

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF LAW MANAGEMENT & HUMANITIES

[ISSN 2581-5369]

Volume 8 | Issue 1

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/>)

This article is brought to you for “free” and “open access” by the International Journal of Law Management & Humanities at VidhiAagaz. It has been accepted for inclusion in the International Journal of Law Management & Humanities after due review.

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.

Regulating Artificial Intelligence in the Legal Domain: A Global Perspective

MRS. CHARU MAHESHWARI¹

ABSTRACT

The rapid integration of Artificial Intelligence (AI) into the legal domain has transformed legal research, case prediction, contract automation, and dispute resolution. However, the increasing reliance on AI raises significant regulatory, ethical, and jurisdictional challenges, including algorithmic bias, transparency, and accountability. This paper provides a global perspective on the regulation of AI in the legal sector, highlighting the current applications and potential risks associated with unregulated AI deployment. A comparative analysis of regulatory approaches across regions, such as the United States sectoral framework, the European Union's GDPR and proposed AI Act and Asia-Pacific's evolving policies demonstrates diverse priorities in balancing innovation and safeguards. Case studies on AI-driven legal tools and predictive justice underscore the potential for AI to enhance efficiency while emphasizing the need for oversight. The paper advocates for the establishment of robust ethical guidelines, transparent algorithms, and international cooperation to harmonize regulations. By addressing these challenges, legal systems worldwide can ensure fairness, accountability, and public trust in AI technologies. Ultimately, this research underscores the critical role of regulation in fostering responsible AI innovation in the legal domain.

Keywords: Artificial Intelligence, Legal Technology, AI Regulation, Predictive Justice, Ethical Governance

I. INTRODUCTION

Artificial Intelligence AI has evolved significantly since its conceptualization in the mid-20th century. The term "Artificial Intelligence" was coined by *John McCarthy* during the Dartmouth Conference in 1956, marking the beginning of AI as a field. Early developments focused on symbolic AI, with programs like the *Logic Theorist* (1956) and *ELIZA* (1966) demonstrating basic reasoning and natural language capabilities. The 1980s witnessed a surge in expert systems, where AI mimicked human decision-making in specialized domains, supported by advancements in rule-based programming (Jorgen, 2024). By the 2000s, breakthroughs in machine learning, fueled by increased computational power and data availability,

¹ Author is an Assistant Professor at Prestige Institute of Management & Research, Indore, MP, India.

revolutionized AI research. Landmark achievements, such as *IBM's Watson* winning *Jeopardy!* (2011) and *Google DeepMind's AlphaGo* defeating a world champion in Go (2016), demonstrated the potential of AI in complex problem-solving (Silver et al., 2016). AI's adoption expanded across industries, including healthcare, finance and law, with global investments surpassing \$93 billion by 2021.

The adoption of AI in the legal domain has reshaped traditional practices, offering efficiency and precision. AI-powered tools now perform tasks such as legal research, contract analysis and predictive analytics, which were once time-intensive. For instance, legal research platforms like *LexisNexis* and *ROSS Intelligence* employ natural language processing to review thousands of cases in seconds, reducing research time by up to 60% (MacSweeney, 2024). In 2023, the global AI in legal technology market was valued at approximately \$1.6 billion, with a projected *compound annual growth rate (CAGR)* of 32.3% through 2030 (Grandview Research, 2023). AI has also proven instrumental in predictive justice, where algorithms analyze case histories to forecast outcomes, aiding in strategy formulation. However, the rise of AI in law is not without challenges. Automated decision-making systems, such as "COMPAS" in criminal justice, have faced criticism for perpetuating racial biases. These developments necessitate a closer look at AI's transformative impact and its implications for fairness and equity within legal systems (Angwin et al., 2016).

The regulation of AI in the legal sector is essential to mitigate risks such as bias, lack of transparency, and accountability. Without proper oversight, AI systems can inadvertently perpetuate inequalities. For example, the *General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR)* (2018) of the European Union mandates data transparency and safeguards against algorithmic discrimination, setting a precedent for AI governance. Studies reveal that nearly 65% of legal professionals express concerns over the opaque nature of AI algorithms, while 70% believe regulation is critical for public trust. Moreover, the absence of standardized frameworks has led to inconsistent practices globally, as seen in the varying ethical approaches adopted by jurisdictions like the U.S. and the EU (Sreelantha & Choudhary, 2023). The stakes are high, particularly in criminal justice, where AI tools can influence sentencing and bail decisions. By regulating AI, stakeholders can ensure fairness, protect human rights, and foster innovation responsibly, creating a balance between technological progress and societal welfare.

