



VBCL Law Review

ISSN No. 2456-0480

DECEMBER 2025

Vaikunta Baliga College of Law

(A Unit of Dr. T. M. A. Pai Foundation, Manipal)

KUNJIBETTU, UDUPI - 576 102 KARNATAKA

Phone: (0820) 2520373

Email: principalvbcl57@gmail.com Website: www.vbclaw.edu.in

THE LEGAL DYNAMISMS OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE IN THE INDIAN JUDICIAL SYSTEM

Mr. Srinivas M.K.*

ABSTRACT

The judiciary, long considered one of the most tradition-bound institutions, is now encountering an entirely new collaborator: artificial intelligence (AI). Unlike earlier technological shifts such as the digitization of records or the introduction of online dispute resolution AI goes beyond speeding up processes; it reshapes the fundamental logic of how adjudication itself operates. Instead of asking only how courts can use machines to decide faster, the deeper question is: how does the presence of non-human intelligence alter what we mean by law, fairness, and authority? By placing different legal systems in dialogue, this study asks whether AI in courts is merely an auxiliary instrument or the beginning of a new form of “judicial intelligence,” where human and machine reasoning co-author justice. This piece of work highlights not only technical and institutional challenges, but also cultural, political, and philosophical stakes: whether law remains a fundamentally human act or becomes a hybrid form of decision-making, where fairness is reimagined through code as much as through conscience. This study looks at how artificial intelligence affects judicial decision-making and legal processes, the normative, ethical, and constitutional implications of its use in courts, and the policy frameworks, checks, and balances that shape its application across different political systems. This is because, despite AI’s rapid integration into justice delivery mechanisms worldwide, there is still a dearth of legal

* Ph. D. Scholar (Law), Department of Studies in Law, University of Mysore

scholarship. In this context, the study looks at the Indian legal system, where judges act as human representations of justice and judicial backlogs necessitate innovation. This raises the prospect of using “AI” as a means of rethinking access to justice in a diverse society, rather than merely as a tool for efficiency.

Keywords: Artificial Intelligence, Judicial System, Adjudication, Access to Justice, India

INTRODUCTION

The application of human intelligence is given top priority in the judiciary, where decisions are made based mostly on inventiveness, morality, contextual reasoning, and most importantly, humanity. The challenge of transferring all human senses to an algorithmic neural network of artificial intelligence (AI) in decision-making and having judges approve it is the answer to simplifying the legal system in tandem with emerging technology and providing the public with practical services. In its broadest definition, artificial intelligence (AI) is a field of computer science concerned with the reproduction of human intellect in computers.¹

The government’s ambitious policy prescription to expand the concept of smart courts began in the mid-2000s with the gradual introduction of smart e-courts. In addition to approving virtual courts and information kiosks, Phases 1 and 2 have begun to roll out the necessary digital hardware and provide impetus to develop the infrastructure in the direction of establishing e-courts and case management systems by scheduling timely hearings and making them clearly accessible to stakeholders and providing them with accurate services. Phase 3 was a vision statement that aimed to improve technical breakthroughs via artificial intelligence (AI) by introducing “intelligent law making,” which could convert the study of intellectual data into decisions in the judicial system. AI expedites “user Centricity” and ensures that judicial tasks are handled quickly. One of the key initiatives in this draft is “intelligent scheduling,” which aims to enhance the use of digitalisation in the legal system. Pilot projects have signalled the introduction of new technology into the system, such as Portal for Assistance in Court Efficiency (SUPACE) for research support to case scheduling and management to benefit stakeholders, and Supreme Court *VidhikAnuvaad* Software (SUVAS) for document translation into the necessary languages.² The government has set up INR

1 ‘Smart Automation and Artificial Intelligence in India’s Judicial System: A Case of Organised Irresponsibility?’ <<https://www.digitalfutureslab.in/publications/smart-automation-and-artificial-intelligence-in-india-s-judicial-system-a-case-of-organised-irresponsibility>> accessed 5 September 2025.

2 Siddharth Peter de Souza, ‘AI and the Indian Judiciary: The Need for a Rights-Based Approach [HTML Version]’ (28 November 2024) <<https://www.thehinducentre.com/incoming/ai-and-the-indian-judiciary-the-need-for-a-rights-based-approach-html-version/article68917505.ece>> accessed 6 September 2025.

7000 crores for these AI projects in 2023, which are intended for phase 3 of the e-court projects.³

THE STAKEHOLDERS

To bring about change in the Indian judiciary, which calls for significant innovations and discussions across interdependent groups, the interaction of several stakeholders is essential. In its earliest stages, government ministries, courts, and legislative and executive policy makers are intricately linked with non-governmental organisations, civic technology organisations, and engineering colleges that are considering cataloguing and incorporating machine learning models to leverage judicial knowledge and transform it into repositories for the benefit of the public. For private law firms, the legal IT sector is more thriving, and financing options range from venture capital to bootstrapping in a more comprehensive sense. In conjunction with the eCommittee in the judicial side of things, the Ministry of Electronics and Information Technology (MeitY) in the technology side of affairs weaves together the framework for policymaking and recommendations. The Ministry of Electronics and Information Technology (MeitY) and the Nodal Ministry for all information technology (IT) policy matters established four committees in 2018 to enhance India's AI policy and to consider the application of technology in their respective domains.⁴ Additionally, its draft study highlights four significant applications of AI in the judicial sector, including the translation of court rulings and search engines to put information at the fingertips of interested parties.

