision-making are shaped by current judicial standards.

4.1 Article 21 and the Due Process Requirement

According to Article 21 of the Indian Constitution, no one may be deprived of their life or personal freedom unless a legally prescribed process is followed. This clause has developed into a substantive due process guarantee through judicial interpretation, mandating that any process affecting liberty be reasonable, fair, just, and non-arbitrary.

The Supreme Court concluded in Maneka Gandhi v. Union of India that laws affecting individual liberty must meet fairness and rationality standards, rejecting a limited, formalistic interpretation of procedure. This broadened understanding has significant ramifications for criminal justice algorithmic decision-making. Article 21 raises significant concerns about AI systems that use proprietary algorithms, opaque processes, or inexplicable risk rankings.

The right to appeal unfavourable rulings is another requirement of due process under Indian constitutional law. Affected people may not have meaningful access to remedies when AI techniques produce outputs without giving clear explanations. Lack of explainability restricts judicial scrutiny and compromises procedural justice. Therefore, any AI system that affects liberty must be visible, contestable, and subject to human judgment in order to comply with the constitutional guarantee under Article 21.

4.2 Bail Jurisprudence and the Right to Liberty

The defense of individual freedom is at the core of Indian bail law. The Supreme Court has consistently upheld that, especially for inmates awaiting trial, bail is the norm and incarceration is the exception. In ***Hussainara Khatoon v. State of Bihar***, the Court exposed thousands of undertrials' unlawful incarceration and clearly connected Article 21 to the right

to bail and a prompt trial.

In ***Arnab Manoranjan Goswami v. State of Maharashtra***, the Court reiterated this rights-oriented approach by emphasizing that constitutional courts must protect individual liberty and step in when it is unjustly restricted. The ruling emphasized that impairment of liberty necessitates rigorous judicial review and rational defense.

If utilized mechanically, AI-based bail assessment methods that categorize accused individuals using risk scores or predictive models may be in violation with this doctrine. These methods run the risk of putting statistical probability ahead of specific situations, which could result in preventive detention based on anticipated behaviour rather than shown behaviour. This strategy is at odds with India's constitution, which places a strong emphasis on judicial reasoning, individual justice, and the presumption of innocent.

4.3 Sentencing, Proportionality, and Judicial Discretion

The ideas of proportionality, individualization, and reformative justice govern sentencing in India. The Supreme Court has repeatedly ruled that the severity of the sentence must take into account the offender's individual circumstances as well as the nature of the offense. In ***State of Punjab v. Prem Sagar,*** the Court emphasized that rather than using strict uniform standards, sentencing necessitates a thorough assessment of aggravating and mitigating elements.

At the sentence stage, judicial discretion is crucial to attaining substantive justice. Courts are supposed to take into account things like age, purpose, socioeconomic background, potential for reform, and the larger context of the offense. Because algorithmic sentencing models rely on predetermined criteria and previous data, they run the risk of overly standardizing and reducing complicated human situations to numerical scores.

The constitutional commitment to individualized justice may be compromised by such standardization. Algorithmic methods may marginalize rehabilitative factors and turn sentencing into a mechanical process by emphasizing efficiency and consistency. This is in direct opposition to Indian constitutional ideals, which see punishment as a tool for social reintegration as well as retaliation.

4.4 Judicial Observations on Technology and Algorithms

Indian courts have emphasized the necessity for constitutional protections while expressing cautious engagement with technology. The Supreme Court cautioned against uncontrolled data gathering and processing in Justice ***K.S. Puttaswamy v. Union of India,*** acknowledging informational privacy as an essential element of Article 21. For AI systems that rely on vast amounts of personal and behavioural data, this ruling has important ramifications.

The Court emphasized that any invasion of privacy must meet the requirements of proportionality, need, and legality. Because AI-driven criminal justice tools handle sensitive personal data, they must function inside well-defined legal frameworks and accountability systems.

