International Journal of Law Research, Education and Social Sciences

Open Access Journal – Copyright © 2025 – ISSN 3048-7501
Editor-in-Chief – Prof. (Dr.) Vageshwari Deswal; Publisher – Sakshi Batham

Justice on Autopilot: Navigating the Ethics of AI in Legal Practice

Sukhvinder Singh[a]

[a]Maharshi Dayanand University, Rohtak, India

Received 10 July 2025; Accepted 06 August 2025; Published 09 August 2025

Artificial Intelligence (AI) is revolutionising legal systems across the globe at an unprecedented rate, bringing with it efficiencies unrivalled hitherto but also raising profound ethical issues. This article is a critical analysis of the ethical consequences of the use of AI in legal practice, including aspects of legal research, predictive justice, contract analysis, and sentencing algorithms. The discussion places focal points on urgent issues, algorithmic discrimination and bias, decision-making opacity ("black box" risk), accountability gaps, and data protection, within developing regulatory and constitutional frameworks. The article derives comparative lessons from the UK, USA, EU, and India and examines regulatory regimes, judicial decisions, and legislation governing responsible AI embedding. Particular focus is given to the Indian terrain, taking up notable cases like Justice K.S. Puttaswamy v Union of India and new policy tools like the Digital Personal Data Protection Act, 2023 (DPDP Act) and NITI Aayog's AI guidelines. The article ends by suggesting practical recommendations for ethical regulation, transparency, and accountability of AI-driven legal frameworks, calling for a balance between development and the timeless values of justice and human rights.

Keywords: *artificial intelligence, legal ethics, algorithmic bias, transparency, data privacy.*

INTRODUCTION

The fusion of Artificial Intelligence and legal systems represents a profound shift in how justice is conceived, delivered, and accessed across society.[1] AI tools—from sentencing calculators to document review software, haul promises of reducing caseloads, increasing precision, and filling chasms of access to justice.[2] But with such hope exists fear: what if the technology reinforces, or even widens, the very biases that the law aims to correct?[3] What protections are there when algorithmic secrecy negates the transparency that underlies legal judgment?[4] This article addresses these questions critically, comparatively, and across disciplines, and specifically addresses the regulatory issues involved in importing AI into legal spheres and the search for ethical, responsible innovation.

THE INCREASING ROLE OF AI IN LEGAL SYSTEMS ACROSS THE WORLD

The Global Spread of Legal AI: Legal AI means algorithms and machine learning applied to automate, augment, or assist in legal reasoning, research, and decision-making. New York to New Delhi, from courtrooms to law firms, intelligent document review platforms, client intake chatbots, and predictive bail or sentencing determiners have started being accepted.

Pulleys behind the growth include:

- Overloaded judicial systems and shortages of resources;
- Pain for greater efficiency and cost savings;
- Exponential growth of contractual and regulatory documentation;
- Rise of new global markets for legal technology and investments.

[1] Richard Susskind, *Tomorrow's Lawyers: An Introduction to Your Future* (3rd edn, OUP 2023)
[2] 'Responsible AI for All - Adopting the Framework: A Use Case Approach on Facial Recognition Technology' (2022) Discussion Paper <https://www.niti.gov.in/sites/default/files/2022-11/Ai_f> accessed 02 July 2025
[3] Julia Angwin et al., 'Machine Bias' (*ProPublica*, 23 May 2016) <https://www.propublica.org/article/machine-bias-risk-assessments-in-criminal-sentencing> accessed 02 July 2025
[4] *Justice K.S. Puttaswamy v Union of India* (2017) 10 SCC 1

Scope and Impact: AI's influence stretches way beyond basic automation these days. Modern systems harness natural language processing to handle intricate legal tasks – stuff like making sense of legislation, breaking down previous court decisions, and actually trying to guess what judges will decide next. Countries like the United States and the UK have really embraced AI tools for things like e-disclosure in court cases, platforms that evaluate legal risks, and sophisticated research systems.[5] India's doing something similar with their Smart Courts initiative, where they're building specialised AI to deal with those never-ending case backlogs and make their court system work better.

PRINCIPAL APPLICATIONS OF AI IN LEGAL PRACTICE

Legal Research: Lawyers are increasingly turning to AI-driven tools like Westlaw Edge and ROSS Intelligence when they need to sift through enormous volumes of legal material. These systems excel at tracking down specific case precedents, statutory provisions, and other essential legal information that lawyers need. Take India's approach, for instance, they've developed NyayaAnumana, which works specifically with their own legislative records and court decisions.

