

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL FOR LEGAL RESEARCH AND ANALYSIS



Open Access, Refereed Journal Multi-Disciplinary
Peer Reviewed

www.ijlra.com

DISCLAIMER

No part of this publication may be reproduced or copied in any form by any means without prior written permission of Managing Editor of IJLRA. The views expressed in this publication are purely personal opinions of the authors and do not reflect the views of the Editorial Team of IJLRA.

Though every effort has been made to ensure that the information in Volume II Issue 7 is accurate and appropriately cited/referenced, neither the Editorial Board nor IJLRA shall be held liable or responsible in any manner whatsoever for any consequences for any action taken by anyone on the basis of information in the Journal.

Copyright © International Journal for Legal Research & Analysis

EDITORIALTEAM

EDITORS

Dr. Samrat Datta

Dr. Samrat Datta Seedling School of Law and Governance, Jaipur National University, Jaipur. Dr. Samrat Datta is currently associated with Seedling School of Law and Governance, Jaipur National University, Jaipur. Dr. Datta has completed his graduation i.e., B.A.LL.B. from Law College Dehradun, Hemvati Nandan Bahuguna Garhwal University, Srinagar, Uttarakhand. He is an alumnus of KIIT University, Bhubaneswar where he pursued his post-graduation (LL.M.) in Criminal Law and subsequently completed his Ph.D. in Police Law and Information Technology from the Pacific Academy of Higher Education and Research University, Udaipur in 2020. His area of interest and research is Criminal and Police Law. Dr. Datta has a teaching experience of 7 years in various law schools across North India and has held administrative positions like Academic Coordinator, Centre Superintendent for Examinations, Deputy Controller of Examinations, Member of the Proctorial Board



Dr. Namita Jain

Head & Associate Professor

School of Law, JECRC University, Jaipur Ph.D. (Commercial Law) LL.M., UGC -NET Post Graduation Diploma in Taxation law and Practice, Bachelor of Commerce.

Teaching Experience: 12 years, AWARDS AND RECOGNITION of Dr. Namita Jain are - ICF Global Excellence Award 2020 in the category of educationalist by I Can Foundation, India. India Women Empowerment Award in the category of "Emerging Excellence in Academics by Prime Time & Utkrisht Bharat Foundation, New Delhi. (2020). Conferred in FL Book of Top 21 Record Holders in the category of education by Fashion Lifestyle Magazine, New Delhi. (2020). Certificate of Appreciation for organizing and managing the Professional Development Training Program on IPR in Collaboration with Trade Innovations Services, Jaipur on March 14th, 2019



Mrs.S.Kalpana

Assistant professor of Law

Mrs.S.Kalpana, presently Assistant professor of Law, VelTech Rangarajan Dr.Sagunthala R & D Institute of Science and Technology, Avadi. Formerly Assistant professor of Law, Vels University in the year 2019 to 2020, Worked as Guest Faculty, Chennai Dr.Ambedkar Law College, Pudupakkam. Published one book. Published 8Articles in various reputed Law Journals. Conducted 1Moot court competition and participated in nearly 80 National and International seminars and webinars conducted on various subjects of Law. Did ML in Criminal Law and Criminal Justice Administration. 10 paper presentations in various National and International seminars. Attended more than 10 FDP programs. Ph.D. in Law pursuing.



Avinash Kumar



Avinash Kumar has completed his Ph.D. in International Investment Law from the Dept. of Law & Governance, Central University of South Bihar. His research work is on "International Investment Agreement and State's right to regulate Foreign Investment." He qualified UGC-NET and has been selected for the prestigious ICSSR Doctoral Fellowship. He is an alumnus of the Faculty of Law, University of Delhi. Formerly he has been elected as Students Union President of Law Centre-1, University of Delhi. Moreover, he completed his LL.M. from the University of Delhi (2014-16), dissertation on "Cross-border Merger & Acquisition"; LL.B. from the University of Delhi (2011-14), and B.A. (Hons.) from Maharaja Agrasen College, University of Delhi. He has also obtained P.G. Diploma in IPR from the Indian Society of International Law, New Delhi. He has qualified UGC – NET examination and has been awarded ICSSR – Doctoral Fellowship. He has published six-plus articles and presented 9 plus papers in national and international seminars/conferences. He participated in several workshops on research methodology and teaching and learning.

