ILE MULTIDISCIPLINARY JOURNAL

ILE Publication House is the **India's Largest Scholarly Publisher**

IS AI IN THE JUDICIAL SYSTEM A BOON OR BANE?

AUTHORS - BHAIRAVI THAKKAR & DEWESH SHARAN, STUDENTS AT KES' SHRI. JAYANTILAL H. PATEL LAW COLLEGE, MUMBAI

Abstract

The incorporation of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in the judicial system gives a chance of transformation with many advantages as well as demanding issues. By simplifying administrative duties, increasing legal study accuracy, and allowing predictive analytics to predict case results, AI driven tools can help to improve efficiency. Furthermore, artificial intelligence promotes more impartiality by lowering human prejudices in legal ruling and by providing inexpensive alternative solutions increases accessibility to legal assistance.

But their benefits notwithstanding, AI in the judiciary presents many dangers including algorithmic prejudice, absence of openness, and overreliance on technology. Trained on historical data, AI systems might accidentally perpetuate social disparities and bias. Ethical issues relating privacy, data security, and the lack of human empathy in sensitive legal cases like family law, together with moral quandaries, further complicate AI's place in the legal terrain.

AI-driven decisions have both potential and drawbacks, as case studies, including COMPAS in criminal justice, AI in UK family courts, and Chicago predictive justice tools. Although AI can enhance access and judicial efficiency, it has to be used with care so as to avoid unjust results. To guarantee that AI supports rather than replaces human judgment, one still needs transparency, ethical oversight, and human intervention.

Finally, AI's place in the judiciary should be tightly controlled so as to preserve justice, equity, and responsibility. To make sure that artificial intelligence benefits rather than hinders the legal system, one must have a balanced approach—that is, using its advantages while reducing its risks. The judiciary can improve performance by integrating AI sensibly even while maintaining basic legal and ethical standards.

Introduction:

In today's modern world, AI in the judicial field has evolved fast and penetrates several sectors of society from healthcare to banking. The jury is set to offer major advantages and great challenges when AI is introduced. Its use in the courtroom is increasingly a subject of great significance as AI keeps shaping the future of law, therefore raising both hope and worry. The advantages, possible drawbacks, and moral issues of AI in the judiciary are discussed in this post, therefore highlighting its transformative power while admitting the need for cautious and responsible usage.

AI in the legal world promised: The Boom

1. Better Efficiency and Case Handling

Document classification, case management, and scheduling are all chores that AI-driven tools can automate, thus freeing court employees and judges to concentrate on more complex subjects. Thus, AI in courts can enable to cut delays, decrease backlogs, and raise general case disposition time by handling data

ILE MULTIDISCIPLINARY JOURNAL [IF SCORE – 7.58]

VOLUME 4 AND ISSUE 1 OF 2025

APIS – 3920 – 0007 | ISSN - 2583-7230

Published by

Institute of Legal Education

https://iledu.in

more quickly than human colleagues and arranging it.

2. Advanced Legal Research and Accuracy

The time it takes to find pertinent case law may be dramatically reduced by AI systems created to help with legal research. Additionally, it lowers the potential for human error, can process enormous volumes of information and spot patterns that might pass unseen by people and that too within a couple of minutes. It leads to more informed legal arguments and more precise, fact-finding judgment.

3. Greater Objectivity and Reliability

AI's dependence on data-driven algorithms allows it to make decisions based on patterns found in historical rulings, thereby lessening the effect of personal biases and emotional judgment that could sneak into human decision making in the judicial system.

4. Improved access to justice and cost cut.

By providing automated solutions for common legal chores such as legal document generation, contract reviews, and case analysis, AIdriven systems can reduce the price of legal services. Especially for those in underrepresented or underserved areas, legal chatbots and internet sites can give people with cost effective access to legal counsel.

5. Forecasting case outcomes: analytics in action

Predictive analytics by AI can examine past data to forecast case results and therefore offer insightful knowledge on how particular cases might go. This ability can enable judges and attorneys to evaluate a case's weaknesses and advantages, therefore supporting more knowledgeable decision-making.