Indian courts have expressed cautious engagement with technology while highlighting the need for constitutional protections. In Justice ***K.S. Puttaswamy v. Union of India***, the Supreme Court recognized informational privacy as a crucial component of Article 21 and issued a warning against unchecked data collection and processing. This decision has significant implications for AI systems that depend on enormous volumes of behavioural and personal data.

The Court stressed that proportionality, necessity, and legality must all be met by any breach of privacy. AI-driven criminal justice technologies must operate under well-defined legal frameworks and accountability procedures since they handle sensitive personal data.

5. AI in Bail Decision-Making

The first and frequently most important stage in the criminal justice system's involvement with an accused person's freedom is bail. At this point, decisions are made that decide whether a person will be detained for an extended period of time before to trial or remain free. Therefore, there are serious constitutional, ethical, and practical issues with the use of AI in bail decisions, especially in a system already beset by systemic injustices and overcrowding in prisons.

5.1 Risk Assessment Tools and Pretrial Justice

AI-based bail assessment tools are intended to help judges forecast the probability that an accused individual would flee, falsify evidence, or conduct additional crimes after being

released. These systems usually use statistical models that have been trained on historical data to produce risk scores based on factors like age, work position, residence stability, past compliance with legal procedures, and criminal history.

These methods, according to their supporters, encourage uniformity and lessen subjective bias in bail determinations. Critics point out that socioeconomic deprivation is closely linked to several of the indicators studied. Marginalized groups are disproportionately affected by factors including precarious housing, informal work, or past police contact. Therefore, even in the absence of major criminal activity, structurally disadvantaged people may be classified as "high risk" by risk assessment methods.

Over-reliance on numerical risk scores runs the risk of turning bail into a technocratic risk-management exercise rather than a rights-based judicial decision. Algorithmic results that are seen as objective or scientific may eclipse judicial reasoning, which generally entails individualized evaluation and constitutional balancing. This weakens the presumption of innocent and moves the emphasis from legal responsibility to hypothetical future behaviour—a change that is challenging to reconcile with constitutional norms.

5.2 Implications for Undertrial Prisoners in India

One of the biggest groups of undertrial inmates in the world is found in India, where a sizable percentage are held for non-violent or petty offenses. Prolonged pretrial detention is already a result of structural delays, restricted access to legal counsel, and socioeconomic vulnerability. The use of AI-based bail tools is risky in this situation.

Inaccurate or biased forecasts may lead to an unwarranted denial of bail, despite the fact that such technologies are frequently marketed as remedies for prison overcrowding and the backlog in the courts. Even in cases where judicial discretion may otherwise favor release, people deemed high risk by algorithmic models may be imprisoned for prolonged periods of time. The constitutional commitment to individual liberty and fair procedure under Article 21 is directly compromised by this result.

Furthermore, by essentially penalizing people before conviction, algorithmic prediction-based undertrial detention undermines the presumption of innocence. Marginalized accused people are least prepared to resist unfavourable algorithmic assessments in a system

where access to data, technology knowledge, and effective legal challenge remain unequal. The application of AI in bail decision-making has the risk of exacerbating already-existing disparities rather than reducing them in the absence of explicit protections, openness, and court supervision.

6. AI in Sentencing Decision-Making

One of the criminal justice system's most intricate and normatively significant tasks is sentencing. Sentencing necessitates that courts engage in moral examination, proportionality, and individualized assessment, in contrast to procedural stages that concentrate on risk management or administrative efficiency. Therefore, there are specific constitutional issues with discretion, openness, and the character of judicial reasoning itself when artificial intelligence is used in sentencing decisions.

6.1 Models for Algorithmic Sentencing

Based on statistical analysis of prior cases, algorithmic sentencing models are intended to suggest sentencing ranges or outcomes. These systems utilize patterns across variables such as age, offense type, criminal history, and past sentencing patterns to make forecasts with the goal of increasing consistency and decreasing disparity. In addressing arbitrary or unequal punishment, consistency in sentencing is a key goal.

In contrast, the sentencing under Indian constitutional law is much more than just numerical consistency. When sentencing, courts must take into account aggravating and mitigating circumstances, the offender's intent and role, socioeconomic status, and the possibility of recovery. These factors necessitate moral judgment and qualitative evaluation that cannot be adequately represented by algorithmic modelling.

