

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, stored, transmitted, or distributed in any form or by any means, whether electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, without prior written permission of the Managing Editor of the *International Journal for Legal Research & Analysis (IJLRA)*.

The views, opinions, interpretations, and conclusions expressed in the articles published in this journal are solely those of the respective authors. They do not necessarily reflect the views of the Editorial Board, Editors, Reviewers, Advisors, or the Publisher of IJLRA.

Although every reasonable effort has been made to ensure the accuracy, authenticity, and proper citation of the content published in this journal, neither the Editorial Board nor IJLRA shall be held liable or responsible, in any manner whatsoever, for any loss, damage, or consequence arising from the use, reliance upon, or interpretation of the information contained in this publication.

The content published herein is intended solely for academic and informational purposes and shall not be construed as legal advice or professional opinion.

**Copyright © International Journal for Legal Research & Analysis.
All rights reserved.**

ABOUT US

The *International Journal for Legal Research & Analysis (IJLRA)* (ISSN: 2582-6433) is a peer-reviewed, academic, online journal published on a monthly basis. The journal aims to provide a comprehensive and interactive platform for the publication of original and high-quality legal research.

IJLRA publishes Short Articles, Long Articles, Research Papers, Case Comments, Book Reviews, Essays, and interdisciplinary studies in the field of law and allied disciplines. The journal seeks to promote critical analysis and informed discourse on contemporary legal, social, and policy issues.

The primary objective of IJLRA is to enhance academic engagement and scholarly dialogue among law students, researchers, academicians, legal professionals, and members of the Bar and Bench. The journal endeavours to establish itself as a credible and widely cited academic publication through the publication of original, well-researched, and analytically sound contributions.

IJLRA welcomes submissions from all branches of law, provided the work is original, unpublished, and submitted in accordance with the prescribed submission guidelines. All manuscripts are subject to a rigorous peer-review process to ensure academic quality, originality, and relevance.

Through its publications, the *International Journal for Legal Research & Analysis* aspires to contribute meaningfully to legal scholarship and the development of law as an instrument of justice and social progress.

PUBLICATION ETHICS, COPYRIGHT & AUTHOR RESPONSIBILITY STATEMENT

The *International Journal for Legal Research and Analysis (IJLRA)* is committed to upholding the highest standards of publication ethics and academic integrity. All manuscripts submitted to the journal must be original, unpublished, and free from plagiarism, data fabrication, falsification, or any form of unethical research or publication practice. Authors are solely responsible for the accuracy, originality, legality, and ethical compliance of their work and must ensure that all sources are properly cited and that necessary permissions for any third-party copyrighted material have been duly obtained prior to submission. Copyright in all published articles vests with IJLRA, unless otherwise expressly stated, and authors grant the journal the irrevocable right to publish, reproduce, distribute, and archive their work in print and electronic formats. The views and opinions expressed in the articles are those of the authors alone and do not reflect the views of the Editors, Editorial Board, Reviewers, or Publisher. IJLRA shall not be liable for any loss, damage, claim, or legal consequence arising from the use, reliance upon, or interpretation of the content published. By submitting a manuscript, the author(s) agree to fully indemnify and hold harmless the journal, its Editor-in-Chief, Editors, Editorial Board, Reviewers, Advisors, Publisher, and Management against any claims, liabilities, or legal proceedings arising out of plagiarism, copyright infringement, defamation, breach of confidentiality, or violation of third-party rights. The journal reserves the absolute right to reject, withdraw, retract, or remove any manuscript or published article in case of ethical or legal violations, without incurring any liability.

“ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE AND THE TRANSFORMATION OF LEGAL EDUCATION IN INDIA: OPPORTUNITIES, CHALLENGES AND THE FUTURE OF LEGAL LEARNING”

AUTHORED BY - ANJALI MOHAN

B.com, LLB, LLM

Sree Narayana Guru College Of Legal Studies, Kollam.

ABSTRACT

The increasing integration of Artificial Intelligence (AI), particularly generative AI, into legal education is reshaping conventional approaches to teaching, learning and legal research. AI tools are increasingly being used by law students and educators for case analysis, legal research, drafting, summarisation, academic writing and personalised learning. While such technologies can improve efficiency, accessibility and learning outcomes, their growing use raises significant concerns regarding accuracy, fabricated legal authorities, academic integrity, plagiarism, data privacy, algorithmic bias and technological dependency. Of particular concern is the possibility that excessive reliance on AI may weaken independent legal reasoning, critical thinking and professional skills essential to legal education.

This study examines the impact of AI on legal education in India, focusing on its implications for legal research, teaching and learning, legal writing and professional skill development. It adopts a doctrinal and empirical research approach by analysing relevant literature, legal and policy frameworks and, where applicable, the experiences and perceptions of law students and teachers regarding AI-assisted legal education. The study further identifies the challenges associated with responsible AI adoption and examines the need for institutional guidelines and ethical safeguards.

The article argues that AI should function as an assistive educational technology rather than a substitute for human reasoning and pedagogical judgment. It proposes a responsible AI-assisted framework emphasising AI literacy, verification of AI-generated content, academic integrity, critical thinking and professional ethics. The study contributes to the ongoing discourse on developing an adaptive and ethically responsible framework for AI-integrated legal education in India.

Keywords: *Artificial Intelligence; Generative AI; Legal Education; Legal Research; AI-assisted Learning; Academic Integrity; Legal Ethics; India.*

INTRODUCTION

The twenty-first century has witnessed remarkable technological developments that have transformed the manner in which knowledge is created, accessed and disseminated. Among these developments, Artificial Intelligence (AI) has emerged as one of the most influential technologies, with applications extending across healthcare, finance, governance, education and the legal profession. The emergence of generative AI has further accelerated this transformation by enabling computer systems to generate human-like text, analyse large volumes of information, summarise complex materials and assist users in performing tasks that traditionally required substantial human effort. The growing accessibility of such technologies has consequently created new opportunities as well as challenges for institutions of higher education.

