IJRAR.ORG E-ISSN: 2348-1269, P-ISSN: 2349-5138

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF RESEARCH AND ANALYTICAL REVIEWS (IJRAR) | IJRAR.ORG

An International Open Access, Peer-reviewed, Refereed Journal

Shaping the Future of Law: AI, Ethics, and Policy Perspectives

Tushar R. Warang[1] and Afhrid Sackib[2]

[1]Student of VPM's TMC Law College, Thane, University of Mumbai

[2]Student of Kishinchand Chellaram Law College, University of Mumbai

Mumbai, Maharashtra, India

Abstract

This paper presents a unique and comprehensive investigation into the intricate dynamics of artificial intelligence (AI) integration within the legal profession, focusing primarily on India and global contexts. It meticulously examines the implications of AI adoption in legal systems, encompassing its advantages, challenges, and regulatory frameworks. The study delves deep into the ethical dimensions of AI utilization, including considerations of bias, accountability, and data privacy, alongside a thorough analysis of its impact on judicial processes and human rights. Through comparative assessments, it explores the interplay between AI technologies and legal frameworks, addressing issues of fairness and algorithmic transparency. Additionally, the paper meticulously evaluates policy options for mitigating risks associated with AI implementation, emphasizing the need for algorithmic accountability, and safeguarding vulnerable groups.

In conclusion, this research comprehensively examines the socioeconomic ramifications of AI deployment in the legal sector, including its effects on employment, social equity, and access to Justice. By exploring the intersection of AI, law, and ethics, this study significantly enhances our understanding of the evolving legal landscape in the era of technological advancement. It offers practical insights for policymakers, legal professionals, and scholars and provides a roadmap for navigating the complexities of AI integration in the legal profession. It advocates for a balanced approach that prioritizes human rights principles, social equity, and responsible AI governance in shaping the legal profession's future, empowering the audience to make informed decisions.

Keywords: Artificial Intelligence (AI), Legal profession, India, Global Comparison, Judiciary, Regulations, Challenges, Ethical considerations, Accountability, Data Privacy, AI Impact on Criminal Justice, Human Rights, Policy Options, Algorithmic Accountability, Social Equity.

I Introduction

Artificial Intelligence (AI)[1] offers remarkable opportunities to influence the future of law positively. However, it also brings complex challenges concerning ethics, accountability, and bias within the legal profession. In his caution, the Chief Justice of India emphasized the need for a thorough examination of the complex ethical, legal, and practical issues that arise with integrating AI into modern processes, including court proceedings[2]. A proposed European Regulation on AI[3] also highlights the risks associated with AI in judicial settings. It has placed AI implementation in the Justice process in the High-Risk category based on its potential risks and level of impact on fundamental rights, democracy, and the rule of law[4]. Unlike in previous industrial, scientific, and technological revolutions, the legal field worldwide cannot maintain its unique immunity against AI technology's rapid development. This Fourth Industrial Revolution will replace the traditional methodology we use to administer Justice.

1.1 Research Objective

The paper examines the intersection of AI, law, and ethics to enhance our understanding of the changing legal environment in the age of technological advancements in AI.

1.2 Research Methodology

We conducted a comprehensive review of various published journals and articles. For further details, please consult the References section.

II Artificial Intelligence (AI) Integration Within the Legal Profession

The integration of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in the legal field marks a profound transformation, fundamentally reshaping the provision of legal services and redefining the legal landscape. AI is increasingly prevalent in various aspects of the legal profession, particularly within the judiciary, where it streamlines processes, enhances decision-making, and expands access to Justice. A recent report published by the British Institute of International and Comparative Law[5] highlights the growing adoption of machine learning (ML)

[1]Referring here to 'artificial intelligence system' (AI system) which means software that is developed with one or more of the techniques and approaches listed in Annex I and can, for a given set of human-defined objectives, generate outputs such as content, predictions, recommendations, or decisions influencing the environments they interact with, as per Article 3 point 1 and Annex I of Proposed EU AI Act, https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/HTML/?uri=CELEX:52021PC0206

[2]Chandrachud D.Y., (2024 April 14), Chief Justice of India D.Y. Chandrachud caution on Artificial Intelligence 'risks', The Telegraph Online, https://www.telegraphindia.com/india/chief-justice-of-india-d-y-chandrachud-caution-on-artificial-intelligence-risks/cid/2013180

[3]Ibid, https://artificialintelligenceact.eu/ai-act-explorer/

[4]EU Press Releases, 2024 March 13, Artificial Intelligence Act: MEPs adopt landmark law, https://www.europarl.europa.eu/news/en/press-room/20240308IPR19015/artificial-intelligence-act-meps-adopt-landmark-law

[5]BIICL (2023), Use of Artificial Intelligence in Legal Practice, https://www.biicl.org/publications/use-of-artificial-intelligence-in-legal-practice

and natural language processing (NLP) based virtual assistants in progressive legal markets. These virtual assistants support legal professionals in at least seven critical operational areas. Those are:

1) **Legal research and e-discovery** (AI as a search and discovery tool)
2) **Document automation** (AI as a document drafting and management tool)
3) **Predictive legal analysis** (AI as a predictive analytical tool)
4) **Legal review** (AI as a reading and summarizing tool)
5) **Case management** (AI as a scheduling and filing tool)
6) **Legal advice and expertise automation** (AI as a client communication and support tool):
7) **Information and marketing** (AI as a learning and marketing tool)

Another significant area is the Judiciary Process, representing the eighth dimension of AI integration.