Algorithmic sentencing runs the risk of transforming a very human judicial role into a mechanical process due to excessive standardization. By depending on historical sentencing data, these models may also perpetuate antiquated or unfair punitive practices that were ingrained in earlier judgements. This contravenes the fundamental tenet of individualized justice in the constitution and runs against the reformative nature of Indian criminal jurisprudence.

6.2 Transparency and Sound Decisions

The Indian constitutional jurisprudence gives a lot of weight to the need that judicial rulings be reasoned, transparent, and subject to review. Accountability, appellate review, and public faith in the judicial system are all based on reasoned judgments. This requirement takes on special significance in cases where decisions entail depriving someone of their freedom.

This constitutional requirement is countered by opaque algorithmic recommendations. Some AI systems operate as "black boxes," generating results without clearly explaining how particular factors were taken into account or how choices were made. It becomes harder for judges to provide independent explanations, for defendants to appeal unfavourable verdicts, and for appellate courts to do a thorough review when such recommendations affect sentencing.

Due process may be jeopardized by the lack of transparency, which reduces judicial accountability. The constitutional guarantee of fairness is undermined if sentencing choices are impacted by algorithmic logic that cannot be explained or questioned. As a result, any application of AI in sentencing must guarantee judicial oversight, explainability, and the continued importance of human reasoning in constitutional adjudication.

7. AI's Role in Choices Regarding Parole and Probation

The point where penalties meet rehabilitation is represented by decisions on parole and probation. At this juncture, the criminal justice system weighs if keeping someone in prison is still a valid way to achieve justice, or if releasing them with certain restrictions would be a better way to help them change. Therefore, putting Artificial Intelligence into decisions about parole and probation brings up serious worries about how to properly weigh the need to keep the public safe, help individuals reform, and respect basic human rights as promised by the constitution.

7.1 Forecasting the Chances of Re-offending

The main goal of AI-driven instruments in parole and probation is to figure out how likely someone is to commit another crime. To determine the chances of someone re-offending if set free, these systems examine past information. Common factors taken into account include past convictions, age when the first crime was committed, how long they were in prison, and how well they followed the prison rules. These types of predictive evaluations are often

displayed as unbiased and fact-based tools for making decisions.

However, these instruments commonly depend on fixed historical details that do not evolve with time. Consequently, they might not properly document proof of personal progress, shifts in behaviour, or involvement in programs designed to help prisoners rehabilitate. It is difficult to measure things like an individual's development, regret, and attempts to reintegrate into society, but these are essential when deciding on parole based on the Indian philosophy of punishment.

Furthermore, predictive models have a tendency to mix up correlation with causation. Classifications of being at high-risk may be a reflection of underlying disadvantages, rather than a true tendency to re-offend. This brings up important doubts regarding fairness and correctness, especially when algorithmic forecasts greatly impact decisions that result in the continuing restriction of freedom.

7.2 Helping People Change Versus Controlling Dangers

The current legal rules for criminal court cases in India have always emphasized a fair approach that aims to improve and help people, viewing penalties for wrongdoings not only as revenge but as a way to bring people back into society. Programs like parole and monitored freedom are very important in achieving these aims, as they allow a gradual return to life in the community while being watched.

Over-relying on computer predictions of danger could shift parole rules from helping people recover to keeping them imprisoned to stop potential future offenses. If future risk becomes the main thing, choices about parole may focus more on statistical safety than on upholding vital constitutional ideas, like treating people fairly, matching penalties to crimes, and offering hope for change. This method weakens the basic concepts of compassion and understanding in the Indian justice system, and it starts seeing individuals as mere data points in a danger calculation rather than as people possessing rights.

This type of shift also raises important concerns under the Indian constitution, especially Article 21, which protects not only a person's freedom but also their right to live a dignified life. Without enough safeguards, clear procedures, and human decisions, using artificial intelligence for parole choices could lead to harsher penalties, which would go against

the constitutional idea of giving people a chance to reform.

