WWW.IJRPR.COM

International Journal of Research Publication and Reviews

Journal homepage: www.ijrpr.com ISSN 2582-7421

An Analytical Study on the Use of Artificial Intelligence in Judicial Decision-Making in India

Bhaswati Talukdar.

Assistant Professor, University law college, Gauhati University.

ABSTRACT

The integration of Artificial Intelligence (AI) into the judicial decision-making signifies a ground-breaking move in the Indian judiciary, heralding the potential for unprecedented efficiency and the alleviation of chronic case backlogs. This study delves deeply into the transformative role of AI, methodically examining its multifaceted applications, tangible benefits, inherent challenges, and profound implications for human rights and the autonomy of judicial processes. AI technologies, such as predictive analytics, natural language processing, and machine learning, are increasingly being utilized to optimize case management systems, facilitate the study of vast repositories of legal precedents, and even assist in the formulation of judgments. Notable advancements, including the Supreme Court of India's establishment of the Artificial Intelligence Committee and initiatives like SUPACE (Supreme Court Portal for Assistance in Court Efficiency), richly illustrate the judiciary's earnest adoption of AI to enhance its operational framework.

Nevertheless, the use of AI in judicial process presents significant challenges, particularly concerning algorithmic bias, transparency in decision-making, and the accountability mechanisms required to uphold principles of justice, fairness, and impartiality. The association of AI's data-driven precision with the judiciary's deeply rooted humanistic ethos underscores the urgency of instituting a robust regulatory framework. This study critically interrogates whether AI can genuinely function as a supportive tool without eroding judicial discretion or diminishing public trust in the system.

Moreover, the analysis situates India's adoption of AI within the broader spectrum of global best practices while underscoring the critical need for AI solutions tailored to India's intricate socio-legal realities. Ending with actionable recommendations, the study emphasizes achieving a harmonious balance between technological progress and the constitutional commitment to fairness and justice, thereby paving the path for a transparent, equitable, and forward-looking judicial system.

Key words: Artificial intelligence, Indian judiciary, benefits of AI, risks and biases, reforms.

1. Introduction.

Brief Overview of Artificial Intelligence (AI) and its Applications

Artificial Intelligence (AI) refers to the regeneration of human intelligence practices by machines, typically by the computer systems. These procedures include learning (acquiring information and rules for using it), reasoning (using rules to reach approximate or definite and certain conclusions), and self-correction. AI has started to make important strides across various domains, from healthcare, where it supports in diagnosis and treatment planning, to finance, where it assists in scam detection and algorithmic trading. The legal field is no exception, with AI transforming legal research, document review, and even predictive analytics for litigation practices.[1] The incorporation of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in judicial decision-making in India marks an important advancement in the judiciary's endeavour to enhance proficiency, accuracy, and accessibility in legal procedures. AI technologies are being involved for predictive analysis, case law research, drafting, and even computerized case organization. The Supreme Court of India has started projects like the Artificial Intelligence Committee to explore AI's potential in simplifying the judiciary's workload[2].

The admissibility of electronic evidence in Indian law has undergone significant judicial scrutiny, starting with the Supreme Court's ruling in Anvar P.V. v. P.K. Basheer where the Court held that under Section 65B of the Indian Evidence Act, 1872, electronic records are admissible only if accompanied by a certificate under Section 65B(4), making such a certificate mandatory for secondary electronic evidence[3]. However, this rigid interpretation was relaxed in Shafhi Mohammad v. State of Himachal Pradesh, where a two-judge bench of the Supreme Court held that the 65B certificate is not mandatory

[1] P. Russel and P. Norvig, *Artificial Intelligence: A Modern Approach* 34-35. (4th edn, Pearson 2020)

[2] Ministry of Law and Justice, 'Artificial Intelligence Committee of the Supreme Court' (Govt. of India, 2020) https://main.sci.gov.in accessed 27 December 2024.

[3] (2014) 10 SCC 473.

in cases where the party relying on the electronic evidence does not have access to the original device, and courts may admit such evidence using their discretion under Section 136 of the Evidence Act[4]. Later, this position was overruled by a larger bench in Arjun Panditrao Khotkar v. Kailash Kushanrao Gorantyal where the Supreme Court reaffirmed the mandatory nature of the 65B certificate for electronic evidence, holding that the certificate is a precondition for admissibility unless the original device is produced in court, and explicitly held the decision in *Shafhi Mohammad* to be incorrect in law.cy in reducing procedural deferrals.[5]

The judiciary has long faced concerns such as case backlogs, delays, and the need for constant decision-making. AI offers encouraging solutions to these challenges by enabling quicker case processing, improving efficiency, and dropping human error in routine judicial tasks.[6]For example, AI-powered tools can support in legal research, helping judges and lawyers find relevant precedents with superior speed and accuracy. Furthermore, predictive analytics can provide visions into case outcomes based on historical data, aiding in more informed decision-making.[7] While AI cannot swap human judges, its role as an assistive tool can meaningfully improve the delivery of justice.[8]

objective of the article.

This article travels around and examines the integration of AI into judicial decision-making, probing its applications, benefits and assistances and trials. It proposes a comparative analysis of AI usage in various jurisdictions, with an emphasis on India. Ethical, legal, and jurisprudential inferences are discussed, emphasizing the need for a balanced attitude to AI adoption. The article concludes with recommendations for effective AI integration into judicial processes, ensuring alignment with principles of justice and human rights.[9]

Research methodology.

Doctrinal method of research has been used to carry out this research. Data has been collected from secondary sources like books, statutes, journals and law reporter.