ABOUT US

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL FOR LEGAL RESEARCH & ANALYSIS
ISSN

2582-6433 is an Online Journal is Monthly, Peer Review, Academic Journal, Published online, that seeks to provide an interactive platform for the publication of Short Articles, Long Articles, Book Review, Case Comments, Research Papers, Essay in the field of Law & Multidisciplinary issue. Our aim is to upgrade the level of interaction and discourse about contemporary issues of law. We are eager to become a highly cited academic publication, through quality contributions from students, academics, professionals from the industry, the bar and the bench. INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL FOR LEGAL RESEARCH & ANALYSIS ISSN 2582-6433 welcomes contributions from all legal branches, as long as the work is original, unpublished and is in consonance with the submission guidelines.

AI IN JUDICIARY: ETHICAL IMPLICATION OF AI TOOLS IN LEGAL DECISION MAKING

AUTHORED BY - OMHITA V NAIR

LLB

Amity Law School Amity University Maharashtra

AI IN JUDICIARY: Ethical Implications of AI Tools in Legal Decision Making.

One of the most massive technological changes in contemporary legal practice has been the integration of artificial intelligence (AI) into judicial systems. This research investigates the complex ethical landscape of AI uses in legal decision-making processes, including both the transformative potential and the serious concerns. Modern AI systems challenge traditional understandings of judicial authority while promising increased efficiency and accessibility. While such advances have significant ethical challenges regarding fairness, transparency, accountability and human oversight that need to be carefully addressed to sustain the integrity of justice systems, however, these advances do exist.

Introduction

Artificial intelligence being introduced into judicial decision-making processes and can bring about benefits such as increased efficiency, consistency, and the capacity to process massive amounts of data. Now, however, various AI systems — from simple decision support tools to more advanced predictive analytics — are being deployed across various parts of the legal system. Yet, these technologies may speed up judicial processes and even make justice more accessible and efficient¹. One such example is the use of tools such as ROSS Intelligence and IBM's Watson already present in legal adjudication, which have raised questions about how they will change the fundamental nature of judicial decision making.

As for the areas of application of AI in judiciary contexts, that is, case outcome prediction, risk assessment in criminal justice, document analysis and review, legal research assistance and administrative automation. There are several ethical challenges that need to be addressed for each application of AI integration in judicial processes to uphold rather than undermine the

¹ Javed K, "Bias in adjudication: investigating the impact of artificial intelligence, media, financial, legal institution in pursuit of social justice" PubMed central (2025)

principles of justice.

The quick development and implementation of such technologies raise the need to comprehensively analyze their ethical considerations because legal decisions make a drastic difference in people's lives and society's confidence in courts. Analyzing these implications involves looking not only at the technical nature of AI systems but also their societal extent and interplay with the current legal systems and principles.

Evolution of AI in Legal Systems

The development of AI within legal frameworks has moved from straightforward rule-based software to more advanced machine learning systems that can read patterns in legal information and make predictions. The advancement has been fueled by increasing computational power, data availability, and algorithmic complexity, which have allowed AI systems to take on increasingly advanced legal tasks.

Yet, as they increasingly become embedded in judicial systems, they challenge fundamental issues concerning the nature of legal authority and the place of human judgment within the administration of justice. The vision of "rob judges" deciding cases in courts of the future leads to contemplation of whether adjudication is an exclusively human task or a task that can be taken on by machines gradually.²

AI tools offer several potential benefits to judicial systems. They can enhance efficiency by automating routine tasks, provide consistency in decision-making, improve access to justice through faster processing, and assist in analyzing complex legal information that might overwhelm human capacitors.

Such technologies offer more efficiency, precision, consistency, and ease that-if achieved-would render justice more attainable to larger portions of society. AI systems can sift through enormous quantities of legal information in a quick manner, recognizing applicable precedents and trends that would take human researchers a long time to find. They can also assist in regularizing specific facets of legal decision-making, possibly lowering inconsistencies created by human elements like fatigue or unconscious bias.