8. Comparative International Approaches to AI in Criminal Justice

8.1 United States

Throughout the United States, AI-powered risk evaluation instruments are widely utilized during bail proceedings and sentencing determinations. Software solutions like COMPAS have faced considerable backlash due to claims of racial prejudice and a deficiency in openness. Legal authorities have made it clear that automated systems should not take the place of personalized assessments carried out by judges.

8.2 United Kingdom

Within the United Kingdom, the utilization of AI is predominantly centered on law enforcement and probationary procedures. Observance organizations and judicial authorities emphasize the importance of providing clear explanations, ensuring appropriate measures, and enforcing necessary human monitoring, thereby showcasing a careful strategy when handling decisions affecting personal freedoms.

8.3 European Union

The European Union is embracing a legal structure focused on upholding individual rights. According to the proposed EU Artificial Intelligence Act, AI systems employed in criminal justice are classified as presenting a high degree of risk and are subjected to stringent guidelines concerning regulation, transparency, and the need to be accountable.

8.4 Lessons for India

An examination of international practices reveals that incorporating AI into criminal justice calls for explicit legal guidelines, rigorous monitoring by the judiciary, and firmly established constitutional limitations. Knowledge acquired from other countries demonstrates that employing algorithmic instruments without regulation or in a non-transparent way could potentially erode faith in due process and diminish public confidence. For India, these findings emphasize that AI should serve as a tool to assist, instead of replacing, judicial thought processes. Considerations based on human discernment, openness, and an awareness of rights

should remain central to all judgments affecting an individual's liberty.

9. Challenges in AI-Based Criminal Justice Decision-Making

9.1 Algorithmic Bias and Data Quality

How well AI systems work depends on old information, and this information often shows strong biases related to social class, money, gender, and caste. Unfair information sets that appear because of unfair policing, certain ways of enforcing rules, and missing reports can cause predictions that are not fair. Because of this, groups that are already pushed to the side may be wrongly labelled as likely to commit crimes, making existing unfair situations even worse instead of better.

9.2 Transparency and Explainability

Many AI tools used in the criminal justice area work like confusing "black boxes," giving answers without giving any reasons that people can understand. This lack of openness hurts the fairness of the steps taken and goes against the legal need for decisions to be based on good reasons. When people who are affected cannot understand or question what the computer programs decide, it makes it much harder to get justice, have appeals, and have court oversight.

9.3 Accountability and Responsibility

Using AI in decisions makes the normal lines of legal responsibility unclear. It can be hard to know who is responsible, as it is spread among judges, system creators, data providers, and government groups, leading to problems in how things are controlled. If clear rules and ways to assign blame are not present, AI could act like a power that cannot be held to account, reducing the chances of getting payment for being wrongly put in prison.

10. Boundaries of AI in Legal Systems

While AI offers certain benefits, inherent limitations hinder its suitability for use in making crucial decisions related to criminal law. AI systems lack ethical understanding, compassion, and the capability to fully comprehend the complex social and personal drivers behind criminal actions. The resolution of legal cases demands value-driven assessments of

justice, remorse, potential for rehabilitation, and proportionate penalties, all of which are challenging for computers to perform.

There exists a significant risk of over-reliance on AI, as judicial figures, parole boards, or governing bodies might unduly depend on AI's output, assuming its objectivity and superior scientific merit. Over-dependence of this kind can diminish the critical thinking abilities of judges and reduce their engagement with the specifics of individual case instead of merely supporting decision-making,

11. Conclusion

For those who work in criminal justice, using Artificial Intelligence could make decisions about bail, punishments, and parole better, helping to create fairer and more consistent methods. But, as India's basic rules say, any limit on someone's freedom must be based on laws, fairness, and good sense. If choices made by computers are not watched carefully, this could put at risk the honesty of fair legal processes, equal treatment, and the freedom of judges to make their own choices Judges should watch AI's job as a helpful tool very closely, making sure things are clear and follow the rules of the constitution. In the end, people will only trust the criminal justice system if it is fair, responsible, and treats everyone with respect.