

---

# REGULATING ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE IN LEGAL PRACTICE: LEGAL AND ETHICAL CHALLENGES FOR THE LEGAL PROFESSION

---

Nikhat Saheen, Amity Law School, Amity University, Patna, Bihar

## ABSTRACT

Artificial Intelligence (AI) is rapidly transforming the legal profession by assisting lawyers, law firms and legal institutions in legal research, document review, contract analysis, due diligence, drafting and information management. The development of Generative AI has further expanded these applications by enabling AI systems to produce legal summaries, arguments, drafts and other forms of legal content. Although these technologies may improve efficiency and reduce repetitive work, their increasing use also creates significant legal and ethical challenges concerning professional competence, confidentiality, client privilege, accuracy, accountability, algorithmic bias, data protection, intellectual property and the unauthorized practice of law. One of the most important concerns is AI hallucination, where an AI system may generate apparently convincing but factually incorrect information, including fabricated case names, citations or legal propositions. If such information is used by lawyers without verification, it may affect the administration of justice and raise questions of professional responsibility. Similarly, entering confidential client information into external AI systems may create risks relating to confidentiality, privacy, data security and professional privilege. India presently does not have one comprehensive legislation specifically regulating the use of Artificial Intelligence by legal professionals. Instead, the issue is governed through existing legal and professional frameworks, including the Advocates Act, 1961, professional conduct rules, information technology law, data-protection legislation, evidence law and constitutional principles. This paper examines the legal and ethical challenges created by AI-assisted legal practice, analyses the adequacy of the existing Indian framework and compares it with selected international approaches. The paper argues for a balanced, risk-based and technology-neutral regulatory framework that promotes technological innovation while preserving professional responsibility, client confidentiality, human judgment and the integrity of the justice system.

**Keywords:** Artificial Intelligence, Legal Profession, Generative AI, Legal Ethics, Professional Responsibility, Confidentiality, Data Protection, AI Hallucination, Legal Technology, Accountability, Regulation.

## **Introduction**

The legal profession has traditionally depended upon human reasoning, interpretation, legal research, drafting and professional judgment. Artificial Intelligence is now changing the manner in which many of these activities are performed. AI systems can assist lawyers in analysing large volumes of legal material, identifying relevant authorities, reviewing contracts, summarising judgments, organising documents and preparing preliminary drafts. Generative AI has expanded these capabilities by allowing users to provide natural-language instructions and receive detailed textual responses.

The development of AI is particularly significant for the legal profession because legal practice is highly dependent upon information. Lawyers routinely examine statutes, judicial decisions, pleadings, contracts, evidence, regulations and other legal documents. AI can process large amounts of information quickly and can therefore reduce the time required for certain repetitive tasks. However, legal practice involves more than processing information. It requires interpretation, professional judgment, ethical responsibility and an understanding of the specific facts of each case.

The use of AI therefore creates an important legal question: whether traditional professional duties remain applicable when legal work is performed with the assistance of AI. The answer has significant consequences for lawyers, clients and courts. An AI system may generate an incorrect case citation or legal proposition, but the lawyer who relies upon that information may still have professional responsibility for the final submission. Similarly, if confidential client information is entered into an AI platform, questions may arise regarding confidentiality and data protection.

AI therefore represents both an opportunity and a challenge for the legal profession. The central issue is not simply whether lawyers should use AI, but how AI can be incorporated into legal practice without weakening professional ethics, client protection and the administration of justice.

## **AI in Contemporary Legal Practice**

Artificial Intelligence refers broadly to computational systems capable of performing functions associated with human intelligence, including pattern recognition, language processing,

prediction, classification and decision support. The use of technology in law is not new. Earlier legal technology included electronic databases, digital case-law repositories, document-management systems and technology-assisted review. Modern AI has significantly expanded these capabilities.

