HARNESSING ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE FOR JUDICIAL EFFICIENCY: OPPORTUNITIES, ETHICAL CHALLENGES, AND FUTURE IMPLICATIONS WITH A FOCUS ON THE INDIAN JUDICIARY IN A GLOBAL CONTEXT

Dr. Chandra Kishore Yadav

ABSTRACT

The rapid advancement of artificial intelligence (AI) is significantly transforming the justice system, fundamentally changing how information is processed and how the system engages with the public. In regions such as Europe, the Americas, and the Asia-Pacific, courts are actively adopting AI technologies to improve case management, streamline legal document processing, anonymize judicial decisions, facilitate the translation of rulings, transcribe court proceedings, and support judges and court staff in conducting research. The benefits are evident: accelerated processing times, reduced administrative workloads, and enhanced access to justice. However, the integration of AI in judicial contexts also raises critical concerns regarding bias, due process, legitimacy, and accountability, particularly when algorithmic systems influence decisions affecting individual rights or freedoms. This article presents a thorough, practice-oriented examination of these opportunities and challenges, drawing on the experiences and objectives of India's judiciary within the ongoing e-Courts Phase III initiative (2023–2027). It is contextualized within international governance frameworks, including the UNESCO Guidelines for AI in Courts and Tribunals, the Council of Europe's CEPEJ European Ethical Charter, and the European Union AI Act. The article concludes by proposing a detailed, risk-tiered strategy for the implementation of trustworthy AI over the next five years, specifically designed for large, multilingual justice systems, and incorporates comparative insights from systems in Europe and the Americas.

Keywords: Artificial intelligence; judicial efficiency; Indian judiciary; e-Courts Phase III; COMPAS; UNESCO Guidelines; EU AI Act; CEPEJ; access to justice; algorithmic governance.

1. INTRODUCTION

The integration of artificial intelligence (AI) into judicial systems is becoming increasingly crucial as courts worldwide grapple with persistent challenges, including rising caseloads, limited resources, and growing public demands for timely, transparent, and fair resolutions. In response, governments and court services are progressively adopting AI technologies to streamline internal processes—such as classification, summarization, and anonymization—enhance service delivery through chatbots, digital notifications, and plain-language explainers, and improve performance monitoring with dashboards and trend analysis. The Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) highlights this trend, documenting AI implementations in countries like Argentina, Brazil, Colombia, France, Greece, Slovenia, and Spain, where AI tools aid in case routing, ruling summarization, and record management, while also cautioning about issues related to data quality, skill shortages, opacity, and the critical need for robust governance[2]. In Europe, the Council of Europe's Commission for the Efficiency of Justice (CEPEJ) has identified over a hundred cyberjustice and AI tools, noting a rise in natural language and generative capabilities and emphasizing that current systems should remain under human supervision; no fully autonomous AI systems are deemed appropriate for court use[3]. UNESCO's 2025 Guidelines for the Use of AI Systems in Courts and Tribunals set forth fifteen operational principles emphasizing transparency, auditability, security, explainability, and human-in-the-loop control, reflecting a global consensus that AI can assist but should not replace judicial decision-making[1].

India's judiciary presents a particularly compelling case. With tens of millions of pending cases, significant linguistic diversity, and uneven infrastructure across districts, India has adopted a cautious approach: employing AI mainly for transcription, translation, e-filing scrutiny, and research assistance, while ensuring that adjudication remains a human task. The Government of India's Press Information Bureau (PIB) reinforced this perspective in February 2026, describing technology as 'an enabler of justice, not a substitute for judgment,' as part of e-Courts Phase III (2023–2027) [5]. Independent legal analyses further underscore why India's scale and multilingualism make AI-assisted tools particularly effective in broadening access to justice[7].

This article is structured as follows: Section 2 explores the global landscape of AI applications in courts. Section 3 delves into India's specific strategy and tools. Section 4 examines ethical and legal risks. Section 5 reviews global governance frameworks. Section 6 presents

comparative case studies. Section 7 proposes a risk-tiered adoption framework. Section 8 outlines technical and organizational safeguards. Section 9 addresses AI-generated evidence and deepfakes. Section 10 presents forward-looking scenarios for 2026–2030. Section 11 proposes a twelve-step action plan. Section 12 concludes.

