ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE IN LEGAL SYSTEMS: JUDICIAL APPLICATION, ETHICAL DILEMMAS, AND THE PURSUIT OF REGULATORY CERTAINTY

Aarsh Dwivedi, BALLB (Hons.), Christ University, Pune, Lavasa

ABSTRACT

The paper will look upon the development, adoption, and governance of Artificial Intelligence (AI) within international laws with a special focus on how it has become a transformative technology in aiding to the efficiency, uniformity, and access to justice through legal courts. It focuses on the judiciary in India and uses comparative examples of the jurisdictions in the United States, the European Union, and China to explain the ways AI used ethically and with regulation can mitigate systemic inefficiencies e.g., case backlog, procedural delays, etc. It forms technological authorities of AI featuring natural language processing, predictive analytics, and expert systems, and evaluates how they have developed within court administration and adjudication. It reviews actual applications, including AI-aided legal research (SUPACE in India), predictive sentencing algorithms (COMPAS in the U.S.), and smart courts in China, through a comparative, case-study method. The analysis in this paper will also highlight the advantages of AI to speed up the justice process and enhance consistency of decision-making, as well as points to underlying risks. Among the main ethical and human rights issues identified in the paper, there are algorithmic bias, lack of transparency (the black box problem), lack of accountability, and privacy issues. It emphasizes the fact that judicial AI should be heavily controlled by humans to be fair and trusted by the population. Moreover, it examines major regulatory and governance frameworks including the proposed AI Act of the EU, AI Ethics Recommendations of UNESCO, and the NITI Aayog AI strategy of India exposing their inability to balance innovation and accountability. It will further reveal, that although the technology can be used to improve the efficiency of the legal system and access to justice, the legitimacy of the technology should be determined by the normative and ethical correspondence with the rule of law. In line with this, it presents adaptive regulation, human supervision as a prerequisite, and disclosed algorithm design to make sure that AI reinforces and not replaces judicial integrity. The paper in its conclusion shows that responsible regulation can bring the promise of AI to the court system, which will be a very important point of intersection bet Patani Boladeko so this citation can show Oscilla my name is Oscar ween technology and ethics and pursuit of justice in the digital era.

I. Introduction

The earlier decade has seen Dramatic world surge In the application golf Artificial intelligence (AI) Across legal systems. Many jurisdictions confronted important judicial backlogs and resources problems, Are using and exploring AI tools to improve Access efficiency. New technologies are now regarded by One commentator, who is the primary supports to making the legal system of a more effective, as well as being accessible to justice available and improving the quality of legal process. This digital Change has been pushed by the Covid 19 pandemic as quotes around the world went online with hearings and implemented case management platforms. And in this case, AI will improve the efficiency and will introduce faster, more Adaptable, and efficient justice, helping to automate the document review case research and routine drafting process of the judicial system, And other professionals. In fact, built an artificial intelligence packages can scan papers, anonymize personal information, and underline pertinent precedents of law features that save a lot of time and considerably decrease the amount of human error.

Other than that, Th May maybe maybe Oscola Carrie silica citation citation e emergence of AI In quotes creates fundamental concerns regarding the issue of Fairness, Transferability, and governance. Reviewing two critics, technology is not enough to fill the gap of judgment and moral soundness of human adjudicators. The main argument of this paper is that AI can serve justice, however, Strict ethical and regulatory measures are needed for the usage and adjudication of AI. Specifically, we compare the aims of implementing AI in courts (efficiency, consistency,acces) With a range legal ethical issues(bias, accountability, privacy, and even human rights). This paper also compares and examine The use of AI in four jurisdictions which include India, the United State,s The European Union, and China at various levels of AI implementation and regulation. In the further instances we discuss the practical value of AI tools(Indian translation software to Chinese smart courts) As well as the regulation of these example a new on data protection in India, the European Union Act and the ethical standards and structures of the world . We also examine that unless human centric design and proper and clear regulations are put in place, the potential of in the Judiciary might weaken, and not strengthen the rule of law. Courts can only use AI as a servant of justice and not its master by making thoughtful governance, which integrates innovation into the core protection of fundamental rights.

II. Principles of evolution and technology.

The main plan of legal AI is decades old and has developed over time as earlier expert systems Midway to modern machine learning ones. Early Systems in 1970s and 1980s took the form of role based logic like legal expert systems to copy Simple reasoning. The current AI in law is heavily dependent on machine learning (ML) and natural language processing(NLP) with the development of increased Calculator and the access of data. For an example, tools that help guess future outcomes using past data have the ability to learn about previous case results with the aim of making a judicial decision. In their McShane et al. (2012) used Bayesian models and NLP to guess ranges of settlement in a US securities class action. In a similar manner, Alectras ET al. (2016) Created SYM classifiers to classify case results at the European Court of Human Rights using textual features[1]. NLP summarization also used different systems to obtain proper facts of a judgment, Machine Learning legal research engines like Ross Intelligence are used to find relevant case laws, and knowledge graphs understand the relationships of statutes, precedents and arguments. The Major components are :

Predictive analytics and ML: A system that spots patterns to make future predictions of the result or risk score which is based on the previous cases are data. For example, The empirical research has shown AI can reach significant accuracy if it comes to the judicial decision classification like it had been done in Brazil and France.[2]

Case Law finding: Cases the Lex Machina is a big data product used to extract patterns, trends and similar cases by scanning through the millions of documents. And these findings are sometimes based on the graph or databases models that connect patterns of facts and rulings.