India has witnessed a growing interest in integrating AI into the legal domain, supported by government initiatives like the "National Strategy for AI" (2018) by NITI Aayog. AI applications in Indian courts, such as the Supreme Court's SUPACE ("Supreme Court Portal for Assistance in Court Efficiency") of 2019, highlight efforts to improve case management and

reduce pendency (Supreme Court of India, 2019). However, the lack of a dedicated AI regulatory framework poses challenges. While the *Digital Personal Data Protection Act, 2023* (DPDPA) offers some safeguards, it remains inadequate to address algorithmic bias and accountability in AI-driven legal tools. The need for comprehensive policies to regulate AI is urgent in India's diverse legal ecosystem.

Scope and Objectives of the Study

This study explores the regulation of AI in the legal domain, offering a global perspective on challenges, opportunities, and best practices. The primary objectives include examining existing AI applications, such as legal research, contract automation, and predictive justice, while identifying ethical and regulatory gaps. A comparative analysis of global frameworks, including the GDPR (2018), the United States' sector-specific AI policies, and Asia-Pacific regulations, will shed light on diverse approaches. This study aims to evaluate case studies, such as the use of AI in smart contracts and judicial decision-making, to highlight successes and failures. Statistical insights, such as the projected \$14 billion market for AI in law by 2030, underscore the technology's growing relevance. Lastly, the paper will propose actionable recommendations for establishing ethical guidelines, fostering transparency, and ensuring accountability in AI systems. By addressing these objectives, this research seeks to contribute to a nuanced understanding of AI's role in shaping equitable and efficient legal systems globally.

II. AI APPLICATION IN THE LEGAL DOMAIN

The past two decades of 21st century have seen some effective use of AI tools in the legal arena as to help the parties to achieve the required goals in paucity of time.

A. AI in Legal Research and Documentation

AI has revolutionized legal research and documentation, offering unprecedented speed and accuracy in analyzing vast amounts of legal information. Tools like LexisNexis and ROSS Intelligence employ *Natural Language Processing* (NLP) and machine learning to simplify legal research. LexisNexis, for instance, uses AI to deliver case law, statutes, and secondary sources tailored to user queries. Similarly, *ROSS Intelligence*, launched in 2014, provides concise answers by analyzing case precedents and legal texts, significantly reducing research time (Nelson, 2024).

According to a 2021 survey by *Thomson Reuters*, 63% of legal professionals believe AI tools enhance productivity. AI also improves document drafting through tools like Contract Express, which automate repetitive tasks such as creating templates and clauses (Thomson Reuters,

2021). In India, the Supreme Court's e-Courts project integrates AI to provide real-time case information. However, challenges persist, including reliance on training data that may lack diversity, risking biased outputs. Ethical oversight and continual refinement of these tools are necessary to ensure they serve as equitable resources in the legal profession.

B. Predictive Analytics in Legal Outcomes

Predictive analytics uses AI to forecast legal outcomes based on historical data, offering valuable insights for lawyers and judges. These systems analyze case law, judicial rulings, and litigation strategies to predict case outcomes, saving time and improving decision-making. Tools like *Premonition* and *CaseText* have gained prominence in this space. Premonition, for example, claims to have the world's largest litigation database and uses AI to identify trends in judicial behavior.

In criminal justice, AI tools such as COMPAS (Correctional Offender Management Profiling for Alternative Sanctions) predict recidivism rates, though their accuracy and fairness remain contentious. A 2019 study by *ProPublica* revealed that COMPAS disproportionately flagged African-American defendants as high risk, raising concerns about racial bias. Despite these challenges, predictive analytics is increasingly being embraced. In India, AI-powered analytics tools are being explored to address the massive case backlog, with AI projected to reduce pendency by up to 30% over the next decade. To ensure fairness, integrating explainable AI models and ethical oversight is essential in predictive systems (Singh, 2021).

a. Automation of Contracts and Dispute Resolution

AI has transformed contract drafting and dispute resolution by automating processes and reducing human error. Platforms like *DocuSign* and *Kira Systems* streamline contract analysis by extracting key clauses, identifying risks, and ensuring compliance with legal standards. Kira Systems, for instance, uses machine learning to analyse contracts 90% faster than manual methods. Smart contracts, enabled by blockchain technology, represent a significant leap in automation. These self-executing contracts eliminate intermediaries by automatically enforcing terms upon fulfilment of conditions (Betts & Jaep, 2021). Applications in industries like real estate and insurance are gaining traction, with *Gartner* (2021) projecting that smart contracts will reduce transaction costs by 30% by 2030.