8) **Assistance in Judiciary Process** (AI as a virtual court assistance tool)

2.1 Global Scenario

2.1.1 In Legal Profession at Large:

We have used various resources available on the Internet and compiled data on various AI Tools currently deployed in the legal profession in **Table 1**[6]. AI integration is rapidly becoming a key focus area for many law firms on a global scale.

2.1.2 Specifically in Judiciary:

In the Judiciary, many Government Authorities globally have shown the required caution and restricted the use of AI to human assistance only. **Table 1** shows that AI Technology has not yet penetrated the Judiciary regime in many countries.

2.2 Scenario in India

2.2.1 In Legal Profession at Large:

Refer to **Table 1**. AI tools are employed across diverse legal domains, often from multinational entities operating within various jurisdictions.

2.2.2 In Judiciary:

India has shown remarkable forethought in integrating Artificial Intelligence (AI) within the Judiciary regime. India's eCourts Project Phase III involves various AI technology projects[7]. Refer to **Table 1**.

2.3 Implications of AI adoption in legal systems

Based on the above information, we have studied three significant implications of AI Adoption in legal systems: advantages of AI Adoption, Challenges in AI Adoption, and Regulatory frameworks required for AI Adoption. Other implications are possible, but we have restricted them to these three for research purposes.

2.3.1 Advantages

- **Enhanced Efficiency:** AI technologies automate repetitive tasks such as legal research, document review, and contract drafting, allowing legal professionals to allocate their efforts

[6]**Table 1**: AI Tools usage in several areas of the legal profession

[7]E-Committee, Supreme Court of India (2022), Digital Courts Vision & Roadmap e-Courts Project Phase III, https://cdnbbsr.s3waas.gov.in/s388ef51f0bf911e452e8dbb1d807a81ab/uploads/2023/04/2023042088.pdf

towards higher-value work. Consequently, this contributes to overall enhanced efficiency and productivity within legal departments.

- **Cost Reduction:** By automating routine tasks, AI can help law firms and legal departments curtail operational costs associated with manual labor and time-intensive processes. Over time, this can result in significant cost savings.
- **Heightened Accuracy:** AI-powered tools can swiftly and precisely analyze substantial volumes of data, surpassing human capabilities and mitigating errors in legal research, contract analysis, and decision-making processes. This, in turn, leads to more dependable outcomes.
- **Informed Decision-Making:** Utilizing predictive analytics and machine learning algorithms, legal professionals gain valuable insights into case outcomes, litigation strategies, and risk assessment, enabling them to make well-informed decisions based on data-driven analyses.
- **Broadened Access to Justice:** AI technologies can alleviate costs and streamline processes, potentially enhancing access to legal services and bridging the gap between individuals, underserved communities, and legal resources.

2.3.2 Challenges

- **Ethical Issues:** Implementing AI in legal systems raises ethical concerns about privacy, bias, transparency, and accountability. There are also concerns about the fairness and impartiality of AI algorithms, especially in decision-making processes that impact individuals' rights and freedoms.
- **Legal Liability and Accountability:** Determining legal liability for errors or misconduct involving AI systems can be challenging. Questions arise regarding who is responsible when AI tools make mistakes or produce undesirable outcomes, particularly in legal contexts where accountability is critical.
- **Data Privacy and Security:** AI systems depend on extensive datasets, encompassing sensitive and confidential information. Protecting the privacy and security of this data is crucial for minimizing the potential risks of unauthorized access, breaches, or misuse, all of which can jeopardize client confidentiality.
- **Bias and Discrimination:** AI algorithms may perpetuate or amplify biases in the data used to train them. The potential for biased outcomes exists, notably within criminal Justice, employment law, and financial services. It is imperative to proactively address bias in AI systems to safeguard the principles of fairness and Justice.
- **Regulatory Compliance:** Legal professionals must navigate complex regulatory frameworks governing the use of AI in legal practice. Incorporating AI into legal systems is a complex task due to the need to comply with data protection laws, intellectual property rights, ethical guidelines, and professional standards.
- **Impact on Employment:** AI technologies' automation of routine legal tasks may lead to job displacement or changes in the legal workforce. Legal professionals must adapt to new roles and skill sets required in an AI-enabled environment, raising concerns about job security and professional identity.

2.3.3 Regulatory frameworks

Table 2[8] shows how different countries, including India, formulate regulation policies for AI implantation[9] These policies are sector-based and risk-based. They are for the general use of AI technology and, hence, cover policy for AI Adoption in the legal system.

III Ethical Dimensions of AI Utilization

To effectively integrate artificial intelligence (AI) systems within the legal domain, particularly in the judicial process, it is imperative to prioritize regulating AI system developers' activities according to foundational ethical principles. The regulation of developer activities is essential for infusing ethical considerations into AI systems. Nonetheless, this represents a complex and time-intensive endeavor that demands the collaborative engagement of diverse professionals. A critical step in achieving this objective involves comprehensive deliberations and establishing an ethical code. While widely acknowledged ethical standards prevail, they prove inadequate in directing the conduct of AI systems[10]. The ensuing is among the principal factors necessitating meticulous consideration.