NLP in Summarization and help: These are the program that can restate or rewrite lengthy filings frame issues clearly, and prepare simple legal briefs. Legal text without a proper structure are now processed by artificial intelligence systems to help judges and clerks regularly.

Knowledge graphs and expert systems: These mixed systems use knowledge and rules to give structured support, combining logic for compliance checks with data Insights for more meaningful advices. In the end, It is implied that judicial AI is a heterogeneous technology. It classical rule based systems of well defined tasks like document automation with modern data

[1] Blakeley B. McShane, Oliver P. Watson, Tom Baker & Sean J. Griffith, *Predicting Securities Fraud Settlements and Amounts: A Hierarchical Bayesian Model of Federal Securities Class Action Lawsuits*, 9 J. Empirical Legal Stud. 482 (2012), U. Penn Inst. for Law & Econ. Research Paper No. 12-20

[2] Abeer Aljohani, *Predictive Analytics and Machine Learning for Real-Time Supply Chain Risk Mitigation and Agility*, 15 *Sustainability* 15088 (2023)

driven systems like NLP off pattern recognition. The major factor is the objective of facilitating It is not a number of machines to manipulate legal data on skills speeds that are not possible for a normal human. This innovation, called the Primitive Expert Systems Information up to current High level data insights call has prepared the concrete AI tools in the courtroom, which is addressed next.

III. Comparative jurisdiction adoption

India

The judiciary system of India is trying a lot to use AI based tools, usually in the name of the national E justice programs. The E quotes project which was initiated in the 2000s developed A single platform used to manage every step of a case to all District and High courts. It allows filing of cases online, case status tracking and document management. More recent certain AI platforms are introduced like the Case Information System(CIMS) which is implemented in Supreme Court and certain High Courts as well is a self driven case intake and scheduling system. The Intgrated Decision Support System (IDSS) is a system which actually helps the Judiciary to give a proper reasoning or makes their decision making speed easy by using different this system in the form of SUVAS and SUPACE. [3]These are the AI systems that are now used in the Indian Judiciary and it helps in the process of giving speedy justice also focusing on the decision making without any kind of bias and in a fair manner.

The SUVAS, SUPACE and CIMS, are the AI systems that are now being used in the Judicial System and these are the Ais that are the part of the project named as e-Courts Project which was implemented to modernize and enhance the Judicial system, and also to solve the problem of the pending cases in the Indian Judicial environment.[4] The use of SUVAS has been helping in bridging the linguistic gaps that are present in the whole country easing the burdens on the Indian courts.

Interestingly , India is the first country to have opened its own AI platforms through its Supreme Court. Supreme Court Portal- Assistance in Courts Efficiency (SUPACE) is an advanced logic based tool that is used to help Supreme Court judges find legal information and prepare cases. [5]SUVAS (Vidhik Anuvaad Software) allows machine translations between English and the regional languages of India to enable decisions and filing to be made across language

[3] AI Portal SUPACE, Drishti IAS (Apr. 7, 2021),
[4] Can Artificial Intelligence (AI) Revolutionize India's Judiciary System, IndiaAI (2025),
[5] Use of Artificial Intelligence in Legal Field, Press Information Bureau (Dec. 11, 2025),

boundaries. The goals of these initiatives are both efficiency (e.g. SUPACE lessening the research time) and access (e.g. SUVAS eliminating the language barriers). Even though academic reviews are still continuing, the stakeholder critique points out these instruments as relieving pressure on Indian courts.[6] To give some examples, SUPACE is reported to have decreased the usual time taken to initial reading of cases (although there is little official statistics on this) and SUVAS is now a useful tool to the judges who know multiple languages.

United States

In the US, AI has been applied more on experimental basis and decentrally in courts. The best-known example is COMPAS (Correctional Offender Management Profiling Alternative Sanctions), a commercial risk-assessment program which has been utilized in a few states to predict the possibility of recidivism of a offender.[7] COMPAS applies such information as criminal backgrounds and examples to produce a recidivism score that judges may take into account during bail and sentencing. Nevertheless, its application has elicited a severe controversy of bias and transparency (discussed below). The federal system in the U.S. has not adopted national AI platforms in courts, as it is in the case of India. Various trial courts and agencies are experimenting with NLP research assistants and e-filing portals, although there is no common approach used.