2. Historical Context

Evolution of AI and Its Initial Applications in the Legal Field

The origins of Artificial Intelligence can be traced back to the mid-20th century when researchers began probing and exploring computational models of human cognition. Alan Turing's seminal work, *Computing Machinery and Intelligence* (1950), set the stage for AI by suggesting the Turing Test to determine a machine's ability to display intelligent behaviour. In the legal domain, early AI systems were typically rule-based, employing logical algorithms to assist in specific tasks similar to statutory interpretation and legal research.[10]For instance, the 1980s saw the arrival of expert systems such as MYCIN and HYPO, which provided rudimentary legal reasoning capabilities.[11]Over time, developments in machine learning, natural language processing, and data analytics revolutionized AI applications, enabling tools like predictive analytics and automated document review that could practice vast volumes of legal data with precision and speed.[12]

Early Attempts at Using Technology in Judicial Systems

The incorporation of technology into the judicial systems precedes AI, beginning with digital case administration systems and electronic court records in the late 20th century. These early initiatives intended to address issues such as inefficiency and case backlogs. In the United States, for example, the Public Access to Court Electronic Records (PACER) system was presented in 1988 to provide public access to court records electronically.[13] Similarly, India introduced the e-Courts Mission Mode Project in 2005 to digitize case records and modernize judicial workflows.[14]The early use of AI in courts began with legal research tools such as LexisNexis and Westlaw, which engaged basic AI to enhance the efficiency of recovering legal precedents and

[4] (2018) 2 SCC 801.
[5] (2020) 7 SCC 1.
[6] S. S. Kapoor, *Judicial Process and AI Integration56-59.*

(Eastern Book Company 2021)

[7] B. George, 'The Role of AI in Enhancing Legal Processes' 45(2) *Journal of Law and Technology* 123-125, (2020)

[8] R. Menon, 'AI and Judicial Decision-Making: Prospects and Challenges'12(3) Indian *Law Review* 78-80, (2022)

[9] Ministry of Law and Justice, 'AI and Justice: A Framework for India' (2023) <www.lawmin.gov.in> accessed 25 December 2024.

[10] S. Kumar, 'Artificial Intelligence in Legal Decision-Making: A New Era of Judicial Assistance' 10(2) *Journal of Legal Technology* 112-114, (2023)

[11] H. Prakash, *Artificial Intelligence and Legal Reasoning23-26* (Eastern Book Company 2019)

[12] E. Susskind, *The Future of Law: Facing the Challenges of Information Technology* 89-92.

(Oxford University Press 1996)

[13] R. Meena, 'The Evolution of AI in Legal Research' 47(4) *Indian Journal of Legal Studies* 210-213, (2021)

[14] Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, 'Public Access to Court Electronic Records (PACER)' (2023) <www.pacer.gov> accessed 25 December 2024.

case law [15].Although very basic compared to today's standards, these efforts laid the foundation for more refined and sophisticated AI applications in judicial processes.

Global Examples of AI Integration in Courts

In current years, several countries have adopted AI to enhance judicial efficacy and approachability. Estonia, for instance, has employed an AI-based virtual judge for resolving small claims disputes, substantially reducing the time and cost involved in such cases.[16] In China, the Supreme People's Court has introduced "smart courts," which use AI to automate case filing, evidence analysis, and even parts of judicial reasoning.[17] These courts depend on advanced technologies like facial recognition and block chain to ensure clearness and security in legal proceedings. In the United States, AI-driven tools like COMPAS (Correctional Offender Management Profiling for Alternative Sanctions) are used in sentencing and bail decisions, although these systems have ignited debates over bias and fairness.[18]These global initiatives demonstrate the transformative potential of AI in judicial systems while highlighting the need for careful regulation and ethical oversight.[19]

3. Theoretical Framework

Understanding AI in Judicial Decision-Making: Definitions and Processes

Artificial Intelligence in judicial decision-making refers and denotes the use of AI technologies to assist in, or automate, various stages of the legal process, from case analysis to judgment delivery. AI systems can process large datasets, recognize patterns, and make predictions or recommendations, all of which can support legal professionals in making more informed and up to date decisions. AI's envelopment in judicial decision-making goes far past mere automation of administrative tasks; it targets to improve cognitive capabilities by aiding judges in applying legal rules to specific facts of a case, analysing precedents, and even proposing likely outcomes based on previous judgments.[20] The judicial process itself, which conventionally involves human reasoning, judgment, and the application of law, is thus augmented by machine-driven insights that can process data at a scale and speed unattainable by human beings alone. However, the human component remains vital , as AI is used to assist, not replace, human discretion.[21]

Types of AI Used in Judicial Contexts

There are several types of AI technologies involved in the judicial system, with the two most prominent being Machine Learning (ML) and Natural Language Processing (NLP).

Machine Learning (ML): Machine learning, a subset of AI, involves algorithms that allow systems to "learn" from data and improve over time. In the judicial framework, ML can be used to forecast case outcomes based on historical data, identify patterns in case law, and even support in sentencing recommendations. For example, ML algorithms can analyse large datasets of past judgments to predict how a judge might rule in a similar case, taking into account factors like legal reasoning and past rulings.[22]

Natural Language Processing (NLP): NLP emphases on enabling computers to comprehend, interpret, and generate human language. In the legal domain, NLP is important for automating tasks such as legal research, document review, and contract analysis. By processing vast amounts of legal text, NLP systems can extract relevant case law, statutes, and legal principles, helping legal professionals find pertinent information more competently. NLP is also used in legal Chabot and AI-driven virtual assistants, which can guide users through legal processes by answering questions and providing recommendations.[23]

Role of Algorithms in Legal Decision-Making

Algorithms play an essential role in the integration of AI into judicial decision-making. In modest terms, an algorithm is a step-by-step set of instructions designed to perform a specific task or solve a problem. In the legal field, algorithms are chiefly be used to analyse large datasets, make predictions, and provide recommendations for legal professionals. For example, an algorithm can analyse thousands of preceding cases and identify trends in judicial decisions that are pertinent to a current case, helping judges make more reliable and informed decisions.[24]Moreover, predictive algorithms can be used for tasks such as risk assessment in criminal justice systems, where they evaluate the likelihood of a defendant re-offending based on historical data.

---

[15] Department of Justice, India, 'eCourts Mission Mode Project' (2024) <ecourts.gov.in> accessed 25 December 2024.

[16] D. Parthasarathy, 'The Impact of Legal Research Tools on Judicial Processes' 16(1) *National Law Review* 45-48, (2020)

[17] B. Xiao, 'Smart Courts in China: Innovations and Challenges' 14(2) *Asian Journal of Law and Society* 56-59, (2022)

[18] J. Angwin, 'Machine Bias: COMPAS and Racial Disparities in Sentencing' (2016) *ProPublica* <www.propublica.org> accessed 25 December 2024.

[19]ibid

[20] R. Meena, 'The Evolution of AI in Legal Research' 47(4) *Indian Journal of Legal Studies* 210-213, (2021)

[21] ibid

[22] ibid

[23] ibid

[24] R. Meena, 'The Evolution of AI in Legal Research' 47(4) *Indian Journal of Legal Studies* 210-213, (2021)

Despite their benefits, the use of algorithms in legal decision-making raises significant concerns about transparency, accountability, and fairness, as the proprietary nature of some algorithms can obscure the reasoning behind their predictions.[25]

Applications of AI in Judicial Systems.

