The Academic
International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research

An Online Peer Reviewed / Refereed Journal
Volume 4 | Issue 1 | January 2026
ISSN: 2583-973X (Online), SJIF IF: 5.6
Website: www.theacademic.in

Structural and Ethical Challenges in Deploying AI in Law

Aparna Choudhary, Dr. Somlata Sharma

[1] Aparna Choudhary, Research Scholar, Faculty of Law, Maharishi Dayanand University, Rohtak and Additional Civil Judge (Senior Division), Haryana. Email: aparna1288@gmail.com

[2] Dr. Somlata Sharma, Associate Professor, MDU – CPAS, Gurugram, Email:sharma.shamli@gmail.com

DOI : https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18643172

ARTICLE DETAILS

Research Paper

Accepted: 24-01-2026

Published: 10-02-2026

Keywords:

Artificial Intelligence, Legal System, Legal Technology, AI Ethics, Legal Decision-Making

ABSTRACT

The integration of artificial intelligence (AI) in the legal system offers both transformational opportunities and impressive challenges. When AI devices penetrate various aspects of legal practices and legal procedures, they promise increased efficiency, consistency and accessibility. However, the unique features of legal thinking, the complexity of legal language, ethical considerations, and the issues of accountability and distortion are significant obstacles to effective implementation. In this article, the most important challenges when using AI are considered in legal systems that include technical, ethical, legal and organizational hurdles. Discussing various AI based applications used in different legal entities worldwide along with the case studies where AI committed errors. Closing with recommendations for a balanced approach to adopting and implementing AI in a legal context.

1. INTRODUCTION

Artificial Intelligence (AI) will revolutionize industries around the world, including healthcare, finance, transportation and the increasingly legal sector. The ability of AI to analyze large data records, and to recognize and perform tasks that traditionally require human intelligence, offer potential benefits, including improved access to justice, reduced pitfalls, and improved decision-making effectiveness (Surden, 2019). However, the introduction of AI into the legal system has been affected by a wide range

of challenges. The Legal systems are based on principles that are naturally complex, context-dependent and beyond pure logic. The rule of law, human rights, and judicial independence are fundamental elements that may not be seamlessly aligned with the deterministic nature of AI algorithms (Zouridis, 2020). In this article, the most important issues related to AI implementation are examined in the legal system and are divided into technical, ethical, legal and organizational areas. Recently, former Chief Justice of Supreme Court of India, Sh. D.Y. Chandrachud said further development of technology and artificial intelligence (AI) in the justice system is inevitable, while being discussed at the conference on "Technology and Judicial Dialogue" at New-Delhi. He also argued that the issue of using AI in court obligations cannot be avoided. Integrating AI into modern processes, including legal procedures, raises complex ethical, legal and practical considerations that require thorough investigation. The use of AI in judicial expression represents both opportunities and challenges to justify nuanced considerations. AI as a double-edged sword with the ability to improve or undermine efforts for justice (The Hindu, 2024). The adoption of AI can highlight inequality by preferring people with access to advanced technology, but it opens doors for new players and services and disrupts existing hierarchies. While artificial intelligence in the legal system offers benefits like increased efficiency, accuracy, and fairness, it also presents potential risks. These include issues related to substantiality, ethical forecasting, confidentiality, and the preservation of human freedom (Vargas-Murillo 2024).

2. TECHNICAL CHALLENGES

2.1 Complexity of Legal Language

Legal texts are often complex, subtle, and specific to context. Understanding laws, case law, contracts, and legal opinions requires a deep knowledge of social norms and legal precedents. Although natural language processing is improving, it still struggles with understanding proper legal terms, implied meanings, and contextual details (Ashley, 2017).

2.2 Lack of Standardized Data

AI systems rely on large, high-quality data for training and operation. Legal data tends to be fragmented, unstructured, and often protected by privacy regulations. Inconsistent data formats and limited access hinder the development of strong AI models (Bench-Capon et al., 2012).