Legal education is particularly affected by these developments because the study and practice of law are fundamentally dependent upon information, interpretation, research, analysis and communication. Traditionally, legal education has relied upon textbooks, statutes, judicial decisions, legal databases, classroom teaching, moot courts, seminars and independent research. AI-assisted technologies are now introducing an additional dimension to these conventional methods. Law students can use AI tools to identify legal issues, obtain preliminary explanations of complex concepts, summarise judgments, develop research questions, assist in drafting and organise legal materials. Similarly, teachers may employ AI in preparing instructional materials, designing hypothetical problems, developing assessments and providing learning support.

The integration of AI into legal education, however, cannot be viewed solely from the perspective of technological advancement. Legal education aims not merely to transmit legal information but also to cultivate independent reasoning, critical analysis, problem-solving abilities, research competence, communication skills and professional responsibility. Consequently, the increasing dependence on AI raises important questions concerning whether technology enhances these objectives or, when used without adequate supervision, may weaken them. The possibility of inaccurate information, fabricated case citations or legal authorities, biased outputs and insufficient contextual understanding creates particular concerns in legal education, where accuracy and reliability are fundamental. Students may also become dependent upon AI-generated responses instead of developing the ability to independently

locate, interpret and evaluate primary legal sources.

Academic integrity represents another significant dimension of the issue. The ability of generative AI to produce essays, research summaries and other forms of academic writing has created new challenges for conventional methods of assessment. It has become increasingly difficult to distinguish between legitimate AI-assisted learning and the submission of substantially AI-generated work as a student's own intellectual contribution. This development requires educational institutions to reconsider traditional approaches to assessment, plagiarism and academic honesty while also developing students' capacity to use AI responsibly.

At the same time, completely excluding AI from legal education may not provide an adequate response to technological change. The legal profession itself is increasingly interacting with legal technology and AI-assisted systems. Future lawyers are therefore likely to require not only traditional legal knowledge and professional skills but also sufficient technological and AI literacy to understand the capabilities and limitations of these systems. Legal education must consequently prepare students to work effectively with emerging technologies while preserving the human qualities that remain central to the legal profession, including ethical judgment, accountability, empathy, interpretation and independent reasoning.

The issue therefore extends beyond whether AI should be permitted in law schools. The more significant question is how AI can be integrated into legal education in a manner that enhances learning without compromising the intellectual, ethical and professional foundations of legal education. This requires a balanced approach in which AI is treated as an assistive instrument rather than a substitute for human reasoning, teacher guidance or independent student research.

ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE AND LEGAL EDUCATION

Artificial Intelligence (AI) is no longer confined to the domain of computer science and technological innovation. Its applications have increasingly extended into education and professional fields, including the legal sector. The significance of AI in legal education is particularly evident because legal learning involves extensive interaction with statutes, judicial decisions, regulations, academic literature and other sources of legal information. The development of generative AI has expanded these possibilities by enabling users to obtain explanations, generate and organise textual material, summarise complex information and receive assistance with analytical and drafting activities. The growing presence of these technologies has consequently encouraged educational institutions to reconsider traditional approaches to teaching and learning. At the same time, international organisations such as UNESCO have emphasised that the adoption of generative AI in education should preserve

human agency, promote inclusion and equity, protect privacy and encourage responsible technological use.

➤ *Artificial Intelligence and Legal Research*

Legal research is among the areas of legal education most significantly influenced by AI-based technologies. Conventionally, law students are required to search for relevant legislation, judicial precedents, regulations, commentaries and scholarly writings using libraries, legal databases and other research resources. AI-powered applications can supplement these conventional methods by assisting students in formulating search queries, identifying potentially relevant authorities, summarising lengthy legal materials and arranging information around particular legal questions.

The principal educational advantage of AI-assisted legal research is its ability to improve the speed and efficiency of preliminary research. For instance, a student encountering an unfamiliar legal issue may use an AI system to obtain an initial overview of the subject before proceeding to authoritative sources. Such assistance may reduce the time required for preliminary information gathering and allow students to devote greater attention to interpretation and legal analysis.

However, speed and convenience should not be confused with legal reliability. AI systems may generate inaccurate propositions, identify inappropriate authorities or provide references that require further verification. Studies examining the application of large language models to legal education have also identified limitations in dealing with jurisdiction-specific legal issues and complex factual scenarios. The possibility of hallucinated authorities and overconfident but incorrect responses further demonstrates the importance of human verification.

➤ *Artificial Intelligence and Legal Writing*

Generative AI can provide assistance at various stages of legal writing. Students may employ such tools to organise preliminary ideas, improve language, summarise materials, formulate possible arguments and identify alternative perspectives. Used appropriately, these functions can support students in improving the structure and presentation of their legal work.

Nevertheless, legal writing involves considerably more than linguistic accuracy. A competent legal writer must identify the relevant issue, locate the applicable legal principles, analyse judicial authorities, apply the law to the facts and develop a logically supported conclusion. These processes require intellectual engagement and cannot be reduced merely to the production of well-structured text.

Consequently, a distinction should be drawn between AI-supported legal writing and AI-substituted legal writing. In the first situation, AI assists the student while the substantive intellectual contribution remains with the student. In the second, the technology performs a substantial part of the analytical and writing process, potentially weakening the student's ability to formulate and defend an independent legal argument.

➤ ***Artificial Intelligence and the Role of the Law Teacher***

The application of AI in legal education also has implications for the traditional role of the law teacher. AI-based systems can assist educators in preparing hypothetical situations, generating discussion questions, developing preliminary instructional material and presenting alternative explanations of difficult legal concepts. They may also support more individualised learning by enabling students to seek explanations and practice exercises according to their particular learning requirements.

However, the educational function of a law teacher extends beyond the transmission of legal information. Teachers guide students in interpreting conflicting authorities, questioning assumptions, identifying weaknesses in arguments and understanding the broader social and ethical implications of legal rules. These functions involve judgment, contextual understanding and interpersonal engagement that cannot simply be delegated to an automated system.