² Isabella Banks, University of Amsterdam, "Operationalising human oversight of AI supported judicial decision-making : A systematic perspective" AlogSoc (2023)

In administrative settings, AI can automate case management, document processing, and scheduling, releasing human resources for higher-level judgment tasks. For judges and lawyers, AI-assisted research tools can offer detailed analyses of applicable case law, statutes, and legal scholarship to inform better decision-making.

One major potential advantage of AI in legal systems is increased access to justice and transparency within institutions. AI systems have the ability to make legal information more accessible to those without legal expertise and, at the same time, cut down on costs involved in legal processes. They also have the potential to increase transparency by formalizing decision-making procedures and making them more uniform in various cases and jurisdictions.

But achieving these advantages depends on careful deployment to avoid inadvertently perpetuating current injustices or creating new ones. The promise of greater access and transparency must be weighed against fears of algorithmic bias and the risk that AI systems will make decisions opaque rather than transparent.

Ethical Issues and Challenges

One of the primary ethical concerns of using AI in judicial decision-making is that there is the risk of continuing pre-existing biases. AI algorithms are trained on historical data, which may contain biases that reinforce social prejudices. This means that bias may be inadvertently embedded in the AI's decision-making process which may lead to unfair decision-making.

There are many sources of risk for AI bias, which can be data errors during training, biases in the way the algorithms score and assign risk to particular information. If actions that result from biased AI are not properly handled, we may see a system that produces decisions that continue to disadvantage marginalized communities and exacerbate current inequities, rather than alleviate them. This risk highlights the need to insist on a higher standard of fairness and scrutiny from AI systems, particularly in matters of legal adjudication.

To promote fairness in the legal system, and ensure that AI systems were designed and trained with bias mitigation in mind, it is essential that officials will use AI systems have to use diverse, representative training data, high levels of transparency around the algorithms, and continuous monitoring and evaluation to identify potential sources of bias in their AI systems. Engaging diverse stakeholders in the design and implementation of AI systems is also needed to mitigate

biases.

Transparency on how AI systems arrive at their conclusions is required to sustain faith in judicial procedures. If algorithmic analyses are presented as evidence in court, defendants must have the right to know how the tools arrived at their conclusions and be permitted to challenge the outcomes³.

The Forensic Algorithms Act justice is meant to guarantee this transparency, arguing that criminal defendants have the ability to comprehend the functioning of algorithms whose conclusions are being utilized as evidence against them and challenge the strength and pertinence of the algorithms' rationale and conclusion. As Berkeley Law Professor Andrea Roth argued, just like human experts become adversarial scrutiny in court, the same must happen with software.

But bringing transparency about is made difficult by the fact that most AI systems, especially those that employ deep learning, are "black boxes" whose path from input to output is not readily explainable. Forensic algorithms are mostly controlled by private enterprise that may invoke trade secret privileges to prevent inspection of how their systems work. These obstacles demonstrate the clash between proprietary interests and the public's right to transparent judicial proceedings.

Accountability for decisions that AI systems have made is yet another important ethical concern. Identifying responsibility if an AI system makes a mistake or a prejudice decision is very difficult-whether it is among the developers, the data vendors, or users of the AI system.

Having clear lines of responsibility is crucial to mitigate this issue and ensure that there are mechanisms in place to correct mistakes or biases. This involves the delineation of roles and responsibilities for human oversight, having rigorous testing and validation processes in place prior to deployment, and having avenues for appeal and redress when AI systems generate undesirable outcomes.

The problem of accountability also transcends technical issues into legal and ethical contexts.

³ Jule Pattison-Gordan, "Courtroom Algorithms Must Have Transparent Decision-Making", *Governing*, (2022)

It needs to redesign the conventional views on responsibility and liability in a scenario where ever more autonomous systems exist, and evolve new forms that can include the peculiar attributes of AI as well as retain human values and rights intact.

COMPAS Risk Assessment System

The COMPAS (Correctional Offender Management Profiling for Alternative Sanctions) risk assessment algorithm provides a compelling case study of the ethical challenges involved in using AI for judicial decision-making. Research on this algorithm has revealed several concerning patterns in how it affects human judgment and fairness.