6. Improved Legal Studies and Training

By offering interactive learning platforms for students and practitioners, artificial intelligence can also help to revolutionize legal instruction. For example, AIdriven simulations could provide law students with training in case analysis,

argument construction, and application of legal principles in several situations.

AI's Risks in the Judiciary: The Bane

1. Prejudices and Discrimination

Trained on historical data, AI systems may contain biases reflecting social disparities. This might lead to unjust and biased consequences for underrepresented groups. AI-driven predictive tools could affect people from particular racial or economic backgrounds quite differently, for instance, if the data used to train the AI mirrors past discriminatory trends.

2. Loss of Transparency and Accountability

AI reasoning processes are not always clear, Particularly in the context of court judgments, this absence of openness can severely compromise accountability. It may be challenging to follow a verdict that depends on an AI gadget that offers an incorrect or unfair suggestion. It could be difficult to decide who is to blame when an AI tool damages a person's rights or liberty without clear accountability mechanisms.

3. Dependency on Technology

AI systems may offer recommendations or insights, but they should not replace human judgment. Within ethical, moral, and societal values, the law entails sophisticated judgments that AI may not grasp. Relying too much on AI could result in decisions ignoring the human element of justice, hence producing unjust effects or a feeling that the system is uncaring.

4. Migration and Unused Value

AI tools need huge volumes of information including personal, sensitive data about people involved with legal cases. The main concern is how such data is kept, guarded, and handled in view of this. Unauthorized access to this data might result in privacy violations, identity theft, cyberattacks, the abuse of personal information, etc. Therefore possibly endangering the independence of the legal system.

5. Limited sympathetic understanding and ethical analysis

Emotional intelligence, empathy, and ethical reasoning are missing in AI systems. Particularly in legal matters can be quite personal and emotive. AI might not completely value the human aspects of these cases. Apart from the actual wording of the statute, judges have to weigh the more general social setting and make rulings in line with moral standards and human values.

6. Loss of Legal Autonomy

AI systems become too central in decisionmaking, there may be worries that judges could more and more rely on technology rather than use independent judgment. This might erode the power of the judiciary over time since judgments could be seen as produced by algorithms rather than legal rationale and human judgment.

III. Moral Issues and the Road Ahead

1. Transparency and Accountability

AI's decision-making mechanisms have to be open for it to be reliable in the court. Legal experts need to know how AI tools come about their findings or suggestions. Moreover, systems of accountability have to be put in place to make certain that responsibility is unambiguously set if artificial intelligence make error. The application of AI in the legal framework relies critically on openness. AI systems lack the natural capacity to clearly justify their decisions, unlike human judges. For people who depend on AI generated suggestions, this presents difficulties.

For instance, should a judge use an AI device to recommend an appropriate sentence for a criminal, the AI's recommendation might lack an effortlessly clear rationale. The absence of openness can undermine confidence in the process and cause doubts about the fairness of the decision-making. AI tools employed in the court should be created so that their decision-making processes can be tracked and clarified in a clear way if this is to be solved. Even if the

logic is derived from sophisticated algorithms, legal experts including attorneys and judges should have the means to grasp how AI systems arrived at their judgments. The construction of "explainable AI" systems could allow users to judge the logic of the model and therefore its output, hence enabling this openness by providing internal workings insights.

Furthermore, to guarantee their equity, transparency, and observance of moral standards, artificial intelligence systems must be audited periodically. By putting such audit tools in place, legal institutions can make sure AI is used deliberately and protect against unconscious biases or errors in the AI systems.

2. Bias Mitigation and preserving data integrity

By guaranteeing that training data is wide, precise, and free of past discrimination, one helps to correct partiality in AI systems. To find and correct any prejudices, AI model audit and data audit should be done on a regular basis. In view of evolving customs and legal criteria, AI systems should also constantly be revised.

