THE IMPACT OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE IN THE LEGAL FIELD AND THE ETHICAL TRAJECTORY PROFESSIONAL ETHICS DEMANDS

Ryssa Lemos, Narsee Monjee Institute of Management Studies- School of Law (Deemed-to-be-University)

Arpita Jain, Narsee Monjee Institute of Management Studies- School of Law (Deemed-to-be-University)

ABSTRACT:

With Artificial Intelligence (AI) permeating into our lives by each passing day, it does not come as a surprise that even the legal sector is no more isolated from technology. As the legal sector becomes increasingly infused with technology, its practices lead us to essential questions concerning human judgment, empathy, and ethical standards. This research paper explores the impact of AI on legal representation, highlighting the indispensable need for human element in ensuring adequate representation and climbing the ethical trajectory. This research uses a comparative lens on the legal profession in three countries—the USA, the UK, and India—and places at its centre the conversation about the human element in legal representation and the rising trajectory of professional responsibility in an ethics horizon increasingly dominated by the shadow of AI. The study examines the permissible limits of AI usage in accordance with ethical standards, considering who or what determines these boundaries. The research findings reiterate the importance of combining technological advances with professional ethics, and call for an approach that combines human ability and artificial intelligence in legal practice. This research is a direction and addition to the ongoing ethical debate of using AI in law; helping steer us toward responsible innovation and contribution to good professional practice.

Keywords: Artificial Intelligence (AI), professional ethics, ethical trajectory, indispensable human element, generative AI, legal, framework, regulatory framework

Introduction:

Law and society are intertwined with each other acting as a reflection of the other and as the society develops the law moves hand in hand to gain pace with the ever-changing dynamics of the society. Given that technology advances more quickly than legal administration, which lack the appropriate processes to keep pace with technology, technologies like artificial intelligence (AI) often surpass it. The bar associations responsible for regulating the legal profession all over the world face an ethical dilemma to regulate the use of AI in the legal profession. The major reason for this concern is that AI in itself in unregulated and many aspects of AI are still unknown. Such has been the story of humankind with all the technologies that have emerged the past- the major one being the internet. Each emergence of technology has halted us and questioned us on ethical standards and the need to reform them with revolution of technology.

According to the ABA report[1] the Artificial intelligence has caused a wide-scale disruption as it not only encompasses legal technology but also legal transformation. The vast literature [2] review expands the understanding of potential advantages of employing artificial intelligence (AI) in legal decision making. One major benefit is the fact that the use of AI systems results in decreasing time to take a decision. AI technologies can fasten decision-making since they can simplify procedural tasks and assist in legal research which may be beneficial for the legal profession. AI algorithms make it possible to enhance the resolution of legal questions because of the capacity of the algorithms in handling voluminous legal data encompassing legislation, case-law, among other legal features.

The profession of a lawyer is data driven and most crucially, lawyers have a duty towards their client therefore human judgement and expertise will always be needed to make conclusions and deploy legal knowledge. Instead of just concentrating on what is right, we should acknowledge the capacity that humans have for thought both logical intelligence as well as emotional intelligence and consideration of other points of view. Then and only then will we be able to program AI in a way that is genuinely humane and respectful of the integrity and safety of data.

---

[1] Journal, A. (2016, April 1). How artificial intelligence is transforming the legal profession. ABA Journal. https://www.abajournal.com/magazine/article/how_artificial_intelligence_is_transforming_the_legal_profession #google_vignette.

[2] Madaoui, N. (2024). The impact of artificial intelligence on legal systems: challenges and opportunities. Problems of Legality, 1(164), 285-303. https://doi.org/10.21564/2414-990x.164.289266.

AI is at a stage of development and still in its premature condition, but, the undisputed fact remains it is only going to increase in its capability and uses. If it has so much impact in its premature stage, it is unimaginable to wrap our minds over the implication it will have in the future in every aspect of our lives. This research paper focuses on how AI affects legal representation, emphasising how important human interaction is to obtaining sufficient representation and moving up the ethical ladder.

Research Methodology:

The work was shaped by foreign legislation pertaining to the regulatory framework of artificial intelligence. The research methodology follows a doctrinal analysis involving analysing sources like journals, bar associations reports and notifications.

Research Objectives:

1. To analyse the need of indispensable human element as that is the foremost requirement of providing adequate client representation and to determine the extent of human intervention required in provision of legal services while identifying areas of convergence and divergence in the tensions between:

a. Technical Expertise and Human judgement when both contradict and conflict each other

b. Efficiency and empathy

2. To examine the authorities and mechanisms regulating the utilization of AI in the legal field in compliance with ethical rules and standards and to define the main actors and decisions regarding this issue.