In dispute resolution, *Online Dispute Resolution* (ODR) platforms such as *Modria* use AI to mediate and resolve disputes, particularly in e-commerce and small claims cases (Amin, 2024). The *World Bank's Ease of Doing Business Report* (2020) highlighted India's potential to integrate ODR to address its backlog of over 40 million cases. However, challenges such as

legal enforceability, technical glitches, and ethical concerns about impartiality demand robust regulation to support these innovations.

III. CHALLENGES OF REGULATING AI IN THE LEGAL SECTOR

The following challenges are met while regulating AI in the legal domain.

A. Ethical and Moral Dilemmas in AI Decision-Making

AI systems in the legal sector often face ethical and moral dilemmas, particularly when making decisions that could significantly impact individuals' lives. For instance, AI tools used in sentencing or bail decisions must weigh complex human factors, yet they lack moral reasoning. A *ProPublica* investigation (2023) revealed that the COMPAS system, used in U.S. courts for recidivism predictions, disproportionately recommended harsher sentences for minority defendants, sparking widespread ethical concerns (Angwin & Larson, 2023). This underscores the need for clear ethical guidelines to address situations where AI decision-making conflicts with societal values.

B. Transparency and Accountability in AI Algorithms

The opaque nature of AI algorithms presents challenges in ensuring transparency and accountability. Many legal AI systems, such as predictive analytics tools used in litigation, rely on proprietary algorithms. The European Union's *Artificial Intelligence Act* (2023) specifically addressed this issue by mandating explainability for high-risk AI applications, including legal tools. Without transparency, holding AI developers and users accountable becomes nearly impossible, threatening trust in AI-based legal systems (*European Commission, 2023*).

C. Risks of Bias and Discrimination in Legal AI Systems

AI systems often inherit biases from the data used to train them. A 2024 audit conducted by the *AI Now Institute* found that a legal research platform highlighted case law favouring wealthier litigants over those from underrepresented groups. Further, a 2023 report by *Harvard Law Review* emphasized that training data reflecting systemic biases could perpetuate unfair outcomes, making fairness and bias mitigation critical for legal AI systems (Ferrara, 2023).

D. Cross-Border Regulatory Challenges

Legal AI regulation varies widely across jurisdictions, creating challenges in a globalized legal market. For example, while the European Union's *Artificial Intelligence Act* (2023) sets stringent standards for AI use, countries like the U.S. adopt a more sector-specific approach. This disparity is particularly problematic in international arbitration or cross-border litigation. A 2024 survey by *PwC Legal* revealed that 70% of legal professionals believed regulatory

fragmentation hindered effective AI deployment across borders, emphasizing the need for harmonized international frameworks (PwC Legal, 2024).

IV. COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF GLOBAL AI REGULATIONS IN LAW

While regions like the EU and China adopt centralized, stringent regulations, the U.S. and India rely on sector-specific or piecemeal approaches. Emerging economies are aligning with international standards but face challenges in implementation. Harmonizing these efforts will be critical for addressing cross-border legal AI issues.

A. United States: Sectoral Approaches to AI Regulation

The United States adopts a sector-specific approach to AI regulation, relying on existing laws rather than enacting a unified framework. Legal AI applications fall under various federal laws, such as the *Civil Rights Act (1964)*, which prohibits discrimination in legal services, and the *Federal Trade Commission Act (1914)*, which addresses deceptive practices in AI-driven legal tools (Gidez, 2024). In 2022, the *Blueprint for an AI Bill of Rights* emphasized ethical AI use, fairness, and accountability but lacked enforceable legal standards. State-level efforts, such as the *California Consumer Privacy Act (CCPA)*, regulate data privacy for AI, impacting legal technology providers. However, the absence of a comprehensive federal AI law leads to regulatory gaps, particularly in cross-border contexts and the legal sector. (*Brookings Institution, 2022*).