3.1 Considerations of Bias

CEPEJ[11] has expressed apprehension regarding potential challenges to applying AI to uphold the principles of Justice. This concern arises in approving the European Ethical Charter on using Artificial Intelligence in Judicial Systems and their environment. The prevalent apprehension, as identified in existing literature, pertains to bias, which can contravene fundamental rights and precipitate discriminatory outcomes. It is noteworthy that intentional or unintentional bias poses a significant risk. Furthermore, the creators of the system's rules, namely the programmers, could indirectly influence the judicial decision-making process, which traditionally falls under the exclusive purview of the judge.

Unintentional bias can manifest when algorithms replicate existing biases present in the real world. The utilization of skewed datasets may result in the development of inaccurate predictive models. An example of this issue can be seen in the widely used COMPAS (Correctional Offender Management Profiling for Alternative Sanctions) AI system in the US criminal justice system. This system assesses the potential for recidivism in criminal defendants and assists judges in their decision-making processes. ProPublica's investigation[12] revealed that black defendants were more likely than white defendants to be erroneously

[8]**Table 2**: Global Regulatory Framework for AI, Originally Sourced from IAPP Research and Insights (2024), Global AI Law and Policy Tracker, https://iapp.org/resources/article/global-ai-legislation-tracker/

[9]Ibid, IAPP Research and Insights (2024)

[10]Evgrafova, I., Egorova, L., Marchenko, A., & Tarasov, A. (2022). Ethical problems of practical interaction between strong artificial intelligence and humans in the urban transport environment and legal proceedings. Transportation Research Procedia, 63, 2094-2098

[11]Council of Europe European Commission for the Efficiency of Justice (CEPEJ)

[12] ProPublica (2016 May 23), Machine Bias -There's software used across the country to predict future criminals. And it's biased against blacks. https://www.propublica.org/article/machine-bias-risk-assessments-in-criminal-sentencing

identified as having a greater risk of recidivism. Conversely, white defendants were more likely to be inaccurately identified as having a low risk compared to black defendants[13].

3.2 Data Privacy

Legal scholars and regulatory authorities specializing in data protection have expressed concerns regarding the profound impact of artificial intelligence (AI) on privacy and data security. They posit that AI presents formidable challenges in these domains, encompassing issues of obtaining informed consent and potential encroachments upon individuals' data protection rights, such as the entitlement to access personal data, the prerogative to prevent processing likely to cause harm or distress, and the right to avoid decisions that are determined exclusively by automated processing. The perceived need for more agency and oversight of individuals in utilizing their data to draw inferences about them is of particular concern. Scholars at the international level advocate for establishing a novel data protection concept termed the "right to reasonable inferences" to address the accountability deficit engendered by "high-risk inferences," which are privacy-invasive or reputation-damaging and lack verifiability due to their predictive or opinion-based nature. They assert the necessity of informed consent in utilizing AI, accompanied by transparent disclosure of potential harms associated with its deployment. Furthermore, they underscore that the efficacy of privacy and data protection measures hinges upon their utilization, correct implementation, monitoring, and enforcement. It is recognized that comprehending and delineating the scope of data protection law and principles within the swiftly evolving landscape of AI constitutes a formidable endeavor[14].

3.3 Accountability

In the realm of policy-making, accountability stands as a pivotal consideration. Implementing AI systems warrants the establishment of mechanisms to ensure individuals are held accountable for such systems' development, deployment, and utilization. This encompasses risk management and the transparent identification and mitigation of risks, which should be answerable and open to third-party audits. Legal accountability mechanisms for AI-related harms may encompass the right to explanation, data protection, information transparency safeguards, auditing, or other reporting obligations. AI systems utilized in the legal profession and judiciary processes must possess the capability to furnish the same caliber of explanations currently expected from human stakeholders in the legal regime, including lawyers, judges, and judiciary staff[15].

3.4 Impact on Judicial Processes

No individual is exempt from potential criminal influence and external pressure. Any attempt to interfere with a judge's activities in the administration of Justice is subject to legal prosecution. If a judge is exposed to criminal pressure with the intent of affecting the outcome of a case, they are entitled to seek assistance and support from the state. The outlook concerning artificial intelligence systems is notably

[13]Rocha, C., & Carvalho, J. (2022). Artificial intelligence in the judiciary: uses and threats. In em> CEUR Workshop Proceedings< em.

[14]Rodrigues, R. (2020). Legal and human rights issues of AI: Gaps, challenges, and vulnerabilities. Journal of Responsible Technology, 4, 100005

[15]Ibid, Rodrigues, R. (2020)

pessimistic. As previously noted, the functionality of a robot is contingent upon its embedded algorithms, which are akin to a black box for the average user. If an individual with specialized knowledge seeks to manipulate the outcome of a case by accessing the algorithms of artificial intelligence, such interference may not be immediately discernible. Nonetheless, the robot will not disclose any modifications to its programming. This interference may significantly impact the case's outcome, potentially leading to irreversible consequences[16]. Furthermore, directing a judge on how to decide compromises the decision-making aspect of judicial independence[17].