Experiments with the COMPAS algorithm have revealed that algorithmic risk scores can become anchors that create cognitive bias, with human evaluators anchoring their predictions to the algorithm's score. Specifically, participants who saw a low anchor algorithm provided risk scores on average 42.3% lower than those who saw a high anchor algorithm when evaluating the same defendants⁴. In addition, subjects frequently didn't know that the algorithm's scores were guiding their choices, and thus how influential these instruments can be in shaping human judgment.

From the standpoint of accuracy, the COMPAS algorithm was more accurate in its prediction of recidivism than the human participants (65.0% compared to 54.2%). When participants made decisions on the basis of including the algorithm's judgments, their accuracy did not increase. This implies that human-AI collaboration does not necessarily have the effect of improving the quality of decisions and can at times produce poorer results than either humans or AI systems in isolation.

Most disturbing are the results about fairness. When participants saw COMPAS scores, fairness of their predictions varied based on balanced error rate and accuracy equity measures, yielding more beneficial results for white defendants compared to black defendants. Even when warnings regarding the possibility of disparate impact on minorities were given, the biasing effect occurred, which suggests that general advisements might not be enough to offset algorithmic bias.

⁴ Isabella Banks, University of Amsterdam, "Operationalising human oversight of AI supported judicial decision-making: A systematic perspective" AlogSoc (2023)

The EU AI Act and High-Risk Systems

The European Union has made noteworthy efforts towards regulation of AI systems, especially the ones applied to judicial purposes. The EU AI Act categorizes AI systems which are meant for use by administrative or judicial institutions to help them research, interpret facts and law, and apply law to real facts as "high-risk"⁵. This category makes these systems subject to tight regulations involving conformity assessment, certificates, registration duties, and ex post controls.

The high-risk category of judicial AI systems acknowledges the degree to which limitations can influence fundamental rights. However, recital 41 of the AI Act note that just because a system is identified as high-risk it does not mean it is incompatible with other acts of Union law or national law that are compatible with EU law. The systems use can still be compliant to the extent that their use satisfies the relevant requirements of the Charter of Fundamental Rights and the relevant acts of secondary Union law and national law.

Several fundamental tenets in national constitutions, the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR) and Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union (CFREU) ensure that AI does not take the place of humans who function as judges. Any fully automated judicial decision-making system would constitute an infringement of constitutional guarantees related to jurisdiction for example the right to a fair trial, the right of the parties to defend themselves and the obligation for judicial decisions to justify their reasoning.

Justice in Forensic Algorithms Act

While the Justice in Forensic Algorithms Act wants more access to information by the defence that will permit it to contest the results of algorithmic forensic analyses rendered in court, one has to accept the idea that sound forensic science involves such limitations.

This legislation speaks to the uncertainty surrounding these non-disclosure-forensic algorithms, which operates within those assessments. A case in point is the Government Accountability Office report of 2021, which noted that analysts and investigators have experienced difficulties regarding bias, misuse, misinterpretation, and poor communication with these tools.

⁵ Vaccaro, Michelle Anna, 2019, "Algorithms in human decision-making : A case study with the COMPAS Risk assessment software." Bachelor's thesis, Harvard college

Currently, forensic algorithms are not subjected to any federal standards and they mostly belong to private industries, which can freely exercise their trade secret privileges to prohibit criticism of their functioning. As such, the Justice in Forensic Algorithms Act is a balancing act between the advantages of these technologies and the required safe-guarding of process and rights to fair trial.

American Bar Association Ethics Ruling

The American Bar Association (ABA) played a huge role in the backdrop of thinking within an ethical framework upon which AI may apply in legal contexts through its Formal Opinion 512 published on July 29th, 2024. This 15-page document explains how generative AI is currently being used in legal circles, the transformational promise it holds, and includes tremendous advice on how to use the technology efficiently and ethically.

The ethics decision is especially important because it sets ethical guidelines for the application of generative AI while also legitimizing it in the legal system.⁶ The American Bar Association contributes to the development of a fair strategy that can direct judges, lawyers, and other legal professionals in their adoption of AI by recognizing both the advantages and disadvantages of this technology in the practice of law.