3. To conduct a comparative analysis of the legal frameworks and regulatory approaches adopted in the United States, United Kingdom, and India, with respect to the integration of AI in legal practice.

Research Questions:

1. What is the attitude and perception of the legal practitioners of the influence of AI technology?

2. What or who will determine the permissible limit within which AI can be used in accordance with ethical standards?

3. To what extent does AI affect the decision-making process and moral responsibility of legal practitioners?

Research Analysis:

1. **The element of Human Representation:**

The foremost duty of a lawyer is to provide adequate representation to its client which "requires the legal knowledge, skill, thoroughness and preparation reasonably necessary for the representation."[3] According to the Advocates Act, 1961 a lawyer needs to have a degree from a college recognised by the Bar Council of India stressing the importance of having legal education as a pre-requite to practicing law. All the legal issues that are raised in a case have to be handled with utmost care and due-diligence by them. The profession of law requires an ongoing study to stay updated on the developments in the legal field -new statutes, recent case laws including the advantages and disadvantages of emerging legal technology and adhere to professional development in order to maintain the necessary knowledge and skills.

When a lawyer utilises an artificial intelligence (AI) system in the practice of law, as well as when significant legal concerns pertaining to AI systems are involved, AI calls into question the obligation to determine technical proficiency. A thorough grasp of the distinctive characteristics of AI systems is necessary for lawyers to effectively advocate on behalf of their clients on a wide range of substantive legal problems, including those pertaining to patent and trademark liability, privacy, cybersecurity, and contractual rights. Additionally, artificial intelligence (AI) solutions are being launched for a wide range of legal operations, such as billing, time management, electronic discovery, legal study, drafting legal documents, due diligence, contract review and, and patent and trademark applications. Understanding the positive and negative aspects of the AI that powers the program or application is necessary for each of these AI-empowered legal procedures.

---

[3] ABA, Model Rules of Professional Responsibility, Rule 1.1 Competence – Comment 8, available at https://www.americanbar.org/groups/professional_responsibility/publications/model_rules_of_professional_con duct/rule_1_1_competence/comment_on_rule_1_1/.

Most lawyers around the world don't have the technical know-how to comprehend these AI systems at this time because lawyers per se are not trained in these aspects. These kinds of arrangements are swiftly proliferating in both the subject matter and procedure of law. Therefore, more training is desperately needed in order to enable the majority of lawyers to utilise and comprehend AI in their profession.

A well-known instance of this kind of situation happened recently in New York, when a lawyer used ChatGPT to find relevant case law. The lawyer even provided the complete text of purported rulings that the generative AI had referenced, but the opponent's lawyer was unable to locate that particular case. As such generative AI methods are known to carry some inherent danger, it came out that ChatGPT had "imagined" and created references and the entire judgement. Although deploying artificial intelligence by a lawyer is not "inherently improper," the judge in the case sanctioned the lawyer, saying that "existing rules impose an oversight duty on lawyers to guarantee the veracity of what they bring to the Court." This is specifically important in an adversarial system of law where the lawyers guide the judges to come to ratio decidendi.

Due to this, a qualified lawyer must confirm the accuracy of any information and references generated by a generative AI application like ChatGPT. However, the obligation of competence goes beyond just identifying and removing artificial intelligence-generated misleading results. Since AI systems are 'speculative' meaning they don't really comprehend the substance of the language they produce, lawyers ought to verify the logic of the text created by these systems. As a result, these systems can overlook crucial arguments or counterarguments or misinterpret the ideas they discuss in their writing. Even though AI systems are always evolving, for the foreseeable future, professional comprehension, review, verification, and rectification of generative AI material will be necessary which only strengthens our point of emphasis -the indispensable human judgement.

When AI is utilised to substitute human judgement, it becomes hazardous. For a variety of reasons, AI is not prepared for this. One possibility is that there is bias in the data used for training, which the final machine-learning models will amplify and further establish. Another issue with employing AI in due process is that it is neither transparent nor comprehensible. We cannot understand the mental faculties of a deep learning artificial network. AI reflects some of humanity's basic shortcomings back to us. More significantly, though, it could be morally

unacceptable to let algorithms make choices that determine people's rights. This mistrust may be particularly unwarranted when it comes to AI because its algorithms may not be as 'intellectual' as it first appears to be.