The digitisation of the courts was started in 2005 as part of the national eGovernment project, and the Department of Justice, which is part of the Ministry of Law and Justice, provides excellent services for financing and overseeing the eCourts project module. Judges and invited members of the government and bar joined the Supreme Court's "e-Committee" in 2005 to develop the smart e-Courts initiative. For the project's compatible execution at the threshold level, representatives from the High Court and District Court were also involved in the "*eCommittee*". The "*eCommittee*" worked with a subcommittee made up of technically proficient AI policy research professionals and civic-tech groups including Vidhi Centre for Legal Policy (Vidhi), Daksh, and Agami to develop the draft Phase 3 document for public

3 'India Budget | Ministry of Finance | Government of India'
<<https://www.indiabudget.gov.in/>> accessed 5 September 2025.

4 Urvashi Aneja and Dona Mathew, 'Artificial Intelligence Committees Reports - Digital India | Leading the Transformation in India for Ease of Living and Digital Economy | MeitY, Government of India' (Digital Futures Lab 2023)
<<https://www.digitalindia.gov.in/initiative/artificial-intelligence-committees-reports/>> accessed 5 September 2025.

comment in 2021.⁵ In 2019, the Supreme Court established an AI committee to investigate the increasing interest in AI applications, including document translation, administrative task simplification, and legal research support.

AI INTEGRATION IN INDIA'S JUDICIAL SYSTEM

The judicial and executive branches, in collaboration with third parties such as policy organizations, NGOs, legal-tech startups, civic-tech groups, and academic institutions, are developing infrastructure for AI-related research and development in the judiciary. Platforms like Vidhi and Daksh are promoting accountability in the automation of judicial processes and are recognized for their exemplary contributions to AI initiatives in the legal system.⁶

The eCommittee, with support from advisory platforms such as Agami, is leveraging and redesigning algorithmic neural networks to advance AI in the justice system. Agami not only explores solutions to challenges in justice delivery but also provides a collaborative space for innovators and nurtures cutting-edge research. Existing AI modules have been further upgraded into OpenNyAI, with the broader goal of fostering an inclusive Open AI community and enabling the development of new AI models built upon existing frameworks. Initiatives under OpenNyAI also include AI-assisted tools such as summarizers, judgment analysis systems, and entity recognition models.⁷

In order to create accessible models for the legal system, it is crucial to have accurate data, and Agami has categorised and arranged data in the necessary forms. One readily available source of India's legal and judicial data is the Justice Hub, which was developed by Civic Data Lab in partnership with Agami. Improving the interoperability and accessibility of court information is one of the Justice Hub's main goals. This development in open AI aims to support the open data movement by including a broad spectrum of stakeholders and empowering them to use open data to expedite the administration of justice in India.⁸ One of the milestones achieved by

5 'Final Report on the Vision Document for Phase III of eCourts Project' <<https://cdnbbsr.s3waas.gov.in/s35d6646aad9bcc0be55b2c82f69750387/uploads/2024/07/202407161620804267.pdf>> accessed 6 September 2025.

6 Urvashi Aneja and Dona Mathew (n 5).

7 'Ideas That Serve Justice | Agami' <<https://www.agami.in/>> accessed 5 September 2025.

8 Rangin Pallav Tripathy, 'Unveiling India's Supreme Court Collegium: Examining Diversity of Presence and Influence' (2023) 18 Asian Journal of Comparative Law 179 <<https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/asian-journal-of-comparative-law/article/abs/unveiling-indias-supreme-court-collegium-examining-diversity-of-presence-and-influence/43E897488FD14CF572F609FDC0A3188D>> accessed 5 September 2025.

CivicDataLab is the integration of the Haq model into judicial data research and trend analysis using cutting-edge technologies to track cases under the Protection of Children from Sexual Offences Act (POCSO).⁹

The National Law University has made a significant contribution by providing access to its database for research purposes. In parallel, the World Bank, as part of its expanding initiatives, launched the AI-backed project DE JURE to consolidate data collected from all e-Courts, including those of the lower judiciary, into a unified judicial platform. As part of this project, the World Bank has incorporated “labeled names” into the database, assigning gender and religious identity to support large-scale deep learning models.¹⁰

This project has developed safeguards to protect the right to privacy by avoiding the labeling of judges and litigants, thereby ensuring their identities remain concealed. In addition, the DE JURE project has collaborated with SAMA, an online dispute resolution platform designed to resolve disputes among stakeholders while also conducting impact assessments within a virtual neural network. This collaboration supports the development of new possibilities for dispute resolution in Lok Adalats and contributes to the automation of case allocation processes.

The National Informatics Centre (NIC) provides technological support for e-Court projects under MeitY, and the NIC Pune software team has developed the Case Information System.¹¹

NIC Pune has served as a representative of the Centre for Development of Advanced Computing (C-DAC) under MeitY and is also a member of the eCommittee. Alongside these efforts, the Computer and IT Cells in various courts have been actively contributing to technology-building initiatives. The drive toward automation has also been reinforced by organizations working on machine learning, particularly through the development of Indian legal language benchmarks. The OpenNyAI initiative has further collaborated with the publicly funded software company ThoughtWorks, serving as both a visionary partner and a technology collaborator.¹²

9 ‘Tracking the Implementation of the POCSO Act | CivicDataLab’ <<https://civicedatalab.in>> accessed 5 September 2025.