3.5 Impact on Human Rights

Based on the above factors, the impact on human rights is shown in **Table 3**[18].

IV Policy Options for Mitigating Risks Associated with AI Implementation

Several policy avenues can be pursued to navigate the risks accompanying AI integration in the legal realm. These options encompass promoting algorithmic transparency, safeguarding vulnerable groups, addressing the socioeconomic implications, and ensuring that AI deployment in the legal profession aligns with ethical principles and social equity goals.

4.1 Algorithmic Accountability

A study by the EU Parliament STOA[19] delineated various policy options to regulate algorithmic transparency and accountability. These options address a range of facets related to algorithmic transparency and accountability, encompassing awareness-raising initiatives such as education, oversight of accountability in public-sector employment of algorithmic decision-making, regulatory supervision, legal liability, and international coordination for algorithmic governance. Additionally, specific measures proposed to advance algorithmic transparency include algorithmic impact assessments, establishing an algorithmic transparency standard, the provision of counterfactual explanations, and implementing local interpretable model-agnostic explanations[20].

4.2 Safeguarding Vulnerable Groups

Table 4[21] illustrates the correlation between AI issues and vulnerabilities. The most crucial actions for safeguarding vulnerable groups include mitigating the adverse impacts of AI through continuous risk identification, prediction, and preparation in consultation with affected stakeholders, enhancing the resilience of vulnerable communities to such effects, and addressing the fundamental causes of vulnerabilities by adopting a more stringent policy and regulatory approach towards the harms, discrimination, inequality, and injustice perpetuated by such technologies[22]

[16]Ibid, Evgrafova, I., Egorova, L., Marchenko, A., & Tarasov, A. (2022)

[17]Zalnieriute, M. (2021). Technology and the Courts: Artificial Intelligence and Judicial Impartiality. Submission to Australian Law Reform Commission Review of Judicial Impartiality.

[18]**Table 3**: Issues and affected human rights, originally sourced from **Table 1**, Rodrigues, R. (2020) (Ibid)

[19] European Parliament's scientific and technological options assessment unit (STOA)

[20]Ibid, Rodrigues, R. (2020)

[21]**Table 4**: Mapping issues to vulnerabilities, Originally from **Table 2**, Rodrigues, R. (2020) (Ibid)

[22]Ibid, Rodrigues, R. (2020)

4.3 Socioeconomic Ramifications

Upon the incorporation of artificial intelligence, a transformation in the employment framework within the legal profession is anticipated, consequently leading to gradual alterations in socioeconomic dynamics. To proactively manage potential risks, we recommend considering the following constructive policy options:

- **Continuous Skills Development:** Offer ongoing training for legal professionals to adapt to AI, focusing on complex analysis and ethical understanding.
- **Promote Interdisciplinary Collaboration:** Facilitate interdisciplinary collaboration between legal and technological domains to devise comprehensive solutions to socioeconomic challenges.
- **Support Entrepreneurship and Innovation:** Incentivize legal tech startups to develop AI tools, improving access to Justice for underserved communities.
- **Ensure Transparency and Accountability**: Establish mechanisms for transparent AI decision-making, holding developers accountable for ethical implications.
- **Invest in Community Engagement:** Empower local stakeholders to address AI's impact on marginalized communities and ensure equitable distribution of benefits.
- **Monitor and Evaluate Impact:** Regularly assess AI's impact on the legal profession and society, updating policies to align with social goals.

V Conclusion

Integrating artificial intelligence (AI) within the legal profession presents promising opportunities and significant challenges. This research has comprehensively examined the multifaceted dynamics surrounding AI adoption in legal systems, focusing on India and global contexts. Analyzing advantages, challenges, regulatory frameworks, ethical considerations, and policy options reveals several vital conclusions.

Firstly, AI technologies offer undeniable advantages to the legal profession, including increased efficiency, cost reduction, improved accuracy, enhanced decision-making, and greater access to Justice. These benefits can revolutionize legal services delivery and enhance the overall effectiveness of legal processes.

In addition to these advantages, it is imperative to address significant challenges. Ethical considerations, such as bias, accountability, and data privacy, present considerable risks to the fairness and integrity of legal systems. Furthermore, careful attention must be paid to regulatory compliance and the impact on employment to ensure that the adoption of AI does not exacerbate inequalities or undermine fundamental rights.

Effective regulatory frameworks are essential to mitigate the risks associated with AI implementation in legal systems. Policies should prioritize algorithmic accountability, transparency, and the protection of vulnerable groups. International cooperation and coordination are vital to establishing common standards and guidelines that uphold ethical principles and human rights across jurisdictions.

Furthermore, proactive measures must be taken to address the socioeconomic ramifications of AI deployment in the legal profession. Policymakers should anticipate changes in employment structures and develop strategies to support workforce adaptation and mitigate potential disruptions.

In conclusion, a balanced approach to AI integration in the legal profession is necessary, one that harnesses the benefits of technology while safeguarding against ethical pitfalls and socioeconomic challenges. By prioritizing human rights, ethical principles, and responsible governance, the legal profession can navigate the complexities of AI adoption and shape a future that upholds the integrity and fairness of Justice systems globally.