The profession of a lawyer is data driven and most crucially, lawyers have a duty towards their client therefore human judgement and expertise will always be needed to make conclusions and deploy legal knowledge. Instead of just concentrating on technical proficiency, we should acknowledge the capacity that humans have for thought both logical intelligence as well as emotional intelligence and consideration of other points of view. Then and only then will we be able to program AI in a way that is genuinely ethical and respectful of the integrity and safety of data.

Another aspect that questions the ethical trajectory of Artificial intelligence is the obligation to communicate and discuss with the client the maters that are ultimately going to affect his rights. This legal obligation highlights the question of whether a lawyer representing a client using AI must consult with them and obtain their authorisation before using AI. If authorisation is necessary, how much information is needed about the kind of AI system being used—or even the vendor—and how it will be specifically applied to the client's case?

Certain AI applications—like those for reviewing documents, drafting of contracts, or due diligence—may have an impact on the conclusion of the case or on the cost of rendering legal advice. Other uses of AI could be orientated towards internal operations in legal firms, including billing AI-based software or keeping track of time, or used for case management. As such, it could be challenging to say with certainty whether using AI systems calls for client notification and approval. When using AI systems, lawyers/attorneys may need to provide client-specific data for instruction or applicability purposes, which adds another layer of complexity of data breach. Client permission would appear to be necessary for such a usage of customer data. However, determining this ethics question would need the collaboration of bar associations to determine the rules of conduct when using AI.

2. The tension between technical expertise and human judgement:

The use of AI in the legal profession may guide you towards a technical expertise but it is not competent to replace human judgement. For instance, as much as knowledge in law is vital for operating within the legal systems, it is insufficient to support the client in his or her emotional

and psychological aspects (Westaby & Jones, 2017)[4]. This might cause a gap between the lawyers and the clients and as such hinder the quality of services being rendered. In addition, perspective-taking which is a part of the cognitive empathy is essential to grasp the clients' contexts, and reasons for their actions (Decety & Yoder, 2015)[5]. However, when rationality dominates, persons are at risk of being turned into cases rather than appreciated for the stories of their lives and feelings that they also have. In some instances, AI may provide you with the correct technical expertise but it can never take into account the cognitive ability thereby raising human judgement to a higher pedestal.

3. The tension between efficiency and empathy:

It is not the intention of technology to replace the lawyers but to make their job easier and faster. It is therefore important to note that the element of empathy is essential in the practice of law. For this reason, the two authors assert that empathy should be adopted as a core component of professionalism within the legal framework. Another area of concern with regard to the supply of legal service provision is work intensity where relationships between efficiency and empathy arise. In a culture that associates time with money, the focus is often made more on the fast delivery of services rather on the personalized approach towards clients. With such concentration, there is a likelihood of developing a technical outlook on the legal practice with little concern on the feelings that come with client interaction (Westaby & Jones, 2017)[6]. The literature shows that empathy has benefits towards the improvement of client satisfaction and trust, ensuring better results (Wood et al., 2014)[7].

For example, one of the functions of intelligence is compassion which helps to develop a rapport with clients and understand their situation better that can help in coming up with more efficient and client appropriate legal approaches (Wood et al., 2014)[8]. On the other hand, the lack of empathy may lead to the clients as a whole not feeling valued and may also not understand the legal process hence a negative influence might be achieved. Therefore, one can

---

[4] Westaby, C. and Jones, E. (2017). Empathy: an essential element of legal practice or 'never the twain shall meet'?. International Journal of the Legal Profession, 25(1), 107-124. https://doi.org/10.1080/09695958.2017.1359615.
[5] Decety, J. and Yoder, K. (2015). Empathy and motivation for justice: cognitive empathy and concern, but not emotional empathy, predict sensitivity to injustice for others. Social Neuroscience, 11(1), 1-14. https://doi.org/10.1080/17470919.2015.1029593.
[6] See supra note 4.
[7] Wood, J., James, M., & Ciardha, C. (2014). 'i know how they must feel': empathy and judging defendants. The European Journal of Psychology Applied to Legal Context, 6(1), 37-43. https://doi.org/10.5093/ejpalc2014a5.
[8] See supra note 7.

conclude that while efficiency is an important part of the practice of law, it should not be realised to the detriment of personalised client relations.

The impartial reasoner or 'thinking machine' has without doubt upturned the world of the lawyer and law. Nevertheless, there exist those actions while performing which human lawyers continue to do better than AI and for which the latter cannot be easily programmed.

The complexities of legal practice frequently call for empathy, contextual awareness, and interpretation. This emphasises how important it is to have human lawyers' extensive knowledge, practical experience, and innovative problem-solving abilities. Cultivating a rational, analytical, and innovative attitude to problem-solving and solution-finding is an essential component of thinking like a lawyer, which extends beyond just legal knowledge. Human lawyers are able to identify important components, draw conclusions, and use these to create arguments, decisions, and intuitions that are convincing.

