

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IJLRA welcomes submissions from all branches of law, provided the work is original, unpublished, and submitted in accordance with the prescribed submission guidelines.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 ITS IMPACT ON LEGAL RESEARCH IN INDIA: OPPORTUNITIES, CHALLENGES AND THE CHANGING ROLE OF THE LEGAL RESEARCHER”

AUTHORED BY - ANJALI MOHAN

B.com, LL.B, LL.M

Sree Narayana Guru College of Legal Studies, Kollam

Abstract

Artificial Intelligence (AI) is increasingly transforming the manner in which legal information is identified, analysed and utilised. Legal research, traditionally dependent upon the manual examination of statutes, judicial decisions, commentaries, journals and other legal materials, is now being supplemented by AI-powered search, document analysis, summarisation and legal reasoning tools. These technologies have the potential to reduce the time required for locating relevant authorities and to assist researchers in handling increasingly large volumes of legal information. At the same time, their use creates concerns relating to accuracy, fabricated authorities, algorithmic bias, confidentiality, privacy, copyright, transparency and excessive technological dependence. This article examines the changing nature of legal research in the context of artificial intelligence, with particular attention to the Indian legal environment. It explores the ways in which AI can assist different stages of legal research and examines whether greater technological efficiency necessarily produces more reliable legal research. The article adopts a doctrinal and analytical approach and also considers developments in selected foreign jurisdictions. It argues that AI should be understood as an assistive technology rather than a replacement for the independent judgment of the legal researcher. Human verification, critical evaluation and professional responsibility remain essential even where sophisticated AI systems are used. The article concludes by suggesting principles for responsible and reliable use of AI in legal research.

Keywords: Artificial Intelligence, Legal Research, Generative AI, Legal Technology, Legal Researcher, Legal Databases, Human Oversight, Legal Profession.

INTRODUCTION

Legal research forms the foundation of the process through which legal rules are discovered, understood, interpreted and applied. The work of a legal practitioner preparing a case, a judge considering a legal question, a student undertaking academic research, or a scholar conducting socio-legal investigation all depends upon the reliability and depth of the research supporting the final analysis. Traditionally, legal research has required the researcher to identify the precise legal problem, trace the applicable statutory provisions and judicial decisions, examine their interpretation by courts, consult relevant secondary literature and critically assess the materials collected before arriving at a legal conclusion.

The introduction of electronic legal databases brought a major change to this traditional process. Access to legislation, judgments, commentaries and academic materials became considerably easier, reducing the dependence on physical law reports and conventional library-based research. Researchers could increasingly locate authorities through electronic searches using keywords, case names and citations. The development of Artificial Intelligence has taken this technological progression a step further by introducing systems capable of processing and analysing legal information in more sophisticated ways.

AI-enabled tools can assist researchers in locating potentially relevant authorities, analysing lengthy judicial decisions, summarising legal materials, comparing provisions and organising large quantities of information. The emergence of Generative AI has expanded these possibilities further by allowing users to interact with technological systems through ordinary language and obtain responses that resemble human-generated explanations and written material. Consequently, AI is beginning to influence not only the retrieval of legal information but also the manner in which researchers organise and approach legal problems.

Nevertheless, the apparent sophistication of an AI-generated response cannot by itself establish its legal accuracy. AI systems may misunderstand the context of a judicial decision, provide an incomplete interpretation of a legal provision, rely upon outdated information or generate references to cases and sources that cannot be verified. Such shortcomings assume particular significance in legal research, where an incorrect authority or misleading statement of law can influence legal advice, academic conclusions, litigation strategies and submissions before courts.

The important question, therefore, is no longer simply whether Artificial Intelligence has a place in legal research. Its use has already become a practical reality. The more significant concern is how AI can be incorporated into the research process while preserving accuracy, ethical responsibility, independent legal reasoning and professional standards. The challenge

is to determine the appropriate balance between technological assistance and human judgment. Against this background, the present article examines the changing relationship between Artificial Intelligence and legal research. It proposes that the development of AI need not result in the disappearance of traditional legal research methods or the complete automation of legal analysis. Rather, an emerging model of collaborative research may develop in which AI performs information-intensive and repetitive functions, while the human researcher remains responsible for verifying sources, interpreting legal materials, evaluating competing authorities and exercising independent legal judgment.