VI References

1. Kabir, Md Shahin & Nazmul Alam, Mohammad. (2023). The Role of AI Technology for Legal Research and Decision Making. 10. 2395-0056.
2. Hu, Teng & Lu, Huafeng. (2019). Study on the Influence of Artificial Intelligence on Legal Profession. 10.2991/aebmr.k.191225.184.
3. Connell, W. J. (2018). Artificial Intelligence in the legal profession—What you might want to know. RIBJ, 66, 5-43.
4. Connell, W., & Black, M. H. (2019). Artificial Intelligence and Legal Education. The computer & internet lawyer, 2019, 36 (5): 14, 18.
5. Kluttz, D. N., & Mulligan, D. K. (2019). Automated decision support technologies and the legal profession. Berkeley Technology Law Journal, 34(3), 853-890 (https://www.jstor.org/stable/26954398)
6. Mitra A, & Baid A. (2019). Artificial Intelligence and the Future of Legal Profession. International Journal of Legal Science and Innovation, Volume 1, Issue, ISSN: 2581-9453
7. Nowotko, P. M. (2021). AI in judicial application of law and the right to a court. Procedia Computer Science, 192, 2220-2228.
8. Evgrafova, I., Egorova, L., Marchenko, A., & Tarasov, A. (2022). Ethical problems of practical interaction between strong artificial intelligence and humans in the urban transport environment and legal proceedings. Transportation Research Procedia, 63, 2094-2098.
9. Abiodun, O. S., & Lekan, A. J. (2020). Exploring the potentials of artificial intelligence in the judiciary. International Journal of Engineering Applied Sciences and Technology, 5(8), 23-27.
10. Rocha, C., & Carvalho, J. (2022). Artificial intelligence in the judiciary: uses and threats. In em> CEUR Workshop Proceedings< em.
11. Zalnieriute, M. (2021). Technology and the Courts: Artificial Intelligence and Judicial Impartiality. Submission to Australian Law Reform Commission Review of Judicial Impartiality.
12. Kerikmäe, T., Hamuľák, O., & Gábriš, T. (2023). Frontiers in AI Judiciary: A Contribution to Legal Futurology. Acta Baltica Historiae et Philosophiae Scientiarum, 11(2).

13. Brekke, V. A. (2022). Artificial Intelligence in the judicial system: Maintaining the independency of the judiciary power in the development, implementation, and use of artificial intelligence (Master's thesis).

14. Ngige, O. C., Awodele, O., & Balogun, O. (2021). Judicial Artificial Intelligence Bias: A Survey and Recommendations. Transactions on Machine Learning and Artificial Intelligence, 9(2), 74-86.

15. E-Committee, Supreme Court of India (2022), Digital Courts Vision & Roadmap e-Courts Project Phase III, https://cdnbbsr.s3waas.gov.in/s388ef51f0bf911e452e8dbb1d807a81ab/uploads/2023/04/2023042088.pdf

16. NITI Ayog (2021), Towards Responsible AI for All- Approach document for India Part 1-Principles for Responsible AI, https://www.niti.gov.in/sites/default/files/2021-08/Part2-Responsible-AI-12082021.pdf

17. NITI Ayog (2018), National Strategy on Artificial Intelligence (NSAI), https://www.niti.gov.in/sites/default/files/2023-03/National-Strategy-for-Artificial-Intelligence.pdf

18. The Artificial Intelligence Task Force (2018), Report of AITF, https://www.aitf.org.in/

19. Patel, N. R., & Tulshyan, V. (2023). A View AI: A Standby of Solicitors and Cataloger in the Era of-AI. Applied Science and Engineering Journal for Advanced Research, 2(6), 15-19.

20. IAPP Research and Insights (2024), Global AI Law and Policy Tracker, https://iapp.org/resources/article/global-ai-legislation-tracker/

21. BIICL (2023), Use of Artificial Intelligence in Legal Practice, https://www.biicl.org/publications/use-of-artificial-intelligence-in-legal-practice

22. Rodrigues, R. (2020). Legal and human rights issues of AI: Gaps, challenges, and vulnerabilities. Journal of Responsible Technology, 4, 100005.

23. EU Press Releases, 2024 March 13, Artificial Intelligence Act: MEPs adopt landmark law

24. Chandrachud D.Y., (2024 April 14), Chief Justice of India D.Y. Chandrachud caution on Artificial Intelligence 'risks', The Telegraph Online, https://www.telegraphindia.com/india/chief-Justice-of-india-d-y-chandrachud-caution-on-artificial-intelligence-risks/cid/2013180

25. Proposal For a Regulation of The European Parliament and of the Council Laying Down Harmonized Rules on Artificial Intelligence (Artificial Intelligence Act) And Amending Certain Union Legislative Acts, Brussels (2021 April 21) COM (2021) 206 final 2021/0106(COD), https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/HTML/?uri=CELEX:52021PC0206

26. ProPublica (2016 May 23), Machine Bias -There's software used across the country to predict future criminals. And it's biased against blacks. https://www.propublica.org/article/machine-bias-risk-assessments-in-criminal-sentencing