2. WHAT COURTS ARE ACTUALLY DOING WITH AI TODAY

2.1 Administrative Automation and Workflow Acceleration

Globally, courts have initially directed their AI initiatives towards administrative and back-office operations, where the potential for efficiency improvements is substantial, and the associated risks are relatively low[2]. Early and impactful applications include document classification, summarization, and anonymization. In Spain, generative AI tools have been tested to classify and summarize legal documents and anonymize judgments, thereby saving time and enhancing data protection practices[2]. These implementations demonstrate AI's capability to manage repetitive, low-risk tasks at scale without encroaching on judicial reasoning. In regions such as Latin America and Europe, AI is employed to streamline filing processes and manage case records, thereby reducing delays and allowing staff to focus on more complex issues[2]. These applications suggest that initial, high-impact successes are primarily observed in registry and back-office functions rather than in the adjudication process itself.

2.2 Access-to-Justice Tools

The deployment of virtual assistants and legal navigation chatbots is expanding in judicial contexts [6]. Portugal's justice chatbot and Greece's i-ACCESS system illustrate how AI can provide straightforward guidance and triage for vulnerable groups, including child victims, highlighting the potential of conversational interfaces to overcome informational barriers[2]. In terms of multilingual inclusion, India's SUVAS system translates Supreme Court judgments into multiple Indian languages at scale. As of February 2026, over 100,000 translated judgments have been made publicly accessible, and TERES facilitates near-real-time transcription of complex hearings, with human editors reviewing and correcting each output[5].

2.3 Decision Support—Not Decision-Making

India's SUPACE and LegRAA (Legal Research Analysis Assistant) tools are designed to extract facts from extensive records, highlight precedents, and create structured summaries to

support, rather than replace, judicial reasoning. Both tools are non-autonomous and require human verification[1]. Brazil's RAFA 2030 program aligns judicial outputs with Sustainable Development Goals, while Israel employs AI to enhance oversight in public defense. These non-adjudicative applications contribute to improved systemic accountability[2].

2.4 Systemwide Digital Reform Platforms

The United Kingdom's Her Majesty's Courts and Tribunals Service (HMCTS) has reported significant gains from the digitization of civil, family, and tribunal services, including increased user satisfaction and faster processing of online civil claims, divorce, and probate, supported by extensive video capabilities for hybrid hearings[8]. However, parliamentary and practitioner reviews have identified execution challenges, usability issues, and risks of burden-shifting, indicating that ongoing improvement requires iterative evaluation and the continuous publication of findings [8]. The most reliable efficiency gains today arise from administrative and informational use cases. UNESCO's framework explicitly advocates 'assistive, not substitutive' deployments in justice settings—ensuring that humans remain accountable for legal judgments while AI streamlines routine tasks[1].

3. THE INDIAN JUDICIARY: SCALE, STRATEGY, AND SELECTED TOOLS

3.1 The Scale of the Challenge and the National Approach

The Indian judicial system is recognized as one of the most extensive and intricate globally. Studies reveal that there are over 50 million cases pending at various judicial levels, a situation aggravated by an uneven judge-to-population ratio and ongoing procedural difficulties[7]. Initiated in 2005, the e-Courts project, now in its third phase (2023–2027), aims to address these challenges by adopting digital technologies and leveraging artificial intelligence. According to the Government's PIB release from February 2026, there is a focus on integrating transcription, translation, defect detection, and research tools with Digital Courts 2.20 to ensure human oversight throughout the process[5]. The update confirms that Phase III has made substantial progress, including the digitization of over 618 crore pages of court records and the facilitation of over 3.93 crore video-conferencing hearings. Independent assessments validate that these technological applications—encompassing language processing, voice-to-text conversion, and triage—are effective solutions for managing India's multilingual and high-volume judicial environment[7,17].

3.2 Exemplars of Assistive AI in India

The Supreme Court Vidhik Anuvaad Software (SUVAS) is instrumental in facilitating AI-driven translation of judicial judgments into over eighteen Indian languages, with subsequent mandatory human linguistic post-editing.[3] By February 2026, this initiative had rendered more than 100,000 translated judgments publicly accessible, thereby significantly enhancing accessibility for both citizens and legal practitioners beyond the English-speaking demographic[5].