The teacher increasingly becomes responsible for helping students critically assess AI-generated information and understand its limitations. This approach is consistent with the broader human-centred approach to AI in education, which emphasises the preservation of human agency and the empowerment of both teachers and learners.

➤ ***Artificial Intelligence and the Development of Legal Skills***

The incorporation of AI into legal education also requires reconsideration of the competencies that law students should develop. Conventional legal education seeks to cultivate a range of skills, including:

- legal research;
- interpretation of statutes;
- analysis of judicial decisions;
- legal reasoning;
- drafting;
- advocacy;

- communication;
- problem-solving; and
- professional and ethical judgment.

AI can assist with certain components of these activities¹, particularly preliminary information retrieval, organisation of materials and drafting support. Its increasing use, however, may make certain human-centred skills even more important. Students must be capable of evaluating the accuracy of AI-generated information, identifying weaknesses in automated reasoning, recognising contextual differences and taking responsibility for the conclusions they ultimately present.

Thus, the emergence of AI does not necessarily diminish the importance of traditional legal skills. Instead, it may require those skills to be applied at a more sophisticated level. A future lawyer must not merely know how to obtain an answer from an AI system but must be capable of determining whether the answer is legally correct, contextually appropriate and ethically defensible.

➤ *Artificial Intelligence and Academic Integrity*

One of the most significant challenges created by generative AI concerns academic integrity. The ability of AI systems to produce essays, summaries, research material and answers to problem questions has complicated conventional approaches to authorship and plagiarism. Students may now produce apparently sophisticated academic work without undertaking the entire intellectual process traditionally associated with such assignments².

The central issue, therefore, should not be limited to whether a student has used AI. Instead, educational institutions need to distinguish between legitimate technological assistance and the replacement of the student's own intellectual contribution.

For example, using AI to identify possible research questions or improve grammatical expression may constitute a different form of assistance from submitting an AI-generated legal analysis as one's own work. This distinction is especially significant in legal education because academic exercises are intended to evaluate a student's ability to research, reason, analyse authorities and construct legal arguments independently.

This development may require law schools to reconsider existing assessment practices. Greater

¹ Daniel Martin Katz et al., GPT-4 Passes the Bar Exam, 380 Phil. Transactions of the Royal Society A 20230254 (2024); UNESCO, *Guidance for Generative AI in Education and Research* 5–9 (2023), <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000386693>.

² Varun Magesh et al., *Hallucination-Free? Assessing the Reliability of Leading AI Legal Research Tools*, arXiv:2405.20362 (2024) (examining AI tools designed for legal search, case-law summarisation and drafting).

use could be made of supervised research, oral presentations, viva voce examinations, research journals, problem-based assessments, drafting exercises and requirements for students to disclose the nature and extent of AI assistance. Such measures can help institutions assess not merely the final written product but also the student's underlying legal reasoning.

Recent developments in legal education demonstrate that institutions are responding to generative AI in different ways. Some have introduced restrictions on its use, while others have incorporated AI-related courses or permitted controlled use within academic activities. The absence of a uniform approach highlights the continuing need to determine appropriate institutional standards for the responsible use of AI in legal education.

➤ *Artificial Intelligence, Equality and Accessibility*

AI also presents opportunities to make aspects of legal education more accessible. Students can use AI systems to obtain simplified explanations of complex legal concepts, receive language assistance, practice problem questions and access learning support beyond normal classroom hours. Such capabilities may be particularly useful within India's linguistically and educationally diverse environment.

However, the benefits of AI are not necessarily distributed equally. Differences in internet connectivity, availability of suitable devices, access to paid AI services and levels of digital literacy can influence the extent to which individual students benefit from these technologies. Consequently, although AI has the potential to address certain educational barriers, unequal access to technology may simultaneously create new forms of educational disparity.

The adoption of AI in legal education should therefore be accompanied by measures addressing digital accessibility, affordability, technological literacy and equal educational opportunity. A responsible educational framework must ensure that technological advancement does not result in a situation where the quality of a student's education depends disproportionately upon their financial or technological resources³.

AI can enhance research, learning and teaching when used appropriately, but its educational value depends upon the continued involvement of students and teachers in critical evaluation, independent reasoning and ethical decision-making. The objective should consequently be to develop an AI-assisted model of legal education, in which technology supplements human intellectual capacity without replacing the skills and values that constitute competent legal

³ Justine Griffin, *Can You Ethically Use AI in Law School?*, ABA Student Lawyer (2024), https://www.americanbar.org/groups/law_students/resources/student-lawyer/professional-development/can-you-ethically-use-ai-in-law-school/.

education⁴.

CONSTITUTIONAL DIMENSIONS OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE IN LEGAL EDUCATION

The integration of Artificial Intelligence into legal education raises questions that extend beyond pedagogy and technological efficiency. In India, the use of AI in educational institutions must operate within the broader constitutional framework governing equality, freedom, privacy, dignity, education and access to knowledge. Although the Constitution of India does not contain a specific provision dealing with Artificial Intelligence, its fundamental rights and directive principles provide a normative framework within which technological developments in education must be understood.

The constitutional significance of AI in legal education becomes particularly evident when questions of unequal technological access, collection of students' personal data, automated evaluation, freedom of expression, academic autonomy and educational opportunity are considered. The constitutional framework therefore provides important principles for determining how AI can be introduced into legal education without compromising individual rights or the broader objectives of education.

➤ *Article 14: Equality and Non-Discrimination*

Article 14 guarantees equality before the law and equal protection of the laws⁵. Its relevance to AI-assisted legal education arises principally from the possibility of unequal access to technology and discriminatory outcomes produced through automated systems.

AI-based educational tools may depend upon access to high-quality devices, reliable internet connectivity, paid subscriptions and adequate digital literacy. Students who lack these resources may not be able to obtain the same educational benefits as students with greater technological and financial advantages. In the Indian context, where significant differences exist in access to digital infrastructure, indiscriminate adoption of AI without appropriate institutional support could consequently deepen existing educational inequalities.