Case Management and Legal Research.

AI has meaningfully improved case management systems by automating administrative tasks, rationalizing workflows, and improving the competence of legal proceedings. Traditional court systems often scuffle with backlogs, delayed filings, and manual case processing, which AI can help address. AI-powered case management systems can track the status of cases, assign tasks, and alert relevant parties about deadlines and court dates. Additionally, AI can assist in handling and organizing vast quantities of case data, permitting quicker recovery and more efficient processing.[26]

In legal research, AI tools like natural language processing (NLP) enable deeper analysis of legal texts, such as statutes, regulations, and case law, by mining pertinent information and summarizing key points. These tools help lawyers, judges, and legal researchers identify precedents and statutes that are relevant to the current case in hand, often with greater speed and correctness than traditional manual methods. For example, AI-driven legal research platforms such as ROSS Intelligence and LexisNexis use AI to comprehend legal questions modelled in natural language, providing tailored search results and insights, thus saving significant time and effort.[27]

Predictive Analytics for Case Outcomes

Predictive analytics is one of the most promising applications of AI in judicial systems. By analysing vast datasets, AI models can forecast the probable outcome of a case based on historical data and patterns from past rulings.[28] Predictive tools use machine learning algorithms to calculate factors such as the judge's past decisions, the specific laws applied, the nature of the case, and even external factors like public opinion or socio-political trends. This information helps legal professionals better know the strengths and weaknesses of a case, enabling more informed decision-making.[29]

For example, AI models can predict the likelihood of accomplishment in civil litigation, or the risk of reoffending in criminal cases, which could impact settlement negotiations or sentencing decisions. Though predictive analytics can help guide decisions, it is important to recognize that such models are only as worthy as the data they are trained on. Bias in data or algorithmic design can lead to skewed predictions, raising apprehensions about fairness, reasonableness and transparency.[30]

Assistance in Drafting Judgments and Orders

AI can also play a pivotal role in assisting judges with drafting judgments and orders. Legal writing is a time-consuming task that needs accuracy, coherence, and adherence to complex legal standards. AI tools can significantly speed up this process by generating preliminary drafts of judgments based on the facts of the case and applicable legal principles. These drafts include references to relevant precedents, legal arguments, and statutes, which judges can then modify and finalize. For example, platforms like Lex Machina use AI to analyse large volumes of legal text, including judgments and briefs, to produce insights that can guide judgment drafting. Such systems can assist in safeguarding that decisions are consistent with prior rulings, reducing the risk of error or oversight. This application of AI also allows judges to focus on the more complex and nuanced aspects of the case, improving the overall competence of the judicial process.[31]

Data Analytics for Identifying Legal Trends

AI-powered data analytics tools can help legal professionals and policymakers recognize developing trends in legal cases and rulings. By analysing large datasets of judgments, legislation, and legal opinions, AI can uncover patterns that may not be instantly apparent. This can be principally useful for identifying changes in judicial reasoning, detecting systemic issues such as legal delays, or recognizing biases in legal outcomes.[32]

For example, data analytics can disclose trends in how certain types of cases (e.g., human rights violations, economic offenses) are decided across different jurisdictions. AI tools can also be used to track the implementation of new laws or the success of particular legal reforms, providing valued feedback for future policymaking. Through this methodology, AI helps in augmenting transparency and accountability in judicial processes while contributing to data-driven legal reform.[33]

---

[25] ibid

[26] R. Srivastava, 'Artificial Intelligence in Legal Research and Its Impact on Legal Practice' 55(2) *Indian Law Review* 95-97, (2021)

[27] A. Sharma, 'Predictive Analytics in the Judiciary: Potential and Pitfalls' 36(1) *Indian Journal of Technology and Law* 112-114, (2022)

[28] S. Kapoor, *Artificial Intelligence in the Indian Judiciary* 158-160. (Eastern Book Company 2023)

[29] ibid

[30] A. Gupta, 'AI-Assisted Judgment Writing: A Practical Approach' 12(4) *Journal of Legal Technology* 77-80, (2021)

[31] D. Kumar, 'Data Analytics in Legal Systems: An Emerging Trend' 24(5) *International Journal of Law and Technology* 68-71, (2022)

[32] ibid

[33] M. N. Reddy, *AI in Judicial Systems: An Overview* 97-99(OUP 2022)

4. Advantages of AI in Judicial Decision-Making

Speed and Efficiency in Resolving Cases

AI has the capacity to meaningfully enhance the speed and efficiency with which cases are processed in judicial systems. Traditional court procedures, including case filing, document review, and legal research, are often time-consuming due to the manual and physical nature of these tasks. AI tools, such as case management systems and legal research platforms, can automate many of these functions, reducing the time required for lawyers, judges, and other legal professionals to complete them. AI-powered systems can promptly retrieve relevant case law, statutes, and legal opinions, enabling quicker formulation of arguments and legal strategies.[34]Furthermore, AI can help in organizing and prioritizing cases, making it easier for courts to allocate resources and time proficiently. In jurisdictions with higher caseloads, the integration of AI systems helps facilitate faster case resolutions, eventually leading to a more efficient justice delivery process.[35]

By automating repetitive tasks, AI tools free up human resources for more complex aspects of legal decision-making. As a result, the time spent on each case can be radically reduced, leading to quicker turnaround times for legal proceedings and judgments. This surge in speed and competence not only benefits individual litigants but also adds to a more efficient judicial system overall.[36]

Reduction in Pendency and Backlog of Cases

One of the most tenacious challenges faced by judicial systems worldwide is the backlog of pending cases. Courts in countries like India, with over millions of pending cases, often tussle with delays in proceedings, which can extend for years. AI presents a promising resolution to this issue by improving case management and helping courts streamline their workflows. AI systems can detect the most urgent cases, manage court calendars, and predict delays based on historical data. This predictive competence allows courts to allocate resources more effectively and prioritize cases that require immediate attention.[37]

Additionally, AI can aid in automating routine administrative tasks, such as development hearings, processing court documents, and managing case files. This lessens the load on court staff and minimizes the risk of human error that often exaggerates delays. With AI tools managing time-consuming tasks, judges can emphasis on substantive legal issues, thus enabling quicker case resolutions and a decrease in the backlog.[38]In countries like Estonia, AI-driven systems have been engaged to manage lesser claims disputes, which has resulted in quicker resolution times and a reduction in the number of cases pending in the judicial system.[39]

Enhanced Accuracy in Repetitive or Data-Driven Tasks.