10 Varsha Aithala and others, ‘Decision Time: Illuminating Performance in India’s District Courts’ (2024) 6 Data & Policy e32<<https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/data-and-policy/article/decision-time-illuminating-performance-in-indias-district-courts/19F152C3E024BB0ED2B B2393E0E6DADB>> accessed 5 September 2025.

11 ‘Case Information System (CIS) | Official Website of e-Committee, Supreme Court of India | India’ <<https://ecommitteesci.gov.in/division/case-information-system-cis/>> accessed 5 September 2025.

12 ‘XConf | Thoughtworks India’ <<https://www.thoughtworks.com/en-in/about-us/events/xconf>> accessed 5 September 2025.

Thought Works identified the absence of NLP benchmarks for Indian legal language as a major hindrance to the development of Legal AI applications. Progress accelerated when scholars from IIT Delhi, IIIT Hyderabad, and IIT Kanpur created a Hindi legal document repository containing more than 900,000 documents.¹³ Similarly, researchers at IIT Kharagpur and IIT Kanpur developed prototypes of automated case and outcome prediction models, contributing to the faster growth of AI applications in e-Courts.

AI-based translation tools have been significantly advanced by the EkStep Foundation, including the open-source Project Anuvaad, which aims to train deep learning models. It is also recognized as a tool of excellence, incorporating high-quality Neural Machine Translation (NMT) systems for major Indian languages.¹⁴ This project supported Supreme Court of India to launch the Supreme Court *VidhikAnuvaad* Software (SUVAS) for translation of Judgements to nine major Indian Languages. Supreme Court Portal for Assistance in Court's Efficiency (SUPACE) was developed by ManCorpInnovations Lab (ManCorp) at no cost.¹⁵ Another project by name *AmarVasha* was simultaneously developed software for language translation in Bangladesh Supreme Court.¹⁶ IIT-Madras explored an initiative by not specific language oriented open source language AI for Indian Languages called AI4Bharat module.¹⁷ ManCorp has been the forerunner in Developing AI technology tools and chatbots for the Patna and Jharkhand High Courts.¹⁸ This ManCorp is startup company contributed to the AI initiatives in eCourts to understand and solve problems. ManCorp organised a conference on 'AI and Judiciary', with the participation from over 6000 members of the Judiciary,

- 13 Prathamesh Kalamkar, Janani Venugopalan Ph D and Vivek Raghavan Ph D, 'Indian Legal NLP Benchmarks: A Survey' (arXiv, 13 July 2021) <<http://arxiv.org/abs/2107.06056>> accessed 6 September 2025.
- 14 Vijit Malik and others, 'ILDC for CJPE: Indian Legal Documents Corpus for Court Judgment Prediction and Explanation' in Chengqing Zong and others (eds), *Proceedings of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 11th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (Volume 1: Long Papers)* (Association for Computational Linguistics 2021) <<https://aclanthology.org/2021.acl-long.313/>> accessed 5 September 2025.
- 15 'Supreme Court's New AI-Based System to Assist Judges' <[https:// www. dqindia. com/supreme-courts-new-ai-based-system-assist-judges/](https://www.dqindia.com/supreme-courts-new-ai-based-system-assist-judges/)> accessed 5 September 2025.
- 16 Felicity Bell and others, *AI Decision-Making and the Courts: A Guide for Judges, Tribunal Members and Court Administrators* (Australasian Institute of Judicial Administration Incorporated 2022).
- 17 'IIT Madras Launches "Nilekani Centre at AI4Bharat" to Advance Indian Language Technology' <<https://news.careers360.com/iit-madras-launches-nilekani-centre-at-ai4bharat-advance-indian-language-technology>> accessed 5 September 2025.
- 18 'The Integration of Artificial Intelligence in the Indian Judiciary: MCIL CEO Manthan Trivedi' <<https://www.barandbench.com/interviews/integration-artificial-intelligence-indian-judiciary-mcil-ceo-manthan-trivedi-interview>> accessed 5 September 2025.

encompassing High Court AI committees. Jupitice is the another startup that provides AI based solutions to Judiciary. The Rajasthan State Legal Services Authority (RSLSA) is touted as the Country's AI powered Lokadalat, an online platform to settle disputes.¹⁹

The funding for implementation of AI based cutting edge technologies generated through the government, philanthropists ,VC funding and bootstrapping .The Executive is responsible for generating funds for the projects of eCourts. The Cabinet Committee on Economic affairs (CCEA) sourced funds to eCourt project in February 2007 with subsequent funding extentions.²⁰ The government budgeted INR 1700 crore in financial bill 2016 for the cause of Phase 2 of the eCourtsproject.²¹ Omidyar Network India(ONI) emphasising the possibilities of emerging advanced AI powered technologies in data analysis and dispute resolution ,invested in Presolv360 ,which is an AI technology based dispute resolution platform during 2022.²² Philanthropical society like The Rohini Nilekani Philanthropists Foundation has contributed significantly to the data-driven access to the justice.²³ Agami, Vidhi and Daksh among other organisations fund for the cause of developing and building just and equitable access to justice in India.