TERES offers AI-assisted real-time transcription services for the Constitution Bench and other intricate legal matters, ensuring precise record-keeping and expediting the drafting of orders. Human editors meticulously review all transcripts to guarantee accuracy prior to finalization[5].

The Supreme Court Portal for Assistance in Court Efficiency (SUPACE) is designed to process extensive case files, extract pertinent facts, and highlight precedents, thereby aiding judges in managing information overload. This system functions as a decision-support tool rather than a decision-making engine, with its outputs subject to judicial scrutiny and potential override.[1]

LegRAA, a research and analytics assistant integrated into the Supreme Court's workflows under Phase III, enhances the efficiency of literature reviews and metadata extraction while maintaining confidentiality constraints.[5]

Smart Registries and e-Filing Defect Detection systems automate the review of legal filings, promptly flagging defects to counsel and expediting the listing process—addressing a major bottleneck in high-volume registries[6]. Increasingly, courts are using digital channels to minimize adjournments, improve access for rural litigants, and provide real-time case updates[5].

3.3 Ecosystem Pilots and State-Level Momentum

Several High Courts are currently piloting Adalat AI for case management, voice-to-text transcription, and workflow support, including for depositions and cross-examinations[7]. Reports indicate that nine High Courts are operational with pilots in five additional courts. These initiatives are part of a broader strategy to integrate AI with the National Judicial Data

Grid and state registries, with commentators noting that such tools save time on routine documentation, allowing judges to concentrate more on core adjudication tasks[5,18].

3.4 Guardrails: The 'Assistive, Not Substitutive' Stance

Government communications and Supreme Court publications consistently underscore that AI outputs serve as inputs to human reasoning rather than as replacements for it[5]. The Press Information Bureau (PIB) frames AI as a tool to support transcription, translation, research, and litigant communication, never as an autonomous adjudicator, thereby aligning with UNESCO and CEPEJ principles on human oversight, transparency, and accountability [1,3].

4. ETHICAL AND LEGAL RISKS: FROM DUE PROCESS TO DATA PROTECTION

4.1 Bias, Fairness, and Disparate Impact

The ongoing discourse regarding the Correctional Offender Management Profiling for Alternative Sanctions (COMPAS) risk-assessment tool in the United States underscores the complex interplay among accuracy, fairness, and due process in the context of algorithmic decision-making that affects individual liberties. ProPublica's 2016 investigation brought to light the unequal error rates among racial groups, revealing that Black defendants were more frequently misclassified as high-risk, while White defendants were often misclassified as low-risk[11]. This finding has catalyzed extensive scholarly debate and official responses concerning the competing fairness criteria and the statistical trade-offs involved. Subsequent peer-reviewed research underscores the necessity of making these trade-offs explicit and normatively justified, rather than obscured within opaque algorithms, and of subjecting them to legislative and judicial oversight [11]. For India, this serves as a cautionary example: tools that impact rights, such as those used in pre-trial detention, sentencing, or parole decisions, pose significant risks and should not be employed without rigorous fairness testing, explainability, and the establishment of meaningful challenge rights, supported by empirical audits and clear legal authority. UNESCO and CEPEJ emphasize that when applications affect fundamental rights, non-discrimination and due process are crucial; such applications must remain under strict human oversight and be fully contestable[1,3].

4.2 Opacity and the Right to Reasons

Opaque models present significant challenges to judicial scrutiny and appellate review. The

CEPEJ Charter mandates transparency, impartiality, and fairness, and requires external audits; UNESCO's Guidelines call for explainability proportional to the risk, especially when outputs may influence case outcomes[1,3]. Literature from the American Bar Association similarly emphasizes that AI should not replace judicial reasoning and that tools must be sufficiently explainable to allow for adversarial challenge and appellate review[14]. The ABA's Formal Opinion 512 (July 2024) provides the first comprehensive professional ethics guidance on the use of generative AI, emphasizing that lawyers retain full responsibility for verifying AI outputs under Model Rule 1.1[20].

4.3 Generative AI Hallucinations and Courtroom Integrity

In Mata v. Avianca, Inc. (S.D.N.Y. 2023), the court sanctioned the lawyers for submitting a brief containing AI-generated case citations and nonexistent opinions[13]. This case underscored the professional duty to verify sources under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 11 and led to a series of bar advisories and judicial orders clarifying that legal professionals remain responsible for ensuring accuracy. For courts, the implications are twofold: first, filing rules must clearly address AI-assisted submissions; and second, training and detection protocols must support practitioners' obligations to verify information[6,13].

