INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF LAW

MANAGEMENT & HUMANITIES

[ISSN 2581-5369]

Volume 8 | Issue 4

2025

© 2025 International Journal of Law Management & Humanities

Follow this and additional works at: https://www.ijlmh.com/

Under the aegis of VidhiAagaz – Inking Your Brain (https://www.vidhiaagaz.com/)

In case of **any suggestions or complaints**, kindly contact **support@vidhiaagaz.com**.

To submit your Manuscript for Publication in the **International Journal of Law Management & Humanities**, kindly email your Manuscript to **submission@ijlmh.com.**

Artificial Intelligence and the Future of the Indian Judicial System

MIMANSHA JAISHAL[1]

ABSTRACT

The Indian judiciary is plagued by a significant backlog of cases, language barrier, and administrative inefficiency; In this context, the introduction of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in the judicial system will not only enhance efficiency and accessibility but also reduce the large number of pending cases. AI tools are helpful in assisting legal research, case prediction, document review, and court management, bringing a transformative shift in the global legal system and law enforcement. However, the use of AI in the judiciary remains limited, unregulated, and underexplored. There is a pressing need to critically analyse how AI can be effectively integrated into the judicial system, and also explore the legal as well as ethical concerns posed by these AI tools.

I. INTRODUCTION

Introducing AI in the judicial system will reduce bias in the case, improve legal research, be cost-effective, and also reduce the burden on court staff. In India, some of the AI tools used by the Supreme Court are SUPACE (Supreme Court Portal for Assistance in Court Efficiency), SUVAS (Supreme Court Vidhik Anuvaad Software), ICJS (Inter-Operable Criminal Justice System), eCourts Services App, NSTEP (National Service Tracking of Electronic Processes), etc. These AI tools summarize cases' facts, laws, and precedents, translate judgments and orders, and minimize manual data entry. It assists judges in delivering speedy justice. So far, AI has been beneficial in various fields such as medicine, transportation, and marketing. In the judicial domain, AI will play a significant role in reducing the 4.5 crore pending cases.

There is no universal definition of 'Artificial Intelligence' that is accepted by all nations. The UNESCO Recommendation on Ethics of AI defines Artificial Intelligence as "*technological systems that use machine and/or human-based inputs to: perceive real or virtual environments, process data, and derive conclusions. make recommendations, predictions, or decisions influencing real or virtual environments.*[2] India also does not have any statutory definition; however, NITI Aayog defined AI as "*AI refers to the ability of machines to*

---

[1] Author is a Research Scholar at Dr. Ram Manohar Lohiya National Law University, Lucknow, India.
[2] UNESCO Recommendation on Ethics of AI, UNESCO (2021).

perform cognitive tasks like thinking, perceiving, learning, problem-solving, and decision-making."[3] AI, with its cognitive ability, can identify the issue of a particular case and predict case outcomes with higher accuracy. In countries like the USA and Canada, courts are already taking the assistance of AI in cases of bail and parole. In the matter of bail, the AI assesses the previous conviction, age, employment, sex, and nature of the case, and on the basis of these factors, it predicts the likelihood of reoffending. *COMPAS,* an AI technology of the USA, which assists courts in measuring the risk of granting bail.[4]

It is evident that AI is not like Google or any other search engine because these search engines produce resources available on the internet from which the person can do their research and form a conclusion. Here, in the case of AI, it produces a result for your specific reference to your problem. Therefore, using AI will reduce the time of research and give you instant results.

The AI is useful for resolving petty cases, such as traffic challans issued through the E-challan system, where AI-integrated software detects the vehicles violating traffic rules. It enables efficient and automated imposition of fines. In the Future, AI will also predict the maintainability of appeal as to whether the particular judgement justifies or satisfies both parties. It will reduce the number of appeals. Technological integration into the court will bring transparency to the judicial system as records of cases from filing a petition till the final order could be accessible online. The Supreme Court recently recommended the digitization of trial court records, which will save time for the high court, as manual transmission of documents is time-consuming.[5] Furthermore, the CJI of the Supreme Court of India, Justice Chandrachud, introduces the live transcription services, which translate judicial proceedings into 18 different languages so that legal information can be imparted among the people without any language barriers.

II. ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE IN JUDICIAL DECISION-MAKING

However, on the one hand, AI improves the efficiency of the judicial system, but on the other hand, it brings certain legal and ethical challenges. For example, there are no statutory guidelines to regulate the use of AI in courtrooms, and many legal professionals, like senior advocates or judges, are not well-versed in technology. There may also be a threat to data

---

[3] National Strategy for Artificial Intelligence #AIFORALL, NITI Aayog (June 2018). National Strategy for Artificial Intelligence

[4] IDR. Komila Aggarwal, AI and the Indian Judicial System, International Journal of Creative Research Thoughts (April 2025).

[5] Digital Transformation of Justice: Integrating AI in India's Judiciary and Law Enforcement, Ministry of Law and Justice (February 2025).

privacy and security; personal details of the accused or the victim may be misused.