MEANING AND EVOLUTION OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE IN LEGAL RESEARCH

Artificial Intelligence (AI) may broadly be described as technology that enables computer systems to perform tasks involving capabilities commonly associated with human intelligence. These capabilities include understanding language, recognising patterns, learning from information, processing data and generating responses. Within the legal domain, AI has increasingly been applied to the handling of legal information and to activities such as searching, classification, document analysis and research assistance¹.

The relationship between technology and legal research, however, did not begin with Generative AI. The transformation started with the gradual computerisation of legal materials. Earlier, researchers were largely dependent on printed statutes, law reports, textbooks, journals and physical legal libraries². The introduction of electronic legal databases changed this practice by allowing large collections of legal materials to be accessed and searched digitally. This reduced the amount of time required to locate relevant authorities and made legal information more readily accessible. Nevertheless, the researcher continued to determine the search strategy, examine the material retrieved and assess its legal significance.

A further development occurred with the introduction of more sophisticated search technologies. Modern legal research platforms increasingly moved beyond simple matching of keywords and began incorporating techniques capable of recognising relationships between legal concepts and documents. As a result, researchers could identify potentially relevant

¹ Stuart Russell and Peter Norvig, *Artificial Intelligence: A Modern Approach* (4th edn, Pearson 2021).

² Harry Surden, 'Artificial Intelligence and Law: An Overview' (2019) 35 Georgia State University Law Review 1305.

materials even when the exact terminology used in the search did not appear in the document³. Generative AI has brought another significant development to this process. Unlike conventional databases, which primarily return existing documents, Generative AI systems can respond to questions expressed in ordinary language and produce new textual outputs. In legal research, such systems may be used for preliminary exploration of an unfamiliar subject, identification of possible research issues, organisation of research materials, summarisation of lengthy documents and preparation of preliminary research structures.

The significance of this development lies in the changing role of technology within the research process. Earlier technologies mainly assisted researchers in finding information, whereas contemporary AI systems can also assist in organising and processing information. This distinction is important because legal research cannot be reduced to information retrieval alone. A proper legal inquiry requires the researcher to determine the authority of a source, understand its context, distinguish relevant from irrelevant material, consider competing interpretations and apply the law to the issue under investigation⁴.

The technological progression may therefore be represented as follows:

Printed legal resources



Computerised legal databases



Advanced electronic search



AI-assisted legal research



Generative AI and natural-language research

This progression illustrates a continuing shift in the methods used to access and manage legal information. However, the fundamental purpose of legal research has remained constant: the identification and critical examination of reliable legal materials in order to develop a sound understanding of the law.

³ National Institute of Standards and Technology, *Artificial Intelligence Risk Management Framework: Generative Artificial Intelligence Profile*, NIST AI 600-1 (2024). NIST identifies generative AI as a distinct category requiring attention to its particular risks and trustworthiness considerations.

⁴ UNESCO, *Recommendation on the Ethics of Artificial Intelligence* (adopted 23 November 2021). UNESCO emphasises human oversight, accountability, transparency and the principle that AI systems should not displace ultimate human responsibility.

It is therefore necessary to distinguish between AI as a research tool and law as an authoritative source. An AI-generated response does not acquire legal authority merely because it is expressed with confidence or appears legally convincing. The researcher must trace significant propositions back to their original and authoritative sources. AI can facilitate the research process, but the responsibility for determining whether the information is accurate, relevant and legally applicable continues to rest with the human researcher.

The development of Artificial Intelligence should consequently be understood as a transformation of the method and efficiency of legal research, rather than as a replacement for the analytical and evaluative functions performed by legal researchers.

TRADITIONAL LEGAL RESEARCH AND AI-ASSISTED LEGAL RESEARCH

The incorporation of Artificial Intelligence into legal research has altered the manner in which researchers approach legal information, but it has not eliminated the conventional foundations of legal research. The essential task continues to be the identification of reliable legal sources and the interpretation of those sources in relation to a particular legal question. What has changed is the manner in which information can be located, organised and initially examined. Under the conventional approach, legal research normally proceeds through a series of deliberate steps. The researcher first defines the legal issue and identifies the relevant areas of law. Appropriate statutes, judicial decisions, rules, regulations and secondary literature are then located through books, law reports, legal databases and other research resources. Each source is examined by the researcher, who determines its relevance and authority before using it in the research. Where a substantial body of material is involved, this process can demand considerable time and effort.