AI systems on the other hand are capable of quickly and accurately evaluating documents. They do not, however, possess the independence of thought required to reach wise conclusions and decisions.

4. Who or What will determine the permissible limits of usage of AI?

This new relationship between the lawyer and the machine has given rise to a new analytical dimension about the boundaries of what is acceptable and what is not. Lawyers now have to decide if, when, and how much to employ AI in providing legal services to their clients. The degrees to which AI is allowable for practice within the legal profession are markedly defined by the legal regulations of a specific country, the professional code of conduct, and the flexibility of the use of AI. As AI becomes incorporated into legal processes, important concerns arise on who is to blame when things go wrong, and how transparent and ethical the use of AI is.

Legal frameworks, ethical codes as well as the dynamics of AI contribute to defining the acceptable degree of integration of AI into the legal practice. The application of AI in legal systems also poses some contentious issues such as who has the responsibility, how transparent is the system and whether its use is ethical? Additionally, it can be as well viewed that AI has a very important impact on the development of the concept of legal education and practice. AI

technologies are poised to substitute legal activities, improve research and information searches, and provide justice to people. Such a shift requires new competencies among lawyers since the work landscape of legal activities is in the process of changing due to the use of artificial intelligence, as elaborated by Roy, 2023[9] and Masithoh, 2023[10]. But, the integration of AI also has issues on social impacts, meaning, the displacement of human legal practitioners and the issue regarding legal responsibility on the use of AI (Savira, 2023)[11].

According to Khisamova and Gaifutdinov 2019[12], The permissible level of AI integration into legal practice is defined in part by legal frameworks, ethical rules, and AI dynamics. Differentiating the legal responsibilities of artificial intelligence creators and users should form the cornerstone of any legislation governing artificial intelligence.
The adoption of ethical and moral codes shared by all artificial intelligence creators and users should be a distinct field of legal regulation.

We observe that while discussing prescriptive legal regulation in the area of AI, it is important to comprehend how the existing legal framework considers the likelihood that such systems may exist and how it may be used to structure interactions under the circumstances of their application.

Artificial intelligence poses new legal difficulties to a number of fields, ranging from criminal law to intellectual property law and all that comes in between. The best current method is to establish a specific legal regulating mechanism that clearly delineates the responsibilities of those who build and utilise artificial intelligence systems, as well as those who utilise the technology itself. The establishment of standard ethical guidelines for all users and producers of artificial intelligence systems ought to be a distinct field. In this regard, the strategy used inside the Asilomar principles' framework is the most ideal. It is our belief that these Principles

---

[9] Xudaybergenov, A. (2023). Toward legal recognition of artificial intelligence proposals for limited subject of law status. Irshad J. Law and Policy, 1(4). https://doi.org/10.59022/ijlp.55.
[10] Roy, R. (2023). Artificial intelligence: involves new skills in advocacy. International Journal of Research Publication and Reviews, 4(9), 1787-1794. https://doi.org/10.55248/gengpi.4.923.92452.
[11] Savira, J. (2023). Polemic of artificial intelligence (ai) technology on the development of human resources, especially in legal practitioners. Edunity Kajian Ilmu Sosial Dan Pendidikan, 2(10), 1089-1095. https://doi.org/10.57096/edunity.v2i10.162.
[12] Khisamova, Z., & Gaifutdinov, R. (2019). On Methods to Legal Regulation of Artificial Intelligence in the World. *International Journal of Innovative Technology and Exploring Engineering*, *9*(1), 5159–5162. https://doi.org/10.35940/ijitee.a9220.119119.

have the potential to serve as the foundation for transnational legal regulatory systems concerning the creation and execution of AI.

The Asilomar principles' framework deals with 13 values of ethics which are[13] "safety, failure, transparency, judicial transparency, responsibility, value alignment, human values, personal privacy, liberty and privacy, shared benefit, shared prosperity, human control, non-subversion, AI-arms race." The same principles can guide the regulators of legal profession to develop a framework that allows for permissible use and impermissible use of AI.

5. The comparative analysis of USA, UK, India

Although artificial intelligence has been around for many years, some legal practitioners are apprehensive about whether they may use AI-powered technologies in their legal field in an ethical manner given the state of the technology's recent developments. We look at this through a comparative analysis of USA, UK, India.