4.4 Ex Parte Concerns and the Duty of Technological Competence

The US National Center for State Courts highlights potential issues related to ex parte communications and independent investigations arising from judges' use of external AI tools without proper disclosure or authorization. It underscores the ethical responsibility to exercise technological competence for both judges and legal practitioners [6]. This aligns with India's emphasis on human oversight and the need to establish clear, accessible policies governing the permissible use of AI in judicial processes[5].

4.5 Data Protection, Privacy, and Security Courts are entrusted with the management of highly sensitive personal and legal data. UNESCO's Recommendation on the Ethics of AI and the EU AI Act's risk-based approach both call for robust data governance frameworks. These frameworks should include measures such as data minimization, secure processing environments, comprehensive logging, and auditability[4,10]. In the context of Indian courts, it is imperative that vendor contracts prohibit the use of court data for model training, specify timelines for breach notification and incident response, and require transparent model

documentation as a fundamental condition of procurement[5].

5. GLOBAL GOVERNANCE: PRINCIPLES AND BINDING RULES

5.1 UNESCO's 2025 Guidelines for Courts and Tribunals

The 2025 Guidelines from UNESCO establish the first all-encompassing global ethical and operational framework for the application of AI in judicial environments. This framework is structured around fifteen core principles, including human oversight, transparency, accountability, security, explainability, proportionality, and the safeguarding of rights[1]. The guidelines advocate for AI to be used as a supportive tool rather than a replacement, highlighting the necessity of disclosure, contestability, and effective remedies. They also provide capacity-building resources for judicial personnel in over 160 countries, making them especially relevant for intricate, multilingual systems like those in India[1,9].

5.2 CEPEJ European Ethical Charter (2018)

The CEPEJ Charter articulates five essential principles for the integration of AI in the justice system: respect for fundamental rights, non-discrimination, quality and security, transparency and impartiality, and 'under user control[3]. It includes structured checklists to evaluate adherence and advises particular caution in criminal applications, given the potential for discriminatory outcomes[3]. These principles have become a pivotal reference for justice systems globally and have informed UNESCO's subsequent guidelines.

5.3 The EU AI Act: A Risk-Based, Enforceable Framework

The EU AI Act, effective from 1 August 2024 with a phased implementation through 2026–2027, classifies AI systems by risk level and assigns corresponding obligations[4]. High-risk systems, particularly those in the public sector that could impact fundamental rights, are required to meet standards for risk management, data governance, logging, human oversight, transparency, and post-market monitoring. Enforcement is overseen by a central AI Office and national competent authorities, with 2 August 2026 being a key date for the applicability of many high-risk obligations. This framework provides a concrete compliance benchmark for court systems within or interacting with the EU, aligning with UNESCO/CEPEJ principles while introducing enforceable legal obligations[4,19].

5.4 The Council of Europe Framework Convention on AI

The Council of Europe's Framework Convention on Artificial Intelligence and Human Rights, Democracy and the Rule of Law, opened for signature in 2024, establishes binding obligations on AI governance for both EU and non-EU Council of Europe member states and observer nations. This instrument complements the CEPEJ Charter by imposing hard-law obligations on parties to ensure that AI systems used in public administration, including courts, adhere to human rights standards, the rule of law, and democratic principles[21].

6. COMPARATIVE CASE STUDIES: INDIA IN DIALOGUE WITH THE WORLD

6.1 India—Language Scale, Transcription, and Triage

India has implemented a suite of tools, including SUVAS, TERES, SUPACE, LegRAA, and smart registries, to mitigate specific inefficiencies that consume judicial resources without necessitating direct judicial involvement. These tools facilitate the translation of judgments into languages accessible to the public, generate precise transcripts, condense intricate records, and accelerate the scrutiny and listing processes[2]. This approach is consistent with UNESCO's emphasis on providing support rather than replacement and aligns with CEPEJ's principle of maintaining user control[1,3].