AI-assisted research introduces automation into some of these stages. A researcher can communicate a legal problem in ordinary language and use an AI-enabled system to explore related concepts, identify potentially relevant materials or organise a large collection of documents. AI may also assist with preliminary summaries, comparison of legal texts and identification of recurring themes in judicial decisions. Consequently, activities that previously required substantial manual effort can, in appropriate circumstances, be completed more efficiently.

The principal differences may be illustrated as follows:

Conventional Approach	AI-Assisted Approach
-----------------------	----------------------

Research is predominantly conducted through manual examination of sources.	Human research is supplemented by automated processing.
Considerable emphasis is placed on selecting appropriate keywords and search expressions.	Legal questions can often be presented in conversational or natural language.
Researchers individually examine extensive collections of materials.	AI can help narrow, classify or organise potentially relevant materials.
Summaries are prepared through the researcher's own reading and analysis.	AI can produce preliminary summaries for subsequent examination.
Comparing numerous cases or documents can require substantial time.	AI can assist in detecting textual or conceptual similarities.
Evaluation of authorities is undertaken directly by the researcher.	AI may suggest authorities or interpretations, but these require independent assessment.
The researcher's primary challenge is often locating and processing information.	Greater emphasis may be placed on checking and evaluating information supplied by the system.

The introduction of AI should therefore be regarded as an alteration in the method of conducting research, rather than a change in the fundamental nature of legal inquiry. Even when an AI tool is used to identify a potentially relevant judgment, the researcher must read the original decision and determine what the court actually decided. Similarly, an AI-generated explanation of a statutory provision cannot replace examination of the statutory text and relevant judicial interpretation.

This becomes particularly significant with Generative AI. Conventional databases generally provide access to information that already exists within their collections. Generative AI, in contrast, can construct an apparently coherent response based on patterns within its training and processing systems. The resulting answer may therefore appear authoritative even where an individual proposition, citation or interpretation is incorrect. The ability to obtain an immediate answer can consequently create a temptation to treat convenience as evidence of reliability.

The use of AI consequently changes the skill set required of a legal researcher. In addition to knowing how to locate legal materials, researchers increasingly need to understand how AI systems operate, recognise their limitations and scrutinise their outputs. Verification becomes

particularly important where the information relates to a case citation, statutory provision, judicial holding or other proposition that will form the basis of a legal argument.

The distinction can therefore be expressed through a simple progression:

Traditional **research:**

Identify issue → Search → Locate sources → Read → Analyse → Conclude

AI-assisted **research:**

Identify issue → Query/AI-assisted search → Locate potential sources → Verify original sources → Analyse → Conclude

The second approach does not make the human researcher unnecessary. Instead, it changes where human effort is most important. AI may reduce the burden associated with searching and organising information, while the researcher must retain responsibility for determining whether the information is authentic, legally relevant and correctly understood.

Accordingly, the most appropriate understanding of AI-assisted legal research is that of a supporting relationship between technological capability and human legal judgment. The effectiveness of the process depends not merely on the ability of AI to produce information, but on the researcher's capacity to critically evaluate that information before relying upon it.

APPLICATIONS OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE IN LEGAL RESEARCH

The influence of Artificial Intelligence on legal research becomes more apparent when its practical applications are examined. AI is no longer confined to the function of retrieving information from electronic databases. Depending upon the technology involved, it can assist researchers in discovering relevant authorities, processing large volumes of material, identifying patterns, summarising documents and organising research findings. These developments have the potential to alter several stages of the traditional research process.⁵

➤ Legal Information Retrieval

The identification of relevant legal material is one of the areas in which AI can provide substantial assistance. Conventional electronic searches generally require researchers to select appropriate keywords and formulate search expressions. AI-based systems can allow questions to be presented in more natural language and can assist in identifying legal concepts that may be connected to the research problem.

⁵ Harry Surden, 'Artificial Intelligence and Law: An Overview' (2019) 35 *Georgia State University Law Review* 1305.

This can be particularly useful during the preliminary stage of research, where the researcher may not yet be familiar with all the terminology associated with a particular legal issue. AI can therefore function as a tool for discovering possible directions for further investigation. However, information identified through AI should be treated as a starting point for research rather than as a substitute for examination of authoritative sources.⁶

➤ ***Identification and Analysis of Judicial Decisions***

Case-law research is often one of the most demanding aspects of legal research because a single legal issue may be considered in numerous decisions across different courts. AI-based systems can assist in identifying decisions dealing with similar legal questions, factual circumstances or principles.