The regulatory structure of the U.S is also divided. On the federal level, Congress has thus far resisted enacting an expansive AI regulation, preferring voluntary guidelines and industry laws (e.g. FTC enforcement, the proposals of the Algorithmic Accountability Acts). The significant legal changes have been achieved in case law. In State v. Loomis In 2016[8], the Wisconsin Supreme Court, which declared that a non transparent way that a trial court used was not a violation of due process, declared that the use of the proprietary COMPAS algorithm did not violate due process (Loomis 2016, Wis.). The Court emphasized that COMPAS was a single among many factors and had put procedural protections: all current reports that used the COMPAS must include warnings of the limitations of the systerm. Other states (such as California) have gone further than Loomis, and restricted or investigated practical risk tools, but normally, the U.S. has failed to come up with a unified AI policy in court. The outcome is an innovation-meets-caution approach the judges might be able to see data-driven tools as

[6] Artificial Intelligence (AI) and Judicial Processes in India, JuryScan (Oct. 10, 2025),
[7] Saachi Dhingra, *COMPAS — Correctional Offender Management Profiling for Alternative Sanctions: A Global and Comparative Perspective*, Record of Law (Nov. 30, 2024)
[8] State v. Loomis, Wisconsin Supreme Court, 130 Harv. L. Rev. 1530, United States

actually useful, yet they also touch restrictions on issues of accountability. Precisely , the U.S. courts, are testing the waters (like in pilot projects of AI-based research and sentencing), yet , the level of publicity is fierce due to the distorted nature of laws and traditions of strong civil liberties.

European Union

European strategy involves, regulating with principles and deployments. The brand-new Artificial Intelligence Act of the EU (completed in 2025), categorizes AI systems according to their risk and includes tough regulations on those of high risk. [9]Even tough, the Act is actually industry and publicly inclined, it mainly prohibits, the use of unacceptable uses (e.g. social scoring by states) and regulates high-risk systems, (like biometric identification and judicial sentencing systems) even though, the Act does not explicitly require the use of AI in a court of law, its risk framework would apply to any tools that is used by judges. Simultaneously, the EU has made strong ethical declarations: EU Charter of Fundamental Rights (Articles 7-8)[10] provides privacy, protection of data, and non-discrimination which limits judicial AI. The CEPEJ of the Council of Europe has also adopted a so-called European Ethical Charter on AI in judicial systems that, among other things, demands fairness, transparency, and human control in automated judicial processes.

Member states have had particular AI initiatives in the EU. As an example, Italy came up with Giustizia Predittiva, an assistive platform that analyses case outcomes (even though it is an experimental tool developed by the Ministry of Justice). Predictive analytics to backlog of civil cases have been tested in Finland and Germany. Notably, the EU also is not necessarily about massive deployment but rather the establishment of a governance system: the AI Act presupposes that any AI system utilized to make decisions must be preceded by documents, risk analysis and oversight by humans. In fact, the international human-rights law in Europe explicitly subjects the member states to this area: according to one analysis, Articles 7[11] and 12 [12]of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and Articles 2[13], 3[14] and 17[15] of the ICCPR (incorporated in the EU law) binds privacy and non-discrimination, and, therefore, the

[9] High-Level Summary of the Artificial Intelligence Act, ArtificialIntelligenceAct.eu (May 30, 2024),
[10] CHARTER OF FUNDAMENTAL RIGHTS OF THE EUROPEAN UNION (2000/C 364/01) Article 7 & 8, EU
[11] G.A. Res. 217 A (III), Universal Declaration of Human Rights, art. 7 (Dec. 10, 1948).
[12] G.A. Res. 217 A (III), Universal Declaration of Human Rights, art. 12 (Dec. 10, 1948).
[13] International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, Dec. 16, 1966, 999 U.N.T.S. 171, art. 2.
[14] International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, Dec. 16, 1966, 999 U.N.T.S. 171, art. 3.
[15] International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, Dec. 16, 1966, 999 U.N.T.S. 171, art. 17

decisions produced by AI should be predictable and should be subjected to the human factor. The right to privacy and private life is enshrined under the EU charter (Art. 8 ECHR; Art. 7 EU Charter) and the protection of data (Art. 8[16] EU Charter) must be especially stringent. To conclude, the EU situation is more focused on regulating the uses of AI (particularly the high-stakes uses) and ethical limitation, not on the wholesale judicial mechanization.

China

China is the most ambitious regarding expanding the scale of AI courts all over the country. Since 2006 China has continued to bring AI devices into police, prosecutorial, and judicial functions. [17]The Supreme People Court went so far as to state that, all courts would utilize some AI aid by the end of 2025, and the AI will be completely embedded in the judicial process by 2030. In reality, Chinese courts have introducd reforms under the name of Smart Court: they involve the possibility of online filing of cases, case allocation based on AI, and automatic writing of decisions. It is significant to note that China was the first country to establish Internet Courts (e.g. Hangzhou, Beijing, Guangzhou), in which litigants submit and present cases completely via the Internet. These courts have non-humans as judges that appear in the form of holographic avatars. An AI judge was depicted as a three-dimensional photograph in a black robe by a journalist, posing questions to litigants and making decisions without having a person in the room. The AI-mediated judgments can still be added to human appellate courts by the parties (Conditional).