The transformational and necessary technology require the statements and documents from the governmental officials and judges. The upgradation and co-axial integration of AI technology increases efficiency, speed and ease of the judicial system. The Prime Minister of India, while speaking in Gujrat High Court diamond jubilee celebrations in February 2021 said that “The use of AI will not only improve the efficiency of the judiciary but will also speed up the entire system”.²⁴ Justice Bobde pitches the importance of AI in the

19 ‘Rajasthan Gets AI-Powered Tool for Fast Disposal of Cases at Lok Adalat – ThePrint – PTIFeed’ <<https://theprint.in/india/rajasthan-gets-ai-powered-tool-for-fast-disposal-of-cases-at-lok-adalat/1043362/>> accessed 5 September 2025.

20 ‘E-Courts Mission Mode Project | Official Website of e-Committee, Supreme Court of India | India’ <<https://ecommitteesci.gov.in/project/brief-overview-of-e-courts-project/>> accessed 5 September 2025.

21 ‘Homepage | Official Website of E-Committee, Supreme Court of India | India’ <<https://ecommitteesci.gov.in/>> accessed 5 September 2025.

22 ‘Online Dispute Resolution Platform Presolv360 Raises \$1.08 Million in Seed Funding from MGA Ventures, Omidyar Network India, and Others - BW Disrupt’ <<https://www.bwdisrupt.com/article/online-dispute-resolution-platform-presolv360-raises-108-million-in-seed-funding-from-mga-ventures-omidyar-network-india-and-others-421288>> accessed 6 September 2025.

23 Justice within reach, ‘Access to Justice Archives’ (*Rohini Nilekani Philanthropies*) <<https://rohininilekaniphilanthropies.org/field-of-work/access-to-justice/>> accessed 5 September 2025.

24 www.ETGovernment.com, ‘PM Pitches World-Class Judicial System Powered by AI’ (*ETGovernment.com*) <<https://government.economictimes.indiatimes.com/news/digital-india/pm-pitches-world-class-judicial-system-powered-by-ai/80743006>> accessed 5 September 2025.

improvement of the efficiency of the judicial system”.²⁵ Justice UU Lalit insisted on the ease of justice that AI would bring in digital Lokadalats.²⁶ This is also narrated that multitasking trends would be redirected judicial time to complex matters by digitalising the repetitive mechanical tasks without replacing human Bar and Bench. The Judges and Governments are of the opinion that mechanical and mathematical tasks would be carried out easily by AI cutting edge technology. These AI tools can assist the process of decision making and remain non-partisan in any given circumstances, however, not a substitute for human sense of values and discretion and ratification of AI decision making by human intellect is required to be put in place. The road map for implementation of AI technologies in the Judiciary was galvanized in the Draft of Phase 3 vision document of the eCourts project aimed at the automation of Judiciary. There is a paradigm shift from “monolithic systems” to those systems which may coordinate and adapt to the changing requirements of the citizen as it happens with agile environment of cutting edge technologies in the field of AI with the software development approach.

JUDGING WITH MACHINES

The discourse on artificial intelligence in courts is often reduced to managerial language efficiency, automation, and speed. Such an approach, while practical, fails to capture the profound transformation underway.²⁷ AI does not merely help courts “do more with less”; it changes what counts as knowledge, authority, and judgment in the legal process. If law is a way of organizing truth through rules, narratives, and evidence, then AI inserts a radically different epistemology one grounded in probabilistic inference, data-driven correlations, and non-human cognition. The main question now is, “What can AI do for courts?” AI not only speeds up decision-making but also changes the epistemic underpinnings of justice. Courts run the danger of becoming platforms of hybrid cognition, where power is shared between people and algorithms, rather than being venues for human discussion. Therefore, creating institutions that uphold the human validity of the law while recognising the machine as its inevitable co-author rather than rejecting or embracing AI is the way to go forward in the legal system. The judge in this

25 KC Gopakumar, ‘High Court Judgments Should Be Translated into Local Languages: Kovind’ *The Hindu* (28 October 2017)

<<https://www.thehindu.com/news/national/kerala/high-court-judgments-should-be-translated-into-local-languages-kovind/article19938877.ece>> accessed 5 September 2025.

26 ‘Emerging Trends in Data Governance’ <<https://ccgdelhi.s3.ap-south-1.amazonaws.com/uploads/ccg-edited-volume-emerging-trends-in-data-governance-343.pdf>> accessed 5 September 2025.

27 Arno Schubbach, ‘Judging Machines: Philosophical Aspects of Deep Learning’ (2021) 198 *Synthese* 1807 <<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11229-019-02167-z>> accessed 5 September 2025.

new environment is more of a curator of computational possibilities than a narrator of the law.²⁸ Determining whether to accept or reject algorithmic recommendations will be the key to judicial legitimacy, not creating compelling stories. Therefore, the core of judgement shifts from applying the law to navigating machine cognition.

