



INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL FOR LEGAL RESEARCH AND ANALYSIS

Open Access, Refereed Journal Multi Disciplinary
Peer Reviewed Edition :

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 2 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

IJLRA

EDITORIAL TEAM

EDITORS



Megha Middha

Megha Middha, Assistant Professor of Law in Mody University of Science and Technology, Lakshmangarh, Sikar

Megha Middha, is working as an Assistant Professor of Law in Mody University of Science and Technology, Lakshmangarh, Sikar (Rajasthan). She has an experience in the teaching of almost 3 years. She has completed her graduation in BBA LL.B (H) from Amity University, Rajasthan (Gold Medalist) and did her post-graduation (LL.M in Business Laws) from NLSIU, Bengaluru. Currently, she is enrolled in a Ph.D. course in the Department of Law at Mohanlal Sukhadia University, Udaipur (Rajasthan). She wishes to excel in academics and research and contribute as much as she can to society. Through her interactions with the students, she tries to inculcate a sense of deep thinking power in her students and enlighten and guide them to the fact how they can bring a change to the society

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.

SUPERHUMAN CAPABILITIES OF AI IN LAW- FUNDAMENTAL CHANGE TO WHITE-COLLAR ROLES IN INDIA

AUTHORED BY - M. SNEHA GOUD

Research Scholar, MNLU Nagpur

ABSTRACT

The twenty-first century has champeroned consequential technological progressment that pervades all notions of our existence. Artificial Intelligence (AI) technology is applied forthwith to conduct legal work once fulfilled solely by legal practitioners. Recently, the Constitution of India has underwent a lot of transformation after adopting AI Technologies. Also, with the implementation of AI technologies, a vast transformation happened, mainly in the accessibility and transparency of the Indian legal framework. AI has facilitated more efficiency in the Indian legal structure through its techniques and has also redefined conventional legal roles AI apparatus are very prompt and intelligent enough to offer case laws, statutes, a streamlined research process, legal literature, and a summary of case analysis to Indian legal professionals within seconds. Thus AI tools can be embraced as a transformative tool and can be considered as a cause of justice for all. This observation contours what AI is and probe the present day application of AI in the legal field. It also recognizes AI products and evolution that are in the setting. The legal field, though dilatory in the modification of this technology, is embarking to upturn the momentum. Ultimately, it contends that lawyers will invariably be required in the modus operandi of law, regardless of the constant and consistent progress of AI and the change in the conventional legal roles and responsibilities after the adoption of AI pertaining to the transformation of legal roles in India harnessing AI for enhanced efficiency and access to Justice.

Keywords: *Artificial Intelligence (AI) Technology, Machine Learning(ML), Legal Fields, Law, Indian Legal System*

INTRODUCTION

This is an indubitable certitude that artificial intelligence (AI) is undoubtedly transfiguring all of the industry leveled over to compact settings but the repercussions is way more preponderant than we formerly perceived. Nonetheless, there are trifling technological progression in the Indian legal profession; lawyers even now ply methodologies which have been in place within this indentation for eternity now. At present it has become compliant to assemble, govern and reserve data and AI can be a paradigm shifter when it comes to altering the means lawyers utilise, apply data and outlook law wholly.ⁱ

One such massive disorderliness that Artificial Intelligence (AI) can bring to endure on the legal profession is in its legal research field. Nevertheless with AI apace with, Indian law firms will embark on comprehending ineffable cognizance into the realm of legislation in an instance. At this moment, legal research draws copious time and resources, consequently producing law firm's customary cost retrieval distress as less profitably overlaying them.ⁱⁱ Though, AI may design a level playing field throughout the overall legal community. In defiance of not flexible on standard micro-scale or macro-sale law firms can complaisantly endorse such podiums by application of AI research for law systems objectives or additional requisites without preconception whose enthrall it might be assisting.ⁱⁱⁱ

To synthesize future-generations legal research arenas using NLP, innumerable Indian legal tech startups are preserving time for the law firms and discovering additional pertinent outcomes for them. As an alternative of reckoning on ingenuous keyword-rooted probing, these platforms study the entire subject of legal documents to impart more precise and prudent outcomes. Furthermore astonishing is that a part of these start-ups are locomoting rapidly to institute their AI research potentialities and have even launched their own AI research labs.^{iv}

However, lawyers not to mention law firms also agonize about being outnumbered by AI which is not precised findings. On the contrary, it will aid both lawyers and law firms become more potent and coherent. The utilisation of AI can execute monotonous functions like document review, contract drafting and even legal research. As an aftermath, advocates can instantly partake in tactical ventures such as structuring alliance with clients or contending cases in court while issuing authentication functions to computers. AI can redefine the judicial system too; for an instance, judges may exercise AI during a case to abstract both parties' arguments in addition to

analyse pertinent laws & regulations.^v Subsequently, this would aid the judges prevail on notable verdicts before they are delinquent.