2.3 Explainability and Transparency

AI models, especially deep learning systems, often act as "black boxes." This makes it challenging to clarify how they make decisions. In the legal field, where clarity and justification are essential, the inability to explain how an AI reached a conclusion damages trust and acceptance (Doshi-Velez & Kim, 2017).

2.4 Generalization and Transferability

AI systems trained on specific legal regions might not perform well in others due to differences in laws, processes, and language. This lack of transferability limits how well AI solutions can expand across various legal systems (Susskind, 2019).

3. ETHICAL AND SOCIAL CHALLENGES

AI systems, particularly those based on machine learning, have the autonomy that makes traditional ideas of legal responsibility difficult. One of the most important challenges is to assign responsibility for AI decisions. Traditional legal procedures usually result from human actors such as judges, lawyers, and agencies. However, AI systems can make independent decisions and raise complex questions about who should be responsible for errors, fraud, or unintended consequences. Allocating responsibility in the AI context requires a rethinking of existing rights wing doctrines to absorb the autonomous decision system (Andrea Renda, 2019). The current legal framework does not include clear guidelines on how to assign liability if damage arises from the decisions that AI is generated. This lack of clarity can discourage AI from accepting it in key legal functions such as decisions and beliefs, where human supervision remains essential.

Furthermore, the ethical implications of AI decision-making in the Legal Department are profound. The legal system is based on principles of justice, equity and human rights. When AI systems commission legal decisions, there is a risk of undermining these principles, especially if the technology is not affected by proper supervision and accountability.

3.1 Algorithmic Bias and Discrimination

One of the most urgent concerns about AI in the legal system is algorithm distortion. AI systems often learn from historical data with inherent distortions. If these biases are embedded in AI algorithms,

existing inequality can be maintained and even further strengthened. This is particularly problematic in the legal context, as biased decisions can have a serious impact on individual rights and freedoms.

A study by Julia Angwin and colleagues highlighted that the predictive algorithms disproportionately targeted minority communities, providing concerns about equity and appropriate procedures. These biases have deep impacts on the society at large. The biased use of AI in areas while deciding sentences, grant of bail and parole can lead to unfair outcomes that disproportionately affect marginalized groups (Angwin et al., 2016).

Efforts to reduce algorithmic bias include improving various training data records, developing fairness-conscious algorithms, and implementing regular audits from AI systems. However, these measurements are often hampered by the opaque nature of many AI algorithms, with limited access to high-quality data. Assurance of fairness in AI-controlled legal processes requires obligations to transparency, inclusiveness and strict ethical supervision. Assurance of fairness requires strict detection of bias and continuous monitoring.

3.2 Accountability and Responsibility

If AI systems are involved in legal decision-making, there is a problem with the assignment of accountability. It is unclear who should be held responsible for whom, or who, if the AI system makes a false or unfair decision. This ambiguity complicated the liability and compensation mechanisms (Calo, 2015).

3.3 Ethical Decision-Making

Legal decisions often contain moral and ethical considerations which is challenging to be fed into the algorithms. AI lacks human values, empathy, and moral thinking that are essentially important in contexts such as family law, asylum cases, and adolescence justice (Coeckelbergh, 2020).

3.4 Erosion of Human Judgment

Overdependency on AI may lead to the erosion of the way humans respond to legal reasoning and judgment. Legal professionals might become overly dependent on AI recommendations, resulting in lowering their self-analysing, reasoning capabilities and interpretive skills (Katz et al., 2014).

4. LEGAL AND REGULATORY CHALLENGES

The lack of a comprehensive regulatory framework for AI in the legal system is another important issue. Existing laws cannot adequately address unique characteristics of AI, such as autonomy, adaptability, and opacity. Political decisions - Makers need to develop regulations that promote innovation, while simultaneously ensuring accountability, fairness and transparency.