AI can also assist in extracting portions of judgments and generating preliminary summaries. Such functions may be particularly useful where the researcher has to examine a large number of decisions within a limited period.

The usefulness of this technology, however, depends upon careful verification. A judicial decision cannot be properly understood merely by reading an automated summary. The researcher must examine the original judgment, including its facts, issues, reasoning, ratio decidendi and subsequent judicial treatment. The need for such verification has become particularly evident from recent Indian judicial proceedings concerning the use of fabricated or hallucinated case authorities generated through AI systems.⁷

➤ ***Statutory and Legislative Research***

AI can also assist in the examination of legislation. Researchers may use AI-based tools to compare provisions, identify related statutory rules, trace amendments and explore possible connections between different legislative instruments.

Such assistance can be valuable where a research problem involves several statutes or subordinate legislative instruments. Nevertheless, the authoritative text of the legislation must remain the foundation of the analysis. An AI-generated explanation may assist the researcher in understanding a provision, but it cannot itself determine the meaning or legal validity of the provision.

➤ ***Summarisation of Legal Materials***

Legal research frequently involves documents of considerable length, including judgments,

⁶ Richard Susskind, *Transforming the Law: Essays on Technology, Justice and the Legal Marketplace* (OUP 2000).

⁷ *Pooja Ramesh Singh v Jammu and Kashmir Bank Ltd* 2026 INSC 668 (2 July 2026). The Supreme Court's case summary records that the proceedings concerned reliance by the NCLT and NCLAT on six AI-generated citations that were subsequently found to be non-existent or associated with non-existent paragraphs.

legislative materials, consultation papers, reports and academic publications. AI-based summarisation can help researchers obtain an initial overview of such material and identify portions that require closer examination.

The principal limitation is that summarisation involves selection. An automated summary may leave out qualifications, exceptions, factual details or aspects of judicial reasoning that are important to the final legal conclusion. Consequently, AI-generated summaries should be regarded as preliminary research aids and not as replacements for reading the original source⁸.

➤ ***Comparative Legal Research***

AI has potential applications in comparative legal research, particularly where researchers need to examine legal rules or regulatory approaches across several jurisdictions. It can assist in arranging information, identifying apparent similarities and differences and providing an initial structure for comparative analysis.

The use of AI can therefore reduce some of the difficulties associated with handling large quantities of foreign legal material. However, genuine comparative analysis requires more than identifying textual similarities between laws. Differences in constitutional arrangements, legal traditions, institutional structures, judicial approaches and social circumstances must also be considered by the researcher.

➤ ***Literature Review***

A literature review requires the researcher to identify and examine existing scholarship relating to the research problem. AI can assist in organising academic materials, identifying recurring themes and grouping literature according to particular issues.

This can be especially useful in large research projects where numerous articles, books and reports must be examined. However, references suggested by AI should always be independently verified. A researcher should confirm that the publication exists, that the cited author and title are accurate and that the source actually supports the proposition for which it is being cited.

➤ ***Identification of Research Gaps***

AI may also assist researchers in exploring possible areas that have received comparatively limited scholarly attention. By processing substantial quantities of literature, AI can help identify frequently discussed themes, recurring arguments and areas requiring further investigation.

Nevertheless, the identification of a genuine research gap remains an intellectual exercise. A

topic should not be considered a research gap merely because an AI system does not identify sufficient material on it. The researcher must examine the existing literature systematically and determine whether an unresolved question, inconsistency or unexplored dimension actually exists.

➤ ***Organisation and Classification of Research Material***

Legal research often produces substantial quantities of cases, statutory provisions, articles, reports and research notes. AI-assisted tools can help classify this material according to subject, legal issue or other categories.

Such organisation can improve the researcher's ability to identify relationships between different sources and may make the later stages of analysis more manageable. The ultimate classification, however, should remain subject to the researcher's assessment because the significance of a legal source cannot always be determined solely by textual similarity.

➤ ***Assistance in Legal Writing***

AI can also contribute to the preliminary stages of legal writing. Researchers may use AI to organise ideas, prepare an outline, improve the structure of a draft or identify portions requiring further research.

This application should nevertheless be distinguished from allowing AI to determine the substantive legal argument. Academic and professional legal writing requires independent reasoning and responsibility for the propositions advanced. AI-generated text therefore requires careful review, factual verification and appropriate attribution where necessary.