AI outshines at tasks that require handling large bulks of data, repetitive calculations, and pattern recognition. In judicial systems, this translates to an enhanced level of accurateness and precision when performing tasks such as legal research, contract analysis, and document review. AI tools use natural language processing (NLP) and machine learning algorithms to go through thousands of legal documents, identifying relevant precedents, statutes, and legal arguments with remarkable precision. AI systems can also analyse inclinations in past rulings to offer more consistent recommendations for legal practitioners.[40]

For example, AI can analyse past case outcomes to determine probable rulings in similar cases, providing a data-driven basis for legal decisions. This process significantly declines the human bias that can sometimes influence judgments. Legal research platforms powered by AI can rapidly scan databases of legal texts and offer all-encompassing summaries of relevant laws and precedents. In areas like contract review, AI tools can recognize risky clauses or inconsistencies, providing a higher level of accurateness in identifying potential issues compared to manual reviews. By automating these repetitive and data-driven tasks, AI ensures that they are done correctly and consistently, which is crucial in legal decision-making.[41]

Minimizing Human Error.

Human miscalculation is an unavoidable part of any decision-making process, including judicial systems. Judges, lawyers, and court staff are often weighed down with cases, leading to fatigue, oversights, and mistakes in legal proceedings. AI's role in lessening human error is particularly critical in repetitive tasks, such as reviewing lengthy documents or analysing case law, where small mistakes can have significant legal consequences. AI systems

---

[34] V. Kapoor, 'The Impact of AI on Judicial Efficiency and Case Resolution' 56(3) *Journal of Artificial Intelligence and Law* 203-205, (2023)

[35] P. Agarwal, 'Artificial Intelligence in Judicial Systems: A Solution to Pendency and Delays' 28(2) *Indian Journal of Law and Technology* 112-114, (2021)

[36] R. Sharma, 'Efficiency and Speed in Legal Decision-Making: The Role of AI' 32(1) *Law and Technology Journal* 89-91, (2023)

[37] A. Joshi, 'AI and Case Management Systems: A Comparative Analysis' 45(4) *Indian Journal of Legal Studies* 77-79, (2022)

[38] K. Patel, 'Reducing Case Backlogs through Artificial Intelligence: A Case Study of Estonia' 18(2) *Global Journal of Law* 130-133, (2020)

[39] Ministry of Law and Justice, 'AI and Case Management: Transforming the Indian Judiciary' (2023) <www.lawmin.gov.in> accessed 25 December 2024.

[40] A. P. Narayan, 'AI-Powered Tools for Reducing Backlogs in the Indian Judiciary' 19(1) *Journal of Legal Innovation* 41-43, (2021)

[41] B. Yadav, 'AI in the Courtroom: Potential and Challenges for Legal Decision-Making' 14(2) *Indian Law Review* 109-112, (2022)

are intended and designed to perform such tasks with a high degree of constancy and accuracy, reducing the likelihood of errors due to human oversight or fatigue.[42]

Moreover, AI algorithms can flag discrepancies or discrepancies that may go unobserved by human decision-makers. In the context of legal judgments, AI tools can assist judges in cross-referencing cases, statutes, and legal principles to ensure steadiness and avoid contradictions. For example, AI-driven tools used in judicial decision-making can recognize prior rulings that line up with the facts of a current case, ensuring that decisions adhere to established legal precedents. While AI does not eliminate the potential for human error entirely, it acts as an effective safeguard, dropping mistakes and enhancing the overall dependability of the judicial process.[43]

5. Challenges and Risks

Lack of Transparency and Accountability in AI Algorithms

One of the main apprehensions in the integration of AI into judicial decision-making is the lack of transparency and accountability in the algorithms used. AI systems, chiefly those that employ machine learning models, often operate as "black boxes," meaning that it is difficult to understand how they arrive at precise decisions or recommendations. This opacity raises serious fears about accountability, mainly when AI tools are used to assist in critical decisions, such as sentencing or case outcomes. The decisions made by AI algorithms are often based on patterns discovered from large datasets, but the process by which these patterns are recognized and applied can be complex and inaccessible to human scrutiny.[44]

This lack of clearness postures challenges for legal professionals, judges, and the public, as it becomes hard to assess whether AI-driven decisions are justifiable or based on faulty reasoning. Without a clear understanding of how an algorithm functions, it is difficult to hold the developers or users of the technology accountable for flawed or biased outputs. In the legal framework, this could lead to unjust decisions being made without any avenue for challenge or correction. Additionally, if AI systems are installed without necessary oversight, there is the risk that they could perpetuate systemic issues without anyone being held accountable for the consequences. Therefore, establishing liability frameworks for AI in judicial processes is indispensable to mitigate these risks.[45]

Risks of Bias and Discrimination

Another imperative challenge of incorporating AI into judicial decision-making is the threat of bias and discrimination. AI algorithms are trained on historical data, which may reflect biases inherent in past human decisions. For instance, if an AI system is trained on court decisions that have factually discriminated against certain groups (e.g., racial minorities, women, or economically disadvantaged individuals), the system may inadvertently learn and replicate these biases. This is particularly in relation to legal contexts where impartiality and fairness are vital.[46]

Bias or prejudice in AI systems can manifest in several ways. In criminal justice, for example, risk-assessment tools powered by AI might unduly flag certain racial or ethnic groups as higher risk for reoffending, based on biased historical data. These biases can continue existing societal inequalities, leading to unfair outcomes for susceptible populations. Moreover, AI models are often skilled using data sets that do not fully signify the diversity of the population, worsening disparities in legal outcomes. Addressing this issue requires a rigorous effort to ensure that AI systems are developed using diverse, representative, and unbiased data, along with consistent audits to detect and correct any biases that may occur.[47]

Threats to Judicial Independence and Human Discretion

The integration of AI into judicial processes could also threaten judicial independence and human discretion. Judicial independence is a keystone of a fair and impartial legal system, guaranteeing that judges are free from exterior influences when making decisions. However, the use of AI may weaken this principle if it leads to a scenario where judges rely too severely on AI recommendations or predictions rather than exercising their own judgment.[48]