The Delhi High Court in the case of *Christian Louboutin SAS & Shoe Boutique,*[6] stated that AI cannot substitute human intelligence in the adjudicatory process, it may produce unreliable, fictitious case law or imaginary data. In this case, the court rejected the ChatGPT response to a trademark suit where the plaintiff stated that 'Red sole shoe' is a registered trademark in India. The Court held that relying on ChatGPT for the adjudication of legal matters may lead to erroneous judgments. Furthermore, Criminal cases, child custody, and refugee claims often require empathy, equitable principles, and the socio-economic condition of the accused, which AI fails to consider. Though the Delhi Court said that these technologies can be used in a preliminary understanding or the research of the case.[7]

Justice Nagaprasanna of the Karnataka High Court said that the use of AI in writing judgements could be dangerous if it does not adhere to the safeguards of section 69A of the Information Technology Act, 2000.[8] He further added that too much dependency on AI could ruin the profession itself. It can identify the pattern of how the particular person thinks or behaves and, according to those patterns, it may generate a particular content of judgement. Biased data may jeopardise the justice system and lead to a violation of the rights of citizens or persons.[9] Judges apply their minds backed by legal reasoning, free from any bias. The judgment is pronounced on the basis of facts, statements of witnesses, and evidence produced before them. The judgments may differ depending on the facts and circumstances of a particular case, which AI may fail to take into account.

III. COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF AI IN THE JUDICIAL SYSTEM: INDIA AND GLOBAL TREND

In India, notable development has been made in AI use to enhance the efficiency of the judiciary; however, it is still at an early stage. It brings efficient case scheduling, aiding judicial officers in research and drafting, etc. India is yet to adopt AI for adjudication purposes; its use remains limited to administrative functions. However, in India, there is still no legal framework to regulate the use of AI in the judiciary. Though the USA and China are ahead of India in regulating the use of AI in the judiciary.

In the *USA*, AI tools like COMPAS (Correctional Offender Management Profiling for alternative sanctions), RECORD (Record Access Project) are integrated into the judicial

---

[6] 2023:DCH:6090, CS (COMM) 583/2023.
[7] Can AI substitute Human Intelligence in Legal Matters? Press Trust of India (27 Aug 2023).
[8] X. Corp. Vs Union of India, W.P. (C) no. 7405 of 2025.
[9] Aamir Khan, AI-powered Indian judiciary: A step forward or cause for concern? (June 2023).

system. The COMPAS gives a statistical assessment in a sentencing, bail, or parole case; the assessment is based on sex, age, and previous conviction, risk of future crimes, and other factors. It assists the judges in the speedy disposal of bail cases. Furthermore, once the accused is convicted, the judges consult the algorithms to recommend the type and severity of punishment that should be imposed on the convicted criminals. The US Sentencing Commission uses AI to make guidelines so that fair and consistent punishment can be imposed. The USA also develops a chatbot that shows the court schedule, procedure, and basic information of a case, such as facts, issues involved, or adjudication. It is accessible to the general public, where they can ask common questions about the case.[10]

China has launched 'Smart Courts' initiatives to integrate technology into the judiciary. It includes virtual courtrooms, provision of e-filing, and AI-driven decision-making. The introduction of 'smart judges' will be a breakthrough for the judicial system to reduce pending cases. These smart judges will recommend a possible decision after taking into consideration the legal precedents, statutes, evidence, and facts of the case. However, these AI-driven decisions could lead to over-reliance on the technologies and may impact the discretionary power of the judges. These machine-generated outcomes may also affect the minority opinion of the judges. From time to time, China issues guidelines on how AI should be utilized so that justice remains fair, transparent, and human-centred. It provides that the application of AI in the judiciary should not infringe the data security and should be used in petty cases to improve work efficiency.[11]

IV. CONCLUSION

Generative AI Chatbots may not always give accurate decisions because these decisions are always based on legal precedents and existing statutes. It might be possible that these tools are not trained to consider the latest development of laws because laws evolve over time, what is considered unconstitutional today may not be declared illegal or unconstitutional tomorrow. The AI-driven decision may fail to consider the latest development, as the changes will not be found in the statute or case laws.

AI assists the judicial system in analysing large amounts of case laws, making it more concise with facts, issues, and decisions with reasoning, and it also speeds up the legal research. drafting, case classification. Though it can reduce the judicial backlog, the use of AI in adjudication may pose a serious threat because it lacks subjectivity, empathy, and human

---

[10] R. Sai Spandana, AI and the Law: A New Era in the Justice System? (Feb 2023).
[11] *Id.*

emotion in its decisions. There may also be a possibility that this system may possess bias, which may be based on race or religion. Gender or any other criteria. Therefore, a decision solely based on this technology should not be considered unless it is backed by human judges. Excessive reliance on AI may undermine judicial independence and the critical thinking of judges. Therefore, AI in court should be used in such a way that does not undermine transparency, fairness, and public trust.

*****