The modus operandi of law is presently being afflicted by AI technology. This is owing to the certitude that in the short term, AI would likely be better of an aiding apparatus than an unequivocal substitute for lawyers; at the moment, it can hitherto simulate contacts, explore recognize documents and even convoy legal research. Recently, AI has also been harnessed to conduct diverse functions like drafting contracts, forecasting legal outcomes and even advocate judicial verdicts circumspecting sentencing or bail.^{vi}

As a matter of fact, there are prospective perks of soliciting AI technology in law. For an instance, it could aid in eluding exorbitant errors and make attorneys operate adroitly. Furthermore, a few cases may require rapid decision-making and research expedition by these devices to accelerate justice.^{vii} Nevertheless, AI cannot yet supplant the human verdict mandatory for exercising law. Although prior to plying this technology in some legal subjects it must subjugate such matters as data-driven AI having rooted partiality and flawed justifiability i.e., one cannot acknowledge the rationality thereupon its verdicts just like humans do because of late the acknowledging of justifications imparted by humans for why an artificial intelligence methodology made assertive verdicts would be onerous to compile before a court or other stakeholders working on a case entailing yields from these networks.^{viii}

THE EXCEPTIONAL POTENTIAL OF AI APPLICATION IN THE FIELD OF LAW

Attorneys use AI and Machine Learning (ML) to analyse contracts more promptly and invariably as they aid in detecting mistakes or flaws that might have been overlooked by professional lawyers.^{ix} At some point, algorithms are being applied to discovery — the judicial method for determining accurate documents from adversary in the filing of a lawsuit. Currently, ML is applied in this accomplishment. Among the prevailing disputes of pleading and tracking the pertinent documents, to anticipate all the disparate means, a concept may be outlined or corroborated stands primarily. At concurring moment, certain documents are being secured from perusal and the counsel (or the judge) might pursue in curtailing the compass of the search eventually to not encumber the producing party. A further domain where AI is hitherto applied comprehensively in the modus operandi of law

is conveying judicial research.

AI has been flawlessly entwined into distinct research services as the attorneys might be unaware about the exercising of AI in this domain.^x The keyword or boolean search method being the emblem of service for an eternity had been aggrandized by morphological search. This implies that the ML algorithms not only counterpart words to keywords but also attempts to acknowledge the interpretation of words.^{xi}

AI can yield subject matter as well as study it. Unlike AI accustomed to energize self-driving cars where errors can have inoperable repercussions, generative AI does not have to be quintessential at all times. In reality, the abrupt and atypical mementos correlated with AI-created projects are segment of what makes riveting. AI adverts the innovative process in a radically disparate means than humans, so the trajectory besotted or matter of course can at times be astonishing. This connotation of AI is called “emergent behavior.” Emergent behavior may pertain to latest tactics to conquest games, exploring latest drugs or solely orating anecdotes in innovative mechanisms. In the case of written subjects, human authors are still required to administer the innovative process, deciding which of the various AI-generated maxims or renditions to manoeuvre.^{xii} The AI must be educated to become a qualified legal practioner for conducively drafting legal contracts. The process of “labeling” necessitates the accumulation of legal performance data on distinct renditions in contract dialect by the developer of AI. Then this labeled data is harnessed to educate AI on how to yield a good contract. Though the legal performances of a contract are assorted by jurisdiction and a dynamic organ of law, it is eminently setting-specific. Further, the provisions of a contracts abide speculative and clandestine to the parties as they are never spotted in a courtroom. The AI generating systems educate on contracts for bounding the peril of augmenting deficient judicial work alongside being virtuous. It is obscure to state AI contract drafters can gain a cut above in the near future with these persisting impetus. AI apparatus solely deficit the zone specificities and left the accuracy in language to labour solitarily. Whilst the concurrent apparatus might be beneficial to draft dialect, professional human beings are yet required for analysing the productivity before complete utilisation.^{xiii}