➤ ***Multilingual Legal Research***

The multilingual nature of the Indian legal environment provides another potential area for AI application. Language-processing and translation technologies can assist researchers in accessing material available in different languages.

Such technologies may contribute to greater accessibility of legal information. However, legal terminology frequently carries context-specific meanings, and automated translation may fail to capture such nuances. Important translated material should therefore be checked against the original text wherever possible.

➤ ***Citation and Reference Assistance***

AI can assist in arranging citations, identifying potentially relevant authorities and organising bibliographical information. This can reduce some of the mechanical work associated with preparing a research paper.

However, the appearance of a properly formatted citation does not establish the reliability of the authority. The researcher must independently confirm the existence, citation, content and

continuing validity of the source before relying upon it.

➤ *Indian Judicial Developments*

The use of AI within the Indian justice system demonstrates that these technological developments are not merely theoretical. The Supreme Court of India has explored AI applications including translation and legal research assistance, while tools such as SUVAS and SUPACE have been developed within the judicial technology framework.⁹ The Supreme Court's more recent work has also recognised the risks associated with unreliable AI-generated legal material. In *Pooja Ramesh Singh v Jammu and Kashmir Bank Ltd*, the Court considered the consequences of judgments that had relied upon AI-generated citations subsequently found to be non-existent or incorrectly attributed.¹⁰

This development is particularly relevant to legal research because it demonstrates both sides of the technological transformation: AI can provide useful assistance in processing legal information, but inaccurate AI-generated material can also enter legal decision-making if adequate verification is not undertaken.

➤ *Overall Assessment*

The various applications demonstrate that AI can support legal research at multiple stages, particularly where the researcher is required to locate, organise or initially process large quantities of information. Its principal contribution lies in reducing some of the time and effort associated with information-intensive tasks.

However, the usefulness of AI depends upon the manner in which it is used. The researcher must distinguish between information generated by a technological system and information that possesses legal authority. The former may assist the research process; the latter must ultimately be established through reliable and authoritative sources.

The emerging model of legal research may therefore be represented as:

**AI-assisted discovery → Source verification → Human interpretation → Critical analysis
→ Legal conclusion**

The continuing importance of the human researcher is therefore not diminished by AI. Instead, the researcher's role increasingly shifts towards verification, evaluation and independent legal reasoning.

IMPACT OF ARTIF

⁹ Government of India, Department of Justice, *White Paper on Artificial Intelligence and Judiciary* (November 2025). The Government document records the Supreme Court's AI initiatives, including SUVAS for translation and SUPACE for assistance in legal research and court efficiency.

¹⁰ *Pooja Ramesh Singh v Jammu and Kashmir Bank Ltd* 2026 INSC 668 (2 July 2026).

ICIAL INTELLIGENCE ON THE ROLE OF THE LEGAL RESEARCHER

The introduction of Artificial Intelligence into legal research is not merely a technological development; it is also changing the nature of the work performed by legal researchers. Traditionally, legal research required considerable time to locate relevant statutes, judgments, commentaries, articles and other legal materials. AI-assisted systems can now perform several preliminary and repetitive tasks within a much shorter period. However, this does not eliminate the need for the legal researcher. Instead, it shifts the researcher's role from primarily locating information towards evaluating, verifying, interpreting and critically applying information.¹¹

➤ *From Information Collector to Information Evaluator*

A traditional researcher generally spends substantial time searching for relevant legal materials. AI can assist in identifying potentially relevant cases, provisions, articles and concepts. As a result, the researcher can devote more time to examining whether the material is legally authoritative, relevant to the particular issue and applicable to the facts under consideration. The researcher therefore becomes less of an information collector and more of an information evaluator. The ability to distinguish between primary and secondary sources, binding and persuasive precedents, current and outdated law, and relevant and irrelevant material remains fundamentally important.

➤ *Greater Importance of Verification*

AI-generated information cannot automatically be treated as legal authority. Generative AI systems may produce inaccurate statements, incomplete reasoning or references to cases and sources that do not actually exist. NIST identifies this problem as 'confabulation', where an AI system confidently produces erroneous or false information, including potentially false citations.¹²

This makes verification an essential stage of AI-assisted legal research. A researcher should independently check the existence of a case, the correctness of its citation, the actual contents of the judgment, the relevant paragraph, subsequent judicial treatment and the current legal position.