Adjudication Hybrid Models

A hybrid future, where AI analyses data but human judges maintain ultimate power, is exemplified by projects like SUPACE and SUVAS. Although this hybridity is often portrayed as a compromise, it really hides a more profound change: human judgement is becoming more and more reliant on machine-structured information. Instead of being the creator of logic, the judge turns into an arbitrator of results.²⁹

Courts as Human-Centered Knowledge Systems

In the past, adversarial processes such as cross-examination, evidence, and a thorough consideration of prior decisions have been used by courts to verify knowledge.³⁰ The judge was a steward of narrative truth in addition to making decisions. The goal of legal reasoning was to be understandable, convincing, and responsible to the public. This design is altered by the Algorithmic Turn in AI. The court no longer depends only on human discovery when platforms like Ross Intelligence provide semantic insights or when technologies like e-discovery tools sift millions of documents.³¹ It instead relies on algorithmic cognition, which is statistical, invisible, and unconcerned with narrative coherence. This is the transfer of authority from interpretation to computation, not just a simple improvement in tools.

Pattern Recognition and Organisation

The goal of traditional legal fact-finding is to piece together what occurred, who was affected, and what the repercussions were.³² This activity

- 28 Isaac Taylor, 'Justice by Algorithm: The Limits of AI in Criminal Sentencing' (2023) 42 *Criminal Justice Ethics* 193 <<https://doi.org/10.1080/0731129X.2023.2275967>> accessed 6 September 2025.
- 29 Fei Yuan and others, 'A Hybrid Automated Event Adjudication System for Clinical Trials' (2023) 20 *Clinical Trials* (London, England) 166.
- 30 Ingo Oswald Karpen and Melis Senova, 'Designing for Trust: Role and Benefits of Human-Centered Design in the Legal System' (2021) 12 *International Journal for Court Administration* <<https://iacajournal.org/articles/10.36745/ijca.422>> accessed 5 September 2025.
- 31 Shilun Zhou, 'Analyzing the Justification for Using Generative AI Technology to Generate Judgments Based on the Virtue Jurisprudence Theory' 0 *Journal of Decision Systems* 1 <<https://doi.org/10.1080/12460125.2024.2428999>> accessed 6 September 2025.
- 32 Wenjuan Han and others, 'LegalAsst: Human-Centered and AI-Empowered Machine to Enhance Court Productivity and Legal Assistance' (2024) 679 *Information Sciences* 121052 <<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0020025524009666>> accessed 5 September 2025.

is reframed by AI as identifying patterns across files, contracts, or earlier rulings. For instance, the Supreme Court of India's SUPACE technology and the Jharkhand High Court's OCR technologies automate the input of facts, removing their narrative character and transforming them into machine-readable data.

The New Epistemology of Prediction

AI moves legal thinking from debate to forecasting when it can anticipate case outcomes with quantifiable accuracy (SCOTUS models at 70.2%, for example).³³ The decision is now predicted by computing rather than being only based on precedent. Here, the court's legitimacy starts to depend on whether its rulings follow or deviate from algorithmic expectations in addition to its rationale.

AI AS A JUDICIAL AUTHORITY CATALYST

Judges will be able to concentrate on more complicated issues since AI is expected to free courts from repetitive duties like managing routine cases, compiling evidence, or organising files.³⁴ However, there are jurisprudential ramifications to this division of labour. The basic notion of what constitutes a court act is altered if AI handles "routine" affairs while human judges only handle "hard cases." Courts have power based on public logic as well as accuracy. AI creates opacity since its results are statistical correlations rather than "reasons." Can the court still say that justice has been reasoned or just optimised if COMPAS makes a proposal for punishment or if a predictive model influences bail decisions? Legal rules must be converted into a machine-readable format for AI to work efficiently. This translation process is not impartial. It imposes strict classifications on law, which is a field that lives on ambiguity, contestation, and interpretation. Legal writings run the danger of becoming data objects once they are digitised, losing the moral and rhetorical nuance of judgement. Thus, AI serves as a silent legislator by re-encoding existing laws into computational logics rather than creating new ones. The loop becomes self-reinforcing when legal data is converted to digital form and fed into artificial intelligence systems. More prediction is made possible by more digitisation, and more prediction validates increased AI dependence. Courts eventually run the danger of becoming into post-human epistemic systems, where justice is determined by computer criteria rather than human reasoning. Judges who defer to algorithmic power rather

33 Daniel Martin Katz, Michael J Bommarito and Josh Blackman, 'A General Approach for Predicting the Behavior of the Supreme Court of the United States' (2017) 12 PLoS ONE e0174698 <<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5389610/>> accessed 5 September 2025.

34 William Orlando Alvarez Araque, Angela Liliana Pinzón Pinzón and Aracely Forero Romero, 'Beyond the Courts: Artificial Intelligence as a Catalyst for Change in Justice Administration' [2024] *Evolutionary Studies in Imaginative Culture* 394 <<https://esiculture.com/index.php/esiculture/article/view/889>> accessed 5 September 2025.

than legislation or precedents run the risk of overusing it rather than abusing it.