AI can now be used for legal research, contract analysis, document review, due diligence, legal drafting and predictive analytics. Legal research systems can identify potentially relevant authorities and organise large quantities of legal information. Contract-analysis systems can identify particular clauses, obligations and risks. AI-assisted document review can help lawyers process large volumes of documents during litigation or corporate transactions. Generative AI represents a further development because it can produce new text based upon user instructions. Lawyers may use such systems to prepare preliminary drafts, summarise legal materials, identify possible arguments or organise information. However, AI-generated content may contain errors and therefore cannot automatically be treated as authoritative legal analysis.

The increasing use of AI demonstrates a shift from traditional computer-assisted legal work towards AI-assisted professional decision-making. This development requires the legal profession to reconsider existing standards of competence, confidentiality, supervision, accountability and professional conduct.

## **STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM**

The primary problem addressed by this research is the regulatory gap between the rapid development of AI technology and the existing framework governing legal professionals. Traditional professional rules were primarily developed around human lawyers performing legal work through conventional methods. AI introduces an additional technological system into legal research, drafting and decision-making.

Several questions therefore arise: Who should be responsible when an AI-generated legal argument is incorrect? What happens when AI produces a fabricated case citation? How can client confidentiality be protected when external AI platforms process legal information? Should lawyers disclose material use of AI to their clients? How should courts deal with AI-generated submissions or evidence? How should liability be determined where an AI system produces biased or discriminatory results?

A particularly serious concern is that AI-generated information may appear authoritative even when it is incorrect. This creates a risk that lawyers may unknowingly rely upon false authorities or inaccurate legal propositions. The problem is therefore not merely technological. It directly concerns professional responsibility and the administration of justice.

## **Applications of AI in Legal Practice**

### **AI-Assisted Legal Research**

AI can assist lawyers in identifying statutes, judgments, regulations and legal commentary. It can reduce the time required for preliminary research by analysing large quantities of information. However, lawyers must independently verify whether an authority exists, whether it remains valid law and whether it actually supports the proposition for which it is being cited.

### **Legal Drafting**

Generative AI can produce preliminary drafts of legal notices, contracts, opinions, pleadings, correspondence and research memoranda. Such drafts can save time, but they require human review. Facts, statutory provisions, limitation periods, jurisdiction and legal arguments must be independently checked before a document is used professionally.

### **Contract Analysis**

AI can identify contractual clauses concerning indemnity, confidentiality, termination, arbitration, liability and other legal obligations. It can also compare multiple agreements. However, contractual interpretation frequently depends upon factual and commercial circumstances that may not be adequately understood by an AI system.

### **Document Review and Due Diligence**

AI can classify and analyse large volumes of documents during litigation, mergers, acquisitions and corporate transactions. It can identify potentially relevant documents and unusual provisions. Human lawyers nevertheless need to evaluate the legal significance of the identified information.

## **Legal and Ethical Challenges**

### **Professional Competence**

A lawyer using AI must possess sufficient understanding of the technology's capabilities and limitations. The lawyer should know when AI is appropriate, what types of errors it may produce and how its outputs should be verified. AI cannot be used as a substitute for professional legal judgment.

### **AI Hallucination**

AI hallucination occurs when an AI system generates information that appears plausible but is factually incorrect. In legal practice, this may include fabricated cases, incorrect citations, imaginary quotations or inaccurate statutory provisions. This is particularly dangerous because the output may appear professionally written. Lawyers must therefore verify important AI-generated legal material before relying upon it.

### **Confidentiality**

Lawyers possess sensitive client information, including litigation strategy, financial information, business secrets and personal information. Uploading such material into an external AI platform may create risks concerning storage, access, processing and disclosure. AI use must therefore be consistent with professional confidentiality obligations and applicable data-protection requirements.

### **Attorney-Client Privilege**

The use of third-party AI systems raises questions concerning the protection of confidential communications. Lawyers should understand how an AI provider stores and processes information, whether data is retained, whether it may be used for model training and whether third parties can access it.

### **Data Protection**

AI systems may process significant quantities of personal data. Lawyers and law firms must consider data minimisation, security, access controls, retention, deletion and lawful processing when using AI systems for legal work.