The significance of this responsibility has become particularly clear in India. In *Pooja Ramesh Singh v Jammu and Kashmir Bank Ltd*, the Supreme Court considered a matter involving six

¹¹ Harry Surden, 'Artificial Intelligence and Law: An Overview' (2019) 35 *Georgia State University Law Review* 1305.

¹² Chloe Autio and others, *Artificial Intelligence Risk Management Framework: Generative Artificial Intelligence Profile*, NIST AI 600-1 (National Institute of Standards and Technology 2024).

AI-generated citations that were subsequently found to be non-existent or incorrectly attributed. The Court emphasised the need for verification before AI-generated material is presented or relied upon as legal precedent.¹³

➤ ***Development of Technological Literacy***

The modern legal researcher increasingly requires a basic understanding of AI technologies. A researcher need not become a computer scientist, but should understand how AI-assisted search and generative systems operate, what their limitations are and why their outputs may differ from conventional legal databases.

Technological literacy therefore becomes an additional research skill. A competent researcher should know how to formulate effective prompts, identify the limitations of AI-generated answers, verify sources and maintain a clear distinction between AI assistance and authoritative legal material.

➤ ***Changing Research Methodology***

AI also changes the workflow of legal research. Instead of following a completely linear process of searching, reading and collecting materials, researchers may use AI at different stages of the research cycle.

A contemporary AI-assisted research process may be represented as:

Identify legal issue → AI-assisted discovery → Locate potential authorities → Verify original sources → Compare authorities → Interpret legal principles → Apply to facts → Human legal conclusion

➤ ***Increased Research Efficiency***

One of the major effects of AI is the reduction of time required for preliminary research tasks. AI tools can assist in identifying themes, organising large volumes of documents, generating preliminary summaries and locating potentially relevant authorities. The Supreme Court of India has itself explored the use of AI-related technologies in the judicial system, including applications aimed at improving translation and assisting legal research and court processes.¹⁴ This may be particularly useful for researchers dealing with large bodies of case law or legislative material. However, efficiency should be understood as a means of improving research rather than as a substitute for careful legal analysis.

➤ ***New Responsibility for Source Authentication***

The increasing use of AI creates a new professional responsibility: source authentication. Earlier, a researcher could generally rely upon established legal databases and published

¹³ *Pooja Ramesh Singh v Jammu and Kashmir Bank Ltd* 2026 INSC 668 (2 July 2026).

¹⁴ Supreme Court of India, *White Paper on Artificial Intelligence and Judiciary* (November 2025).

authorities after appropriate checking. With generative AI, an apparently precise citation may not necessarily correspond to a genuine authority.

Consequently, researchers should develop a systematic verification practice:

AI output → Identify source → Open original source → Check citation → Read relevant passage → Check subsequent developments → Use only after verification

This approach reduces the risk of incorporating fabricated or misleading material into academic writing, pleadings, opinions or judicial submissions.

➤ ***Human Judgment Remains Central***

Legal research ultimately involves questions of interpretation, values, context and judgment. These cannot be reduced merely to retrieving information. AI can assist in identifying patterns and organising material, but the researcher must determine which legal principles are relevant and how they should be understood in their particular context.

The Supreme Court's 2026 discussion of AI-generated authorities illustrates this distinction. The Court recognised the usefulness of AI while simultaneously stressing the need for control and verification when AI-generated material enters legal decision-making.¹⁵

Therefore, the emerging relationship should not be understood as AI versus the legal researcher. It is more accurately described as AI-assisted legal research, in which technology performs appropriate supporting functions while the researcher retains responsibility for legal judgment.

ADVANTAGES OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE IN LEGAL RESEARCH

Artificial Intelligence can improve the speed, efficiency and accessibility of legal research. Its major advantages include:

1. Time-saving: AI can quickly search large volumes of judgments, statutes, articles and other legal materials.
2. Efficient information retrieval: It can identify potentially relevant cases, provisions and legal concepts from extensive databases.
3. Case-law analysis: AI can assist in identifying similarities, differences and recurring principles across judicial decisions.
4. Summarisation: Lengthy judgments, statutes and research materials can be summarised, helping researchers understand their broad contents more quickly.

¹⁵ *Pooja Ramesh Singh v Jammu and Kashmir Bank Ltd* 2026 INSC 668 (2 July 2026).