FIVE ETHICAL PRINCIPLES FOR AI IN JUDICIAL SYSTEMS

Principle of Respect for Fundamental Rights

The legal system is fundamentally a protector of human dignity, due process, and a fair trial, not just a means of settling conflicts. The use of AI must reinforce these assurances rather than weaken them. The unique aspect of this is that AI may change the way people think about rights rather than just applying them. For instance, by removing language obstacles, automatic translation programs such as SUVAS in India expand the right to access justice. However, if algorithmic sentencing techniques like COMPAS reinforce systemic prejudices, there is a greater chance that rights may be violated. Therefore, upholding basic rights in the AI age entails creating legal protections that guarantee human-centered justice is never replaced by machine-driven efficiency.³⁵

Principle of Non-Discrimination

The fairness of AI systems depends on the quality of the data they are trained on. However, judicial data is not objective; rather, it is a reflection of societal biases, historical inequities, and prejudices. Not only is a recidivism tool problematic, but it also deliberately violates the equal protection under the law premise by disproportionately designating minority groups as “high risk.” In this case, nondiscrimination requires both active algorithm auditing and the legal understanding that legal fairness differs from computational fairness. AI techniques used in courts must be regularly evaluated against structural injustices, not simply statistical correctness, in order to be truly non-discriminatory.³⁶

Principle of Quality and Security

One of the most important uses of governmental authority is the judiciary. The advent of AI increases the need for cybersecurity, dependability, and quality. Case files may be distorted by inaccurate OCR text recognition or defective e-discovery outputs, which might change the course of justice. While security entails preventing breaches and manipulations of important legal data, quality refers to making sure AI outputs satisfy the evidential criteria of courts. Crucially, this idea suggests that AI is not a neutral helper; rather, its technological framework becomes a component of the legitimacy

35 Simona Franguloiu, ‘Principles for the Use of Artificial Intelligence (Ai) in the Judiciary as Derived from the European Ethics Charter. Justice Efficiency and Limitations’ [2023] Bulletin of the Transilvania University of Braşov. Series VII: Social Sciences • Law 39
<https://webbut.unitbv.ro/index.php/Series_VII/article/view/6939> accessed 5 September 2025.

36 *Ibid.*

of the legal system. Therefore, courts must conduct legal and IT audits of AI, seeing dependability as a fundamental need.³⁷

Principle of Transparency, Impartiality, and Fairness

In contrast to judges, algorithms generate outputs rather than “reasons” in the legal sense.³⁸ This opacity calls into question the validity of AI-informed conclusions. Here, transparency does not include disclosing every line of source code; rather, it refers to making sure that litigants and judicial actors are aware of how an algorithm arrived at its decision. For AI systems to operate impartially in courts, there must be no covert prejudices or business interests interfering with their operation. In order to be fair, litigants must not be evaluated based on standards they are unaware of or cannot dispute. This approach thus calls for explainable AI (XAI) in legal settings algorithms ought to be understandable enough to be challenged, just as human thinking may be challenged.³⁹

Principle of “Under User Control”

The need that AI remain subject to human judicial power is the most notable aspect of the Charter. Even when machine learning is used to inform choices, the judge’s function cannot be delegated; human judgement is required in the end. This rule protects judges from “automation bias,” which occurs when they give in too easily to automated recommendations. AI should instead serve as an extension of judges’ intellect, enhancing their capabilities without taking the place of their sovereign position. It is impossible to delegate judicial responsibility to computers; keeping control guarantees that courts continue to function as institutions of accountability rather than as computational black boxes.⁴⁰

THE POTENTIAL BENEFITS OF AI ADJUDICATION

Mitigating Judicial Arbitrariness

Human adjudication is often criticised for being prone to arbitrariness. The result of a case often depends more on the “draw” of a sympathetic, forgiving, or very stern judge than it does on the facts or the law.⁴¹ The guarantee of equality before the law is undermined by this phenomena, leaving litigants vulnerable to what has been called the “lottery of justice.”

37 *Ibid.*

38 Dovilė Barysė and Roe Sarel, ‘Algorithms in the Court: Does It Matter Which Part of the Judicial Decision-Making Is Automated?’ (2024) 32 Artificial Intelligence and Law 117 <<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10506-022-09343-6>> accessed 6 September 2025.

39 Franguloiu (n 36).

40 *Ibid.*

41 Admin, ‘role of AI in The Judicial Decision-Making Process - Jus Corpus’ (26 July 2025) <<https://www.juscorpus.com/role-of-ai-in-the-judicial-decision-making-process/>> accessed 5 September 2025.

Because AI adjudication ensures higher uniformity across instances, it might reduce this arbitrariness. The consistent application of codified regulations, precedents, and procedural standards by an algorithm might insulate results from variations in the temperament, personal beliefs, or unconscious prejudices of individual judges. Artificial intelligence (AI) provides the promise of impartial application of the law in every instance, in contrast to a human judge whose judgements may be influenced by weariness, mood, or political attitude.

In this way, AI adjudication is more than just a technical advancement; it is a reaffirmation of one of the fundamental principles of law: that norms, not individuals, should determine justice. The public's trust in courts as establishments of logical authority rather than on human judgement is enhanced by AI's reduction of arbitrariness.