Article 14 also has relevance where AI systems are used for assessment, admissions, student monitoring or other decisions affecting educational opportunities. If an algorithm produces systematically discriminatory outcomes, the question of constitutional equality may arise. The

⁴ UNESCO, *AI and the Futures of Learning*, <https://www.unesco.org/en/digital-education/ai-future-learning>.

⁵ INDIA CONST. art. 14.

use of AI therefore cannot be justified merely on the basis that an outcome has been generated by a technological system. Human institutions remain responsible for ensuring that technological decision-making does not produce arbitrary or discriminatory consequences.

The constitutional principle of equality should consequently inform the design and implementation of AI-based educational systems. Equal treatment may require institutions to provide common access to AI resources, digital training and appropriate technological infrastructure rather than leaving students to rely entirely upon their individual economic capacity.

➤ *Article 19(1)(a): Freedom of Speech and Expression and Access to Knowledge*

Article 19(1)(a), which protects freedom of speech and expression, also has relevance to the use of AI in education⁶. Legal education requires students to formulate arguments, engage with competing interpretations and express independent legal opinions. AI can support these activities by facilitating access to information and assisting students in exploring different perspectives.

At the same time, excessive institutional control over AI-assisted research and writing may raise questions concerning academic expression and intellectual freedom. A complete prohibition on AI use could prevent students from acquiring familiarity with technologies that are increasingly relevant to contemporary legal practice. Conversely, unrestricted use could compromise academic assessment and independent intellectual development.

The constitutional principle therefore suggests the need for a proportionate approach. Educational institutions should distinguish between legitimate technological assistance and conduct that undermines academic integrity. Regulation should be sufficiently clear to prevent misuse while preserving students' ability to learn, research and engage critically with emerging technologies.

➤ *Article 21: Life, Personal Liberty, Privacy and Dignity*

Article 21 has particular significance in the context of AI because educational technologies may involve the collection, processing and analysis of substantial amounts of personal information⁷. Student profiles, academic performance, learning behaviour, attendance, assessments and interactions with digital platforms may potentially become part of institutional data systems.

⁶ INDIA CONST. art. 19, § 1, cl. a.

⁷ INDIA CONST. art. 21.

The Supreme Court's decision in *Justice K.S. Puttaswamy (Retd.) v. Union of India* recognised privacy as a constitutionally protected right connected with liberty, dignity and individual autonomy⁸. The Court also developed a proportionality-oriented framework for examining restrictions upon privacy.

This constitutional protection becomes relevant where AI systems are used to monitor students, analyse their behaviour or process personal information for educational purposes. The question is not merely whether an institution possesses the technological capacity to collect such information, but whether the collection and processing are legally justified, necessary and proportionate to a legitimate educational purpose.

The emergence of AI therefore strengthens the need for transparent data practices within educational institutions. Students should have meaningful information about what data is collected, how it is processed and for what purposes AI systems use it. Current developments in India's data-protection framework, including the Digital Personal Data Protection Rules, 2025, further demonstrate the growing importance of institutional approaches to responsible personal-data governance.

Privacy is particularly significant in legal education because students may use AI platforms while working with sensitive case materials, research data or information relating to individuals involved in legal disputes. Educational institutions must therefore develop safeguards against inappropriate disclosure of personal or confidential information.

➤ *Article 21A and the Constitutional Importance of Education*

Article 21A establishes the constitutional right to free and compulsory education for children within the specified age group⁹. Although higher and professional legal education does not fall directly within the scope of Article 21A, the constitutional recognition of education demonstrates the importance attached to educational opportunity within the Indian constitutional framework.

The introduction of AI into higher education raises a related question of technological accessibility. If educational institutions increasingly depend upon AI-based systems, students who cannot access such technologies may experience an indirect disadvantage in their educational development.

The constitutional significance of education therefore supports an inclusive approach to technological transformation. AI should function as a means of improving educational

⁸ *Justice K.S. Puttaswamy (Retd.) v. Union of India*, (2017) 10 SCC 1, 12–13 (India).

⁹ INDIA CONST. art. 21A.

opportunity rather than becoming a mechanism through which students with greater economic or technological resources receive substantially better educational assistance.

➤ *Article 41: Educational Opportunity and State Responsibility*

Article 41 directs the State, within the limits of its economic capacity and development, to make effective provision for the right to work, education and public assistance in certain circumstances¹⁰. The Ministry of Education identifies Article 41 among the constitutional provisions having a bearing on education¹¹.

Although Directive Principles are not enforceable in the same manner as Fundamental Rights, they remain constitutionally significant in shaping public policy. Article 41 may therefore provide a useful normative basis for considering how technological developments should be incorporated into educational policy.

From this perspective, the expansion of AI in legal education should not be limited to private institutional initiatives or the purchasing capacity of individual students. Public educational policy may need to address digital infrastructure, AI literacy, teacher training and access to reliable technological resources.

➤ *Article 51A(h): Scientific Temper and Technological Development*

Article 51A(h) places upon citizens the fundamental duty to develop scientific temper, humanism and the spirit of inquiry and reform. This provision has particular relevance to the integration of AI into legal education.

The constitutional commitment to scientific temper supports an educational environment in which emerging technologies are examined through rational inquiry rather than either unquestioning acceptance or categorical rejection. Law students should therefore be encouraged to understand how AI systems function, identify their limitations and critically evaluate their outputs.

➤ *Article 51A(j): Pursuit of Excellence*

Article 51A(j) calls upon citizens to strive towards excellence in all spheres of individual and collective activity. The provision provides an additional constitutional value relevant to technological advancement in education.

¹⁰ INDIA CONST. art. 41.

¹¹ Ministry of Education, Government of India, Constitutional Provisions Having a Bearing on Education, <https://www.education.gov.in/directive-principles-of-state-policy> (last visited Sept. 26, 2026).