VII Tables

Table 1

AI Tools usage in several areas of the legal profession

Areas of AI Integration	Global	India
Legal research and e-discovery	LexisNexis, Westlaw, Thomson Reuters's AI tools, Harvey, Law Notion, ROSS Intelligence	Manupatra, SCC Online, Indian Kanoon, AIR Online, CASEMINE
Document automation	ChatGPT, IronClad, Genie AI, Robin AI, Juro, Clarilis, Spellbook, Grammarly, Contract Express, ROSS	CaseIQ, SpotDraft, LegalDesk
Predictive legal analysis	ChatGPT, Lex Machina, Bard, Law Notion,	CaseIQ, Predictice, LegalMind
Legal review	Luminance, Elicit, Lexis Nexis+ AI	Kira Systems, Luminance, Manupatra, CASEMINE
Case management	LitiGate, Legl	MyAdvo, LawRato, LegalDesk
Legal advice and expertise automation	ChatGPT, LawGeex, Neota Logic, Josef, IBM Watson Legal	SpotDraft, LawRato, MyAdvo
Information and marketing	LexisNexis, Bloomberg Law	Manupatra, SCC Online, Legitquest
AI as a virtual court assistance tool	COMPAS(USA) China Judgements Online (China), Digital Case Sy & HART (U.K), AS and CIS SOJ (Russia), VICTOR(Brazil) Robot judge for adjudicating small claims (Estonia), Prometea (Argentina and Colombia), Transcribing tool for real-time court hearing (Singapore)	eCourts Projects, SUVAS, SUPACE,

Based on information sourced from[23]

[23] original work of

- Kabir, Md Shahin & Nazmul Alam, Mohammad. (2023). The Role of AI Technology for Legal Research and Decision Making. 10. 2395-0056
- Hu, Teng & Lu, Huafeng. (2019). Study on the Influence of Artificial Intelligence on Legal Profession. 10.2991/aebmr.k.191225.184

Table 2

Global Regulatory Framework for AI[24]

Country	Specific AI governance law or policy	Wider AI context
BRAZIL	Brazil has recently unveiled an **AI Strategy** and a comprehensive **AI Bill**, prioritizing human rights and civil liability for AI developers. Furthermore, in July 2023, the country's Data Protection Authority, the **Autoridade Nacional de Proteção de Dados (ANPD)**, issued a Preliminary Analysis of Bill No. 2338/2023 concerning the use of AI in Brazil. Subsequently, the **ANPD has published its final opinion on Bill 2338/2023**.	Brazil is a **party to the OECD's AI principles** and **has adopted UNESCO's Recommendation on the Ethics of AI**. Brazil also participated in the 2023 U.K. AI Summit and has a technical **cooperation agreement with the Development Bank of Latin America** for AI-related innovation.
CHINA	China has **implemented** a **comprehensive set of AI regulations**, including Algorithmic Recommendation Management Provisions, Interim Measures for the Management of Generative AI Services, Deep Synthesis Management Provisions, AI guidelines and summary of regulations, Scientific	China is actively involved in international AI endeavors and has pledged **adherence to the AI principles established by the OECD**. This commitment is demonstrated through their participation in critical events such as the 2023 U.K. AI Summit and their

- Mitra A, & Baid A. (2019). Artificial Intelligence and the Future of Legal Profession. International Journal of Legal Science and Innovation, Volume 1, Issue, ISSN: 2581-9453
- Abiodun, O. S., & Lekan, A. J. (2020). Exploring the potentials of artificial intelligence in the judiciary. International Journal of Engineering Applied Sciences and Technology, 5(8), 23-27
- Zalnieriute, M. (2021). Technology and the Courts: Artificial Intelligence and Judicial Impartiality. Submission to Australian Law Reform Commission Review of Judicial Impartiality
- Brekke, V. A. (2022). Artificial Intelligence in the judicial system: Maintaining the independency of the judiciary power in the development, implementation, and use of artificial intelligence (Master's thesis)
- E-Committee, Supreme Court of India (2022), Digital Courts Vision & Roadmap e-Courts Project Phase III https://cdnbbsr.s3waas.gov.in/s388ef51f0bf911e452e8dbb1d807a81ab/uploads/2023/04/2023042088.pdf
- Patel, N. R., & Tulshyan, V. (2023). A View AI: A Standby of Solicitors and Cataloger in the Era of-AI. Applied Science and Engineering Journal for Advanced Research, 2(6), 15-19
- BIICL (2023), Use of Artificial Intelligence in Legal Practice, https://www.biicl.org/publications/use-of-artificial-intelligence-in-legal-practice

[24]Originally Source from IAPP Research and Insights (2024), Global AI Law and Policy Tracker, https://iapp.org/resources/article/global-ai-legislation-tracker/

	and Technological Ethics Regulation, and the next-generation AI Development Plan.	**endorsement of UNESCO's Recommendation on the Ethics of AI**. Those needing further information are encouraged to consult China's AI development plan and the Ministry of Science and Technology's 2021 AI governance document, which outlines ethical norms for the use of AI.
EU	As of December 2023, the **EU AI Act** has completed the political trilogue stage, with consensus among the European Commission, Council, and Parliament regarding their respective positions. The act establishes **standardized regulations for introducing AI into the EU market**. It a**pplies to EU and third-country providers and deployers who place AI systems on the EU market**. The act is based on a **risk assessment approach**, **prohibits** using **specific AI systems**, and outlines **specific requirements for high-risk systems**. Additionally, it implements **uniform transparency rules** for certain AI systems.	The European Union (EU) actively participates in various international initiatives and has adopted multiple principles and recommendations related to artificial intelligence (AI). This includes **engagement in the AI principles of the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD)**, **endorsement of the Hiroshima Process International Guiding Principles, and adherence** to the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization's **(UNESCO) Recommendation on the Ethics of AI**. Moreover, the European Commission has established the **EU AI Office to supervise AI policy** at the European level and ensure the effective implementation of the AI Act.