For instance, if AI tools provide a definite recommendation for sentencing or case outcomes, there is a risk that judges may succumb to these recommendations, reducing their role to that of a mere implementer of algorithmic decisions. While AI can help in decision-making, it should not supplant the nuanced and context-specific judgment that human judges are capable of providing. Over-dependence on AI could compromise the elasticity of the judiciary to contemplate and consider all aspects of a case, such as the intentions of the parties involved or broader societal implications. Moreover, extreme reliance on AI may lessen public confidence in the judicial process, as the perception may arise that decisions are being made by machines rather than human judges. Ensuring that AI aids as a tool to support, rather than replace, judicial decision-making is crucial for preserving judicial independence.[49]

---

[42] H. B. Sharma, 'Estonia's Smart Courts: A Model for AI Integration' 28(3) *European Journal of Legal Studies* 56-58, (2020)

[43] R. S. Mehta, 'Minimizing Human Error in Judicial Decisions with AI' 23(4) *Journal of AI and Legal Practice* 117-120, (2021)

[44] ibid

[45] S. Bhatia, 'The Transparency and Accountability Challenges of AI in Judicial Decision-Making' 41(5) *Journal of Technology and Law* 132-134, (2022)

[46] ibid

[47] A. Kumar, 'Bias in AI and Its Impact on Legal Systems: A Growing Concern' 29(2) *Indian Law Review* 200-202, (2023)

[48] K. Singh, 'Ethical Dilemmas in the Use of AI in Judicial Decision-Making' 30(4) *Journal of Legal Ethics* 147-150, (2023)

[49] P. Desai, 'The Risk of AI Undermining Judicial Independence' 25(3) *Law and Technology Journal* 97-99, (2021)

Ethical Dilemmas and Questions of Fairness

The use of AI in judicial decision-making increases several ethical dilemmas, particularly relating to fairness and the prospective for injustice. One of the key principled concerns is whether AI can truly make pronouncements that are fair and just, given the complications of human values, emotions, and moral judgment that are often fundamental to legal cases. While AI systems can process data competently, they cannot exclusively account for the human elements that are time and again essential in the legal process, such as empathy, understanding of social contexts, and the ability to weigh moral considerations.[50]

Moreover, AI systems may inadvertently aggravate disparities or create new ethical issues. For instance, an AI model designed to predict recidivism in criminal cases might unfairly penalize individuals based on socioeconomic status or other irrelevant factors, leading to disproportionate punishment for certain groups. Additionally, AI's heavy reliance on historical data could ignore existing societal biases, leading to perpetuated injustices. As such, a vital ethical question in the use of AI in judicial decision-making is whether the technology can be satisfactorily structured and designed to promote fairness, or whether its use ultimately results in a system that is less equitable than traditional human-led decision-making processes. Addressing these apprehensions requires ongoing scrutiny, the development of ethical guidelines, and an emphasis on human oversight.[51]

6. Legal and Ethical Considerations

Compliance with Constitutional Principles like Natural Justice and Due Process

The integration of AI into judicial decision-making progresses significant questions regarding compliance with important constitutional principles, particularly the principles of natural justice and due process. In most democratic legal systems, natural justice is the foundation of judicial fairness, requiring that parties have an chance to be heard and that decisions are made impartially. Similarly, due process guarantees that individuals are not deprived of their rights without a fair and transparent legal procedure.

AI-driven decision-making must line up with these principles to ensure that it does not undercut the fairness of legal processes. For example, if an AI system is used to make decisions about bail, sentencing, or even in more routine matters, there must be protections in place to ensure that the affected parties have the right to challenge or appeal against these decisions. The algorithms behind AI systems must be apparent and understandable so that litigants know how decisions are made and can assess whether these decisions have been made in obedience with natural justice principles. Moreover, ensuring that AI-based decisions are revisable by humans is critical, as automated systems cannot replace human judgment in complex matters that involve individual rights and interests. Failure to sustain due process and natural justice could lead to violations of constitutional rights and dent public trust in the judicial system.[52]

Balancing Technology with Judicial Independence.

Judicial independence is a central principle of any democratic legal system. It guarantees that judges make decisions free from external pressures, including political, financial, or technological influence. The increasing use of AI in judicial decision-making presents both occasions and challenges for maintaining judicial independence. On the one hand, AI tools can provide judges with accurate, data-driven insights and enhance efficiency in decision-making. On the other hand, there is a risk that heavy reliance on AI could erode the human discretion that is central to judicial independence.[53]

If AI systems are given too much importance in the decision-making process, there is a threat that judges may accede to machine-generated recommendations, dipping their role to that of a mere executor of algorithmic outputs. This could diminish the autonomy of the judiciary and lead to a situation where decisions are determined more by technology than by the principles of law and justice. Therefore, it is critical that AI remains a tool for judges rather than a substitute for human judgment. Judicial independence must be secured by ensuring that AI is used in a manner that balances, rather than replaces, the decision-making authority of judges. Courts must have the last say, and the use of AI must be subjected to strict ethical and legal guidelines to stop any undue influence from external technological systems.[54]

Privacy and Data Protection Concerns.

AI systems in the judicial setup often rely on huge amounts of data, including personal and sensitive information about individuals engaged in legal cases. This increases significant privacy and data protection concerns. In many countries, individuals have the right to privacy under constitutional or human rights contexts, and the use of AI in legal decision-making must be in obedience with these privacy rights. The processing of personal data must meet legal standards, including obtaining informed consent, ensuring data security, and respecting individuals' rights to control their personal information.[55]

AI systems must be designed to handle sensitive data sensibly. The risks of data breaches, unauthorized access, or misappropriation of personal information are heightened when large datasets are processed by complex algorithms. Moreover, AI's ability to learn from previous cases and recognize

[50] ibid

[51] R. Narayan, 'AI and the Right to Fair Trial: A Constitutional Analysis') 58(2) *Indian Constitutional Law Review* 220-223, (2021)

[52] S. Kumar, 'The Balance Between Technology and Judicial Independence in India' 41(3) *Journal of Law and Technology* 180-183, (2022)

[53]ibid

[54] A. Patel, 'Data Privacy Concerns in the Use of AI in Judicial Decision-Making' 30(2) *Indian Journal of Data Protection* 115-118, (2023)

[55] ibid

patterns in legal outcomes could lead to situations where personal data is used to make predictions or decisions without the open consent of the individuals involved. Thus, it is crucial for authorities to implement clear data protection policies that regulate the use of AI in judicial decision-making, ensuring that privacy rights are sustained. Legal standards such as the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) in the European Union provide important structures for data protection in AI applications, and similar protections must be applied in other jurisdictions to guarantee the responsible use of AI in the legal field.[56]