Contract Analysis and Management: AI engines surface high-risk clauses, exclusions, or inconsistencies in your contracts so you can do due diligence faster. And they're not just the province of multinational corporations; Indian lawyers, too, must contend with complex statutory regimes.

Predictive Justice and Judicial Analytics: AI models predict case outcomes, estimate likely durations, and guide strategic decision-making. In the USA, Lex Machina examines patent or antitrust litigation case data. Pilot projects by High Courts in India apply predictive analytics to bail cases or the scheduling of cases.

Sentencing and Risk Assessment Algorithms: Arguably most provocatively, judicial sentencing and parole decisions are aided by AI tools such as COMPAS (USA), which predict recidivism probabilities. In India, the equivalent of DSP (Decision Support Programs) for bail and sentencing is on the cards, triggering urgent policy discussions.

[5] Thomson Reuters, *2023 Report on the State of the Legal Market* (2023)

ETHICAL IMPLICATIONS OF AI IN LAW

Bias and Discrimination: Machine-learning algorithms train on past data, finally mirroring and even exaggerating structural and societal biases. Empirical research on risk assessment instruments such as COMPAS has revealed different impacts, especially on racial minorities in the USA. In multiracial countries like India, the threat is that of algorithmic recapitulation of caste, religious, and gender bias.

Famous case: The problem of preemptive presumptions in law was vividly underscored by the Supreme Court of India in State of Punjab v Gurmit Singh (1996), a cautionary tale that remains highly relevant today, reminding us that algorithmic "neutrality" cannot be assumed.[6]

Transparency Issues (Black Box Algorithms): AI systems, particularly those (like many deep learning algorithms) that are based on large numbers of layers and/or neurons, can be near impossible to interpret, often delivering recommendations or decisions that provide little if any understanding about why the answers are being made, even by the people who developed the systems.[7] This opacity is against the idea of due process, where legal decisions (and their reasons) are subject to scrutiny and contestation.

The EU's General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) enshrines a "right to explanation" for those subject to automated decision-making, a principle of growing international importance. In India, the constitutional right to fair procedure under Article 21 adds yet another level of scrutiny to algorithmic obscurity.

Accountability and Due Process: Where AI-driven recommendations or decisions fail, determining the locus of legal fault is notoriously difficult. Is the developer, the deploying agent, or the end-user responsible? Lack of explicit statutory direction maximises risks of "outsourcing" accountability from humans to machines—a trend contrary to fundamental legal doctrines of responsibility.[8]

[6] *State of Punjab v Gurmit Singh* (1996) 2 SCC 384
[7] General Data Protection Regulation 2016, art 22
[8] Laurence F. White and Samir Chopra, *A Legal Theory for Autonomous Artificial Agents* (University of Michigan Press 2011)

DATA PROTECTION AND PRIVACY

AI's need for immense amounts of data, including sensitive personal or biometric data, poses serious data protection and privacy risks. In India, Justice K.S. Puttaswamy v Union of India recognised privacy as a fundamental right and set the bounds for data use by AI systems. The new Digital Personal Data Protection Act 2023 (DPDP Act) imposes more onerous responsibilities to collect, share, and obtain consent for data, but new hurdles in compliance and enforcement are on the horizon.

REGULATORY CHALLENGES AND ETHICAL OVERSIGHT ARE NEEDED

Disjointed and Adaptive Regulatory Strategies: The speed of AI development exceeds the ability of law and regulation to respond.[9] Conventional rules, written for human players, have difficulties with parties that learn and evolve beyond explicit code.

Particularly, regulatory challenges are:

- Establishing legal personhood and responsibility for autonomous entities;
- Requiring transparency and explainability of AI systems;
- Guaranteeing AI conformity with anti-discrimination and human rights principles;
- Incorporating industry-standard norms (e.g., for judiciary versus commerce).[10]

Soft Law, Hard Law, and Ethical Standards: Around the globe, we're seeing an explosion of guidelines, principles, and what lawyers call "soft law" coming from organisations like the OECD, UNESCO, and IEEE, plus various national advisory groups, all trying to fill the gaps where proper regulations don't exist yet. The UK's Alan Turing Institute, India's NITI Aayog, and the EU's High-Level Expert Group on AI have all put out their ethical frameworks for AI, though none of these actually carry legal weight.

[9] Responsible AI for All - Adopting the Framework: A Use Case Approach on Facial Recognition Technology (n 2)
[10] 'Proposal for a Regulation Laying Down Harmonised Rules on Artificial Intelligence' (European Commission,21 April 2021) <https://digital-strategy.ec.europa.eu/en/library/proposal-regulation-laying-down-harmonised-rules-artificial-intelligence> accessed 02 July 2025

Meanwhile, the few binding legal standards that are emerging (like the EU's Artificial Intelligence Act) are running into all sorts of policy headaches, political pushback, and technical challenges.