6.2 Spain—Document Automation with Privacy by Design

Spain's initiatives in generative AI for classification, summarization, and anonymization illustrate how courts can optimize administrative functions without undermining judicial reasoning[3]. This strategy not only improves efficiency but also ensures adherence to data protection mandates, in accordance with UNESCO guidelines and the EU AI Act requirements[1,4].

6.3 United Kingdom—At-Scale Digitisation and Iterative Improvement

The HMCTS reform initiative in the UK exemplifies the complexities of executing a nationwide digital transformation[8]. Although there have been advancements in user satisfaction and processing speed across numerous online services, parliamentary evaluations have identified issues such as usability challenges, deficiencies in error management, and the need to consider the diverse effects on access to justice for vulnerable groups [8]. For India and

other large-scale reformers, the primary lesson is to continuously assess outcomes, transparently share findings, and be prepared to adjust platforms in response to user feedback[8].

6.4 The Americas—Analytics, Accountability, and Risk-Assessment Cautions

In the Americas, tools like RAFA 2030 in Brazil and oversight AI in Israel exemplify how algorithmic systems can enhance transparency and monitor judicial performance[2]. However, the ongoing discourse surrounding COMPAS in the United States highlights the persistent fairness concerns associated with risk scoring that influences liberty or detention[11]. Such systems must remain open to scrutiny, be explainable, and be subject to legislative oversight rather than being confined within opaque proprietary codes.[11,15].

6.5 Global South Perspectives—Brazil, Colombia, and the OECD Corpus

Beyond the debates on risk assessment, courts in Brazil and Colombia have pioneered AI-driven document management and access-to-justice chatbots, serving as instructive models for India. The OECD's 2024/2025 corpus documents how Brazil's STF (Supreme Federal Tribunal) employs the MARIA system, an LLM-driven tool, to summarize documents and conduct preliminary assessments—demonstrating that large-scale, multilingual deployments are operationally feasible when designed with human-in-the-loop safeguards[2]. These case studies underscore the conclusion that the most significant benefits are realized when AI addresses high-volume, low-discretion tasks rather than rights-affecting adjudication.

7. DESIGNING A RISK-TIERED ADOPTION FRAMEWORK

Courts are advised to adopt artificial intelligence through a structured, tiered framework, with controls tailored to the risk level each application presents. This strategy aligns with the principles set forth by UNESCO/CEPEJ and the mandates of the EU AI Act, while also supporting India's human-in-the-loop approach[1,3,4]. Tier 0—Internal Infrastructure Tools (e.g., document management, storage optimization): These tools lack direct legal implications and can be validated through standard quality assurance procedures. Tier 1—Access and Process Tools (e.g., translation, transcription, chatbots, e-filing defect detection): These tools enhance accessibility and efficiency, allowing errors to be corrected before they lead to legal ramifications[2]. Tier 2—Decision-Support Tools (e.g., research accelerators, case

summarizers, performance dashboards): These tools can affect workflows and issue framing, necessitating rigorous internal quality assurance and detailed traceability. Tier 3—High-Stakes or Rights-Affecting Tools (e.g., risk-assessment scores that influence bail, sentencing, or parole): Considering the COMPAS controversy and guidance from CEPEJ and UNESCO, such systems should be used with caution and, when deployed, must be strictly governed by law and comply with transparency requirements. These systems may be classified as high-risk under the EU AI Act when used within the EU [4,11].

8. TECHNICAL AND ORGANIZATIONAL SAFEGUARDS

Data governance by design. Courts are advised to maintain a thorough inventory of AI systems, accompanied by a detailed data map that records data lineage, quality controls, and minimization strategies. Anonymization or pseudonymization should be implemented for training data whenever possible, and vendors should be contractually prohibited from utilizing court data for training purposes. The EU AI Act emphasizes the necessity of documentation, logging, and post-market monitoring as critical obligations[4].

Evaluation and red-teaming. It is essential for courts to establish task-specific key performance indicators (KPIs) that address accuracy and turnaround time, as well as procedural-justice KPIs that focus on consistency and the quality of explanations. Red-team exercises should be conducted to assess hallucinations, data leakage, and bias drift, with incident logs maintained consistently[12].

Explainability and documentation. In scenarios with significant consequences, interpretable models should be prioritized. When complex models are indispensable, model cards, error profiles, and case-level rationales should be provided to facilitate access to meaningful explanations for involved parties[1].