3. Interaction between AI and people Who are Renowned in Their Field.

AI should assist legal experts and supplement human judgment. Not replace it. A hybrid strategy where AI tools support judges and attorneys by offering insights, organizing data, and automating menial chores. It is crucial that AI is not viewed as a substitute for human judgment but rather as a tool that complements human expertise. Considering the stakes tied to legal decision-making, artificial intelligence must be seen as a means that enhances human knowledge rather than a replacement for human judgment. Cooperation among data scientists and legal experts should be given top priority in the evolution of artificial intelligence in the judiciary. This multidisciplinary approach will guarantee that AI systems are developed with a thorough knowledge of both the restrictions of technology and the law.

Furthermore, artificial intelligence systems ought to be developed with human-centered values in view. For example, though predictive analytics can assist with case result estimation, it is absolutely vital that human judges ultimately influence decision-making. AI should serve as an advisory tool, offering insights, organizing information, and assisting with research, but leaving room for human judgment in the final legal conclusions. Human-centered artificial intelligence can also guarantee that technology does not eclipse the significance of legal practitioners such judges and attorneys, who are essential in interpreting the law more generally in an ethical context. For these experts to guarantee that artificial intelligence solutions meet the demands of justice and correspond with moral guidelines, they have to be engaged in their design and appraisal as well.

Most probably, artificial intelligence should work along with people in the judiciary. AI should boost legal professionals' capacity to operate much more quickly and competently, not replace them. Artificial intelligence can help legal professionals free up time for higher-level analysis, argumentation, and decision-making by automating repetitive jobs such as document review or legal research.

The courtroom can also benefit from this cooperation. AI systems could, for instance, support judges by presenting pertinent precedents or proposing potential legal interpretations, but the judge would have the final say in deciding based on the facts of the case. By learning to use artificial intelligence tools as partners rather than as replacements, legal professionals will guarantee that their knowledge is still at the core of the legal system.

4. Community Interaction and Trust

AI in the legal system should be employed such as to preserve popular belief in it. Emphasizing openness will help to remove worries about justice, bias, and responsibility by allowing the general public to be aware of the part AI plays in judicial decision making. How artificial intelligence operates in legal decision making

should be taught to general citizens and judges as well as attorneys. Legal experts' training programs should include artificial intelligence literacy classes so that they may analytically evaluate AI created information.

5. Limited use in Sensitive Cases

In cases of emotional and moral complexity—that of child custody, domestic abuse, or capital punishment—AI should be limited. Under such circumstances, human judgment has to be given more weight than data driven forecasts. Although never the main decisionmaker, artificial intelligence can serve as a supporting device.

6. Legal Frameworks for AI Accountability

Clear legal standards ought to be set by governments defining AI involvement in court proceedings. In instances where AI gives mistaken or prejudiced recommendations, legislation should spell out who is responsible. People damaged by incorrect artificial intelligence judgments should have legal remedy. AI can raise several ethical issues spanning from privacy hazards to biases and justice problems. Strong ethical supervision should be instituted over the application of artificial intelligence in the judicial system to tackle these difficulties. Clear ethical rules for AI in the legal framework should be developed in cooperation with governments, legal institutions, and artificial intelligence (AI) developers.

7. Ethical AI Design and Open-Source Models

Promoting openness and source artificial intelligence models can be done to guard against hidden prejudices and encourage honesty. Development should include ethical AI design principles guaranteeing inclusiveness, fairness, and human rights respect.

8. Limitary privacy shielding and data use

To avoid privacy violation and abuse, artificial intelligence systems should have restricted access to sensitive legal information. The way artificial intelligence gathers, stores, and

processes case material should be controlled by rigorous data protection rules.

9. Periodic Review and Adaptation

Legal artificial intelligence systems need frequent checks and changes to fit changing legal and moral norms since artificial intelligence develops fast. Legal systems should have the flexibility to suspend or modify AI applications if risks outweigh benefits.

10. AI literacy required by legal experts

Legal professionals should have the expertise to assess AI tools and understand them with great care. This includes not only understanding how AI systems work but also recognizing their limitations and ethical implications. Legal training programs and law schools should provide specialized courses on artificial intelligence as it becomes more common, including both the technical features of AI systems and the ethical, legal, and social implications of their use.