### **Algorithmic Bias**

AI systems may reproduce biases contained within their training data. This is particularly important where AI is used for predictive or decision-support functions. Lawyers should therefore critically evaluate AI outputs rather than assuming that computational results are automatically neutral.

### **Transparency and Explainability**

Legal decisions require reasons and justification. If a lawyer relies substantially upon an AI-generated analysis, questions may arise concerning the ability to explain how the conclusion was reached. Transparency becomes especially important where AI materially influences litigation strategy or legal advice.

### **Accountability and Liability**

AI creates uncertainty concerning responsibility for errors. Potentially relevant actors include the lawyer, law firm, AI developer and software provider. However, the use of AI should not automatically transfer professional responsibility away from the lawyer. Where a lawyer adopts AI-generated material as professional work, the lawyer remains responsible for appropriate verification.

### **AI-Generated Evidence**

AI can generate or manipulate photographs, audio, video and documents. This creates challenges concerning authenticity and reliability. Courts may increasingly need to consider digital provenance, metadata, forensic examination and expert evidence when assessing potentially AI-generated material.

### **Professional Responsibility and Duty to the Court**

The Advocates Act, 1961 provides disciplinary mechanisms in cases involving professional or other misconduct. The use of AI does not create a separate exemption from professional responsibility. If a lawyer knowingly submits false information, fails to verify important legal authorities, improperly discloses confidential information or otherwise breaches professional obligations, the use of AI may become relevant to the assessment of professional responsibility.

The central principle should therefore be that AI can change the method through which legal work is performed, but it does not eliminate the lawyer's professional responsibility.

Lawyers owe duties to courts and must ensure that submissions are accurate and not knowingly misleading. If an AI system produces a false case citation or inaccurate legal proposition, the lawyer cannot simply rely upon the fact that the information came from AI. Material legal submissions must be independently verified before being presented to a court.

### **Client Communication and Consent**

An emerging question concerns whether clients should be informed when AI is materially used in providing legal services. Disclosure may be particularly relevant where confidential information is processed, where AI substantially affects legal analysis or where the terms of engagement require transparency. The objective should be meaningful communication rather than requiring disclosure of every minor technological tool used by a lawyer.

### **Legal Fees and Transparency**

AI can reduce the amount of time required for certain legal tasks. This raises questions concerning billing and reasonable professional fees. Where AI substantially reduces the time required for a task, lawyers should maintain transparent and ethically appropriate billing practices. The use of technology should not become a basis for misleading billing.

### **Unauthorised Practice of Law**

AI systems may increasingly provide legal information directly to the public. A distinction must be maintained between general legal information and personalised legal advice. An AI system providing general information about a statute is different from a system advising an individual about the appropriate legal action in a particular dispute. This raises issues concerning professional regulation, consumer protection and accountability.

### **Access to Justice**

AI may improve access to legal information by helping individuals understand basic legal concepts, organise facts and identify relevant legal materials. This may be particularly useful for people who cannot easily access professional legal assistance. However, AI-generated

information should not be treated as equivalent to professional legal representation. Access to information and access to justice are related but distinct concepts.

### **The Changing Role of Lawyers**

AI is likely to automate certain repetitive activities such as document classification, summarisation, basic research and contract comparison. At the same time, human lawyers remain important for advocacy, negotiation, strategic decision-making, client counselling, ethical judgment, factual investigation and courtroom representation.

The future lawyer is therefore likely to work alongside AI rather than simply compete against it. Legal professionals will increasingly require both traditional legal knowledge and technological competence.

### **The Indian Legal Framework**

India does not presently rely upon one comprehensive statute dealing exclusively with AI use in legal practice. Instead, several existing legal frameworks become relevant.

#### **Constitution of India**

Articles 14, 19 and 21 provide important constitutional principles concerning equality, freedom of expression, privacy, dignity and personal liberty. AI applications involving state action or fundamental rights must operate within constitutional limitations.

#### **Advocates Act, 1961**

The Advocates Act provides the institutional and disciplinary framework governing advocates. Section 35 deals with punishment for professional or other misconduct. This provides an important foundation for considering accountability where AI is used in professional legal practice.