Human oversight protocols. Courts should develop explicit guidelines on the circumstances and methods by which judges and staff may consult AI outputs, ensure that any AI use affecting a case is documented in the case file, and outline procedures for parties to contest AI-assisted procedural steps[2].

Professional competence and training. Judicial colleges and bar councils should broaden their curricula to include AI literacy, confidentiality practices, citation verification techniques, and

prompt design, particularly in light of Mata v. Avianca [12, 13].

Vendor governance. Procurement frameworks should mandate security certifications, forbid the use of court data for training, grant audit rights, define incident response timelines, and ensure compliance with applicable regulations, including the EU AI Act for cross-border tools[4].

Open reporting and public trust. Courts should transparently publish AI use policies, pilot objectives, evaluation outcomes, and error summaries, adopting a measure-and-iterate approach—vital for maintaining the legitimacy of AI-assisted justice administration[8].

9. EVIDENCE, AUTHENTICATION, AND THE DEEPFAKE ERA

The advent of synthetic media has led to an increasing number of legal cases involving evidence generated or altered by artificial intelligence. Judicial policy organizations, such as the Thomson Reuters Institute and the National Center for State Courts consortium, are advocating for revisions to evidentiary guidelines, comprehensive judicial training, and rigorous assessment of authentication technologies. These initiatives should be bolstered by due-process protections that facilitate challenges and cross-examinations[6]. Indian courts that incorporate TERES and other audiovisual documentation tools should also establish protocols for maintaining the chain of custody and verifying authenticity, as they prepare for the increasing challenges posed by deepfakes as generative technologies become more prevalent[5,22].

The JUSTICE (UK) report (2025) underscores that AI-generated evidence poses substantial challenges to the rule of law if evidentiary standards are not updated to address issues of provenance, authenticity, and the right to contest such evidence[15]. Consequently, courts must develop both technical and procedural strategies to ensure that defendants can effectively challenge AI-generated or AI-analyzed evidence.

10. THE NEXT FIVE YEARS (2026–2030): REALISTIC SCENARIOS

Advancing from pilot projects to comprehensive platforms. As the EU AI Act's high-risk provisions are fully implemented, judicial systems that use high-impact technologies will be required to comply by maintaining meticulous documentation, oversight logs, and systematic

monitoring. Even in countries such as India, where the Act is not directly applicable, its standards are likely to shape vendor practices and procurement frameworks[4].

India as a global exemplar for multilingual justice. With the nationwide implementation of SUVAS and TERES, India is poised to serve as a model for other multilingual jurisdictions facing backlogs, illustrating that substantial efficiency gains can be achieved without automating judicial decision-making [6].

Harmonization of filing protocols for AI-assisted documents. Following the Mata v. Avianca case, it is anticipated that more courts will mandate counsel certifications, disclosure of AI assistance, and automated verification checks in e-filing systems, thereby enhancing the quality of submissions and reducing unnecessary hearings[13].

Human-centered judicial innovation. The UNESCO J20 Judges Summit underscores that chief justices globally prioritize transparency, explainability, and human oversight as essential conditions for the legitimate use of AI, suggesting that these principles will continue to guide AI developments[9].

Performance and legitimacy as dual metrics. Beyond throughput, courts are expected to increasingly emphasize public trust and perceived procedural fairness. The JUSTICE (UK) report and the OECD governance corpus indicate that institutional trust is founded not only on competence but also on integrity and benevolence—qualities that technology should support rather than undermine[15,2].

11. A TWELVE-STEP ACTION PLAN FOR THE INDIAN JUDICIARY

The following steps present a structured agenda for reforming the Indian judiciary, which can be adapted for other jurisdictions with similar challenges. Step 1. Develop a detailed AI policy that underscores AI's role as an auxiliary tool; prohibit judges from using AI ex parte; mandate disclosure and certification for AI-assisted filings[1]. Step 2. Initially target applications with low risk and high potential benefits: translation (SUVAS), transcription (TERES), e-filing defect detection, anonymization, and legal research support (SUPACE/LegRAA)[5]. Step 3. Establish an AI steering committee comprising judges, technologists, bar representatives, and civil society members; make system inventories and meeting summaries publicly available to foster trust[16]. Step 4. Implement human oversight protocols for each AI system; document