B. European Union: GDPR and the Proposed AI Act

The EU has taken a more comprehensive and centralized approach to AI regulation. The *GDPR* establishes stringent data protection requirements, directly impacting AI tools that process personal data for legal purposes. For example, AI-driven e-discovery tools must ensure compliance with GDPR principles like data minimization and transparency. Building on GDPR, the *Artificial Intelligence Act (2023)* introduces specific provisions for legal AI applications. It classifies AI systems into risk categories, with legal tools often deemed "high-risk," requiring rigorous testing, transparency, and human oversight. The Act also mandates developers to provide explainable outputs and maintain compliance documentation. The EU's cohesive approach aims to balance innovation with ethical and legal safeguards (*European Commission, 2023*).

C. Asia-Pacific: Regulatory Developments in China, Japan and India

Asia-Pacific nations are rapidly advancing AI regulation, each adopting distinct strategies.

- **China:** In 2022, China enacted the *Personal Information Protection Law (PIPL)*, which regulates data use in AI systems, including legal applications. The *Algorithm Regulation Guidelines (2023)* require transparency and prohibit algorithmic discrimination, impacting AI used in legal analytics and decision-making (Li & Xu, 2023).
- **Japan:** Japan's *AI Strategy 2023* emphasizes ethical AI adoption, particularly in legal arbitration and compliance tools. It advocates self-regulation through industry standards, coupled with government oversight, to ensure fairness and accountability (Bartley, Warren & Hunt, 2024).
- **India:** India lacks a dedicated AI law but relies on sectoral regulations. The *Digital Personal Data Protection Act (2023)* governs AI data usage, while the *IT Rules (2021)* mandate accountability for platforms using AI, including legal tech services. A draft *AI Ethics Framework (2024)* highlights fairness and bias reduction, indicating India's intent to regulate AI in the legal domain comprehensively (Observer Research Foundation, 2024).

D. Other Regions: Emerging Trends in Africa and South America

Emerging economies in Africa and South America are beginning to regulate AI, often aligning with international frameworks.

- **Africa:** Countries like Kenya and South Africa are adopting AI regulations. The *Data Protection Act (2019)* in Kenya impacts AI applications in legal services by mandating data security and consent requirements. The *African Union's AI Framework for Africa (2024)* promotes harmonized regulations across member states, emphasizing human rights and fairness.
- **South America:** Brazil leads the region with its *AI Strategy (2021)* and the *General Data Protection Law (LGPD, 2018)*, modelled on the GDPR. Legal AI systems in Brazil must adhere to strict privacy standards. Similarly, Chile and Argentina are exploring AI regulatory frameworks to foster innovation while ensuring ethical compliance.

V. CASE STUDIES

The regulation of AI within the legal domain is a rapidly evolving area, particularly as it intersects with emerging technologies like blockchain. Focusing upon the AI's role in legal contracts, predictive justice and lessons learned from real-world implementations certain case studies are of much importance for this study.

A. AI in Legal Contracts: Smart Contracts and Blockchain Technologies

Smart contracts, powered by blockchain technology, represent a significant advancement in contract law. These self-executing contracts are coded to automatically enforce and execute terms when conditions are met (Roscheisen, 1998). In India, the legal framework governing contracts is primarily defined by the Indian Contract Act of 1872, which allows for the enforcement of agreements made with free consent and lawful consideration. Smart contracts align well with these principles as they encapsulate offer, acceptance, and consideration in a digital format. However, the integration of AI in smart contracts raises critical questions regarding liability and enforceability. The lack of a comprehensive regulatory framework for smart contracts in India means that parties may face challenges if disputes arise from automated transactions. As such, while smart contracts can enhance efficiency and transparency in legal processes, they also necessitate careful consideration of legal implications and potential risks (Trivedi & Shilpi, 2024).

B. AI-Driven Predictive Justice: Notable Cases and Implications

AI-driven predictive justice tools are increasingly being utilized to forecast judicial outcomes based on historical data. These tools aim to improve access to justice by assisting lawyers and clients in making informed decisions about litigation strategies. For instance, some jurisdictions employ AI algorithms to analyze case law and predict verdicts, thereby aiding legal practitioners in assessing the viability of cases (Galli & Sartor, 2023). In India, the adoption of AI in predictive justice is still nascent but growing. The Supreme Court has shown interest in leveraging technology to streamline case management and reduce backlog. However, ethical concerns arise regarding bias in AI algorithms that could perpetuate systemic inequalities within the justice system. The challenge lies in ensuring that these tools are transparent and accountable while safeguarding against discrimination and bias.