Furthermore, continuous professional training should guarantee that judges and attorneys stay current on the most recent developments in AI and its incorporation into the legal system. This ongoing learning approach will enable legal practitioners to judiciously decide on when and how much to incorporate AI in their work.

Case Studies

Case Study 1: COMPAS (Correlational Offender Management Profiling for Alternative Sanctions)
Lessons Learned

The COMPAS instance shows both the promise of artificial intelligence solutions to enhance efficiency in the legal system and the major moral issues raised when biased data trains artificial intelligence models. It highlights the need of ongoing control, data openness, and auditing tools to guarantee artificial intelligence systems do not reinforce current social prejudices.

Case Study 2: Role of artificial intelligence in Family Court, UK
Lessons Learned

Although the application of AI in family courts highlights the need of protecting privacy and ensuring that AI systems consider the unique subtleties of each case, it also shows the promise of technology to help with difficult and time sensitive decisions. Such delicate areas of law require a delicate equilibrium between human supervision and technology.

Case Study 3: AI in Predictive Justice (Chicago's Risk Assessment Tools)
Lessons Learned

The Chicago PSA case study emphasizes the potential of artificial intelligence to speed up the justice system and lower pretrial incarceration. Using imperfect or insufficient historical information, however, exposes the major danger of perpetuating bias if AI systems rely on it. To guarantee equity in the application of AI in judicial systems, constant monitoring, bias correction methods, and openness in the design of AI tools are of utmost importance.

Study 4: The Robot Lawyer DoNotPay
Lessons Learned

By offering inexpensive legal assistance, DoNotPay shows how AI could democratize justice access. Still, it also reminds us that in more difficult situations AI cannot supersede the subtle judgment and experience human attorneys offer. Especially with complex legal issues, AI solutions ought to enhance rather than replace human legal experts.

Study 5: Employment of AI for Legal Research via ROSS Intelligence
Lessons Learned

ROSS Intelligence emphasizes how artificial intelligence helps to lower expenses and to enhance legal efficiency. It underscores, too, though the need of retaining human direction in the deployment on internet of AI solutions. Legal professionals must be alert and use artificial

intelligence as a companion rather than a substitute for their own knowledge and sense.

In essence, these case studies show the range of applications AI is having in the courts, therefore demonstrating both the promise of AI in increasing efficiency, uniformity, and access to justice as well as the difficulties and hazards that come with its integration. Still, problems regarding bias, honesty, privacy, and the requirement for human oversight are central points of worry. Going ahead, a responsible and ethical approach to AI integration in the legal system will be essential to guarantee that technology promotes rather than hinders justice.

Conclusion

At the interface of innovation and ethical accountability lies the integration of artificial intelligence with the judiciary. Although artificial intelligence has amazing benefits in legal study, access, and efficiency, it raises legitimate worries about bias, transparency, accountability, and the human component of justice. The difficulty lies not in denying AI but in using it cautiously so that it continues a tool supporting legal judgment rather than one controlling it.

To safeguard justice, AI must be used as a complementary force, working alongside with attorneys and judges to enhance it and not to replace human judgment. Strict guidelines, regulatory frameworks, and continuous overview of AI must be established to eliminate biases and prevent AI from recreating historical inequalities. Fairness and responsibility will be guaranteed by using methods such as periodic audits, openness in AI driven choices, an intense focus on human intervention in important cases, etc.

Moreover, legal experts need AI literacy so that they can critically evaluate and ethically use artificial intelligence technologies in view of the ongoing development of AI. Open conversations on the part of AI in law must also assist to preserve public confidence in the judicial system and guarantee that justice is based on human values, moral reasoning, and empathy. The future of AI in the judiciary is not about choosing between technology and tradition—it is about striking a balance where AI serves as an instrument of justice, not as its master. With meticulous execution and moral scrutiny, artificial intelligence can transform the legal terrain while respecting the fundamental ideals of fairness, equality, and human dignity.