AI has the potential to improve the efficiency and quality of legal research and learning. However, technological convenience cannot itself constitute educational excellence. Genuine excellence in legal education requires the integration of technological competence with analytical ability, ethical judgment, professional responsibility and independent reasoning.

JUDICIAL EVOLUTION

India has not yet developed a comprehensive Supreme Court jurisprudence specifically governing the use of Artificial Intelligence in legal education. The judicial development has instead proceeded through broader constitutional principles relating to technology, privacy, freedom of expression, Internet access, proportionality and human dignity. This existing jurisprudence provides the conceptual foundation for assessing emerging AI-related questions in education.

➤ *Shreya Singhal v. Union of India*

The decision in *Shreya Singhal v. Union of India*¹² is an important milestone in India's constitutional treatment of digital technologies. The Supreme Court struck down Section 66A of the Information Technology Act, 2000, on the ground that the provision impermissibly infringed freedom of speech and expression.¹⁹

Although the case did not concern AI, its importance for AI-assisted legal education lies in its recognition that constitutional freedoms apply to technologically mediated communication. AI-generated content, AI-assisted research and digital educational platforms therefore remain subject to constitutional principles governing speech and expression.

The case also demonstrates the importance of legal certainty when regulating technological activity. Educational institutions similarly need clearly defined AI-use policies rather than vague prohibitions that leave students uncertain about what forms of AI assistance are permissible.

➤ *Justice K.S. Puttaswamy*

The nine-judge decision in *Justice K.S. Puttaswamy (Retd.) v. Union of India*¹³ transformed the constitutional understanding of privacy by recognising it as a fundamental right connected with liberty, dignity and autonomy.²⁰

For legal education, the decision becomes relevant where AI systems process student

¹² *Shreya Singhal v. Union of India*, (2015) 5 SCC 1, 80–82 (India).

¹³ *Justice K.S. Puttaswamy (Retd.) v. Union of India*, (2017) 10 SCC 1, 64–68, 181–82 (India).

information. Learning analytics, automated assessment, behavioural monitoring and AI-based profiling can potentially involve extensive processing of personal information. The *Puttaswamy* framework therefore provides a constitutional basis for demanding legitimate purposes, safeguards and proportionality when educational technology interferes with privacy interests.

The importance of privacy has become greater with the development of India's statutory data-protection framework¹⁴. The Digital Personal Data Protection Act, 2023 provides a statutory framework governing digital personal data, while the 2025 Rules provide detailed implementation requirements.²¹

➤ *Anuradha Bhasin v. Union of India*

In *Anuradha Bhasin v. Union of India*¹⁵, the Supreme Court examined restrictions on Internet services and held that freedom of speech and expression under Article 19(1)(a) extends to the medium of the Internet.²² The Court further emphasised that restrictions must satisfy the requirements of reasonableness and proportionality.

The judgment has implications for digital education because access to online legal databases, electronic libraries, digital classrooms and AI-assisted research increasingly forms part of contemporary legal learning. It therefore provides a constitutional framework within which restrictions affecting digital educational access may be evaluated.

➤ *Faheema Shirin R.K. v. State of Kerala*

The Kerala High Court's decision in *Faheema Shirin R.K. v. State of Kerala*¹⁶ is particularly relevant to legal education in Kerala. The Court considered restrictions imposed upon a college student's use of mobile phones and Internet access in a hostel and held that access to the Internet formed part of the fundamental right to education and the right to privacy in the circumstances of the case.²³

The judgment is significant because it directly connects digital connectivity with educational participation. Nevertheless, its holding should be understood within its factual context and as a High Court decision rather than as a Supreme Court declaration establishing an unrestricted constitutional right to Internet access or AI tools.

¹⁴ Digital Personal Data Protection Act, No. 22 of 2023, INDIA CODE (2023); Digital Personal Data Protection Rules, 2025 (India), notified Nov. 14, 2025.

¹⁵ *Anuradha Bhasin v. Union of India*, (2020) 3 SCC 637, 697–701 (India).

¹⁶ *Faheema Shirin R.K. v. State of Kerala*, W.P.(C) No. 19716 of 2019 (Ker. H.C. Sept. 19, 2019), AIR 2020 Ker 35.

Thus, the judicial evolution from *Shreya Singhal*, *Puttaswamy* and *Anuradha Bhasin* provides principles that can inform the development of AI policies even though none of these decisions specifically adjudicated AI in legal education.

COMPARATIVE PERSPECTIVES

The incorporation of Artificial Intelligence into legal education is part of a wider international transformation in the field of education. Jurisdictions have responded to the opportunities and risks associated with AI through different regulatory and institutional strategies. The European Union has adopted a legislation-driven, risk-based framework, whereas the United States has relied more substantially upon governmental guidance and institutional autonomy. The United Kingdom has developed detailed guidance emphasising safe and responsible educational use, while Singapore has combined principles-based AI governance with initiatives aimed at developing AI literacy¹⁷. These approaches provide useful comparative material for considering how India could develop an appropriate framework for AI-enabled legal education.

➤ *European Union: Regulation Based on Levels of Risk*

The European Union represents one of the most comprehensive legislative approaches to Artificial Intelligence through the Artificial Intelligence Act. Regulation (EU) 2024/1689 establishes a harmonised legal framework based substantially upon the nature and degree of risk associated with different AI applications.¹⁸

Education constitutes an important area within this framework because certain AI applications can significantly affect an individual's educational opportunities. Systems employed for purposes such as admission decisions, allocation of students to educational institutions or programmes, assessment of learning outcomes, determination of educational levels, or monitoring students during examinations may, subject to the conditions prescribed by the legislation, be classified as high-risk AI systems¹⁹.

This distinction is particularly significant for legal education. An AI application that merely assists a student in understanding a legal concept does not necessarily create the same risks as an automated system that evaluates examination performance or makes decisions affecting a student's educational progression. The European approach consequently demonstrates the

¹⁸ Regulation (EU) 2024/1689 of the European Parliament and of the Council of June 13, 2024, Laying Down Harmonised Rules on Artificial Intelligence (Artificial Intelligence Act), 2024 O.J. (L 2024/1689), arts. 1–3 (EU).