Additional innovative application of AI is forecasting legal consequences. Precisely evaluating the probability of a fortunate aftereffects in filing a lawsuit could be extravagant. This permits the attorney to deliberate if they should take a case on juncture or endow in

experts or prescribe their clients to resolve.^{xiv} Regardless, applying AI in this subject may contemplate, or even augment, the immanent partiality in the data of the criminal justice system. The data accustomed to educate the ML prototypes is entrenched on concrete arrests and conviction rates that may be inclined against some populations. Thus it may revere former injustices, or adverse, deceitfully shroud them in the array of computer-generated non-partisanship.^{xv}

IMPACTS OF AI APPLICATION IN THE FIELD OF LAW

AI emanates a host of questions in the subject of practice of litigation:

- Whether inadequacy to apply AI in certain notions of law (like discovery) will constitute for dereliction of duty? For an instance, there might ascend a professional duty to use AI in the discovery if the non-usage of AI is depicted to have dilated the discovery process that culminates for abridged declarations.^{xvi}
- Whether criminal defendants should have a prerogative to ingress AI apparatus in supportive of their case?^{xvii}
- Whether attorneys are required to declare their application of AI in a case? In that case, is it required to declare educating data and other accruals applied for composing the Machine Learning models?^{xviii}
- Whether deficiency in productive pellucidity by ML models signify them as disproportionate for certain exertions in law?^{xix}
- How non-existence of rooted partiality contemplating chauvinism and racial discrimination based convictions be verified?^{xx}

AI is an introductory apparatus for the source of justice acting as a means to make the mode of litigation rapid and devoid of any mistakes and deletions. AI might be an effective means to resolve civil cases in addition to upsurging foreseeability without begetting an ethical catastrophe at the same time.^{xxi}

It becomes highly controversial when AI is exercised in supplanting for human verdict, particularly in the subject of criminal litigation. AI is unprepared for this due to an amount of reasons. Primarily, there might be subsisting partiality in the educating data which would be augmented and further assimilated by the ML models. It might be possible to subjugate this complication as the method of eliminating partiality from of our educating data might elicit us to comprehend and rectify paramount of the immanent racial discrimination and

chauvinism in the operation of judicial regulations.^{xxii}

However, there also prevails a delinquent process complication of deficiency of pellucidity and justifiability with application of the Artificial Intelligent Technology. It is not plausible yet to interrogate an artificial neural network that studies in depth. AI being a reiterate to the human race, exposes certain immanent blemishes. The method of untwining an impetus on AI signifies that an exhortation might pertain us to a prominent domain to acknowledge the corporeality including the impediments of mankind justifications and elucidations of their verdicts.^{xxiii}

However most significantly, the notion of permitting algorithms to form liberty-depriving verdicts may solely be unscrupulous. It is not improbable that machine learning algorithms will embark on to forecast when a person is likely to perpetrate an ensuing crime with high assurance.^{xxiv}

Another imperative grounds to restrict the application of AI in the criminal subject may be that judges, lawyers and society wholly could progress to have credulous trust in these algorithms. In spite of the fact that the supremacy of the final verdict lies on the human beings, they can be unduly compliant on technology-based exhortation or an Automation Bias phenomenon as it is not unconventional for them in doing so like that. With AI, this credence may be particularly mislaid since the existent potentiality of the technology may not be as “intelligent” as they seem.^{xxv}

REFERENCES:

1. M. Hildebrandt, ‘Position on artificial intelligence and the law’, Position paper for hearing/round table discussion on ‘Artificial Intelligence in the administration of justice’ on at the Second Chamber of Parliament of the Netherlands, March 29 2018.
2. M. Scherer. ‘Artificial Intelligence and Legal Decision-Making: The Wide Open? Study on the Example of International Arbitration’ (May 22, 2019). Queen Mary School of Law Legal Studies Research Paper No. 318/2019.
3. L. Julia. *L’intelligence artificielle n’existe pas (AI does not exist)*. First Edition, Paris 2019, p. 123.
4. D. Kahnemann, *Thinking, fast and slow*, London: Penguin 2011 p. 43.