#### **Information Technology Act, 2000**

The Information Technology Act remains relevant to electronic information, cyber offences and intermediary-related issues. Its provisions may become relevant depending upon the manner in which AI is used.

### **Digital Personal Data Protection Act, 2023**

The Digital Personal Data Protection Act, 2023 is relevant where AI systems process digital personal data. Legal professionals using AI tools must consider applicable requirements concerning processing and protection of personal data.

### **Bharatiya Sakshya Adhiniyam, 2023**

The Bharatiya Sakshya Adhiniyam provides the current framework concerning electronic and digital records. The increasing ability of AI to create or manipulate digital material makes authentication and reliability increasingly important in legal proceedings.

### **Comparative International Approaches**

#### **United States**

The United States has largely approached AI in legal practice through existing professional-responsibility principles supplemented by specific guidance. The American Bar Association's Formal Opinion 512 addresses generative AI and lawyers' duties concerning competence, confidentiality, communication, supervision, candour toward tribunals and fees. This demonstrates that traditional professional obligations continue to apply when lawyers adopt AI tools.

#### **European Union**

The European Union has adopted a broader regulatory approach through the EU Artificial Intelligence Act. Its risk-based framework emphasises transparency, accountability and human oversight for relevant AI systems. The EU approach provides a comparative model for considering how AI-specific obligations may be incorporated into a wider regulatory structure.

#### **Regulatory Gaps in India**

Several issues require greater clarity in India. First, there is a need for AI-specific professional guidance for advocates. Second, there is uncertainty concerning responsibility for AI hallucinations. Third, lawyers require clearer standards concerning confidentiality when using external AI platforms. Fourth, questions remain concerning allocation of liability between lawyers and technology providers. Fifth, there is uncertainty concerning when material AI use

should be disclosed. Sixth, algorithmic bias requires greater legal and technical attention. Finally, judicial and professional training must develop alongside AI technology.

### **Recommendations for Responsible AI Regulation**

India could develop professional guidelines specifically addressing the responsible use of AI by lawyers. Such guidelines could establish minimum standards concerning verification, confidentiality, competence, supervision and accountability. Lawyers should be required to independently verify AI-generated legal authorities before using them in court.

Law firms should establish internal AI policies specifying which systems may be used and what categories of confidential information may be entered into those systems. High-risk AI applications should maintain appropriate audit trails recording inputs, outputs and human verification.

Professional bodies should also consider guidelines concerning client disclosure where AI materially affects legal services. Courts and judicial academies should provide training regarding AI-generated submissions, hallucinations, manipulated digital evidence and technological authentication.

A risk-based approach would be preferable to a blanket prohibition. Low-risk administrative uses of AI may require fewer safeguards, while high-risk applications affecting legal advice, litigation, evidence or confidential information should require stronger human oversight.

### **A Practical Framework for Responsible AI Use**

A simple model for responsible AI use can be remembered as V-E-R-I-F-Y: V – Verify important AI-generated information; E – Ensure confidentiality of client information; R – Retain human judgment over final professional decisions; I – Identify risks such as hallucination and bias; F – Follow professional ethics and applicable law; Y – Yield to judicial responsibility by ensuring accuracy before courts.

The study finds that AI has significant potential to improve efficiency in legal practice, particularly in research, document review, drafting and contract analysis. However, AI cannot replace professional legal judgment. AI hallucination presents a significant risk because incorrect information may appear authoritative. Confidentiality and data protection are major concerns where lawyers use external AI platforms. Existing professional-responsibility

principles remain applicable to AI-assisted legal work, but India would benefit from clearer AI-specific professional standards. International developments demonstrate that regulation can focus on transparency, human oversight, professional responsibility and risk management.

## **Conclusion**

Artificial Intelligence is transforming the legal profession by changing how legal research, drafting, document review, contract analysis and other professional activities are performed. Its benefits include increased efficiency, reduced repetitive work and potentially greater access to legal information. However, its use creates significant legal and ethical challenges concerning professional competence, confidentiality, data protection, accuracy, bias, accountability and the integrity of judicial proceedings.