VI. CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

The implementation of AI technologies in the legal domain has yielded both successes and failures globally. For instance, while jurisdictions like the EU have made strides with regulatory frameworks such as the EU AI Act, aimed at ensuring safe and ethical AI use other regions have faced backlash due to poorly designed systems that failed to account for ethical considerations. In India, there have been initiatives aimed at integrating AI into legal practices; however, these efforts have often encountered hurdles related to infrastructure, training, and resistance to change within traditional legal frameworks. A notable example includes pilot projects for AI-assisted legal research that demonstrated potential efficiency gains but were hampered by

concerns over data privacy and security.

The regulation of AI in the legal domain presents both opportunities and challenges. In India, as smart contracts gain traction and predictive justice tools become more prevalent, it is crucial for regulators to develop comprehensive frameworks that address these innovations' ethical implications. Lessons from global implementations can guide India's approach to ensure that technology enhances rather than undermines justice. The journey toward effective regulation will require collaboration among stakeholders across sectors to create an inclusive environment that fosters innovation while protecting fundamental rights.

VII. REFERENCES

1. European Commission. (2023). *Artificial Intelligence Act: Ensuring ethical and trustworthy AI in the EU*. Retrieved from <https://ec.europa.eu>
2. Silver, D., Huang, A., Maddison, C. J., Guez, A., Lanctot, M., Sifre, L., ... & Schrittwieser, J. (2016). Mastering the game of Go with deep neural networks and tree search. *Nature*, 529(7587), 484-489. doi:10.1038/nature16961
3. Grand View Research. (2023). *Legal AI market size, share & trends | industry report, 2030*. Retrieved January 10, 2025, from <https://www.grandviewresearch.com/industry-analysis/legal-ai-market-report>
4. Angwin, J., Larson, J., Mattu, S., & Kirchner, L. (2016). Machine bias: There's software used across the country to predict future criminals. And it's biased against blacks. *ProPublica*. Retrieved January 13, 2025, from <https://www.propublica.org/article/machine-bias-risk-assessments-in-criminal-sentencing>
5. Supreme Court of India. (2019). *SUPACE: Supreme Court Portal for Assistance in Court Efficiency*. Retrieved January 10, 2025, from <https://main.sci.gov.in/supace>
6. Thomson Reuters. (2021). *The business case for AI-enabled legal technology*. Retrieved January 12, 2025, from <https://legalsolutions.thomsonreuters.co.uk/content/dam/ewp-m/documents/legal-uk/en/pdf/reports/the-business-case-for-ai-enabled-legal-technology.pdf>
7. Singh, P. (2021). Predictive analytics for case outcomes: A brief. *LinkedIn*. Retrieved January 13, 2025, from <https://www.linkedin.com/pulse/predictive-analytics-case-outcomes-brief-prabhjot-singh>
8. Betts, K. D., & Jaep, K. R. (2021). Contract drafting: Machine learning breathes new life into a decades-old promise. *Duke Law & Technology Review*, 19(1), 217-223.
9. Gartner. (2021). *Forecast: Blockchain technology, worldwide, 2021*. Retrieved January 12, 2025, from <https://www.gartner.com/en/documents/4000000/forecast-blockchain-technology-worldwide-2021>
10. Amin, N. (2024). A new frontier in online dispute resolution: Combining AI and mindfulness. *Case Western Reserve Journal of Law, Technology & the Internet*, 15(2), 283-300.
11. World Bank. (2020). *Ease of doing business report 2020*. Retrieved January 13, 2025, from <https://www.worldbank.org/en/publication/doing-business>