5. Comparative research: AI can assist in comparing legal provisions and judicial approaches across different jurisdictions.
6. Literature review: It can help organise scholarly materials, identify recurring themes and assist in locating areas requiring further research.
7. Multilingual accessibility: AI-based translation tools can help researchers access legal materials available in different languages. The Supreme Court of India has also undertaken AI-related initiatives involving translation and other technological applications.¹⁶
8. Organisation of research materials: AI can assist in classifying and arranging large quantities of documents according to subject, case, date or legal issue.
9. Improved accessibility: AI tools can assist students and researchers in understanding unfamiliar legal concepts and identifying relevant starting points for research.
10. Better research efficiency: By reducing repetitive work, AI allows researchers to devote more time to verification, interpretation and critical legal analysis.

CHALLENGES AND RISKS OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE IN LEGAL RESEARCH

Although AI improves the efficiency of legal research, its use also creates important risks:

1. Hallucination and inaccuracy: AI may produce false information, incorrect legal propositions or non-existent case citations.¹⁷
2. Lack of reliability: AI-generated answers may not accurately reflect the contents or current status of a legal authority. The Supreme Court of India has highlighted this concern in *Pooja Ramesh Singh v Jammu and Kashmir Bank Ltd.*¹⁸
3. Bias: AI systems may reproduce biases present in their training data and produce incomplete or distorted results.
4. Privacy and confidentiality: Uploading confidential client information or sensitive legal documents into AI systems may create privacy and professional-conduct concerns.
5. Over-dependence: Excessive reliance on AI may weaken independent legal research, critical thinking and analytical skills.

¹⁶ Chloe Autio and others, *Artificial Intelligence Risk Management Framework: Generative Artificial Intelligence Profile*, NIST AI 600-1 (National Institute of Standards and Technology 2024).

¹⁷ Chloe Autio and others, *Artificial Intelligence Risk Management Framework: Generative Artificial Intelligence Profile*, NIST AI 600-1 (National Institute of Standards and Technology 2024).

¹⁸ *Pooja Ramesh Singh v Jammu and Kashmir Bank Ltd* 2026 INSC 668 (2 July 2026).

6. Academic and professional integrity: Unverified AI-generated material may lead to plagiarism, inaccurate citations and professional errors.

CONSTITUTIONAL, ETHICAL AND PROFESSIONAL CONCERNS

The use of Artificial Intelligence in legal research raises concerns beyond accuracy and efficiency. It also has constitutional, ethical and professional implications.

1. **Right to Privacy:** Confidential client information and personal data entered into AI systems may create privacy and data-protection concerns.
2. **Equality and Non-discrimination:** AI systems may reproduce biases contained in their training data, potentially affecting equal access to reliable legal information.
3. **Access to Justice:** AI can improve access to legal information, but unequal access to technology may create a **digital divide** between those who can use advanced AI tools and those who cannot.
4. **Professional Responsibility:** Lawyers remain responsible for the accuracy of research and submissions prepared with AI assistance. AI cannot transfer professional responsibility from the lawyer to the technology.¹⁹
5. **Academic Integrity:** Uncritical use of AI-generated material may affect originality, proper attribution and independent legal reasoning.
6. **Human Oversight:** AI should remain subject to human supervision, particularly where its output may influence legal advice, academic research or judicial decision-making.

COMPARATIVE PERSPECTIVE: INTERNATIONAL APPROACHES TO AI IN LEGAL RESEARCH

Different jurisdictions are developing different approaches to the use of Artificial Intelligence in the legal field. Although their regulatory methods differ, common concerns include accuracy, transparency, confidentiality, accountability and human oversight.

European Union

The EU AI Act 2024 adopts a risk-based approach to Artificial Intelligence and places greater obligations on higher-risk AI systems. It emphasises transparency, accountability and protection of fundamental rights.²⁰

¹⁹ American Bar Association, Standing Committee on Ethics and Professional Responsibility, *Formal Opinion 512: Generative Artificial Intelligence Tools* (29 July 2024).

²⁰ Regulation (EU) 2024/1689 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 13 June 2024 laying down harmonised rules on Artificial Intelligence (Artificial Intelligence Act).