The central issue is not whether AI should be completely accepted or rejected by the legal profession. The more important question is how AI can be integrated into legal practice while preserving professional ethics and the rule of law. Existing Indian legal frameworks provide some mechanisms for addressing AI-related risks, but greater clarity is required concerning AI-specific professional responsibilities.

The future regulatory framework should therefore adopt a balanced and technology-neutral approach. Lawyers should be permitted to use AI for legitimate professional purposes while remaining responsible for verifying its outputs, protecting client information and exercising independent professional judgment. AI should function as an assistive technology rather than an autonomous substitute for professional responsibility.

The legal profession must consequently adapt to AI without surrendering its fundamental principles. The future lawyer will need not only knowledge of law but also technological literacy, critical evaluation skills and an understanding of AI-related risks. Regulation should therefore seek to achieve a balance between innovation and accountability, efficiency and accuracy, technological development and professional ethics.

Ultimately, the legitimacy of AI in legal practice will depend not simply upon what AI can do, but upon how responsibly legal professionals use it. The objective should be to ensure that AI strengthens legal practice while protecting confidentiality, client interests, judicial integrity, fairness and the rule of law.

## **References**

### **I. Statutes and Constitutional Provisions**

- The Constitution of India, 1950, arts. 14, 19 and 21.
- The Advocates Act, 1961 (Act 25 of 1961), § 35.
- The Information Technology Act, 2000 (Act 21 of 2000), §§ 43A, 72A and 79.
- The Information Technology (Intermediary Guidelines and Digital Media Ethics Code) Rules, 2021.
- The Digital Personal Data Protection Act, 2023 (Act 22 of 2023).
- The Bharatiya Sakshya Adhiniyam, 2023 (Act 47 of 2023), §§ 61–63.

### **II. Judicial Decisions**

- Justice K.S. Puttaswamy (Retd.) v. Union of India, (2017) 10 SCC 1.
- Shreya Singhal v. Union of India, (2015) 5 SCC 1.

### **III. International Instruments and Regulatory Frameworks**

- American Bar Association, Formal Opinion 512: Generative Artificial Intelligence Tools (2024).
- American Bar Association, Model Rules of Professional Conduct, rr. 1.1, 1.6 and 3.3 (2024).
- Regulation (EU) 2024/1689 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 13 June 2024 Laying Down Harmonised Rules on Artificial Intelligence (Artificial Intelligence Act), 2024 O.J. (L 1689).
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), Recommendation of the Council on Artificial Intelligence (2019).

- United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), Recommendation on the Ethics of Artificial Intelligence (2021).

#### **IV. Books**

- Richard Susskind, *Tomorrow's Lawyers: An Introduction to Your Future* (2nd ed., Oxford University Press 2017).

#### **V. Research Articles and Book Chapters**

- Radha Ranjan, J. Bhaumik and A. Patel, "Regulating Artificial Intelligence in Legal Practice: An Accountability Framework," in *Blockchain and AI in Business: Applications, Research and Insights*, 131–140 (Gyanavi Publishers & Distributors 2024).
- Radha Ranjan, "Catalytic Role of Artificial Intelligence in Ameliorating Criminal Justice System: A Critical Analysis," in *Empowerment and Equality: Navigating Human Rights Law in a Complex World*, 47–54 (Institute of Legal Education 2023).
- Radha Ranjan, "Faculty Training and Professional Development for AI," in *AI Risk and Resolution in Higher Education and Academic Integrity* (IGI Global 2026), DOI: 10.4018/979-8-3373-5586-3.ch009.
- Radha Ranjan, "Artificial Intelligence and Law: Navigating the Legal Challenges of Emerging Technologies," in *Law in Crisis: Contemporary Issues Redefining Justice*, 123–142 (The Lawway with Lawyers Journal 2026).
- Dana Remus and Frank Levy, "Can Robots Be Lawyers? Computers, Lawyers, and the Practice of Law," 30 *Georgetown Journal of Legal Ethics* 501 (2017).