International efforts to regulate AI, such as EU law for artificial intelligence, provide a valuable model of legal systems aimed at responsible integration of AI. However, regulatory approaches must be tailored to the specific needs and context of various jurisdictions. Cooperation between governments, legal forces, engineers and civil society is important for the development of effective and integrated framework conditions for AI governance.

4.1 Compliance with Legal Principles

The use of AI must be consistent with basic legal principles such as appropriate procedures, equality before the law, and rights to fair procedures. Comprehensive oversight and legal safeguards are required when ensuring that AI tools do not violate these rights (Wischmeyer, 2020).

4.2 Data Privacy and Confidentiality

Legal work often includes sensitive information. To use AI systems, one must strictly comply with data protection laws such as the General Data Protection Ordinance (GDPR). Data security and trust assurance is of paramount importance (Mantelero, 2018). The implementation of AI in the legal system requires access to a large amount of legal and personal data. This raises important concerns about data protection. Legal data often contains sensitive information, such as personal information, criminal history, and confidential legal procedures. The use of AI in the processing of this data must comply with data protection regulations such as the General Data Protection Ordinance (GDPR).

Bert-Jaap-Koops highlights the importance of coordinating AI applications with basic data protection rights, saying inadequate protection measures can lead to large-scale surveillance and data abuse. Data Protection Management Data Focus is included in AI-marked legal systems to implement robust data (Bert-Jaap-Koops, 2014).

Moreover, legal systems must be equipped with the proper procedure of punishing and penalising the misuse of AI in case of data breaches and unauthorized access, which compromises the integrity of legal

processes. Protecting the privacy of legal data is not only a technical challenge but also a legal and ethical challenge.

4.3 Intellectual Property Concerns

The use of AI in the preparation of legal documents, analysis, and discussions raises questions regarding intellectual property rights. Determining the ownership of AI-generated content and the IP rights of the original author is a complex legal issue (Samuelson, 2017).

4.4 Legal Recognition and Admissibility

Evidence or recommendations generated by AI are not mandatorily recognized as acceptable in court. The lack of a legal framework for the verification and use of AI tools holds an important hurdle for your assumptions in court proceedings (Zalnieriute et al., 2019).

5. ORGANIZATIONAL AND INSTITUTIONAL CHALLENGES

5.1 Resistance to Change

Legal agencies and experts are often conservative and resistant. The introduction of AI requires cultural change, training, and adaptation, which can lead to institutional inertia and skepticism (Remus & Levy, 2016). The success of AI implementation in legal systems depends not only on technology preparation, but also on institutional and cultural factors. Lawyers can oppose the acceptance of AI as their lack of dating, technical knowledge or concern is undermined regarding the weakening of human judgment. This resistance could hinder the integration of AI tools into legal practices.

Harry Surden points out that effective AI implementation requires cultural and educational change in the legal community. [5] Legal specialists must be trained to understand AI technology and collaborate with work, and institutions must promote a culture of innovation and collaboration. Furthermore, the terms of regulatory and political frameworks must support the acceptance of AI while simultaneously protecting legal values and human rights (Harry Surden, 2014).

5.2 Skill Gaps and Training

Effective implementation of AI requires jural experts to understand AI technology fundamentally. Bridging the skills gap between education and training is essential, but challenging for senior practitioners (McGinnis & Pearce, 2014).

5.3 Integration with Existing Systems

Legacy Legal Information Systems and Workflow AI tools integration can be technically and financially demanding. Ensuring interoperability and minimal impediments to existing practices are critical for smooth deployment (Schmitz, 2020).

5.4 Cost and Resource Constraints

AI systems can be expensive to develop, implement, and maintain. Resource restrictions, particularly in public legal institutions and courts, may hinder the widespread adoption of AI technology (Surden, 2019).