Standardization of the Adjudicative Process

The standardisation of judicial reasoning itself is the second significant advantage of AI adjudication. The goal of codified justice, which holds that written rules may result in equal results for circumstances that are comparable, has always been challenged by the diversity of human interpretation.⁴² Even with intricate legislation, judges often have differing interpretations of the law, leading to doctrinal fragmentation. The unmet promise of codified justice may be achieved by AI adjudication. AI systems are able to impose a level of consistency that human judges are unable to consistently attain by encoding legislation, precedents, and interpretive canons into machine-readable form. This is justice that is firmly rooted in legal precedents rather than subjective interpretation, not mechanical justice. By guaranteeing that comparable cases be handled similarly, which is a fundamental component of legal equality, standardisation may help lessen systemic inefficiencies. Furthermore, AI may act as a stabilising factor in systems with backlogs and inconsistent lower-court judgement quality, lowering result uncertainty and improving access to justice.

The Normative Promise of AI Adjudication

Rethinking adjudication as a setting where rules are implemented impartially and without human prejudice or arbitrary judgement is where its deeper potential resides. In this way, AI is an attempt to restore the legitimacy of law to its most basic form: impartial, consistent, and universal.⁴³ Even though AI may be able to eliminate arbitrariness, courts must make sure that

42 Yingtian Mei and Yucong Duan, 'DIKWP Semantic Judicial Reasoning: A Framework for Semantic Justice in AI and Law' (2025) 16 Information 640 <<https://www.mdpi.com/2078-2489/16/8/640>> accessed 5 September 2025.

43 Giovana Peluso Lopes, 'Bias in Adjudication and the Promise of Ai: Challenges to Procedural Fairness' [2025] Law, Technology and Humans <<https://www.austlii.edu.au/cgi-bin/viewdoc/au/journals/LawTechHum/2025/4.html>>accessed 5 September 2025.

justice doesn't become so uniform that it loses its ability to be nuanced. Finally, these advantages together imply that AI adjudication is about more than just cost-effectiveness or efficiency.⁴⁴

APPLICATIONS OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE IN THE LEGAL DOMAIN

AI is being used in litigation in addition to contract analysis, where predictive analytics help attorneys estimate case outcomes, examine precedents, and map court trends. Previously a laborious manual procedure, e-discovery and litigation analytics have made it possible for litigators to search through millions of documents in a precise, data-driven manner. Applications of AI have also benefited international arbitration, such as the automatic draughting and proofreading of submissions, the appointment of arbitrators through pattern recognition, the creation of standard award sections, efficient case management, and translation tools for multilingual proceedings. When combined, these apps provide more rapid, transparent, and predictable results. Blockchain has become a disruptive factor in legal systems, much as AI.⁴⁵

Natural language processing (NLP)-enabled AI-powered systems have completely changed the way contracts are reviewed and managed in the legal industry.⁴⁶ These systems now evaluate contracts against predetermined criteria, highlight problematic sections, and even allow automation, assembly, digital signature, and lifecycle management a significant improvement over the many hours that attorneys used to spend analysing, revising, and draughting agreements. Due diligence is expedited, transaction costs are decreased, human error is reduced, and compliance monitoring is strengthened.

Blockchain serves as a globally verifiable “single source of truth” by ensuring the transparency, immutability, and provenance of transactions as a decentralised ledger. Its legal uses include transparent auditability for regulators and auditors, smart contracts that self-execute when certain criteria are satisfied, and tamper-proof vehicle ownership monitoring. Although there are still difficulties in integrating blockchain with jurisdiction-specific rules of evidence, contract enforceability, and procedural regulations, these aspects provide significant benefits including increased security, cost savings, and accountability. Notwithstanding these developments, there are still a number

44 marutitech, ‘AI for Legal Research: Use Cases, Benefits, Challenges & More’ (*nasscom | The Official Community of Indian IT Industry*, 1 September 2025) <<https://community.nasscom.in/communities/data-science-ai-community/ai-legal-research-use-cases-benefits-challenges-more>> accessed 5 September 2025.

45 Zhou (n 32).

46 ‘AI And The Law – Navigating The Future Together’ (*United Nations University*) <<https://unu.edu/article/ai-and-law-navigating-future-together>> accessed 5 September 2025.

of issues with AI in legal systems. In a similar vein, algorithms like COMPAS demonstrate AI's shortcomings when it comes to making judgements that carry significant weight. Algorithms are limited to strict, data-driven outputs, which creates a gap between legal formality and humanised justice, while judges may weigh statistical risks against human considerations—for example, giving bail to a mother in the best interest of her children.

In the future, it is anticipated that the combination of blockchain technology and artificial intelligence would change the legal profession rather than replace it. Technology has traditionally enhanced professional responsibilities by relieving practitioners of repetitive chores, enabling them to concentrate on strategic and interpretative activities, despite ongoing obsolescence concerns.

Judges, attorneys, and auditors will need to adjust by developing judicial literacy in AI, which means knowing enough about algorithmic processes to assess their dependability and limits without needing to know how to code. Judges are certain to continue making decisions actively rather than passively following AI suggestions because to this literacy.

Lastly, the legal profession has to embrace flexibility by rethinking its function as a facilitator of democratised access to justice rather than a closed gatekeeper of privilege. In the digital era, the judicial system may become more efficient, inclusive, and legitimate by embracing AI and blockchain as tools to strengthen professional judgement and public confidence.