United States

In the United States, the American Bar Association's Formal Opinion 512 (2024) addresses lawyers' use of generative AI. It highlights professional duties relating to competence, confidentiality, communication with clients and responsibility for AI-assisted work.²¹

United Kingdom

The UK judiciary has issued guidance on the use of AI by judicial office holders. The guidance identifies risks including hallucinations, bias and confidentiality concerns and emphasises that judges remain responsible for material produced in their name.²²

Singapore

Singapore is also examining the impact of generative AI on legal practice and the future of legal services. Its judiciary has recognised the growing influence of AI on legal work and the need for legal professionals to develop appropriate technological skills.²³

CRITICAL ANALYSIS

Artificial Intelligence is transforming legal research by making the process of searching, organising and analysing legal information faster and more accessible. However, efficiency alone cannot determine the value of AI-assisted legal research. Legal research involves interpretation, reasoning, verification and professional judgment, which cannot be delegated entirely to an AI system.

The major concern is the reliability of AI-generated information. Generative AI may produce convincing but false information and citations. NIST identifies such outputs as 'confabulations'.²⁴

At the same time, completely rejecting AI would ignore its practical benefits. AI can reduce repetitive research work, assist in handling large volumes of material and improve access to legal information. The Supreme Court has itself recognised technology as an aid to the justice system while emphasising that it should not override judicial reasoning.²⁵

Therefore, the appropriate approach is neither complete dependence on AI nor complete rejection of it. AI should function as an assistive research tool, while the legal researcher

²¹ American Bar Association, Standing Committee on Ethics and Professional Responsibility, *Formal Opinion 512: Generative Artificial Intelligence Tools* (29 July 2024).

²² Courts and Tribunals Judiciary, 'Artificial Intelligence (AI) – Judicial Guidance (October 2025)'.

²³ Supreme Court of Singapore, 'Chief Justice Sundaresh Menon: Speech at the 39th LAWASIA Conference 2026' (16 September 2026).

²⁴ Chloe Autio and others, *Artificial Intelligence Risk Management Framework: Generative Artificial Intelligence Profile*, NIST AI 600-1 (National Institute of Standards and Technology 2024).

²⁵ Supreme Court of India, 'Press Release dated 12 April 2026'.

remains responsible for verifying sources, understanding the law and reaching an independent conclusion.

The future of legal research is consequently likely to be based on human–AI collaboration, where technological efficiency is combined with human judgment, ethical responsibility and critical thinking.

CONCLUSION

Artificial Intelligence has emerged as an important technological development in the field of legal research. Its ability to search, organise, summarise and analyse large volumes of legal information has the potential to make legal research faster, more accessible and more efficient. In India, the increasing use of AI in judicial and legal processes, together with the Supreme Court's *White Paper on Artificial Intelligence and Judiciary*, demonstrates that AI is becoming an important part of the modern legal system.

However, technological efficiency cannot be equated with legal accuracy. AI systems may generate incorrect information, fabricated citations, biased results or incomplete interpretations. The researcher must therefore verify every important authority through authentic primary sources and examine its relevance, context and current legal status. The responsibility for the final research outcome cannot be transferred to an AI system.

The study also demonstrates that AI is changing the role of the legal researcher rather than eliminating it. Routine tasks such as information retrieval, document classification and preliminary summarisation may increasingly be assisted by AI, while human researchers will continue to perform the more complex functions of interpretation, critical analysis, ethical evaluation and legal reasoning.

The future of legal research should therefore be based on a human–AI collaborative model. Law students, researchers, advocates and academics need sufficient technological literacy to use AI effectively, but they must also preserve traditional skills of reading, reasoning, source verification and independent analysis. UNESCO similarly emphasises human oversight, transparency, accountability, fairness and protection of human rights in the development and use of AI.

AI should consequently be viewed neither as a complete substitute for traditional legal research nor as a technology to be rejected. Its value depends upon how responsibly it is used. A reliable model of AI-assisted legal research can be expressed as:

AI-assisted discovery → Verification of authentic sources → Human interpretation → Critical analysis → Independent legal conclusion

Ultimately, the transformation brought by AI is not simply about replacing human effort with technology. It is about redefining how legal researchers work and what skills they require. The most valuable legal researcher in the AI era will not necessarily be the person who obtains information the fastest, but the person who can question, verify, interpret and responsibly apply that information.

Thus, Artificial Intelligence should remain a tool in the hands of the legal researcher, and not a substitute for legal judgment. The future of legal research lies in combining technological capability with human reasoning, professional ethics and accountability. Such a balanced approach can enable the legal profession and academic community to obtain the benefits of AI while protecting the accuracy, integrity and human-centred nature of legal research.