Legal frameworks and regulatory approaches adopted in the United States with respect to the integration of AI in legal practice:

While still in its infancy, generative artificial intelligence regulation is quite active in the majority of US states. Several US states are starting to establish committees and councils to investigate AI. The privacy rights of persons, particularly those related to safeguarding clients and the ability to opt out of AI systems, have received a lot of attention in the context of AI.

In the United States currently, the laws regarding AI within the legal practice are anchored on the American Bar Associations and the State Bar Associations that provide ethical guidelines and regulation. According to the ABA Model Rules of Professional Conduct, it is required from a lawyer to be competent in the use of technology tools, including AI, which is essential to represent the client in a proper way (Rogers & Bell, 2019)[14]. The problem of AI utilization is critical because the use of these technologies involves questions of transparency,

---

[13] Gillis, A. S. (2023, March 22). *Asilomar AI Principles*. WhatIs.
https://www.techtarget.com/whatis/definition/Asilomar-AI-Principles.
[14] Rogers, J. and Bell, F. (2019). The ethical ai lawyer: what is required of lawyers when they use automated systems?. Law, Technology and Humans, 80-99. https://doi.org/10.5204/lthj.v1i0.1324.

responsibility, and possible prejudice as a lawyer (Khan et al., 2022)[15]. Also, the application of AI in legal processes presents questions about the confidentiality and the duty of loyalty towards the clients, to call for the evaluation of the used tools (Rogers & Bell, 2019; Khan et al., 2022)[16].

The State Bar of California adopted rules on November 16, 2023, to assist attorneys in balancing the professional use of generative AI with their ethical responsibilities. 'Practical Guidance for the Use of Generative Artificial Intelligence in the Practice of Law,' a California guidance, assesses generative AI use in relation to the state bar's 'Rules of Professional Conduct.'

The Florida Bar published its own guidelines, titled "Professional Ethics of the Florida Bar, Proposed Advisory Opinion 24-1" on January 19, 2024. The Florida advice acknowledges many state and local ethical rulings that are relevant to AI as instructional.

The State Bar of Michigan published their "Ethics Opinion JI-155" on October 27, 2023, advising judges to strike an equilibrium between their obligations to be competent to comprehend and use technology (including AI) appropriately and to set boundaries to guarantee that it is utilised within the bounds of the law and the duty owed to the court. Recently, the "Preliminary Guidelines on the Use of Artificial Intelligence by New Jersey Lawyers" were released by New Jersey on January 24, 2024.

These state bars allow legal practitioners to employ generative AI in the domain of law, but they also give comparable guidelines on the duties of adequate representation and privacy and advise attorneys to exercise great caution while using this technology. The use of artificial intelligence does not relax the professional duties a lawyer has in fact in the use of AI it emphasizes the obligation of those duties.

The regulations enacted by different state bars provide a supportive acceptance about applying generative AI to the legal domain while assuring professional obligations. Considering how similar state laws are generally, this is both anticipated and comforting. It is quite likely that as this innovative technology advances, so too will the manner in which lawyers need to consider

---

[15] Khan, A., Akbar, M. A., Fahmideh, M., Peng, L., Waseem, M., Ahmad, A., … & Abrahamsson, P. (2022). Ai ethics: software practitioners and lawmakers points of view.. https://doi.org/10.48550/arxiv.2207.01493.
[16] See supra note 14, see supra note 15

it in light of their own duties. Naturally, some concerns over the parameters of laws prohibiting the unlicensed practice of law will also surface. For the time being, self-service generative AI chatbots are conceivable, but they carry the risk of dispensing "legal advice" devoid of oversight and the intervening judgement of a certified lawyer. That again leads us to our first objective about having an indispensable human element while considering formulating a legal advice. Eventually, the lawyer retains complete accountability for the provision of legal services and for offering knowledgeable legal advice, independent of the application of generative AI.

Legal frameworks and regulatory approaches adopted in the United Kingdom with respect to the integration of AI in legal practice

Five fundamental principles serve as the foundation for the cross-sectoral, outcome-oriented approach that the UK government has established to regulate AI. These are contestability and redress; justice; integrity and governance; safety, security, and durability; and adequate transparency and accountability. Regulators will use current legislation and issue additional regulatory guidelines to implement the framework in their respective sectors and domains. The same is applicable for the domain of law and the Law Society of England and Wales and the Bar Council as well as the International Bar Associations have collaborated to provide guidelines for the same. There is the Solicitors Regulation Authority (SRA) which has issued guidelines on legal technology including AI. SRA points out that solicitors must make sure that any technology does not interfere with their roles and responsibilities especially from the aspect of preserving confidentiality of their clients and protection of their data (Bhavani & Thuraisingam, 2022)[17]. The UK legal framework also requires solicitors to continue to understand the capabilities and potential of AI technologies, thus coinciding with the general principle of continuing professional development (Bhavani & Thuraisingam, 2022)[18]. Ethical issues that have been discovered in the UK are similar to these found in the US regarding immediate rights that concern transparency and elimination of conflict of interest relating to utilization of AI tools (Rogers & Bell, 2019; Bhavani & Thuraisingam, 2022)[19].