Institutional inertia and conservative legal traditions can also represent obstacles to AI acceptance. Legal systems are of course cautious and risky aid, which can slow the implementation of new technologies. Overcoming these challenges requires leadership, vision and commitment to modernization.

6. TRANSPARENCY AND DATA PROTECTION

Transparency and explanation of transparency are the basis of legal systems based on open, responsible processes to ensure justice. However, due to lack of interpretability, many AI algorithms, especially deep learning-based algorithms, are often considered "black boxes." This lack of transparency undermines public confidence in AI-controlled legal decisions and represents a challenge of legal accountability.

Sandra Wachter, Brent Mittelstadt, and Luciano Floridi assert "right to explain" especially when AI decisions have a significant impact on legal disputes. The principle of explanation requires that AI systems provide an easy-to-understand, justified reason for their decisions. In a legal context, this is very important in order to maintain the right to proceedings and to fight decisions and appeals decisions (Sandra Watcher et al 2017).

Explainability in AI is a complex task, especially for systems based on large neural networks. Researchers examine methods such as model simplification, distinctive assignments, and decision trees to improve transparency. Legal agencies need to adjust the benefits of advanced AI skills that require clarity and accountability.

7.1 Legal Research and Document Review

AI tools have revolutionized legal research by enabling faster and more accurate retrieval of case law, statutes, and legal commentary.

United States: Tools like **Casetext**, **LexisNexis**, and **Westlaw Edge** use natural language processing (NLP) to enable intuitive legal research and analytics.

Canada: **Blue J Legal** uses AI to predict legal outcomes, helping lawyers make data-informed decisions.

United Kingdom: **Luminance** applies machine learning to legal documents for due diligence and contract analysis.

7.2 AI in Courts and Judicial Decision Support

AI is increasingly being used to assist in court operations and support judicial decision-making.

China: The **206 System** helps judges by offering sentencing recommendations and consistency checks. The **Hangzhou Internet Court** employs AI for online dispute resolution.

India: The **SUVAS** system (Supreme Court Vidhik Anuvaad Software) uses AI to translate judgments into regional languages, making them more accessible.

Estonia: The government is piloting a "robot judge" system to handle small claims disputes, demonstrating the potential of automated adjudication.

7.3 Contract Automation and Management

AI simplifies contract generation, analysis, and compliance monitoring.

Australia: Tools like **Smokeball** and **Josef Legal** allow legal professionals to automate contract workflows and client interactions.

Global: **Kira Systems** and **ROSSum** (Czech Republic) use AI for contract data extraction and risk analysis, widely adopted by multinational firms. AI-powered tools like ROSS Intelligence and LexisNexis use NLP to streamline legal research and contract analysis. While effective in reducing workload, their performance depends heavily on data quality and user expertise (Ashley, 2017).

7.4 Chatbots and Legal Assistance

AI-powered chatbots are improving access to justice by providing free or low-cost legal guidance.

United States & UK: **DoNotPay**, branded as the "world's first robot lawyer," helps users fight parking tickets, cancel subscriptions, and even sue in small claims courts.

Singapore: Startups like **LegalTech Vision** offer AI chatbots that answer basic legal questions and help citizens navigate the legal system.

7.5 Predictive Analytics

AI is used to forecast legal outcomes, analyze litigation trends, and assess case risks.

United States: Law firms and insurance companies use AI tools to predict litigation outcomes and strategize settlements. AI tools like COMPAS (Correctional Offender Management Profiling for Alternative Sanctions) have been used to assess recidivism risk. However, studies have shown that such tools can exhibit racial bias, raising ethical and legal concerns (Angwin et al., 2016).

France & Netherlands: Governments are exploring AI models to identify patterns in judicial decisions and improve policy formulation.

7.6 E-Discovery and Litigation Support

AI accelerates the discovery process by quickly analyzing large volumes of data for relevance in legal cases.

Global Law Firms: Many firms worldwide use AI-powered e-discovery platforms such as **Relativity** and **Everlaw**, which use machine learning to identify pertinent documents in legal proceedings.