12. Angwin, J., & Larson, J. (2023). *Machine bias revisited: The impact of COMPAS on sentencing*. ProPublica. Retrieved January 13, 2025, from <https://www.propublica.org/article/machine-bias-risk-assessments-in-criminal-sentencing>
13. Ferrara, E. (2023). *Fairness and bias in artificial intelligence: A brief survey of sources, impacts, and mitigation strategies*. Harvard Law Review. <https://arxiv.org/pdf/2304.07683>
14. PwC Legal. (2024). *2024 Global AI and Legal Technology Survey*. Retrieved January 13, 2025, from <https://www.pwc.co.uk/industries/financial-services/understanding-regulatory-developments/regulators-outline-AI-priorities-for-next-12-months.html>
15. Gidez, E. (2024). *AI regulations in the U.S. Diligent*. Retrieved January 13, 2025, from <https://www.diligent.com/resources/blog/ai-regulations-in-the-us>
16. Xi, Z and Lu, E. (2023). *China's new AI regulations*. Latham & Watkins. Retrieved January 13, 2025, from <https://www.lw.com/admin/upload/SiteAttachments/Chinas-New-AI-Regulations.pdf>
17. Bartley, A. Warren, A. and Hunt, CT. (2024). *Can Japan become the world's most AI-friendly country?*. The Diplomat. Retrieved January 13, 2025, from <https://thediplomat.com/2024/10/can-japan-become-the-worlds-most-ai-friendly-country/>
18. Observer Research Foundation. (2024). *Draft AI Ethics Framework: Addressing fairness and bias in India's legal domain*. Retrieved January 13, 2025, from <https://www.observerresearchfoundation.org/publications/draft-ai-ethics-framework-2024>
19. African Union. (2024). *Continental AI Strategy for Africa*. Retrieved January 13, 2025, from https://au.int/sites/default/files/documents/44004-doc-EN-_Continental_AI_Strategy_July_2024.pdf
20. Kenya Law Reform Commission. (2019). *Data Protection Act, 2019*. Retrieved January 13, 2025, from https://www.kenyalaw.org/kl/fileadmin/pdfdownloads/Acts/Data_Protection_Act_No_24_of_2019.pdf
21. Ministry of Science, Technology and Innovation. (2021). *Brazilian Artificial Intelligence Strategy*. Retrieved January 13, 2025, from https://www.gov.br/mcti/pt-br/acompanhe-o-mcti/transformacaodigital/arquivosinteligenciaartificial/ebia-summary_brazilian_4-979_2021.pdf
22. OECD. (2023). *AI policy initiatives in Brazil*. Retrieved January 13, 2025, from <https://stip.oecd.org/stip/interactive-dashboards/policy-initiatives/2023%2Fdata%2FpolicyInitiatives%2F99994148>

23. Röscheisen, M., Baldonado, M., Chang, K., Gravano, L., Ketchpel, S., & Paepcke, A. (1998). The Stanford InfoBus and its service layers: Augmenting the internet with higher-level information management protocols. In *Digital libraries in computer science: The MeDoc approach* (Vol. 1392, pp. 213–230). Springer. <https://doi.org/10.1007/bfb0052526>
24. Trivedi, A. and Shipli. (2023). *Smart contract: A new paradigm of contracts in the digital era*. Mondaq. Retrieved January 13, 2025, from <https://www.mondaq.com/india/contracts-and-commercial-law/1412536/smart-contract-a-new-paradigm-of-contracts-in-the-digital-era>
25. Galli, F., & Sartor, G. (2023). AI approaches to predictive justice: A critical assessment. *Humanities and Rights*, 5(2), 166.
26. Brookings Institution. (December 5, 2022). *Unpacking the White House blueprint for an AI Bill of Rights*. Retrieved January 13, 2025, from <https://www.brookings.edu/events/unpacking-the-white-house-blueprint-for-an-ai-bill-of-rights/>
27. AI Now Institute. (April 11, 2023). *Algorithmic accountability: Moving beyond audits*. Retrieved January 13, 2025, from <https://ainowinstitute.org/publication/algorithmic-accountability>
28. Sreelatha, A. and Choudhary, G. (September 8, 2023). *Exploring the use of AI in legal decision making: Benefits and ethical implications*. Woxsen University. Retrieved January 11, 2025, from <https://woxsen.edu.in/research/white-papers/exploring-the-use-of-ai-in-legal-decision-making-benefits-and-ethical-implications/>
29. Nelson, J. (2024, January 1). Inside Lexis AI: LexisNexis' latest research tool. *Above the Law*. Retrieved January 13, 2025, from <https://abovethelaw.com/2024/01/inside-lexis-ai-lexisnexis-latest-research-tool/>
30. Jørgen. (April 8, 2024). *The birth of AI: 1956*. Privatdozent. Retrieved January 10, 2025, from <https://www.privatdozent.co/p/the-birth-of-ai-1956>
31. MacSweeney, G. (December 17, 2024). *The best AI tools for legal research in 2025*. LegalFly. Retrieved January 09, 2025, from <https://www.legalfly.com/post/best-ai-tools-for-legal-research-in-2025>