---

[17] Bhavani, J. R. and Thuraisingam, A. S. (2022). Artificial intelligence and its impact on the legal fraternity. UUM Journal of Legal Studies, 13. https://doi.org/10.32890/uumjls2022.13.2.6.

[18] See supra note 17.

[19] Rogers, J. and Bell, F. (2019). The ethical ai lawyer: what is required of lawyers when they use automated systems?. Law, Technology and Humans, 80-99. https://doi.org/10.5204/lthj.v1i0.1324. ,see supra note 17

Additional to the framework and the actions of specific authorities, makers of highly competent AI models and systems will be required to adhere to optional safety, accountability, and transparency standards. Although the Government does not now plan to codify the framework into law, it anticipates the necessity for focused legislative actions down the road. These measures will fill in the gaps in the existing regulatory framework, especially with regard to the main participants and the hazards associated with complicated General AI-systems

The UK follows cross-sectoral framework that is non-statutory and founded on decided principles. Its goal is to adapt the current "technology-neutral" regulatory framework to AI in a way that strikes an appropriate equilibrium between security and development. The United Kingdom acknowledges that, in the end, legislation will be required, especially in relation to General AI systems. It does, however, believe that it would be early to do so at this time and that more knowledge is needed on the regulatory discrepancies, dangers, and issues related to AI as well as the best ways to solve them.

This strategy is in contrast to other countries like the USA that are implementing more stringent legal measures to some extent. This shows that variance in global AI regulation approaches is more likely despite commitments for international collaboration.

Legal frameworks and regulatory approaches adopted in India with respect to the integration of AI in legal practice:

AI has the power to alter how Indian lawyers practice law and how the public perceives it. Since technology promotes efficiency, impartiality, and transparency, it is significant for governance. The legal fraternity might benefit from artificial intelligence if it makes it easier to review or cross-check their work, procedures, and decisions. The apex court's recent decision to use artificial intelligence (AI) to live transcribe hearings of a court is a significant step towards transforming India's judicial system.

There are currently no laws or regulations in India that specifically address AI regulation. The executive agency for AI-related initiatives is the Ministry of Electronics and Information Technology (MEITY), which established committees to develop an AI policy framework.

Seven responsible AI principles—privacy and security, equality, exclusion of bias, responsibility, transparency, and the preservation and upholding of human values—have been

established by the NITI Ayog. It is the constitutional duty of the Supreme Court and lower courts to uphold basic rights, such as the right to privacy. The Information Technology Act of 2000 and Digital Personal Data Protection Act of 2023 and its implementing regulations are India's main pieces of law pertaining to data protection.

The Bar Council of India has not developed broad and detailed rules what concerns AI but some essential general rules of professional conduct state the requirement of integrity and competence of legal practices (NURATA, 2022)[20]. Indian lawyers are permitted to incorporate AI technologies cautiously into their practice for the legal profession with the permission of the Bar Council but the use of such technologies must be such that they are in compliance with the ethical policies and norms present in the legal profession. AI integration in India also present some sui generis issues like the absence of a sound data protection laws to protect the information of the clients used in the delivery of services as the operation goes digital (NURATA, 2022)[21].

In all the three jurisdictions, the professional conduct rules for lawyers engaged in using AI are underlined by the question of ethics, the requirements for disclosure, responsibility and last but not least, protection of the client.

There will always remain an intrinsic need for formulation of certain rules that guide the application of artificial intelligence when practicing law with an aim of maintaining the ethical standards as well as promoting advanced techniques on the legal profession. (Haidar, 2023)

Research Findings:

 AI has proved that it can improve productivity in legal matters since it is capable of managing extensive documents and data besides strengthening legal research and expediting decisions. However, the insights and 'thinking' provided by AI cannot come close to the subjective human rationing that is still so critical in today's legal professions. Understanding one's client, compliance with legal ethics, legal reasoning all depend on an individual's capacity for context-taking. Unfortunately, cognitive empathy through which a professional can put himself or herself into another's shoes is missing in AI, and this is especially important in order to develop

---

[20] NURATA, Z. C. (2022). The concept of professional ethics and debates on professional ethics in the legal profession: the case of ankara. Siyasal: Journal of Political Sciences, 31(1), 173-193. https://doi.org/10.26650/siyasal.2022.31.1019443.
[21] See supra note 20

friendly relationships with the client, gain their trust and be able to devise a strategy suitable for a specific client.