Global Legal Standards for AI in Judicial Systems (e.g., EU Guidelines)

As AI technology continues to grow, so too do the global legal standards governing its use in judicial systems. In the European Union, for example, guidelines for the ethical use of AI have been developed to safeguard that the technology is deployed in ways that respect human rights, support the rule of law, and promote justice. The EU's Artificial Intelligence Act (AI Act), which is the first of its kind, pursues to control high-risk AI applications, including those employed in judicial and legal decision-making. The Act sets out stern requirements for transparency, accountability, and fairness in AI systems, mostly those that have a direct effect on individuals' rights.[57]

Under these guidelines, AI systems used in judicial frameworks must be transparent, understandable, and subject to human oversight. These systems should also undergo regular inspections to detect and put right any biases or prejudiced practices. Moreover, the AI Act mandates that individuals be informed about the use of AI in decision-making processes and that they have the right to test automated decisions. These provisions align with global doctrines of fairness and due process, guaranteeing that AI enhances, rather than weakens, the justice system.[58]

Internationally, organizations like the OECD (organisation for economic cooperation and development the United Nations have also advanced ideologies and frameworks that highlight the importance of fairness, accountability, and transparency in AI deployment. These global rules provide a standard for jurisdictions seeking to adopt AI in judicial systems, supplementing the benefits of technological progressions with the fundamental rights and freedoms of individuals. Ensuring obedience with these international tenets is crucial in upholding public trust in AI's role in legal processes and safeguarding against potential misuse.[59]

7. Case Studies and Best Practices

AI in Judicial Decision-Making in India: Current Status and Pilot Projects

India is steadily taking on AI technologies in its judicial system, though the full-scale implementation of AI in decision-making is still in its initial stages. The Supreme Court of India and various High Courts have started exploring AI-driven tools to improve case management and legal research. One of the key initiatives in this respect is the eCourts Project, which aims to digitize court records, automate workflows, and enhance accessibility to legal documents. This project has seen success in reducing delays in case hearings and improving the efficiency of court proceedings, particularly in lower courts where case backlog is a substantial challenge.[60]

Additionally, pilot projects such as AI-powered legal research tools have been introduced in several courts to assist judges in quickly accessing relevant case law, reducing the time spent on legal research. In Delhi and Kolkata, AI-driven software systems like Sage AI and JALDI have been tested to help courts manage their caseloads more effectively. However, the application of AI in judicial decision-making, such as sentencing or judgment drafting, remains restricted due to concerns over accountability, transparency, and the need for judicial discretion.

Despite these challenges, India's legal system is beginning to see AI's potential in enhancing efficiency and addressing the growing case backlog. The NITI Aayog, the government's think tank, has been tasked with exploring the use of AI in the legal sector, recommending that AI should be used as a decision-support tool rather than as a replacement for human judgment. This thoughtful but positive approach reflects the necessity to balance technological advancement with the core principles of justice.[61]

Comparative Analysis of AI Use in Other Countries (e.g., USA, UK, China)

The use of AI in judicial decision-making diverges significantly across countries, influenced by legal traditions, technological infrastructure, and monitoring frameworks. In the United States, AI applications in the legal system are concentrated on improving efficiency rather than replacing human judgment. One significant example is the COMPAS (Correctional Offender Management Profiling for Alternative Sanctions) system, which is used to evaluate the likelihood of recidivism in criminal defendants. While this tool has been debated due to concerns about racial bias in its predictions, it

[56] European Commission, 'Artificial Intelligence Act: Ethical Guidelines for AI in Judicial Systems' (2023) https://ec.europa.eu accessed 25 December 2024.

[57] ibid

[58] ibid

[59] ibid

[60] ibid

[61] A. Patil, 'AI in Indian Judicial Decision-Making: Pilot Projects and Prospects' 41(1) *Journal of Indian Legal Technology* 80-83, (2023)

highlights the growing dependence on AI in making important decisions such as parole or bail eligibility. The AI and Law Conference in the USA has supported for transparency and fairness in AI tools used for judicial decision-making, highlighting the need for human oversight in all critical decisions.[62]

In the United Kingdom, AI is used primarily in case management and legal research. Tools like ROSS Intelligence, which use natural language processing (NLP), assist lawyers in drafting legal arguments by analysing case law quickly and competently. The UK also has strong regulatory frameworks to ensure that AI systems follow principles of fairness and transparency. However, the use of AI in substantive legal decision-making, such as sentencing, has been largely resisted, with policymakers vigilant about undermining judicial independence.[63]

China, on the other hand, has integrated AI more strongly into its judicial system, particularly through the use of smart courts. In Hangzhou, an AI-powered system is used to decide small disputes in civil cases, such as contract disputes, by supervising parties through legal procedures and offering automated rulings. China's aggressive implementation of AI in its legal system has sparked discussion globally, particularly regarding its implications for privacy and fairness. While China's AI-enabled legal system is praised for its efficiency, concerns about government surveillance and the potential for automated decisions to favour the state remain important challenges. The Chinese model highlights the importance of bearing in mind both the profits and the risks of AI in the judicial sector.[64]

Lessons from Successful AI Implementations in Legal Systems

The prolific implementation of AI in judicial systems worldwide provides important lessons that can guide other nations, including India, as they explore AI-driven legal reforms. One of the most successful examples is Estonia, which has applied AI in its legal system to such an extent that it has created an AI judge capable of resolving minor civil disputes. The AI judge in Estonia handles cases such as disputes over unpaid bills and simple contract issues, providing rulings that are legally binding. This system has established to be highly efficient, with decisions being made within a matter of hours, reducing the burden on the human judiciary. The key lesson from Estonia's success is that AI can be successfully used for low-stakes cases where the legal issues are forthright, allowing human judges to focus on more complex cases.[65]

Another case study comes from Singapore, where AI is being used to help judges in legal research and case management. The Judicial Analytics and Court Automation System in Singapore aids courts track case outcomes, predict trends, and simplify administrative tasks. By using AI to handle repetitive tasks, the Singaporean legal system has been able to improve judicial efficiency while upholding fairness and transparency. The accomplishment of Singapore's system exemplifies the importance of using AI as a supportive tool that improves, rather than replaces, the role of human judges.[66]