Financial institutions use AI to ensure compliance with complex regulations (RegTech). These applications demonstrate the potential of AI in monitoring and reporting but also highlight the need for regulatory clarity and oversight (Zalnieriute et al., 2019)

Comparative studies highlight the importance of cultural, legal, and political contexts in shaping AI adoption. While some jurisdictions embrace AI for efficiency and innovation, others prioritize human

rights and ethical considerations. Learning from international experiences can inform the development of context-specific strategies for AI integration.

8. CASE STUDIES

8.1 Mata v. Avianca (USA, 2023)

In this classic case a lawyers submitted a brief containing fictitious case citations generated by AI application ChatGPT to a New York court. The court dismissed the case and sanctioned the lawyers, and fined their firm for bad faith conduct. This incident highlights the dangers of AI usage terming the unverified false cases as "hallucinations" in legal filings (The New York Times).

8.2 Michael Cohen and Google Bard (USA, 2023)

In this matter the US President Donald Trump's lawyer, Michael Cohen, provided his attorney with fabricated case law generated by Google Bard. The attorney failed to verify the citations, leading to their inclusion in a federal court brief. Here it is evident that the reliance on unverified AI generated material could be perilous and one should exercise utmost caution while using the same.(The Washington Post).

8.3 British Columbia Supreme Court (Canada, 2024)

Here, in a family law case, legal briefs where generated and used by a lawyer by using AI application ChatGPT. The brief contained non-existent case laws. This fallacy The opposing counsel discovered the error, leading to a court investigation. The lawyer admitted to not verifying the AI-generated content (The Guardian).

8.4 Melbourne Family Court (Australia, 2024)

This case took place in Australia where a lawyer at Melbourne furnished a list of fabricated case with citations generated through an AI tool namely Leap LawY, , in a family court case. The judge referred the lawyer to the legal services regulator for investigation (The Guardian).

8.5 COMPAS Algorithm (USA)

To measure the risk of recidivism the AI tool COMPAS is used by USA. This risk assessment tool has been criticized for racial bias. In the Studies conducted by some forums, it has been found that it disproportionately labelled Black defendants on high risk while underestimating risk for white

defendants. Such type of bias inherently raises the questions about equity and transparency in AI-driven sentencing (Pro Publica).

8.6 DoNotPay (USA, 2024)

In USA DoNotPay, a legal chatbot, was fined $193,000 by the Federal Trade Commssion for falsely advertising its AI capabilities without testing their accuracy. The company claimed its AI could perform tasks like reporting potholes or filing damage claims, but these claims were unverified (Federal Trade Commission).

8.7 Seattle Police Department (USA, 2025)

A Seattle police sergeant used AI tools like ChatGPT and Grammarly to write internal reports, leading to concerns about the accuracy and authenticity of official documents. The city's Office of Police Accountability urged the department to establish a formal AI policy (Axios).

These instances illustrate the capacity pitfalls of integrating AI into prison structures without right oversight and verification. They emphasize the want for clean guidelines and suggestions to make certain the integrity of prison processes.)

9. RECOMMENDATIONS

9.1 It is important to develop ethical guidelines that determine the comprehensive ethical framework conditions for the use of AI in the legal system. This should include principles of fairness, accountability, transparency and respect for human rights (Wischmeyer, 2020).

9.2 Transparency and improved explanations used in legal contexts should be interpreted and explained. Investment in the R&D standards for algorithmic transparency in explainable AI (XAI) can promote trust and acceptance (Doshivelez & Kim, 2017).

9.3 Promotion of interdisciplinary cooperation between cooperation between legal experts, engineers, ethics and political makers. Interdisciplinary research and development can ensure a more holistic and more effective solution (Katz et al., 201).