As the research has clearly pointed out once again, one should not lose empathy just for the sake of effectiveness. While AI can get instrumental and execute technicalities, human lawyers have an upper hand at tackling the individual and psychological aspects of the role. Empathy improves satisfaction of the legal services provided, help build trust and lead to better legal solutions.

One of the biggest problems that arise is determining the extent to which AI can be used in legal practice. Based on the results, there is a necessity for the regulatory bodies to state and clearly defining what is acceptable or allowable usage of AI in the legal field so that AI remained a supportive tool for human legal knowledge. Due to the fact that many of these principles are still experimental, such key principles as safety, transparency, and accountability predefined at the Asilomar conference, can be proposed as the basis for evolution of these regulations.

The resolution of permissible and impermissible limits of Artificial Intelligence (AI) and appropriate ethical standards concerning the involvement of AI in the legal practice may be drawn from different aspects, including the legal perspective, guidelines for self-regulation of the professions that employ AI, and the interdisciplinary approaches. With AI constantly emerging, it will be crucial for the AI developers, government, legal practitioners, and ethicists to continue discussing about the legal and moral implications of the technology's advancement to make use of the AI systems properly in the legal field.

Comparing the US, UK, and India, it is possible to conclude that commitment to professionalism and competence is mutual, yet the difference in regulatory development and methodology between the countries together with lack of specific rules regulating AI technologies can be observed.

Suggestions:

1. International Co-operation

Legal professional organizations, both national and international bar association and legal

regulatory authorities and governments have to collaborate to emerge with specific guidelines regarding the AI use in law practice that can ban certain utilizations as well as allow only certain acceptable uses. Such regulations should focus on issues like; The need for transparency, accountability and issues to do with the privacy of the clients. The collaboration between countries in the establishment of ethical practices can benefit from the use of structures such as the Asilomar AI Principles for the creation of an international benchmark for the handling of the same.

2. Training

There is a need for legal professionals to receive training regarding AI technologies so that they are in a position to understand what they are capable of and their strengths, weaknesses and the available legal and ethical issues associated with such technologies. There are continuing education programs that should be further modified in order to include training on AI.

3. Co-operative development of framework

There is a need for practicing lawyers, artificial intelligence specialists, and ethicists to formulate rules that govern the legal use of artificial intelligence. This partnership may guarantee that AI systems are developed while comprehending the legal profession's particular ethical imperative.

4. Transparency and Consent of Client

AI tools in legal representation should not be used until the clients give their informed consent to do so, to the lawyers. The clients should to be informed in how their case will use AI, the benefits and risks associated with it and the precautions which will be taken in order to secure their privacy and the information that they provide. This way we will be able to ensure that clients trust is not lost in the use of AI and to respect their rights as they expecting from us.

5. Maintaining an equilibrium between efficiency and empathy:

While AI takes charge over routine work and the time-consuming concerns that come with it, then lawyers must make sure to avoid depersonalization of the work that they deliver to their clients. It is essential to consider that understanding the needs and feelings of the clients is

instrumental to successful legal help. The AI tool will help guide legal professional which is good, but it cannot be helpful to develop a strong trust with clients.

6. Supervision:

Legal practices that have incorporated AI should have proper supervision and proper confirmation of its results. Any results generated by an AI system should be checked out by a lawyer pertaining to accuracy, relevancy, and compliance to legal and ethical standards with regards to referral sources, contracts, wills, trusts and other documents that may fall under legal jurisdiction. This will eliminate mistake as seen in New York case where the lawyer was given penalties due to artificial intelligence generated fake case law.

Thus, the integration of these suggestions will enable the legal field to reap the advantages that AI offers while protecting the concepts of justice, ethics, and human dignity. Such a symmetrical transformation is well going to help the AI to contribute to the advancement of the legal profession in a manner which is beneficial to the cardinal principles of the profession.