References

1. Aditya Gatlewar, "Emergence of a New Dimension to the Judicial System:" "AI" – A Threat or Boon?, ADC, 2022- **https://disputescentre.com.au/emergent-of-a-new-dimension-to-the-judiciary-system-ai-a-threat-or-boon/**

2. Aurora V. Solis, Legal Research in the World of AI: A Boon or a Bane for Young Lawyers?, M & J services, Sept. 24, 2024- https://mandjservice.com/blogs/blog/legal-research-in-the-world-of-ai-a-boon-or-a-bane-for-young-lawyers?srsltid=AfmBOopfLdKoMqA-JU29Ngkelj2MNl-C1aM1r503skgzzNqKZx1bY0Ho

3. AI in the legal system: A boon or bane?, Manila Bulletin, Nov. 26, 2024 – https://mb.com.ph/2024/11/26/ai-in-the-legal-system-a-boon-or-bane

4. Shreya Bhattacharya, Artificial Intelligence in the Law Industry: A Boom or Bane, Jus Corpus, Dec. 23, 2022- **https://www.juscorpus.com/artificial-intelligence-in-the-law-industry-a-boon-or-bane/**

5. Rachel Curry, AI is making its way into the courtroom and legal process, CNBC, Nov. 1, 2023 – https://www.cnbc.com/2023/11/01/ai-is-making-its-way-into-the-courtroom-and-legal-process.html

6. CJI Chandrachud, AI in courts: Boom or Bane?, Linkedin - https://www.linkedin.com/pulse/ai-

courts-boon-bane-cji-chandrachud-weighs-jenish-pithadiya-m7awf

7. Motanya duncun, The Intersection of Tech, Law, and AI: Predicting Bias, Recidivism Through Technology, Fintech, Aug.11, 2023 - https://fin-tech.co.ke/2023/08/11/ai-in-law-recidivism-human-algorithm-fairness/

8. Rishabh Srivastava, Artificial Intelligence in the Legal Industry: A Boon or a Bane for the Legal Profession, ResearchGate, Oct. 2018 - https://www.researchgate.net/publication/329987534_Artificial_Intelligence_in_the_Legal_Industry_A_Boon_or_a_Bane_for_the_Legal_Profession

9. **ProPublica (2016).** *Machine Bias: There's Software Used Across the Country to Predict Future Criminals. And It's Biased Against Blacks -* ProPublica Article on COMPAS

10. **Binns, A. (2018).** *Data, Algorithms, and the Law: An Examination of Bias in Predictive Risk Assessment. International Journal of Law and Information Technology.*

11. **The Guardian (2019).** *AI to Help Social Workers Predict Child Protection Risks in Family Courts-* The Guardian Article on AI in Family Courts

12. **Cafcass (2018).** *Children and Family Court Advisory and Support Service: Annual Report-* Cafcass Report

13. **Ross Intelligence (2020).** *Introducing ROSS, the AI Legal Research Assistant.* ROSS Intelligence Official Website

14. **ProPublica (2016).** *The Secretive Company That Might End Privacy in Legal Tech.* ProPublica Article on Predictive Justice Tools

15. **Griffiths, R. (2017).** *DoNotPay: The AI Robot Lawyer Tackling Everything from Parking Tickets to Legal Immigration Services.*
BBC News- BBC News on DoNotPay

16. **European Commission (2019).** *Ethics Guidelines for Trustworthy AI -* EU Guidelines on Trustworthy AI

17. **Binns, A. (2020).** *The Ethics of AI and Predictive Policing: The Dangers of Biased Algorithms in Law Enforcement. Journal of Ethics in Technology and Law.*

18. **Susskind, R. (2019).** *Tomorrow's Lawyers: An Introduction to Your Future. Oxford University Press.*

19. **Susskind, R. (2018).** *The End of Lawyers?: Rethinking the Nature of Legal Services. Oxford University Press.*

20. **Glimcher, P. W. (2020).** *The Law of AI and Smart Machines: Understanding the Legal Impact of Artificial Intelligence, Robotics, and Machine Learning. McGraw-Hill Education.*