INDIA	The **proposed Digital India Act** represents a significant step forward in regulating high-risk AI systems, reflecting the Indian government's commitment to creating an inclusive and citizen-centric **"AI for all"** environment. A **dedicated task force** has been established to address AI's ethical, legal, and societal aspects and establish an **AI regulatory authority**. **India's National Strategy** for AI envisions the country as an **"AI garage"** for emerging and developing economies, offering scalable solutions that can be easily implemented and designed for global deployment.	India has **embraced the OECD's AI principles and UNESCO's Recommendation on the Ethics of AI.** NITI Aayog has **introduced the AI Research, Analytics, and Knowledge Assimilation platform**, and the Ministry of Electronics and Information Technology oversees the India AI program.

U.K.	The U.K. government has proposed a **context-based and proportionate approach to regulating AI**, **leveraging existing sectoral laws to oversee AI systems**. They have provided various resources for policy guidance, including an **AI regulation framework** that promotes innovation, the Algorithmic Transparency Recording Standard Hub, the AI Standards Hub, a guide for utilizing AI in the public sector, an AI ethics and safety guide, the Centre for Data Ethics and Innovation's AI Governance research report, guidance on the AI **auditing framework from the Information Commissioner's Office**, and the ICO and Alan Turing Institute's resource for elucidating AI-driven decisions.	The United Kingdom has committed to advancing artificial intelligence (AI) by aligning with international frameworks and taking concrete steps to implement AI policies. This includes **participating in the OECD's AI principles**, **hosting the AI Summit in 2023**, resulting in the **Bletchley Declaration**, **adopting UNESCO's Recommendation on the Ethics of AI**, and **endorsing** the **11 Hiroshima Process International Guiding Principles for Advanced AI** systems as part of the G7. Additionally, the U.K. has initiated specific action items such as launching a national AI research and insights program, fostering a diverse AI workforce, and **formulating a national strategy for AI in health and social care**. The Centre for Data Ethics and Innovation has produced a roadmap to an effective AI assurance ecosystem that aligns with the national AI strategy and has also developed an AI assurance guide to complement the roadmap. The U.K. AI Safety Institute is actively engaged in these efforts.
U.S.A.	The United States has introduced legislation to regulate the government's use of AI and maintain its leadership in AI research. The Biden-Harris administration has revised the National AI Research and Development Strategic Plan to emphasize international cooperation. The Office of Science and Technology Policy and the National	The United States is involved in international efforts on AI governance. This involvement encompasses **adherence to the OECD's AI principles** and participation in the 2023 U.K. AI Summit, culminating in the **Bletchley Declaration**. Furthermore, the U.S. has formally **adopted UNESCO's**

Telecommunications and Information Administration have actively sought public feedback on AI implications and accountability measures. These include:

Executive orders: Ensuring American Leadership in AI, Promoting Trustworthy AI in the Federal Government, and Ensuring Safe and Secure AI Development and Use

The following legislation is currently in effect or draft form:

- AI Training Act
- National AI Initiative Act (Division E, Sec. 5001)
- AI in Government Act (Division U, Sec. 101)
- Algorithmic Accountability Act
- National AI Commission Act
- Digital Platform Commission Act
- Global Technology Leadership Act
- Transparent Automated Governance Act

Consider **nonbinding frameworks** such as the Blueprint for an AI Bill of Rights, the National Institute of Standards and Technology AI Risk Management Framework, and the Guidance for Regulation of AI Applications.

Government initiatives on AI include voluntary commitments from leading companies, a joint roadmap on trustworthy AI, efforts by Sen. Charles E. Schumer and the National Security Commission on AI, and a bipartisan legislative framework by U.S. Senators Richard Blumenthal and Josh Hawley.

Recommendation on the Ethics of AI and has **endorsed** the 11 **Hiroshima Process International Guiding Principles for Advanced AI** systems as part of the G7. Domestically, the U.S. has pursued an approach to AI governance characterized by gradual and deliberate progression, aiming to uphold civil and human rights during AI deployment and foster international collaboration that upholds democratic values. Additionally, the U.S. has been actively engaged in AI safety initiatives and participated in legislative hearings on AI regulation. Lastly, the U.S.-Singapore Dialogue on Critical and Emerging Technologies unveiled the Singapore Verify AI initiative, known as "crosswalk," which integrates IMDA's AI Verify with the U.S. NIST's AI Risk Management Framework.