9.4 The implementation of government and legal authority regulatory frameworks must create clear regulations for the use of AI in the legal system. These should address questions about acceptability, responsibility, data protection, and algorithm accountability (Mantelero, 2018).

9.5 To prepare future legal professions, the capacity structure of training and capacity structure legal training should be included in AI alphabetization. Current programs for training and professional development help current practitioners adapt to technological changes (McGinnis & Pearce, 2014).

9.6 Public commitment and trust in transparency are essential to the acceptance of AI in the legal system. Transparent communications about skills and limitations of AI tools, and mechanisms of public input, may improve obligations to legitimacy and explanation (Zouridis, 2020).

From a legal perspective, the current lack of recognition of AI as a legal investigation leads to ambiguous relevance in relation to liability, property, and institutions (Xudaybergenov 2023). While artificial intelligence can improve legal procedures, ethical concerns and data protection risks require a comprehensive regulatory framework for interdisciplinary cooperation and responsible integration. (Vargas-Murillo 2024).

10. CONCLUSION

Ultimately, Artificial Intelligence cannot be considered a legal authority without legal approval that can close a contract or other legal agreement that limits a potential application. The changing dynamics of technology need to be reacted in an equally attractive and careful way. As explained in this paper, AI is a double-classified sword because it offers immeasurable possibilities due to its good connection to considerable risk. AI has great promises to transform the legal system, but its implementation comes with complex challenges, including technical, ethical, legal and organizational aspects. Addressing these challenges requires a balanced, interdisciplinary approach that respects the fundamental principles of justice and human rights. Through promoting responsible innovation, transparent governance and integrated cooperation, the company can use the benefits of AI, while simultaneously protecting legal system integrity, equity and promoting the rule of law in the digital age.

REFRENCES:

- Andrea Renda, 'Artificial Intelligence: Ethics, Governance and Policy Challenges', *CEPS Research Report* No. 2019/09 https://www.ceps.eu/ceps-publications/artificial-intelligence-ethics-governance-and-policy-challenges/ accessed 17 April 2025

- Julia Angwin, Jeff Larson, Surya Mattu, S & Lauren Kirchner, 'Machine Bias', *ProPublica* (2016), available at https://www.propublica.org/

- Kevin D. Ashley., 'Artificial Intelligence and Legal Analytics: New Tools for Law Practice in the Digital Age', *Cambridge University Press*, 2017

- Trevor J.M. Bench-Capon, Katie Atkinson & Peter McBurney, 'A Perspective on Argumentation Models of Legal Reasoning', *Artificial Intelligence*, (2012) Vol. 231, pp. 1–15, available at https://doi.org/10.1016/j.

- Bert-Jaap Koops, 'The Trouble with European Data Protection Law', *International Data Privacy Law 250***,** (2014), available at https://doi:10,1093/idpl/ipu2023

- Ryan Calo, 'Robotics and the Lessons of Cyberlaw', *California Law Review,* (2015) 103(3), pp. 513–563, available at https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.

- Mark Coeckelbergh, 'AI Ethics', *MIT Press*, 2020.

- Finale Doshi-Velez & Been Kim, 'Towards a Rigorous Science of Interpretable Machine Learning', arXiv preprint arXiv:1702.08608 (2017) available at https://doi.org/10.48550/

- Harry Surden, 'Machine Learning and Law' (2014) 89(1), *Washington Law Review 87*

- Daniel M. Katz, Michael J. Bommarito & Josh Blackman, 'Predicting the Behavior of the Supreme Court of the United States: A General Approach', (2014) 9(4) PLOS ONE e92462, available at https://doi.org/10.1371/

- Alessandro Mantelero, 'AI and Big Data: A Blueprint for a Human Rights, Social and Ethical Impact Assessment', *Computer Law & Security Review*, 2018 34(4), pp. 754–772, available at https://doi.org/10.1016/j.