the use of AI in cases, including the user and purpose, and ensure this information is accessible to relevant parties[1]. Step 5. Conduct audits for bias, security, and reliability in Tier 2 and Tier 3 systems; publish redacted summaries and corrective action plans[3,11]. Step 6. Standardize vendor contract clauses: prohibit training on court data, require documentation of dataset provenance, demand model documentation, specify breach notification timelines, preserve audit rights, and ensure compliance with the EU AI Act where applicable.[4] Step 7. Enhance data governance by conducting data protection impact assessments (DPIAs) for new tools, implementing least-privilege access, enforcing encryption in transit and at rest, and establishing monitored audit logs[4,10]. Step 8. Provide ongoing training for the bench and bar on AI capabilities and limitations, confidentiality obligations, prompt hygiene, hallucination detection, and citation verification[12,13]. Step 9. Update evidence rules for AI-generated content and deepfakes; equip judges with authentication tools and standards; ensure defendants can mount meaningful challenges[6,22]. Step 10. Emphasize meaningful metrics by pairing cycle-time KPIs with fairness, appeal-outcome, and public-trust metrics; adopt the HMCTS practice of publishing periodic evaluations[8]. Step 11. Employ an iterative approach by time-boxing pilots, setting go/no-go thresholds, discontinuing tools that do not meet performance standards, and scaling those that demonstrate reliable benefits[15]. Step 12. Pursue international alignment by mapping every court AI system to UNESCO/CEPEJ principles; evaluate EU AI Act obligations at the procurement stage when cross-border data flows, or international vendors are involved[1,3,4].

12. CONCLUSION: EFFICIENCY WITH LEGITIMACY

The prospective function of artificial intelligence (AI) within both Indian and international judicial systems is not to supplant judges but to free up judicial time for decision-making and to enhance the justice experience for citizens. India's methodology—comprising transcription, translation, triage, and research assistance, all under human oversight—offers a practical and adaptable framework for other multilingual, high-volume jurisdictions[5].

The international governance landscape provides clear and converging guidelines: implement AI where it reduces friction without compromising rights; ensure transparency, explainability, and effective redress mechanisms; and regulate the highest-risk areas with the greatest stringency. As UNESCO, CEPEJ, and the EU align on common regulatory standards—and as India's e-Courts Phase III progresses with 'assistive' AI—the path forward becomes

increasingly defined[1,3,4].

Over the next five years, success will be evaluated by two concurrent metrics: expedited, more consistent case processing and increased public trust in judicial institutions. Courts that institutionalize governance, enhance competency, and commit to ongoing evaluation will harness AI's efficiency benefits while maintaining the human legitimacy of adjudication. This balanced approach is how AI can truly serve justice[14].

REFERENCES

[1] UNESCO. *Guidelines for the Use of AI Systems in Courts and Tribunals.* Paris: UNESCO; 2025. Available from: https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000396582/PDF/396582eng.pdf.multi

[2] Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). *Governing with Artificial Intelligence: The State of Play and Way Forward in Core Government Functions.* OECD Publishing; 2025. Available from: https://www.oecd.org/en/publications/governing-with-artificial-intelligence_795de142-en.html

[3] Council of Europe, Commission for the Efficiency of Justice (CEPEJ). *European Ethical Charter on the Use of Artificial Intelligence in Judicial Systems and their Environment.* Strasbourg: Council of Europe; 2018. Available from: https://rm.coe.int/ethical-charter-en-for-publication-4-december-2018/16808f699c

[4] European Commission. *Regulation (EU) 2024/1689 of the European Parliament and of the Council Laying Down Harmonised Rules on Artificial Intelligence (AI Act).* Official Journal of the European Union, 12 July 2024. Available from: https://digital-strategy.ec.europa.eu/en/policies/regulatory-framework-ai

[5] Press Information Bureau, Government of India. *From Digitisation to Intelligence: How AI is Enhancing Access to Justice in India.* New Delhi: PIB; February 2026. Available from: https://www.pib.gov.in/PressReleseDetail.aspx?PRID=2226283&reg=6&lang=1

[6] National Center for State Courts. *Artificial Intelligence: Guidance for Use of AI and Generative AI in Courts.* Williamsburg, VA: NCSC; August 2024. Available from: https://www.ncsc.org/resources-courts/ai-state-courts