Advanced analytic is also employed in the judiciary of China. Shanghai courts have created the "206 System" which is used to examine facts and evidence in order to suggest the sentencing ranges in criminal cases. Likewise, AI such as Xiao Baogong forecasts the results of the case and aids in researching defense counsel. The company boasts of tremendous efficiency improvements in internal reports: the Hainan High People's Court states that AI assistance helped to decrease the time required to make a judgment by 70 per cent and the time spent to prepare the procedure documents by 90 per cent[18]. In spite of these leaps, Chinese policy repeatedly reiterates that AI is to support the judges and not to replace them. In 2022 the Supreme Peoples Court released Opinions on the Regulation and the Enhancement of the Applications of AI in the Judicial Fields that give centralized directions to these technologies.

[16] Charter of the United Nations, June 26, 1945, 1 U.N.T.S. XVI, art. 8.
[17] China: AI Deeply Embedded in Criminal Justice System, Tech & Justice Project, Oxford Institute of Technology and Justice (2025),
[18] Yuan Shenggao, *AI-Assisted Sentencing Speeds Up Cases in Judicial System*, China Daily (Apr. 18, 2019),

In contrast to other nations, the strategy of China is top-down: general strategies and infrastructure (e.g. the National Judicial AI Platform), as well as the political objective of efficiency improvement and public trust.[19] To conclude, the adoption of China is the largest: it has automated courts, predictive systems such as the 206 platform, and even holographic AI judges - all as a single program of the government.

IV. Benefits of Judicial AI

The advocates of judicial AI emphasize that it has the potential to accelerate justice, make justice more affordable, and increase access to justice. Any efficiency gains in overloaded court systems can be revolutionary. An example of this is the Hainan High Court in China, which states that AI-assisted drafting enabled the judges to deliver judgments 50 times faster (written judgments took 70 times less time and all court-related documents took 90 times less time). In India, SUPACE and other portals have been given credit in reducing research time of busy Supreme court judges (preliminary reports have indicated that time taken to process cases has reduced, but no firm figures have been established yet). Similarly, the SUVAS translation instrument also addresses the linguistic diversity of India through its feature of quick translation of English verdicts to region languages; this cuts across language barriers and therefore enhances equal justice within the provinces. There is also more consistency with AI: models such as COMPAS in the U.S. can standardize risk measurements such that the similarities between defendants of similar profile will be presented with similar findings .[20]

Another benefit that is touted is better access to justice. Internet related dispute resolution systems (similar to the Internet courts in China) enable people to seek small claims, all at a distance, at a lower price. Having AI chatbots and mobile applications facilitate navigation of filings by self-represented litigants even in Europe or India. Automation of documents can lower the legal costs by making the services of legal practitioners cheaper since they do not have to pay lawyers to handle certain common cases[21]. Digital courts with AI facilitated in Africa and Asia have accelerated the process of claims adjudication. These practical innovations also follow the same logic as is stated by one commentator, AI allows the legal

[19] China's Local Judicial Systems Embrace AI to Improve Efficiency, Xinhua/English.news.cn (Jan. 1, 2025),
[20] Pallavi Rai & Chandra Shekhar, *Reimagining Justice: Accelerating Court Efficiency and Simplifying Legal Language through AI – A Global and Indian Perspective*, 6 IJRPR
[21] Indian Courts Fast-Track Justice With Judicial Language Tech, AI CERTs (Nov. 25, 2025),

texts to be analyzed, the judgments to be anonymized, and the compliance to be checked, which, in turn, will drastically decrease the human error rate and will save time.

Some of the benefits have not been shown in a quantitative manner, but they are eloquently illustrated. Unlike in the UK or the US, in criminal justice, COMPAS-type instruments (and their European counterparts) offer judges evidence-based information about recidivism risk which, according to some research, can be better at predicting reoffense as opposed to relying solely on intuition. (To Loomis, the Wisconsin court conceded that actuarial instruments, though not perfect, are more precise than intuition). By extension, legal research AIs search through voluminous databases of cases within seconds to reveal obscure precedents that would otherwise remain hidden. Delays in filing and scheduling in India have been greatly decreased through e-filing portals and digital case trackers (according to recent National Judicial Data Grid statistics, digitization has eradicated several old-pending case piles). Cultural issues (like the trust of the people) themselves can be improved in case people consider the system as progressive and just. To [22]sum up, judicial AI promises faster operational processes, consistency, and reduced entry barriers. By providing automated resources to the courts and offering them a clearer vision and strategy towards dealing with workloads, integrating AI into case management can provide justice fast and efficiently, just like in the case of the Georgia study.