The Netherlands gives another valued experience through its AI-powered sentencing system used in the Dutch criminal justice system. This system helps judges assess risk factors such as the likelihood of recidivism but still allows the final decision to be made by the judge. The Dutch practice also emphasizes the significance of ensuring that AI is used in a way that supports, rather than substitutes, human judgment, and that the final legal decision always remains in the hands of a human judge.[67]

The key take away from these worthwhile applications is the need for a cautious balance.AI should be used to complement judicial decision-making, improving efficiency, accuracy, and access to justice, but not to substitute the human element that is critical for fairness and empathy in legal proceedings. Countries like Estonia, Singapore, and the Netherlands provide models of how AI can be integrated into judicial systems in a way that respects both legal doctrines and technological innovation.[68]

8. Role of Indian Judiciary and Legislators

Current AI Initiatives by the Supreme Court of India (e.g., SUPACE Platform)

The Supreme Court of India has started numerous efforts to incorporate Artificial Intelligence (AI) into its judicial processes, with a stress on improving efficiency and accessibility. One of the most eminent initiatives is the SUPACE (Supreme Court Portal for Assistance in Court's Efficiency) platform, launched in 2021. SUPACE is designed to assist judges by leveraging AI to conduct research, analyse case law, and offer insights founded on the huge volumes of legal data available. It uses Natural Language Processing (NLP) to process and identify relevant precedents, statutes, and legal documents, thereby helping judges in making informed decisions. This tool is mainly meant to reorganize the process of legal research, making it quicker and more effective, thus dipping the time judges spend on routine tasks like reviewing case law.

The introduction of SUPACE reveals the Indian judiciary's recognition of AI's prospective to improve case management and legal research, especially as courts face challenges like bulky case backlogs and increasing caseloads. However, it is important to note that SUPACE is presently a decision-support tool, meaning that it is not designed to replace the judgment of the court but to help judges in their research. The Supreme Court of India has emphasized

[62] ibid

[63] ibid

[64] S. Zhang, 'AI in China's Judicial System: Efficiency at What Cost?' 15(4) *Asian Journal of Law and Technology* 210-214, (2022)

[65] ibid

[66] ibid

[67] ibid

[68] L. M. Johnson, 'Lessons from Global AI Implementation in Legal Systems' 33(2) *International Journal of Legal Technology* 56-59, (2024)

that the final decision in every case will still be made by human judges, ensuring that judicial independence is preserved. The success of the SUPACE initiative is significant because it marks a step toward integrating AI in ways that support the judicial process without compromising the central values of the justice system.[69]

Analysis of Judicial Pronouncements on AI

While India has not yet wholly incorporated AI for judicial decision-making, various judicial pronouncements highlight the growing engagement of the judiciary with AI and technology in legal matters. In Justice K.S. Puttaswamy (Retd.) v. Union of India, the Supreme Court of India underscored the need for ensuring data privacy and safeguarding personal rights in the context of digital technologies. This landmark judgment, which sustained the constitutional right to privacy, set a precedent for forthcoming judicial pronouncements on the balance between technology and fundamental rights. The Court stressed the importance of regulating technology to avert misuse and to ensure that it does not encroach upon citizens' rights, a principle that must guide the integration of AI in judicial processes as well[70].

Additionally, in Ritesh Sinha v. State of Uttar Pradesh, the Supreme Court accepted the rising role of technology, including AI, in criminal investigations and case management. The judgment, while not focused completely on AI, discussed the use of technology in legal proceedings and stressed that the courts must remain observant about ensuring fairness and transparency in the application of technological tools. Such pronouncements emphasize the judiciary's careful but open attitude to the use of AI in the legal system. The focus remains on using AI in ways that supplement judicial processes rather than replacing judicial discretion, ensuring that human oversight and accountability remain vital[71].

Recent judgments also highlight the rising need for legal and ethical frameworks to govern AI's application in the judicial context. The judiciary has not moved away from raising concerns about the risks of bias in algorithmic decision-making, highlighting the importance of transparency and accountability when adopting AI tools in courtrooms. For example, the Petition for Regulation of Use of AI in Courts filed in the Delhi High Court seeks to examine the consequences of AI use in legal proceedings and confirm that such tools are used in a fair, unbiased, and legally sound manner. These judicial declarations reveal the growing stance of the judiciary toward technology, harmonizing innovation with the protection of rights and fairness.

Legislative Efforts to Regulate AI Use in Legal Frameworks

In addition to the judicial initiatives, the Indian legislature is also working on the way to creating a legal framework to regulate the use of AI, particularly in judicial systems. One of the fundamental developments in this regard is the Artificial Intelligence National Strategy, suggested by the NITI Ayog in 2018, which sketches a roadmap for AI research, development, and implementation across sectors, including the judiciary. The strategy highlights the importance of regulating AI applications to ensure ethical use and alleviate risks such as bias, lack of transparency, and violations of privacy. NITI Aayog's recommendations focus on developing regulatory frameworks for AI that prioritize accountability, transparency, and data protection, ensuring that the use of AI in judicial processes does not compromise fundamental rights or legal moralities.[72]

Legislative efforts to control AI use in India have also been explored through several bills and law, such as the digital personal data protection Act 2023 which addresses apprehensions related to privacy and data security, especially in the context of AI's application in personal and legal data. While this Act is not exactly fixated on AI in judicial decision-making, it has significant implications for how AI technologies are used to process sensitive legal data, ensuring that data protection rights are sustained.[73]

Moreover, in 2020, the Ministry of Law and Justice set up a Committee on Artificial Intelligence and Law, tasked with studying the potential applications of AI in the legal sector and recommending legislative measures for its regulation. This committee's conclusions will play a critical role in shaping future legislative efforts to govern AI's use in India's judicial system. The legislative approach in India is characterized by a careful and incremental adoption of AI, ensuring that technology is installed in a manner that is steady with constitutional values and the principles of justice.[74]

India's evolving legislative and judicial responses to AI's integration into the legal system highlight the need for a balanced approach—one that leverages the advantages of AI to improve judicial efficiency and case management while safeguarding rights, ensuring fairness, and protecting judicial independence. The pace of AI integration is expected to increase as the legal framework surrounding AI use becomes vibrant, but it will be crucial for lawmakers to ensure that AI tools are regulated in ways that respect human dignity and the fundamental rights of individuals.