[7] Kumar R, Singh P. Artificial Intelligence and the Indian Judiciary. *International Journal of Innovative Research and Technology.* 2025;11(7):1-9. Available from: https://ijirt.org/publishedpaper/IJIRT183662_PAPER.pdf

[8] Frontier Economics and IFF Research; Ministry of Justice (UK). *HMCTS Reform Digital Services Evaluation—Overarching Report.* London: GOV.UK; 2025. Available from:

https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/hm-courts-tribunals-service-reform-digital-services-evaluation

[9] UNESCO. *Judges, Not Machines: J20 Outcomes on AI and the Rule of Law.* Paris: UNESCO; 2024. Available from: https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000389786

[10] UNESCO. *Recommendation on the Ethics of Artificial Intelligence.* Paris: UNESCO General Conference, 41st Session; November 2021. Available from: https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000380455

[11] Angwin J, Larson J, Mattu S, Kirchner L. Machine Bias: There's Software Used Across the Country to Predict Future Criminals—And It's Biased Against Blacks. *ProPublica*; May 23, 2016. Available from: https://www.propublica.org/article/machine-bias-risk-assessments-in-criminal-sentencing

[12] Baker JE, Hobart LN, Mittelsteadt M. *An Introduction to Artificial Intelligence for Federal Judges.* Washington, DC: Federal Judicial Center; February 13, 2023. Available from: https://www.fjc.gov/content/375968/introduction-artificial-intelligence-federal-judges

[13] *Mata v. Avianca, Inc.,* 678 F. Supp. 3d 443 (S.D.N.Y. 2023). Available from: https://caselaw.findlaw.com/court/us-dis-crt-sd-new-yor/2335142.html

[14] Russell K. AI's Complex Role in Criminal Law: Data, Discretion and Due Process. *ABA GPSolo Magazine*; March–April 2025; 42(2). Available from: https://www.americanbar.org/groups/gpsolo/resources/magazine/2025-mar-apr/ai-complex-role-criminal-law-data-discretion-due-process/

[15] Adams Bhatti S (lead author); JUSTICE. *AI in Our Justice System: Final Report.* London: JUSTICE; January 2025. Available from: https://files.justice.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2025/01/29201845/AI-in-our-Justice-System-final-report.pdf

[16] Press Information Bureau, Government of India. *e-Courts Phase III: Overview of Project Components and Progress.* New Delhi: PIB; 2024. Available from: https://www.pib.gov.in/PressReleasePage.aspx?PRID=2085127

[17] Acuity Law. Integrating Intelligence: The Courts' Evolving Engagement with AI. *Acuity*

Law Blog; December 2025. Available from: https://acuitylaw.co.in/integrating-intelligence-the-courts-evolving-engagement-with-ai/

[18] Press Information Bureau, Government of India. *Digital Transformation of Justice: Integrating AI in India's Judiciary and Law Enforcement.* New Delhi: PIB; 2026. Available from: https://www.pib.gov.in/PressReleasePage.aspx?PRID=2106239&reg=3&lang=2

[19] Artificial Intelligence Act Implementation Timeline. *EU AI Act—Up-to-Date Developments and Analyses*; 2024. Available from: https://artificialintelligenceact.eu/implementation-timeline/

[20] American Bar Association Standing Committee on Ethics and Professional Responsibility. *Formal Opinion 512: Ethical Obligations for Lawyers Using Generative Artificial Intelligence.* Chicago: ABA; July 29, 2024. Available from: https://www.americanbar.org/news/abanews/aba-news-archives/2024/07/aba-issues-first-ethics-guidance-ai-tools/

[21] Council of Europe. *Framework Convention on Artificial Intelligence and Human Rights, Democracy and the Rule of Law* (CETS No. 225). Strasbourg: Council of Europe; 2024. Available from: https://www.coe.int/en/web/artificial-intelligence/the-framework-convention-on-artificial-intelligence

[22] National Center for State Courts and Thomson Reuters Institute. *AI Policy Consortium for Law & Courts—Guidance on Deepfakes and AI-Generated Evidence.* Williamsburg, VA: NCSC/TRI; 2024–2025. Available from: https://www.ncsc.org/our-centers-projects/trincsc-ai-policy-consortium-law-courts