V. Ethical Legal and Human Rights Issues

However, notwithstanding the promise, judicial AI creates acute issues regarding basic rights and the rule of law. These are classified into a number of categories:

Bias and Fairness: AI models contain any biases in their training data. In criminal justice, it can cause traditionally unfair results of the minority groups. An infamous case in point is COMPAS itself: the researchers concluded that its risk score algorithm ranked black defendants higher than white defendants with similar profiles[23]. The AI merely formalized the racial differences in policing and prosecution that already existed in reality. In a broader sense, discriminant policing may be perpetrated by predictive policing data and parole risk models that have been developed using discriminatory arrest data. Researchers caution of implicit algorithmic bias,

[22] Dr. Jasmine Gill, Judicial Delay and Digital Delivery: The Role of E-Courts in Addressing India's Case Backlogs, 7 (3) Int'l J. Legal Sci. & Innovation 199 (2025),

[23] Julia Angwin, Jeff Larson, Surya Mattu & Lauren Kirchner, Machine Bias: There's Software Used Across the Country to Predict Future Criminals. And It's Biased Against Blacks, ProPublica (May 23, 2016),

which does not reveal the bias inherent in automated judgments either to developers or users. In addition to racism, discrimination can be based on gender, socioeconomic, or disability (such as non-judgmental AI failures in using Google Photos to categorize black people as gorillas or the credit algorithm in Apple applications to prioritize men). Within the judicial system, any race-discriminating (or, its proxies) algorithm can infringe on the equal protection rights. Moreover, even neutral tools can put disadvantaged litigants, who do not have money to provide detailed data. Therefore, AI in courts has a risk of exacerbating the existing inequalities unless it is strictly audited in terms of equality.

Transparency and Explainability: Most AI systems are black boxes and their reasoning is not transparent. The judges and litigants might not find out the derivation of a risk score or case recommendation.[24] This subverts due process and trust. The AI in judicial decision-making should be predictable and under human supervision as an ethical standard elaborates. The specialist recommendations of the EU demand that high-stakes AI must be explainable (so-called XAI) and that it must be answerable to the users. Without transparency, a defendant has no opportunity to appeal an AI-based sentence enhancement, and a judge has no ability to demean an automated suggestion. The Wisconsin Loomis case is an illustration of this tension: the court allowed the use of COMPAS even though it was secret, but made a condition that judges must be clearly informed of its shortcomings. Overall, the unaccountable aspect undermines judicial legitimacy: in case people cannot understand the reason why results have to vary based on AI, they might lose trust in the system. Scholars thus claim that, critical decisions cannot be solely based on algorithms that cannot be understood and that the inputs and logic behind AI suggestions can always be reviewed by human judges.

Responsibility: Who is responsible in case an AI-driven suggestion causes a false conviction or a miscarriage of justice? This lack of responsibility is disturbing. The developers and operators of AI ideally need to be answerable to defects, but in reality most systems are released with no obvious redress provisions. [25]Courts have to determine whether the errors caused by algorithms can be considered evidence (that is particularly, if they are considered unreliable), and legislatures have to explain whether a judge who uses AI may be disciplined. The most important responsibility is human responsibility: black-box warnings in Loomis, and

[24] Cynthia Rudin, Caroline Wang & Beau Coker, *The Age of Secrecy and Unfairness in Recidivism Prediction*, Harvard Data Science Review (Mar. 31, 2020),
[25] Erica Stanford, *Autonomous AI: Who Is Responsible When AI Acts Autonomously and Things Go Wrong*, in *AI, Machine Learning & Big Data Laws and Regulations* 2025, Global Legal Insights (May 15, 2025),

presentence warnings are efforts to make sure that judges do not evade responsibility. There are even scholars who say that judges are supposed to write about the use of AI in the case. Global guidelines (e.g. AI ethics recommendations by UNESCO) also lay stress on the importance of human agency and control and the necessity of well-defined accountability lines. Without these mechanisms, AI may essentially shield decision-makers against accountability, which is against the current standards of transparency and justice.

Privacy and Data Protection: The personal information which is processed by the Judicial AI is typically very sensitive: criminal records, health data, or socioeconomic background of litigants. This increases the risks of leakage or abuse. In this regard, a massive surveillance of China (e.g. the trial of Amazon Rekognition), which is seemingly akin to an equivalent surveillance of Congress members, exemplifies the dangers of mass data collection. In the court case, in case prosecutors input all the personal information in an AI, it may be a breach of privacy rights or data-protection laws. The issue of privacy is urgent since data sets of justice are massive and untransparent; any violation would reveal jurors, witnesses, or victims. The laws on data protection such as the GDPR (and the DPDP Act) of the EU (and India) have stringent regulations concerning the processing of personal data[26]. In such regimes, profiling of defendants or litigants by way of AI could have to be done with express consent or a strong legal justification. Clumsy handling of legal information not only leaves privacy at risk but it also compromises the integrity of proceedings (e.g. use of secret police files as evidence should they be mishandled). In this way, the use of any AI used in the judicial setting has to include highly effective data-security measures and be aligned with privacy standards.