9. Philosophical and Jurisprudential Implications

Impact on Human Rights, with Emphasis on Dignity and Equality

[69] M. Sharma, 'AI in the Indian Judiciary: The SUPACE Initiative' 12(3) *Indian Journal of Legal Technology* 56-59, (2021)

[70] (2017) 10 SCC 1.

[71] (2019) 8 SCC 1.

[72] ibid

[73]ibid

[74] ibid

The integration of Artificial Intelligence (AI) into judicial decision-making carries significant philosophical and jurisprudential challenges, principally concerning human rights. Central to these concerns are the principles of dignity and equality, which strengthen justice systems worldwide. AI systems, while capable of processing huge amounts of data, lack the human capacity for empathy, contextual understanding, and moral reasoning. This absence raises the question of whether AI-driven decisions can satisfactorily uphold human dignity, a cornerstone of justice in democratic societies, including India. For instance, while AI may predict case outcomes or recommend sentences based on statistical models, it cannot delve into the nuanced circumstances of a litigant's life or the social realities underlying their legal problems.[75]

Equality, too, is at stake. AI algorithms rely on historical data, which may inadvertently mirror systemic biases present in the judicial system or society at large. For example, biases connected to caste, gender, or socioeconomic status could be continued or even amplified if not explicitly addressed during the design and deployment of AI tools. The use of biased algorithms in judicial decision-making could lead to a violation of the principle of equality before the law, as enshrined in Article 14 of the Indian Constitution. Thus, ensuring that AI systems are designed with fairness and inclusivity in mind is crucial for maintaining trust in the judiciary and protecting fundamental rights.

Questions of Accountability: Who is Responsible for AI Decisions?

AI's increasing role in judicial processes raises deep questions about accountability, a central tenet of jurisprudence. In traditional judicial decision-making, judges are answerable for their rulings, which can be examined and appealed based on established legal principles. However, when decisions are influenced or entirely made by AI, determining accountability becomes more difficult. Should accountability lie with the developers of the AI system, the judges who rely on its recommendations, or the institutions that deploy it? These questions remain mostly unresolved in legal systems worldwide, counting India.[76]

For example, if an AI system delivers inappropriate or biased advice that influences a judicial ruling, it is unclear whether the accountability lies with the algorithm's design or its application in a specific case. This uncertainty is compounded by the "black box" problem, where AI systems operate as opaque mechanisms, making it difficult to trace how specific decisions are reached. This lack of transparency poses a threat to the doctrines of natural justice, predominantly the right to be heard and to understand the reasoning behind decisions. Ensuring accountability in AI-assisted judicial decision-making will need vigorous regulatory frameworks that establish clear lines of responsibility and mechanisms for reparation.[77]

The Balance Between Technology and Human Judgment in Delivering Justice

The effective integration of AI in judicial decision-making rest on preserving a suitable equilibrium between technological competence and human judgment. While AI can process data and identify patterns far beyond human capabilities, it lacks the moral and ethical judgment that is vital to delivering justice. Judicial decisions often need a deep understanding of social contexts, individual circumstances, and the ability to interpret laws vigorously. AI, by contrast, operates on predefined rules and statistical models, making it ill-suited to address cases requiring moral reasoning or empathy.[78]

A strategic jurisprudential challenge is determining the appropriate scope of AI's role in the judiciary. While it is widely accepted that AI can assist in repetitive tasks such as legal research or case management, its use in core judicial functions, such as sentencing or adjudication, must be approached carefully. Courts must ensure that technology supplements rather than unseats human judgment, conserving the judiciary's role as the arbiter of justice. This balance is mainly severe in a diverse country like India, where socio-legal realities vary suggestively across regions and communities.[79]

10. Conclusion and Future of AI in Judicial Decision-Making

India stands on the point of a transformative era in judicial innovation, with the capacity to create AI-enhanced courts that address long-standing challenges such as case backlog and deferred justice. The successful employment of platforms like SUPACE and the digitization of court records through the eCourts Project indicate that the Indian judiciary is eager to adopt AI to improve efficiency. However, the next frontier includes integrating AI into substantive aspects of decision-making, such as predicting case outcomes, analysing evidence, or even supporting in drafting judgments.

AI-equipped courts in India could revolutionize access to justice by making legal services more affordable and accessible, particularly in rural areas where judicial infrastructure is often insufficient. For example, AI tools could enable virtual court hearings, automated documentation, and real-time translation of legal proceedings into regional languages. However, understanding these prospects will require addressing ethical and practical challenges, such as ensuring that AI systems are comprehensive, transparent, and capable of addressing India's complex socio-legal realities.

Potential Reforms to Integrate AI Effectively

For AI to be integrated efficiently into India's judicial system, several reforms are necessary. First, of all an all-inclusive regulatory framework must be established to govern AI's use in judicial processes. This framework should deliberately address issues such as data privacy, algorithmic bias, and

[75] ibid

[76] ibid

[77] ibid

[78] ibid

[79] S. Kumar, *AI and Human Rights in the Indian Judiciary* (2nd edn, Universal Law Publishing 2023) 45-49.

accountability, ensuring that AI systems operate within the bounds of the law and respect fundamental rights. Second, substantial investment in digital infrastructure and training programs is vital to equip judges, lawyers, and court staff with the assistances needed to work with AI tools effectively.

Moreover, pilot projects and controlled experiments should be directed to assess the effectiveness and fairness of AI systems before their extensive adoption. Lessons learned from other countries, such as Estonia's AI judge and China's smart courts, can provide valuable insights into designing AI systems that align with India's legal and constitutional values. Finally, public consultations and stakeholder engagement will be important for building trust and ensuring that AI tools are developed and deployed transparently.

Recommendations for Policymakers, Technologists, and the Judiciary

Policymakers should prioritize enacting legislation that compromises a clear legal framework for AI's use in the judiciary, addressing concerns of accountability, transparency, and fairness. Technologists must stress on developing AI systems that are ethical, inclusive, and designed with safeguards to prevent misuse or discrimination. Collaboration between technologists and legal experts is vital to ensure that AI tools are aligned with the judiciary's needs and values.[80]

For the judiciary, the importance should be on using AI as a tool to improve efficiency without compromising human judgment. Judges and court staff should be trained to know the strong point and limitations of AI, enabling them to use these tools efficiently and dutifully. Building a culture of ethical AI adoption, where technology supplements rather than replaces human discretion, will be significant in ensuring that AI works as a force for good in the judicial system.

[80] ibid