Conclusion:

The integration of Artificial Intelligence (AI) into the legal field presents a conundrum of potential: On the one hand, AI allows for productivity, automation and data management while, on the other hand, it poses questions to the fundamental concept of practicing law – the part of decision-making based on reason, values and compassion. The findings show that AI can help to advance the practice of law and fill the gaps but it cannot replace human lawyers that are crucial for the effective representation of the client. The concept of AI is still unable to comprehend contexts, emotions, and ethical aspects of a situation, and therefore the human factor remains unavoidable. As legal practitioners operate under this environment, they have to incorporate usage of AI complement the practice rather than replacing expertise. Law everywhere must come together to develop proper guidelines that govern the employment of AI as to maintain the best practice standards alongside innovation while upholding the lawyer's responsibility to the clients, society, and justice system.

References:

1. Journal, A. (2016, April 1). *How artificial intelligence is transforming the legal profession*. ABA Journal.

   https://www.abajournal.com/magazine/article/how_artificial_intelligence_is_transfor ming_the_legal_profession#google_vignette.

2. Madaoui, N. (2024). The impact of artificial intelligence on legal systems: challenges and opportunities. Problems of Legality, 1(164), 285-303. https://doi.org/10.21564/2414-990x.164.289266.

3. ABA, Model Rules of Professional Responsibility, Rule 1.1 Competence – Comment 8, available at https://www.americanbar.org/groups/professional_responsibility/publications/model_r ules_of_professional_conduct/rule_1_1_competence/comment_on_rule_1_1/.

4. Westaby, C. and Jones, E. (2017). Empathy: an essential element of legal practice or 'never the twain shall meet'?. International Journal of the Legal Profession, 25(1), 107-124. https://doi.org/10.1080/09695958.2017.1359615.

5. Decety, J. and Yoder, K. (2015). Empathy and motivation for justice: cognitive empathy and concern, but not emotional empathy, predict sensitivity to injustice for others. Social Neuroscience, 11(1), 1-14. https://doi.org/10.1080/17470919.2015.1029593.

6. Wood, J., James, M., & Ciardha, C. (2014). 'i know how they must feel': empathy and judging defendants. The European Journal of Psychology Applied to Legal Context, 6(1), 37-43. https://doi.org/10.5093/ejpalc2014a5.

7. Xudaybergenov, A. (2023). Toward legal recognition of artificial intelligence proposals for limited subject of law status. Irshad J. Law and Policy, 1(4). https://doi.org/10.59022/ijlp.55.

8. Roy, R. (2023). Artificial intelligence: involves new skills in advocacy. International Journal of Research Publication and Reviews, 4(9), 1787-1794. https://doi.org/10.55248/gengpi.4.923.92452.

9. Savira, J. (2023). Polemic of artificial intelligence (ai) technology on the development of human resources, especially in legal practitioners. Edunity Kajian Ilmu Sosial Dan Pendidikan, 2(10), 1089-1095. https://doi.org/10.57096/edunity.v2i10.162.

10. Khisamova, Z., & Gaifutdinov, R. (2019). On Methods to Legal Regulation of Artificial Intelligence in the World. *International Journal of Innovative Technology and*

Exploring Engineering, *9*(1), 5159–5162. https://doi.org/10.35940/ijitee.a9220.119119.

11. Gillis, A. S. (2023, March 22). *Asilomar AI Principles*. WhatIs. https://www.techtarget.com/whatis/definition/Asilomar-AI-Principles.

12. Rogers, J. and Bell, F. (2019). The ethical ai lawyer: what is required of lawyers when they use automated systems?. Law, Technology and Humans, 80-99. https://doi.org/10.5204/lthj.v1i0.1324.

13. Khan, A., Akbar, M. A., Fahmideh, M., Peng, L., Waseem, M., Ahmad, A., … & Abrahamsson, P. (2022). Ai ethics: software practitioners and lawmakers points of view.. https://doi.org/10.48550/arxiv.2207.01493.

14. Bhavani, J. R. and Thuraisingam, A. S. (2022). Artificial intelligence and its impact on the legal fraternity. UUM Journal of Legal Studies, 13. https://doi.org/10.32890/uumjls2022.13.2.6.

15. Rogers, J. and Bell, F. (2019). The ethical ai lawyer: what is required of lawyers when they use automated systems?. Law, Technology and Humans, 80-99. https://doi.org/10.5204/lthj.v1i0.1324.

16. NURATA, Z. C. (2022). The concept of professional ethics and debates on professional ethics in the legal profession: the case of ankara. Siyasal: Journal of Political Sciences, 31(1), 173-193. https://doi.org/10.26650/siyasal.2022.31.1019443.

17. Xudaybergenov, A. (2023). Toward Legal Recognition of Artificial Intelligence Proposals for Limited Subject of law Status. International Journal of Law and Policy, 1(4). https://doi.org/10.59022/ijlp.55.