AI-Human Cooperation: Striking the Correct Balance Given the distinct capabilities and constraints of both human and artificial intelligence decision-makers, human-machine cooperation in adjudication—more especially, human supervision of decision support systems—may be able to combine the best features of both while avoiding their worst drawbacks. A human professional is usually kept "in-the-loop" to interpret, review, and, if required, question automated outputs as part of human oversight.

The Significance of human agency and supervision has been recognized in the judiciary for a long time. As early as 2013, the European Commission for the Efficiency of Justice stated that judicial AI systems must remain "under user control". Users of such systems must be well-informed, independent, and empowered to check automated judicial decisions and the information used to make them.

⁶ American bar association "ethics ruling on generative AI: Taking advantage of AI technology ethically and effectively"

Nonetheless, it is hard to put in place effective human oversight. Empirical studies of the COMPAS algorithm indicate that human reviewers may be excessively swayed by algorithmic recommendations, which could reduce the effectiveness of oversight. Moreover, the sophistication of contemporary AI systems could render it hard for human overseers to comprehend and critically assess their outputs.

Overcoming these challenges demands thoughtful design of human-AI collaboration systems, extensive education for human overseers, and organizational systems in place that facilitate substantive oversight instead of simply rubber-stamping algorithmic outputs. It also demands constant testing of how these collaborations play out in real-world practice and adaptation based on new evidence.

Conclusion

The incorporation of AI into judicial decision-making has vast potential advantages to efficiency, consistency, and access to justice systems. These need to be weighed against very severe ethical issues on fairness, transparency, accountability, and the role of human judgment in legal outcomes.

Meeting these concerns will need a multilateral strategy of technical measures to reduce prejudice and increase explainability, sound regulatory regimes that strike a balance between innovation and safeguarding core rights, and thoughtful human-AI collaboration system design that maximizes the benefits of both while making up for each's weakness.

As AI technologies develop further and their uses in judicial settings continue to grow, continuous discussion between technologists, lawyers, ethicists, and affected communities will be critical. Such discussion must guide both the creation of particular AI technologies and the general rules governing their implementation so that AI will be used to support rather than erode the core principles of justice systems.

The future promises neither blind acceptance nor blanket dismissal of AI in judicial decision-making, but instead careful integration under the light of transparent ethical principles and a commitment to upholding human dignity and rights as the focus of justice systems. By being optimistic about their possibilities and cautious about their dangers, we can strive toward judicial systems that are more efficient as well as fair.

References

- Javed K , “Bias in adjudication : investigating the impact of artificial intelligence, media, financial, legal institution in pursuit of social justice” PubMed central (2025)
- Isabella Banks , University of Amsterdam, “Operationalising human oversight of AI supported judicial decision-making : A systematic perspective” AlogSoc (2023)
- Jule Pattison-Gordan, “Courtroom Algorithms Must Have Transparent Decision-Making” , Governing, (2022)
- Isabella Banks , University of Amsterdam, “Operationalising human oversight of AI supported judicial decision-making : A systematic perspective” AlogSoc (2023)
- Vaccaro, Michelle Anna, 2019, “Algorithms in human decision-making: A case study with the COMPAS Risk assessment software.” Bachelor’s thesis, Harvard college.
- American bar association “ethics ruling on generative AI: Taking advantage of AI technology ethically and effectively”.
- Ignacio Cofone and Warut Khern-am-nuai, “The Overstated Cost of AI Fairness in Criminal Justice”, (2025) Indian Law journal
- Victorian Law Reform, (2024) “Artificial Intelligence in Victoria’s Courts and Tribunals : Consultation Paper”
- Dr Sreelatha and Dr Gyandeep Choudhary, C0007, “Exploring the use of AI Legal decision making : Benefits and Ethical Implications” (2023)
- Aria Khademi and Vasant Honavar, “Algorithmic Bias in Recidivism Perspective” (Student Abstract) 34 No 10, AAAI -20 Student Tracks.
- Irina Carnat “Addressing the risks of generative AI for Judiciary: The accountability frameworks under EU AI Act” 55, (2024).