¹⁹ *Id.* art. 6(2), Annex III, § 3. The AI Act specifically identifies educational and vocational-training uses involving admission, allocation, evaluation of learning outcomes, educational-level assessment, access to education and monitoring of prohibited behaviour during tests as potentially high-risk applications

importance of considering the purpose, function and potential consequences of an AI system when determining the appropriate level of regulation.

The EU framework also imposes various requirements upon high-risk systems, including obligations concerning risk management, data governance, transparency, human oversight, accuracy, robustness and cybersecurity. These safeguards are particularly relevant where educational institutions contemplate automated assessment, student monitoring or other AI applications capable of materially influencing educational outcomes.

The principal comparative lesson for India is therefore that AI regulation in education may benefit from a risk-based approach, rather than applying identical regulatory requirements to every form of AI technology.

➤ *United States: Institutional Flexibility and Policy-Based Governance*

The United States has followed a comparatively decentralised approach to AI in education. Unlike the European Union, it does not presently operate under a single comprehensive federal legislative framework specifically governing the use of AI throughout higher education. Instead, federal agencies have issued policy guidance, while individual educational institutions have developed their own approaches to the use of generative AI.

The U.S. Department of Education's Office of Educational Technology, for example, published *Artificial Intelligence and the Future of Teaching and Learning: Insights and Recommendations* in 2023²⁰. The report acknowledges the potential of AI to support educational activities while emphasising the continuing significance of teachers, professional judgment and human involvement.

This approach provides educational institutions with considerable flexibility to determine how AI should be incorporated into teaching, research and assessment. Law schools may therefore experiment with AI-assisted legal research, drafting exercises, classroom activities and alternative forms of assessment according to their institutional objectives.

Institutional autonomy, however, may also result in significant differences between educational institutions. Students may encounter different rules concerning permissible AI use, disclosure requirements and academic misconduct. Consequently, while decentralisation can encourage innovation, it may also create uncertainty concerning common academic standards.

The American experience therefore illustrates the need to balance institutional flexibility with

²⁰ U.S. Dep't of Educ., Office of Educational Technology, *Artificial Intelligence and the Future of Teaching and Learning: Insights and Recommendations* (2023). The report examines the opportunities and policy issues arising from AI in education and emphasises the role of educators and human judgment.

minimum standards concerning academic integrity, reliability, privacy, transparency and human oversight.

➤ *United Kingdom: Guidance and Human Oversight*

The United Kingdom has adopted a predominantly guidance-based approach to the educational use of generative AI. The Department for Education has issued guidance addressing both the potential benefits and risks associated with AI in educational settings. The guidance draws attention to concerns including inaccurate or misleading outputs, bias, privacy, intellectual-property issues and the reliability of AI-generated material²¹.

An important feature of the UK approach is its emphasis upon human judgment. AI-generated content is not treated as inherently reliable; teachers and educational institutions are expected to assess whether its output is accurate, appropriate and suitable for the particular educational context. The guidance also emphasises that AI should complement rather than displace the educational relationship between teachers and learners²².

This approach corresponds closely with the concept of AI-assisted rather than AI-dependent legal education. AI may provide information, explanations or assistance, but responsibility for educational judgment remains with human educators.

The UK government has also developed supplementary guidance addressing safe use, practical applications and risks associated with generative AI in educational environments²³. The guidance recognises that effective implementation may be affected by issues such as connectivity and accessibility.

For Indian law schools, the UK experience demonstrates the potential value of developing clear institutional guidance accompanied by practical AI training, particularly in circumstances where a comprehensive AI-specific regulatory statute may not yet exist.

➤ *Comparative Assessment*

The approaches adopted by the Three jurisdictions can be broadly distinguished as follows:

Jurisdiction	Broad regulatory approach	Principal characteristic
European	Risk-based legislative regulation	Differentiation of AI applications

²¹ U.K. Dep't for Educ., *Generative Artificial Intelligence (AI) in Education* (updated Aug. 12, 2025). The guidance identifies benefits as well as risks including inaccurate, biased, outdated and unreliable outputs and intellectual-property concerns.

²² *Id.* The Department for Education states that content produced by generative AI requires critical professional judgment and that AI cannot replace the judgment and deep subject knowledge of a human expert.

²³ U.K. Dep't for Educ., *Safe Use of Generative AI in Education: Module 3* (updated May 19, 2026); U.K. Dep't for Educ., *Use Cases of Generative AI in Education: Module 4* (updated May 19, 2026).

Union		according to their potential level of risk
United States	Policy guidance and institutional autonomy	Flexibility and experimentation at institutional level
United Kingdom	Government guidance and safety-oriented regulation	Human judgment, reliability and responsible educational use
India	Developing constitutional, statutory and institutional framework	Need for a coordinated framework for responsible AI adoption in education

The comparison indicates that no single regulatory strategy is necessarily suitable for every jurisdiction. Different approaches may be combined according to national constitutional structures, educational systems and technological conditions. A framework incorporating risk classification, institutional flexibility, human oversight and AI literacy may offer a balanced approach.

The European Union provides a useful example of differentiating high-impact educational applications from lower-risk uses. The United States demonstrates the advantages of allowing institutions to experiment with emerging technologies.

➤ *Implications for Indian Legal Education*

The comparative experience provides several principles that may be relevant to the future regulation of AI within Indian law schools.

First, regulation should be proportionate to the level of risk. AI employed for language correction, brainstorming or preliminary learning assistance should not necessarily be subjected to the same restrictions as systems used for examination assessment, admission decisions or student profiling.

Second, human supervision should remain indispensable. AI-generated assessments, recommendations or evaluations should not automatically determine a student's academic progression or professional opportunities without meaningful human review.