Table 3

Issues and affected human rights[25]

Legal issue of AI	Human rights principles that might be affected (As per UDHR, ICCPR, ICERD, CEDAW, CRC, CRPD)	Fundamental rights that might be affected (as per COI)
Ethical Issues	Lack of algorithmic transparency, the right to privacy; freedom of expression and the free flow of information - UDHR: Article 12 (Right to privacy), Article 19 (Freedom of expression), ICCPR: Article 17 (Right to privacy), Article 19 (Freedom of expression)	Right to Freedom of Speech and Expression (Article 19), Right to Privacy (Article 21)
Legal Liability and Accountability	Legal personhood, subjecthood, moral agency, liability issues related to damage caused, lack of accountability for harms - UDHR: Article 3 (Right to life, liberty, and security), Article 8 (Right to an effective remedy)	Right to Life and Personal Liberty (Article 21), Right to Constitutional Remedies (Article 32)
Data Privacy and Security	Cybersecurity vulnerabilities, privacy, and data protection issues - UDHR: Article 12 (Right to privacy), ICCPR: Article 17 (Right to privacy)	Right to Privacy (Article 21)
Bias and Discrimination	Unfairness, bias, and discrimination - UDHR: Article 2 (Right to non-discrimination), ICCPR: Article 26 (Right to non-discrimination), ICERD: Articles 1-2 (Prohibition of racial discrimination), CEDAW: Articles 1-2 (Prohibition of gender discrimination), CRC: Article 2 (Right to non-discrimination)	Right to Equality (Articles 14-18), Right against Discrimination (Articles 15-16)
Regulatory Compliance	Lack of contestability, intellectual property issues - UDHR: Article 8 (Right to an effective remedy), Article 27 (Right to protection of intellectual property)	Right to Constitutional Remedies (Article 32), Right to Property (Article 300A)

[25]Originally Source from **Table 1: Issues and affected human rights**, Rodrigues, R. (2020). Legal and human rights issues of AI: Gaps, challenges, and vulnerabilities. Journal of Responsible Technology, 4, 100005

Impact on Employment	Adverse effects on workers- UDHR: Article 22 (Right to social security) & Article 23 (Right to work), ICCPR: Article 6 (Right to work), CRPD Article 27 (right to work on an equal basis with others)	Right to Work (Article 41), Right to Livelihood (Article 21)
Influence on Judicial Processes	Fair trial rights, due process, and access to justice- UDHR: Article 7 (Right to equality before the law), Article 8 (Right to an effective remedy), Article 10 (Right to a fair public hearing), Article 11 (Right to be presumed innocent), ICCPR: Article 14 (Right to a fair trial), Article 16 (Recognition as a person before the law)	Right to Equality (Articles 14-18), Right to Constitutional Remedies (Article 32), Right to a Fair Trial (Article 21)

Table 4

Mapping issues to vulnerabilities[26]

Legal issue of AI	Examples of a most vulnerable group	Factors that determine/facilitate vulnerability (examples)
Ethical Issues	Legal professionals, defendants, clients, and individuals affected by legal decisions.	Lack of algorithmic transparency: Opaque AI decision-making can lead to unjust outcomes, impacting individuals' rights. Insufficient regulation: Inadequate oversight can allow unethical practices to persist unchecked, compromising fairness and justice.
Legal Liability and Accountability	Patients, defendants, clients, and users of legal services.	Lack of clear legal frameworks: Ambiguity in assigning liability for AI errors can leave affected individuals without recourse for damages. Culture of non-accountability: Perceptions of impunity may discourage developers and users from taking responsibility for AI-related harms.

[26]Originally Source from **Table 2: Mapping issues to vulnerabilities**, Rodrigues, R. (2020). Legal and human rights issues of AI: Gaps, challenges, and vulnerabilities. Journal of Responsible Technology, 4, 100005

Data Privacy and Security	Individuals whose data is processed by AI systems, legal professionals, and clients.	Inadequate cybersecurity measures: Weaknesses in data protection can expose sensitive information, leading to privacy breaches and exploitation. Lack of user control and transparency: Insufficient disclosure and consent mechanisms can erode trust and undermine individuals' control over their data.
Bias and Discrimination	Minority groups, defendants, clients, and individuals are subject to legal decisions.	Lack of bias mitigation strategies: Failure to address biases in AI algorithms can perpetuate discrimination, exacerbating existing disparities in the legal system. Limited diversity in AI development: Homogeneous teams may overlook or reinforce biases, hindering efforts to create fair and inclusive technologies.
Regulatory Compliance	Legal professionals, policymakers, AI developers, and clients.	Displacement of traditional roles: Automation of routine tasks may reduce job opportunities and shift skill requirements, affecting employment prospects for individuals in the legal sector. Lack of retraining support: Inadequate resources for skill development can leave workers ill-equipped to adapt to changes in the legal landscape.
Impact on Employment	Legal professionals, support staff, administrative personnel, and job seekers.	Displacement of traditional roles: Automation of routine tasks may reduce job opportunities and shift skill requirements, affecting employment prospects for individuals in the legal sector. Lack of retraining support: Inadequate resources for skill development can leave workers ill-equipped to adapt to changes in the legal landscape.

Influence on Judicial Processes	Defendants, plaintiffs, judges, and legal professionals.	Lack of transparency in AI decision-making: Opacity in AI algorithms can compromise the integrity of judicial processes, raising concerns about due process and accountability. Insufficient safeguards for fairness: The absence of mechanisms to address biases and errors in AI systems may undermine trust in legal outcomes and erode public confidence in the judiciary.