Over-reliance and Judicial Independence: Last, but not the least, is another, more indirect form of danger: the dependence of judges on AI advice. In the event that judges feel that the algorithms are authoritative, they might be reluctant to disagree with an AI score or a recommendation. This may trespass on judicial discretion[27]. This threat is explicitly recognized in the Chinese model: it keeps mentioning that AI tools will help a judge, but not take his or her place. In fact, according to one analysis, in China, AI is always marketed as a tool to efficiency, and not to the replacement of judicial discretion. Devoid of these cultural protective measures, there is the danger of losing such hard judgments to machines under the guise of efficiency[28]. Since the judicial system depends on human judgment and values to be legitimate,

[26] DLA Piper, *Data Protection Laws of the World: India*, DLA Piper Data Protection Laws of the World (2025),

[27] DPDP Rules 2025: India Notifies Digital Privacy Law, India Briefing (Nov. 17, 2025),

[28] Naiya Chung, *AI Is a Tool, NOT a Replacement for Human Judgment*, Sagacity Legal (Aug. 15, 2025),

the legal systems should avoid the technological hegemony. Practically, this would consist of human-in-the-loop requirements and the retention of the right of judges to overrule AI outputs.

Speech-Imaging BCI and Other New Concerns: A new issue has emerged, via the growth of brain-computer interfaces (BCI), which purport to decode perceived speech by imagining it. In case suspects or witnesses were subjected to such technology, it would destroy the right-against-self-incrimination and privacy of the mind. Ethical research cautions that imagined-speech BCI is erroneous and untested. It is questionable in its reliability, and its application in the court may be against the basic rights (e.g. the U.S.). Fifth Amendment or Article 8 ECHR. These points are actually hypothetical issues but they demonstrate how fast the bio-technologies might get involved into legal issues.

To conclude, although AI has the potential to make the work of a judge smoother, it is also accompanied by a host of legal and ethical traps. These difficulties are not on paper: they have been pointed out in studies and case laws.[29] To give an example, the Loomis case was quite explicit in understanding the risks of the opaqueness of algorithms, and the international human-rights organizations have already stated that AI should not override the already established civil and political rights. The following section will survey the attempts that different governments are making to manage this tension between innovation and ethics.

VI. Regulatory and Governance Approaches.

The various jurisdictions have reacted to the promise and risks of AI in diverse ways, making a variety of measures and legislation. Major regional developments are summarized:

India: As it is pointed out, India is working towards the regulation of AI indirectly by means of data and consumer regulations. Meaningful consent is required by the DPDP Act 2023 (discussed above), and AI training limits the usage of data. Recent AI Governance Guidelines by the government (November 2025) focus on the risk assessment and ethical principles. These principles are in line with DPDP and the new Indian Cybersecurity Act that the AI systems must be safe, transparent, and equitable[30]. The regulating bodies (such as the Reserve Bank or Telecom Authority) in the sector have started to issue outlines of AI in banking and telecommunications, and these reiterate the fears of bias and security. It is important to note

[29] UNESCO, *Recommendation on the Ethics of Artificial Intelligence*, adopted Nov. 23, 2021 (UNESCO Doc. No. PF/0000387331) (2022)
[30] India AI Governance Guidelines, Ministry of Electronics and Information Technology, Government of India (Nov. 5, 2025),

that India has not yet adopted a particular AI Act in the style of the EU; it has used a combination of strategy documents (AI strategy, NITI Aayog, 2018), guidelines and the current laws (IT Act, DPDP, consumer law). [31]The civil society and industry groups (e.g. Internet and Mobile Assn.) have spoken with caution and legislative committees are discussing AI-related clauses. Overall, the governance in India remains in the development phase: not only does it advocate the adoption of AI (through funds and pilots), but it also gradually incorporates AI-related responsibilities into the legislation (through DPDP and departmental regulations).

European Union: The EU has been assuming a comprehensive regulation strategy. The AI Act (2025) will become a precedent: It will outlaw some types of unacceptable AI (e.g. social scoring, biometric mass surveillance), and demand high-risk systems to be approached with high risk management. The judicial AI technologies (such as sentencing support) would be considered as high-risk, which would provoke the demand of transparency, human control, quality of data, and healthy documentation. Additionally to the AI Act, legal limitations on any AI system are presented by the Charter of fundamental rights of the EU and the frameworks of the Council of Europe. To illustrate, the Ethical Charter of CEPEJ (2018) explicitly guides the member states to provide human and judicial review of automated decisions and safeguard the rights of the litigants in the AI-assisted cases. Outside Europe, in 2021 UNESCO has taken a Global Recommendation on the Ethics of AI that encourages all countries to uphold human rights and dignity in AI development (including a strong recommendation in favor of transparency, inclusivity, and redress measures). These tools serve as the global standard: the EU frequently refers to the ethics principles developed by UNESCO and OECD AI Principles when working on national regulations. The practical implication of this is that any EU member the use of judicial AI should be in line with rigid due-process principles. It is worth noting that the Charter of Fundamental Rights provides the right to a fair trial (Art). Art. 47) and data protection (Art. 8), which regulators view to prohibit opaque algorithms that may not be contested in court.