LEGAL DISCOURSE AND TAKEAWAY

The horrendous implications pending cases to the gargantuan size of hovering around 500 crores in various courts across India has envisioned the conceptualisation of Smart Courts and open access to all stake holders. The paradigmatic shift towards Artificial Intelligence (AI) has become an inevitable requirement and to a larger acumen as panacea for the speedy disposal of Justice. The final adjudication of by human intellect is the key in empowering AI tools to pronounce the justice which takes care of very threshold corner stone requirements of Compassion, equity, empathy and interplay of circumstantial reflection on the human behaviour. Robot Judge is conceptualised module on the AI powered cutting edge technology in China to give away the final judgement within a time span of forty days of bringing an action of litigation in the courts, however, the pros and cons of automation bias and proposition of garbage-in and Garbage out are working out as bottle-neck in the system and not fulfil the aspirations of stakeholders like Judges, Lawyers and Citizens seeking justice.

Covid-19 had promoted the idea of digital e-courts and worked as an accelerator of AI based technology in the courts across India. The situation has groomed the right advocate appearing virtually in the various courts across India in real time. The virtual hearing encompassing the Online

Dispute Resolution System including arbitration and mediation had promulgated the onset of discourse in the Judicial System of India. The buffer activation required to justify Justice time allocation of only ten percent of cases remaining as unresolved which went on to accumulate a huge dearth of piling cases where as ninety percent of cases will be closed in orderly manner in the Indian Courts in specified reasonable time. Hovering 11 crores 77 lakhs cases were filed all over India between 01.01.15 to 31.01.23 and resonating 9 crores 99 lakhs were disbursed during the period leaving behind only 10 percent of cases enunciating a Case Clearing Ratio of 90 percent. The concept of Robot Judges has again conceptualised transgressed version to percolate down to the idea of Robot Lawyers. In the direction of framing a suitable platform the initiation of E-Seva Kendra for lawyers is a prerequisite to place them to a axiomatic parlance with the *ecourt* projects. In the transformative Judicial System to reverberate and galvanize the AI technology with a promising neural network settled in a algorithmic paraphrase. The concomitant challenge of equity as a steadfast pathway to host them on a platform of smart court should accomplish the digital knowledge required in overcoming digital divide among the populace of stakeholders. This aspect may preferentially be evolved from the student threshold to embark on a cutting-edge technology and accordingly the curriculum should embody the resilience parameters to imbibe them. The disposition of cases by the articulation of canons of justice at the current state of affairs in a Hybrid Module set to develop on both online and offline case management had not only made the system gradually stepping towards Smart Courts coupled with the Policy prescriptions of Government and Pro-tech Institutions. In Jana doc-1 stage of implementation there is a constructive planning to establish four hundred ten Digital Smart courts across length and breadth of the country decisively running on the double engine of E-console compatibility. In addition to the e-court project initiatives, India has made all the efforts to make speedy disposal of the justice, *exempli gratia*, establishing evening courts is one such technological impetus to solve the problem of overburden cases in various courts across the country. Recognition of Technology in UNCITRAL had automated the courts and eventually drawn technological neutrality. Singapore Declaration had given authority for a remotely virtual court and greater rise on witness testimony and Smart Contracts. The coexistence of common law with equity and human elements are necessary alongside of technological innovations in a smart court model. NITIAYOG in 2021 promoted ONLINE DISPUTE RESOLUTION (ODR) and Karnataka High Court has pioneered implementation of these ideas. In this direction a landmark achieved by LIVE streaming of court procedure achieved in *Deo raj vs UOI case and so on*.

CONCLUSION

The neural Network is having Automation Bias and should invariably checked and ratified by the human interface of Judges. The integration of artificial intelligence into India's legal system marks a turning point in the development of innovative and creative ideas of authority, adjudication, and legal knowledge. Stakeholders are essential in building the data repositories, AI tools, and infrastructure required for this progression. These stakeholders include the executive branch, the judiciary, technologists, academic institutions, and Civic -Tech organisations. By using AI in hybrid adjudication models, predictive analytics, and sophisticated pattern recognition, courts may become more efficient and consistent while still functioning as human-centred knowledge systems. AI has a great deal of normative potential by serving as a catalyst for judicial authority. It can reduce arbitrariness, standardise adjudicative procedures, and promote impartial, fair, and transparent decision-making. A basis for responsible implementation is provided by the ethical framework governing the adoption of AI, which includes respect for basic rights, non-discrimination, quality and security, transparency and fairness, and user control. Applications like contract management, arbitration, litigation analytics, and blockchain-driven solutions further show how AI can improve access, lower costs, and increase the precision of legal procedures. Finally, the intersection of technology and law in India offers both possibilities and difficulties, necessitating constant adjustment, professional knowledge, and ethical awareness above all easy access to a common man. India stepped ahead to overcome the dearth of human power in easing the work of judges, colossal decrease in physical interface in Courts and decreasing referrals to paper documentation by switching over to e-filing, e-payments, issuance of online digitally certified copies and convenient utilisation of space in courts for storing of data besides detecting defects therein through easy access to the stake holders. Most prominent among them are "Supportive Technologies" to contemplate Automating Scheduling and Listing of cases including time allocations. When the Indian court adopts these advances with consideration, it may use AI to improve justice, easy access, efficiency, and public confidence in the legal system rather than replacing human judgement.