5. A. D. (Dory) Reiling, 'Courts and Artificial Intelligence' (2020) 11(2) International Journal for Court Administration 8.
6. H.J. van den Herik, Kunnen computers rechtspreken (Can computers be judges?)? (Inaugural lecture Leiden) Arnhem: Gouda Quint p. 33.
7. M. Hildebrandt, 'Position on artificial intelligence and the law', Position paper for hearing/round table discussion on 'Artificial Intelligence in the administration of justice' on at the Second Chamber of Parliament of the Netherlands, March 29 2018.
8. Aletras N, Tsarapatsanis D, Preoțiuc-Pietro D, Lampos V. 2016. 'Predicting judicial decisions of the European Court of Human Rights: a Natural Language Processing perspective'.
9. F. Contini, en G.F. Lanzara. (2017), 'The elusive mediation between law and technology' in P. Branco, N. Hosen, M. Leone and R. Mohr (eds), Tools of Meaning: Representation, Objects, and Agency in the Technologies of Law and Religion, I Saggi di Lexia, Aracne, Rome 2018 p. 4–9.
10. M. van der Put, 'Kan artificiële intelligentie de rechtspraak betoveren (Can AI bewitch the courts)?' Rechtstreeks 2019–02. p. 50–60.
11. Alex Pentland, 'A Perspective on Legal Algorithms', MIT Computational Law Report 6 December 2019, p.4-6.
12. J. McCarthy et al., "A Proposal for the Dartmouth Summer Research Project on Artificial Intelligence (31 August 1955)", in: Jerry Kaplan (red.) Artificial Intelligence: What Everyone Needs to Know, Oxford: Oxford University Press 2016.
13. F. Contini, en G.F. Lanzara. (2017), 'The elusive mediation between law and technology' in P. Branco, N. Hosen, M. Leone and R. Mohr (eds), Tools of Meaning: Representation, Objects, and Agency in the Technologies of Law and Religion, I Saggi di Lexia, Aracne, Rome 2018 p. 4–9
14. A. D. Reiling, Technology for Justice, how information technology can support judicial reform (diss. VU Amsterdam) Leiden: Leiden University Press 2009, p. 111–122.
15. Institute for Crime and Justice Policy Research World Prison Brief, prisonstudies.org last visited on 6 December 2019.
16. H. Prakken. 'Komt de robotrechter eraan (Is the robot judge arriving?)?' Nederlands Juristenblad 2018-04 no. 207.
17. K. Lum and William Isaac, 'To Predict and Serve?' Significance magazine.com, October 2016.

18. M. Hildebrandt, 'Position on artificial intelligence and the law', Position paper for hearing/round table discussion on 'Artificial Intelligence in the administration of justice' on at the Second Chamber of Parliament of the Netherlands, March 29 2018.
19. European Commission for the Efficiency of Justice (CEPEJ). European Ethical Charter on the Use of Artificial Intelligence in Judicial systems and their environment. Strasbourg, Council of Europe 2019.
20. A. D. (Dory) Reiling, 'Courts and Artificial Intelligence' (2020) 11(2) International Journal for Court Administration 8.
21. F. Contini, en G.F. Lanzara. (2017), 'The elusive mediation between law and technology' in P. Branco, N. Hosen, M. Leone and R. Mohr (eds), Tools of Meaning: Representation, Objects, and Agency in the Technologies of Law and Religion, I Saggi di Lexia, Aracne, Rome 2018 p. 4–9
22. European Commission for the Efficiency of Justice (CEPEJ). European Ethical Charter on the Use of Artificial Intelligence in Judicial systems and their environment. Strasbourg, Council of Europe 2019.
23. Alex Pentland, 'A Perspective on Legal Algorithms', MIT Computational Law Report 6 December 2019, p. 4–6.
24. A. D. (Dory) Reiling, 'Courts and Artificial Intelligence' (2020) 11(2) International Journal for Court Administration 8.
25. M. Scherer. 'Artificial Intelligence and Legal Decision-Making: The Wide Open? Study on the Example of International Arbitration' (May 22, 2019). Queen Mary School of Law Legal Studies Research Paper No. 318/2019.

ⁱ M. Hildebrandt, 'Position on artificial intelligence and the law', Position paper for hearing/round table discussion on 'Artificial Intelligence in the administration of justice' on at the Second Chamber of Parliament of the Netherlands, March 29 2018.

ⁱⁱ M. Scherer. 'Artificial Intelligence and Legal Decision-Making: The Wide Open? Study on the Example of International Arbitration' (May 22, 2019). Queen Mary School of Law Legal Studies Research Paper No. 318/2019.

ⁱⁱⁱ L. Julia. L'intelligence artificielle n'existe pas (AI does not exist). First Edition, Paris 2019, p. 123.

^{iv} D. Kahnemann, Thinking, fast and slow, London: Penguin 2011 p. 43.