Third, AI literacy should become an integral component of contemporary legal education. Students should be taught how to formulate effective AI queries, verify generated information, identify hallucinated authorities, recognise algorithmic bias and protect confidential information.

Fourth, institutions should establish transparent academic-integrity rules. Students should be informed about the circumstances in which AI use is permitted, restricted or prohibited and when disclosure of AI assistance is required.

Fifth, privacy and data protection should form an essential part of institutional AI governance. Law schools process considerable amounts of personal and academic information, and the use of external AI platforms may create risks if sensitive information is uploaded without appropriate safeguards.

Finally, technological accessibility must be considered alongside technological innovation. If effective AI-assisted learning depends primarily upon students' ability to purchase premium platforms or possess advanced technological infrastructure, AI may deepen rather than reduce educational inequality.

The comparative experience therefore supports the development of a hybrid Indian model of AI governance in legal education. Such a model could combine constitutional protections, risk-sensitive regulation, institutional AI policies, AI-literacy programmes, human oversight, data protection and academic-integrity safeguards. This would permit law schools to benefit from technological innovation while preserving the intellectual independence, ethical responsibility and professional competencies that remain central to legal education.

CRITICAL ANALYSIS

The growing integration of Artificial Intelligence into legal education demonstrates that AI can no longer be regarded merely as an optional technological facility, as its applications now extend to legal research, drafting, teaching, assessment and personalised learning. This development requires law schools to reconsider conventional teaching methods and the competencies expected of future legal professionals, while also recognising that unregulated or careless adoption may create academic, constitutional and professional risks. The central concern is therefore not whether AI should form part of legal education, but how it can be incorporated without weakening independent legal reasoning, ethical responsibility and professional competence. One of the most significant concerns is the reliability of AI-generated legal information. Generative AI systems can produce responses that appear authoritative even when they contain inaccurate legal propositions, fabricated case citations or incorrect statutory references. Empirical studies have identified instances of legal hallucinations and inaccurate authorities in AI-generated responses, while research concerning specialised legal research systems has also demonstrated that technological sophistication does not completely eliminate the possibility of erroneous output.^{12 13} This concern is particularly important in legal education because students who are still developing research skills may not immediately recognise an invented authority or an incorrectly stated legal principle. AI should therefore be regarded as a preliminary research and learning aid rather than an authoritative source of law. Students may

use AI to identify issues, develop research questions or obtain preliminary explanations, but the final legal position must be established through primary sources such as legislation, constitutional provisions, judicial decisions and reliable legal databases. The appropriate process can therefore be expressed as AI assistance → identification of issues → verification through primary authorities → independent legal analysis → reasoned conclusion, with responsibility for verification remaining with the human researcher. Generative AI also raises important questions concerning academic integrity, plagiarism and authorship. Traditional academic-integrity mechanisms were largely developed on the assumption that submitted work represented the student's own intellectual production, whereas generative AI permits varying degrees of technological assistance, ranging from grammar correction and brainstorming to the production of substantial portions of an assignment. The relevant issue should therefore not simply be whether AI has been used, but the nature, extent and educational significance of such use. UNESCO has recognised the need to reconsider conventional approaches to assessment and learning in light of generative AI while preserving human agency.¹⁴ In legal education, this supports greater emphasis on the process of legal reasoning through research diaries, oral examinations, viva voce assessments, supervised drafting, reflective exercises and problem-based learning. Institutions should also establish clear rules identifying permissible and impermissible uses of AI and specify when disclosure of AI assistance is necessary. Another concern relates to excessive technological dependence and its possible effect on the development of independent legal reasoning. Legal education requires students to identify issues, interpret legislation, distinguish precedents, construct arguments, evaluate competing positions and apply legal principles to facts. If students simply rely upon AI-generated answers, they may have fewer opportunities to engage with the reasoning process itself. Nevertheless, AI does not inevitably undermine critical thinking. It can instead be incorporated into teaching exercises that require students to identify errors in AI-generated arguments, verify citations, locate contrary authorities and explain why an AI-generated conclusion may be legally unsustainable. The educational objective should therefore shift from “AI provides the answer” to “the student critically evaluates the AI-generated answer.” AI can consequently become an object of critical legal analysis rather than merely a source of information. Privacy and confidentiality constitute another major concern. Law students and teachers may handle personal information, case records, client-related information, interview material and unpublished research, and uploading such information to external AI systems may create risks relating to processing, storage, retention and unauthorised disclosure. UNESCO's human-centred approach identifies data privacy as an important consideration in the responsible

educational use of generative AI,¹⁵ while the constitutional recognition of privacy as an aspect of dignity and personal liberty in India provides an additional foundation for protecting educational and personal data.¹⁶ Law schools should therefore establish clear rules regarding information that may be entered into AI systems, requirements for anonymisation or pseudonymisation, approved institutional platforms, data-retention practices, responsibilities of users and procedures for responding to accidental disclosure or data breaches. Privacy protection should consequently be treated not merely as a technical safeguard but as part of the ethical and professional responsibilities associated with legal education. Algorithmic bias and equality also require attention. AI systems may reproduce or amplify biases contained within their training data, design processes or underlying methodologies, and an AI-generated legal explanation may omit particular perspectives, reproduce dominant assumptions or present a contested legal issue as though only one interpretation were possible. UNESCO has therefore emphasised inclusion, equity, diversity and responsible use in the educational deployment of generative AI.¹⁷ This concern is particularly relevant to India because legal education operates within a socially, linguistically and culturally diverse constitutional democracy. Students should therefore be encouraged to question not only whether an AI-generated answer is correct but also what assumptions it contains, whose perspective is represented, which authorities or viewpoints may have been omitted, whether the answer reflects Indian legal realities and whether the proposition can be established through primary sources. AI literacy can thereby become an important component of critical legal reasoning. The digital divide presents a further challenge. Students may differ in their access to reliable internet services, suitable devices, paid AI subscriptions and technological training. If sophisticated AI tools become increasingly important to legal research or academic performance, students with greater financial and technological resources may enjoy educational advantages over those without equivalent access. UNESCO has identified equity and inclusion as important considerations in AI-enabled education and has recognised the possibility that emerging technologies may reinforce existing inequalities.¹⁸ Indian law schools should therefore avoid creating an environment in which effective participation depends upon the ability to purchase expensive AI platforms. Universities could consider providing access to approved tools, developing institutional resources and offering AI-literacy training so that technological differences do not become educational disadvantages. The adoption of AI also transforms the role of the law teacher. When students can obtain explanations, summaries and preliminary research assistance independently, teachers can increasingly function as mentors, facilitators, evaluators and critical guides rather than merely transmitters of information. Teachers can require students to