United States: The U.S does not have extensive AI laws. Rather, the legal system is fragmented: Data protection is through legislation such as the California Privacy Act (CCPA) and industry-specific legislation (health, finance), and there is no federal AI legislation that could be used to take aggrievants to court. One of the federal proposals, an Algorithmic Accountability Act has been stuck in the congress and the Federal Trade Commission applies consumer-frauds

[31] NITI Aayog, *National Strategy for Artificial Intelligence*, (Govt. of India, Mar. 2018),

authority to regulate unfair algorithms. On the state level, certain local legislations or executive orders promote algorithmic auditing (e.g. The only thing that is specific to judicial algorithms is the New York City Local Law 144 that mandates bias auditing of automated hiring systems). There are major legal limitations as was mentioned in the litigation: Loomis is U.S. precedent on AI in sentencing. The ruling has been interpreted as a case of leniency though with caution, since the judges are not unaware of the high stakes. Companies in judicial ethics (e.g. American Bar Association) have started to give guidance on the use of AI by judges, generally recommending openness and research of any software presented. As a matter of practice, the U.S. remains in a case-by-case approach, supported by general due-process and equal-protection principles, but not tech.

China: In China, the policy of the party and high-down court regulations apply. In addition to the 2022 Supreme People court AIs Opinions, China has not enacted an overall AI law. Rather, a patchwork of standards and technological objectives has been given by the central government and judiciary. [32]Indicatively, China has established compulsory national criteria on AI quality (the AI Ethics White Paper), and promotes the system of grading AI reliability by industry. Criminal procedure laws already in existence are still applicable in the legal arena, and the law courts often blend it with internal rules on smart courts. The fact that the Chinese system is not as limited by the norms of judicial independence allows it to implement the transformative measures (such as Internet courts) rapidly. Simultaneously, China is also sensitive to the international response: the addition of China to such forums as UNESCO and OECD is not without purpose, and its AI policy formally supports the principles of personal dignity and privacy in accordance with the world prospects. Nevertheless, it can be stated that the focus of China is on efficiency and stability and not liberal principles due to its political form. Concisely, the Chinese form of governance is very centralized and enforcement-oriented which articulates the intention by the government to ensure a fast modernization of the judiciary.

Global Structures: The entire world recognizes that AI needs to be regulated internationally. UNESCO has also adopted AI Ethics Recommendation 2021, which endorses values such as transparency, fairness and rights of mankind at the request of 194 countries. OECD has incorporated non-binding AI Principles (also impacted by the EU ethics), which are cited by numerous governments. Guidelines on responsible AI use have also been published by even

[32] Chinese Courts Must Implement AI System by 2025, Supreme People's Court of the People's Republic of China (Dec. 12, 2022),

the G20 and World Economic Forum which focus on risk-based regulation and multi-national discussions. These international systems are not substitutes of the national law, however, they influence the minds of lawmakers and judges in the way to promote harmonized law values. As an illustration, both policies globally focus on human-centric AI (people in the center of the design), and AI privacy protection at the least pays lip service to GDPR-like standards. In conclusion, although laws are real and various, globally there is a general agreement that no technology despite its usefulness must degrade the fundamental values of judicial beliefs.

VII. Ethical Standards of Responsible Use.

Following the analysis above, we would suggest a number of principles in the responsible integration of AI in judicial systems:

Human-in-the-Loop & Decision Authority: Judges cannot be excluded as the deciding authority. Artificial intelligence devices are not supposed to substitute the rationale of judges. Practically, it implies that it is obligated to be controlled by humans: any AI-generated advice must be assessed by a judge. The culture and training must drive the points that AI is an advisor and not a dictator. One of the scholars frankly points out that AI systems must not be allowed to totally substitute human judgment and decision-making. This principle may be codified into laws or court regulations, such as by stating that the outputs of AI must be accompanied by disclaimers stating that AI is merely advisory and that the rationale supporting or opposing the judge should be clearly stated.

Risk-Based Regulation: AI is not AI is AI. The intensity of regulatory control must fit in line with the interests of the AI. Light-touch standards might be sufficient in the case of low-risk applications (e.g. language translation in chambers). Strict controls are required when it applies to high-impact purposes (sentencing assistance, forensic evidence). Similar to the EU option, a tiered scheme can establish protocols of high-risk groups which cause pre-deployment certification, continuous auditing, and rights-preventive measures (such as appealability). Importantly , regulators ought to periodically re-evaluate the level of risks since technology keeps on changing.

Explainability and Transparency: The AI systems deployed in a court have to be as transparent as possible. It may imply open-sourcing the algorithms to be viewed by the world or, at least, by third parties. Legal regulations must at least mandate AI tools to reveal their decision criteria in a non-expert format. No tool could be approved by the courts without vendor providing algorithmic impact statements (similar to environmental impact statements). The litigants and

judges should be allowed to learn the evidence mode or risk scores generation approach. The development focus should be on the explainability techniques (XAI): in case AI points out an important factor to the court, it needs to be clear about such data.