^v A. D. (Dory) Reiling, 'Courts and Artificial Intelligence' (2020) 11(2) International Journal for Court Administration 8.

^{vi} H.J. van den Herik, Kunnen computers rechtspreken (Can computers be judges?)? (Inaugural lecture Leiden) Arnhem: Gouda Quint p. 33.

^{vii} M. Hildebrandt, 'Position on artificial intelligence and the law', Position paper for hearing/round table discussion on 'Artificial Intelligence in the administration of justice' on at the Second Chamber of Parliament of the Netherlands, March 29 2018.

^{viii} Aletas N, Tsarapatsanis D, Preotjuc-Pietro D, Lamos V. 2016. 'Predicting judicial decisions of the European Court of Human Rights: a Natural Language Processing perspective'.

^{ix} F. Contini, en G.F. Lanzara. (2017), 'The elusive mediation between law and technology' in P. Branco, N. Hosen, M. Leone and R. Mohr (eds), *Tools of Meaning: Representation, Objects, and Agency in the Technologies of Law and Religion*, I Saggi di Lexia, Aracne, Rome 2018 p. 4–9.

^x M. van der Put, 'Kan artificiële intelligentie de rechtspraak betoveren (Can AI bewitch the courts)?' *Rechtstreeks* 2019–02. p. 50–60.

^{xi} Alex Pentland, 'A Perspective on Legal Algorithms', *MIT Computational Law Report* 6 December 2019, p. 4–6.

^{xii} J. McCarthy et al., "A Proposal for the Dartmouth Summer Research Project on Artificial Intelligence (31 August 1955)", in: Jerry Kaplan (red.) *Artificial Intelligence: What Everyone Needs to Know*, Oxford: Oxford University Press 2016.

^{xiii} F. Contini, en G.F. Lanzara. (2017), 'The elusive mediation between law and technology' in P. Branco, N. Hosen, M. Leone and R. Mohr (eds), *Tools of Meaning: Representation, Objects, and Agency in the Technologies of Law and Religion*, I Saggi di Lexia, Aracne, Rome 2018 p. 4–9

^{xiv} A. D. Reiling, *Technology for Justice, how information technology can support judicial reform* (diss. VU Amsterdam) Leiden: Leiden University Press 2009, p. 111–122.

^{xv} Institute for Crime and Justice Policy Research World Prison Brief, *prisonstudies.org* last visited on 6 December 2019.

^{xvi} H. Prakken. 'Komt de robotrechter eraan (Is the robot judge arriving?)?' *Nederlands Juristenblad* 2018-04 no. 207.

^{xvii} K. Lum and William Isaac, 'To Predict and Serve?' *Significance* magazine.com, October 2016.

^{xviii} M. Hildebrandt, 'Position on artificial intelligence and the law', Position paper for hearing/round table discussion on 'Artificial Intelligence in the administration of justice' on at the Second Chamber of Parliament of the Netherlands, March 29 2018.

^{xix} European Commission for the Efficiency of Justice (CEPEJ). *European Ethical Charter on the Use of Artificial Intelligence in Judicial systems and their environment*. Strasbourg, Council of Europe 2019.

^{xx} A. D. (Dory) Reiling, 'Courts and Artificial Intelligence' (2020) 11(2) *International Journal for Court Administration* 8.

^{xxi} M. Scherer. 'Artificial Intelligence and Legal Decision-Making: The Wide Open? Study on the Example of International Arbitration' (May 22, 2019). Queen Mary School of Law Legal Studies Research Paper No. 318/2019.

^{xxii} F. Contini, en G.F. Lanzara. (2017), 'The elusive mediation between law and technology' in P. Branco, N. Hosen, M. Leone and R. Mohr (eds), *Tools of Meaning: Representation, Objects, and Agency in the Technologies of Law and Religion*, I Saggi di Lexia, Aracne, Rome 2018 p. 4–9

^{xxiii} European Commission for the Efficiency of Justice (CEPEJ). *European Ethical Charter on the Use of Artificial Intelligence in Judicial systems and their environment*. Strasbourg, Council of Europe 2019.

^{xxiv} Alex Pentland, 'A Perspective on Legal Algorithms', *MIT Computational Law Report* 6 December 2019, p. 4–6.

^{xxv} A. D. (Dory) Reiling, 'Courts and Artificial Intelligence' (2020) 11(2) *International Journal for Court Administration* 8.

IJLRA