test AI-generated propositions against judicial authorities, identify weaknesses in AI-generated arguments, compare competing interpretations and defend their conclusions. AI therefore does not necessarily diminish the importance of teachers; instead, it may increase the importance of human pedagogical judgment. The emergence of generative AI also necessitates reconsideration of conventional assessment practices. A take-home assignment completed entirely outside the classroom may provide limited evidence of the student's independent research and reasoning. Rather than abandoning written assessments, institutions can redesign them through AI-assisted assignments with disclosure requirements, oral defence, supervised research exercises, case analysis requiring primary-source verification, research journals, supervised drafting, comparison of AI-generated and independently researched arguments and problem-based assessments. Such approaches can make assessment more resilient to generative AI while encouraging deeper legal reasoning. The implications of AI further extend into professional responsibility because law students eventually become advocates, judges, researchers, academics, corporate lawyers and policymakers. The research habits developed during legal education may therefore influence future professional conduct. A student accustomed to accepting unverified AI-generated citations may carry that practice into professional work, whereas a student trained to verify AI-generated material may develop stronger habits of technological caution. The future lawyer therefore requires a combination of legal knowledge, legal reasoning, research skills, AI literacy, verification skills and ethical judgment. On the basis of the constitutional, judicial and comparative analysis undertaken in this study, this article proposes a Responsible AI-Assisted Legal Education Framework for Indian law schools based upon seven principles: human primacy, verification and source integrity, academic transparency, privacy and confidentiality, equality and accessibility, AI literacy and professional ethics, and continuous institutional review. Overall, Artificial Intelligence presents significant opportunities for Indian legal education by facilitating research, teaching, personalised learning and educational efficiency, but these benefits must be balanced against concerns relating to inaccurate information, academic integrity, privacy, bias, unequal access and technological dependence. The appropriate response is therefore neither blanket rejection nor unrestricted adoption but responsible integration. Law schools should create learning environments in which students are taught to use AI critically, verify its output independently and understand its constitutional, ethical and professional implications. The value of AI in legal education should ultimately be assessed not by the amount of work it can automate, but by whether its use contributes to producing independent, analytical, ethically responsible and technologically competent legal professionals. The future of legal education

should consequently be understood not as a competition between human intelligence and Artificial Intelligence, but as the development of an educational model in which technological capability remains subject to human reasoning, constitutional values, academic integrity and professional responsibility.

CONCLUSION

Artificial Intelligence is emerging as an important force in the transformation of legal education in India. Its applications in legal research, drafting, teaching, learning, assessment and personalised education have the potential to improve efficiency and broaden access to educational resources. At the same time, the integration of AI raises serious concerns concerning the reliability of AI-generated legal information, academic integrity, privacy, algorithmic bias, unequal technological access and the possibility of excessive dependence on automated systems. These concerns demonstrate that technological advancement alone cannot determine the future direction of legal education. The adoption of AI must remain connected with the fundamental objectives of legal education, namely the development of independent reasoning, analytical ability, professional competence, ethical responsibility and respect for constitutional values. The constitutional framework provides important principles for this process. Equality, freedom of expression, privacy, dignity, educational opportunity, scientific temper and social justice provide a normative foundation for determining how AI should be introduced into educational institutions. Judicial developments concerning privacy, digital access, freedom of expression and proportionality further demonstrate that technological measures affecting individuals must remain subject to constitutional safeguards. The comparative examination of the European Union, United States, United Kingdom and Singapore also demonstrates that different regulatory strategies are possible, ranging from risk-based legislation to institutional guidance and principles-based governance. For India, these experiences suggest the value of developing a flexible framework that combines risk-sensitive regulation with institutional autonomy, human oversight, AI literacy, privacy protection, academic-integrity standards and equality of access. The central argument of this study is that AI should be regarded as an assistive educational technology rather than a substitute for human legal reasoning. Students should be trained not merely to operate AI tools but to question their outputs, verify legal authorities, identify inaccuracies and biases, protect confidential information and exercise independent judgment. Similarly, law teachers should increasingly function as mentors and critical evaluators who guide students in using technology responsibly rather than merely transmitting legal information. Legal education institutions also have an

important responsibility to develop clear policies governing permissible AI use, disclosure requirements, assessment methods, data protection and professional ethics. Assessment systems should increasingly examine the student's ability to reason, verify, apply and defend legal conclusions rather than relying solely upon written products that may be generated with substantial technological assistance. The proposed Responsible AI-Assisted Legal Education Framework—based on human agency, verification, transparency, privacy, equality, AI literacy, professional ethics and continuous institutional review—provides a possible pathway for achieving this balance. The ultimate objective should not be to resist technological change or to accept AI without limitation, but to ensure that technological innovation remains consistent with the intellectual and ethical purposes of legal education. The future lawyer will require not only knowledge of law but also the ability to work responsibly with emerging technologies while recognising their limitations. Accordingly, the successful integration of AI into Indian legal education should be measured not by the extent to which human work is replaced, but by whether technology contributes to producing critical thinkers, competent researchers, ethical professionals and constitutionally conscious lawyers. Artificial Intelligence may transform the methods of legal education, but the responsibility for legal judgment, professional accountability and the pursuit of justice must ultimately remain human.

IJLRA