- John O. McGinnis & Russel G. Pearce, "The Great Disruption: How Machine Intelligence Will Transform the Role of Lawyers in the Delivery of Legal Services', *Fordham Law Review*, (2014) 82(6), 3041–3066.

- Dana Remus, D & Frank Levy, 'Can Robots be Lawyers? Computers, Lawyers, and the Practice of Law', *SSRN* (2016), available at https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.

- Sandra Wachter, Brent Mittelstadt and Luciano Floridi, 'Why a Right to Explanation of Automated Decision-Making Does Not Exist in the General Data Protection Regulation' (2017) 7(2) International Data Privacy Law 76

- Pamela Samuelson, 'Intellectual Property and the Regulation of Artificial Intelligence', *Fordham Law Review*, (2017) 87(2), 399–419.

- Amy J. Schmitz, 'Expanding Access to Justice through Online Dispute Resolution: The Ongoing Journey', *Journal of Dispute Resolution*, 2020(1), 115–139.

- Harry Surden, 'Artificial Intelligence and Law: An Overview', *Georgia State University Law Review*, (2019) 35(4), 1305–1337.

- Richard Susskind, 'Online courts and the Future of Justice' (Oxford University Press, 2019).

- Alberto Vargas-Murillo, Ivan De La Asuncion Pari-Bedoya, Angel Turriate-Guzmán, Carlos Delgado-Chávez & Freddy Sanchez-Paucar, 'Transforming Justice: Implications of Artificial Intelligence in Legal Systems', *Academic Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies*, (2024) Vol. 13, No. 2, pp. 437-438 available at https://doi.org/10.36941/ajis-2024-0059.

- Thomas Wischmeyer, , 'Artificial intelligence and transparency: A Blueprint for improving the Regulation of AI', *German Law Journal*, (2020) Vol. 21 No. 1, pp. 56–75, available at https://doi.org/10.1017/glj.

- Monika Zalnieriute, Lyra Bennet Moses & George Williams, 'The Rule of Law and Automation of Government Decision Making', *Modern Law Review,* (2019) Vol 82, No. 3, pp. 425–455, available https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-

- Zouridis, S., 'Automation in the Public Sector: Toward a Digital Legal Order', *Information Polity,* (2020) Vol. 25, No. 3 , pp. 343–360, available at https://doi.org/10.3233/IP-

- Xudaybergenov, A., 'Toward Legal Recognition of Artificial Intelligence Proposals for Limited Subject of law Status', *International Journal of Law and Policy*, (2023) Vol. 1 No. 4, available at https://doi.org/10.59022/ijlp.55.)

- The Hindu Bureau, published on April, 14, 2024 visited on 17 April 2025 (https://www.thehindu.com/news/national/ai-presents-both-challenges-and-opportunities-for-courts-says-cji/article68062517.ece).

- The New York Times https://www.nytimes.com/2023/05/27/nyregion/avianca-airline-lawsuit-chatgpt.html visited on 18 April 2025.

- The Washington Post https://www.washingtonpost.com/technology/2023/12/29/michael-cohen-ai-google-bard-fake-citations/ visited on 18 April 2025.

- The Guardian https://www.theguardian.com/australia-news/2025/feb/01/australian-lawyer-caught-using-chatgpt-filed-court-documents-referencing-non-existent-cases visited on 18 April 2025.

- The Guardian https://www.theguardian.com/law/2024/oct/10/melbourne-lawyer-referred-to-complaints-body-after-ai-generated-made-up-case-citations-in-family-court-ntwnfb visited on 18 April 2025

- Pro Publica https://www.propublica.org/article/how-we-analyzed-the-compas-recidivism-algorithm visited on 18 April 2025.

- Federal Trade Commission https://www.ftc.gov/legal-library/browse/cases-proceedings/donotpay visited on 18 April 2025.

- Axios visited on 18 April 2025 https://www.axios.com/local/seattle/2025/04/14/police-ai-chatgpt-reports-watchdog-complaints.