Fairness and Non-Discrimination: AI software should be created in a way that avoids prejudice. This involves proper curation of data and ongoing disparate impact monitoring. To illustrate this case, when an AI risk tool is trained on past information which portrays biased policing, the system is supposed to be modified or banned. Regulators might demand bias audits in which the results are audited to be demographically fair. Ethical design, models that do not require attributes that are actively avoided (race, gender) to be included but proxy checks of indirect discrimination can be employed. Any decision that involves individuals that is in the form of an algorithm can be questioned on grounds of fair treatment.

Privacy and Data Governance: Judicial AI should put into consideration rights to privacy. Privacy by design is required: it is necessary to process as little data about a person as required by an AI, and strong security controls are to be implemented. Access controls, audit logs and encryption of data are necessary. In the creation of the training models, it is preferable to employ anonymization methods wherever practicable. Judicial data can be afforded regulatory protections such as the consent requirement of the DPDP Act or purpose-limitation of the GDPR. Notably, the litigants must be informed in case their information is part of an AI process, and the existing rules of confidentiality (e.g. evidence privilege) are to be enforced. Especially the sensitive data (e.g. mental health records) require special precautions; these may be forbidden as inputs to algorithms.

Accountability and Redress: It should have open avenues of liability in case AI harms. The issue of who holds the responsibility had to be determined by the courts, whether it is system designers, deployers (courts or agencies), or vendors. To use the case of a false conviction, there must be measures of accountability or of reversive action in the event of a false conviction, owing to the use of an erroneous algorithm. The law can also have to evolve (e.g. strict product liability of AI with threatening results which were unreasonable, or professional regulations on judges using AI). Protections to the whistleblowers might act as incentive to report flaws. Finally, being a human, not a machine, should be made liable to judgements of laws; institutional design (training, supervision) should demonstrate such.

Ethics and Training Ethical players should be trained on the capabilities and limits of AI. AI ethics and technology law should be a curriculum of the bar associations, judicial colleges, and

law schools. There is a need to train the judges to critically interpret the outputs of algorithms. Best practice can be described as benchbooks or guidelines (e.g. how to query an AI recommendation). Incorporating a culture of due scepticism will aid in avoiding the blind faith in software.

Global and Multi-disciplinary Partnership: The use of AI in the courts transcends the national boundary (e.g. algorithms and data can be located in a foreign country). As such, teamwork is healthy. Lessons and standards can be harmonized by the judicial networks and human-rights bodies. As an example, the EU and India may agree on the metrics of fairness, or UNESCO may host forums on AI adjudication across the world. The interdisciplinary contribution is essential, too: ethics, technologists, and law professionals should work out guidelines in collaboration (it has been the case in the AI councils of the few countries).

These rules reflect the emerging models (in particular, the requirements of the EU, Trustworthy AI and ethics, provided by UNESCO) but, are made to fit the specific situation of judges and jurists. What makes this process very similar is the fact that the decent usage of AI in the courts is not only a technical issue, but an ethical and legal one. Technology should be incorporated in a manner that strengthens the judges and not their bashing.

VIII. Conclusion

AI will transforms the judiciary system across the world. Its ability to handle information quickly and facilitate research in law provides frustrating answers to inefficiencies that have been chronically present and issues of access. However, history has also shown that technology may also institutionalize inequities when it goes unbridled. As we have examined comparatively, countries are adopting diverse approaches to AI, but one thing that seems to be resonant across all countries and locations is that AI should be the servant of the judge and not the replacement of the judge. Even in India, some experimental AI projects such as SUPACE or SUVAS explain the way narrow AI can accelerate workflows and across boundaries, but only in a wider legal system now encompassing the privacy provisions of the DPDP Act. Having an open discussion regarding such tools as COMPAS in the United States makes the need to maintain transparency and due process apparent. Examples of the rule of law include the AI Act by EU and the ethical charters, where fundamental rights are considered as uncompromising limitations on technology. The quick, so-called smart courts in China, testify to the benefits of efficiency that AI has, and remind of the dangers in case of weak control.

Finally, promise of efficiency and consistency of judicial AI will only be achieved with pegging on ethical guardrails. Judgment and compassion cannot be replaced with automation. The judges ought to use AI as an advanced assistant - a device to process litres of legislation and evidence - but he or she must take the final decision. With the development of the rule of law in the 21 st century, there should be changes in the laws and codes of conduct. The normative blueprint we mentioned has focused on the concept of risk-based control, human supervision, transparency, and equality as main components of a responsible AI policy. By doing so, the courts will be able to benefit from the AI without endangering the values of justice. When used in a responsible manner, AI will assist in providing quicker verdicts and a fairer access to all without dehumanizing the courtroom floor. It is not a question of how to prevent the emergence of AI but how to steer it, so that it can serve justice, safeguard individuals, and allow technologies to become a servant of justice, rather than its owner.