Oversight Mechanisms: From what we've learned through trial and error across different countries, the most effective approaches seem to be:

- Requiring human oversight for high-stakes legal decisions where AI is involved;
- Regular algorithmic audits and impact assessments to catch problems early;
- Setting up regulatory sandboxes and pilot programs to test things out safely;
- Making sure people have the right to judicial review and explanations when AI affects them.[11]

COMPARATIVE LEGAL PERSPECTIVES: UK, USA, EU, AND INDIA

United Kingdom: The UK has taken what you might call a principles-first approach, steering clear of rigid, technology-specific rules and instead focusing on flexible ethical guidance. The UK Information Commissioner's Office (ICO) and Alan Turing Institute have made transparency, fairness, and preventing discrimination their main priorities. British courts have been okay with using algorithmic tools in administrative and family law cases, but judges remain pretty cautious and typically want to review decisions afterwards.

United States: The American approach is, frankly, all over the place, which isn't surprising given how their government works. They're relying on constitutional protections (things like due process and equal protection), sector-specific regulations (like the Fair Credit Reporting Act), and court cases that are still developing the law as they go. In State v Loomis (Wisconsin, 2016), the court allowed COMPAS to be used for sentencing but required defendants to be notified of its limitations, in the name of fairness and due process. Federal attempts at comprehensive AI regulation are in their infancy.[12]

[11] NITI Aayog, *National Strategy for Artificial Intelligence* (2018)
[12] *State v Loomis* [2016] 881 NW 2d 749 (Wis)

European Union: The EU is really pushing ahead of everyone else when it comes to regulating AI, especially with their proposed Artificial Intelligence Act. What they're doing is pretty smart; they're focusing on high-risk AI systems and putting extra safety measures around them, particularly when these systems are being used in courts or by law enforcement. They've also got the GDPR, which has been around since 2018, setting the rules for how personal data gets handled, what rights people have, and making sure AI decision-making isn't completely opaque. European courts have actually been using GDPR requirements to force organisations to explain how their automated systems work and give people ways to challenge those decisions.

India: India's regulatory landscape is changing. The Information Technology Act 2000, touches on specific areas of cyber law and digital evidence, but says nothing about AI specifics. The DPDP Act, which was passed in 2023, is India's most comprehensive data protection statute to date, creating personal rights over data and standards for legal processing, and central requirements for legal AI systems. In the interim, NITI Aayog's "Responsible AI" principles and the upcoming Digital India Act indicate forthcoming advancements in ethics regulation.

The Puttaswamy case in 2017 was a game-changer, though many lawyers didn't realise it at first. The Supreme Court declared privacy a fundamental right, and suddenly every AI system handling personal data had to justify itself constitutionally. When you combine this with Articles 14 and 21, our equality and due process guarantees, you get a framework that demands transparency and accountability from algorithmic systems affecting legal outcomes.

INDIAN CASE LAW AND STATUTORY INTEGRATION

Justice K.S. Puttaswamy v Union of India:[13] A Constitutional Bench of the Supreme Court unequivocally held privacy to be a basic right under Article 21, practically mandating all data-driven tools of AI in law to comply with stringent privacy, reasonableness, and proportionality requirements.

[13] *Justice K.S. Puttaswamy v Union of India* (2017) 10 SCC 1

State of Punjab v Gurmit Singh:[14] The Court, emphasising the risks of embedded prejudice, reaffirmed that judicial proceedings should not be influenced by bias or social stereotypes, a requirement now applicable to training and use of judicial and risk assessment AI.

Statutory Provisions –

Information Technology Act 2000: Cyber law, digital evidence (Admissibility of electronic evidence, but no guidelines on AI).

Digital Personal Data Protection Act 2023: Legal processing, consent, data rights (Strictly binding duties on data fiduciaries; applies to AI systems).

Evidence Act 1872: Admissibility of electronic records (Computer-generated documents get legal recognition).

Constitution of India: Fundamental rights (Arts. 14, 21) -(Enforce non-discrimination, procedural fairness, and privacy).

Recent Developments –

- Three High Courts are experimenting with AI, though with varying degrees of enthusiasm. Delhi's automated cause lists seem to work well, Bombay's bail prediction system has raised some eyebrows, and Karnataka's case summarisation tool is still being evaluated.

- Each court has set up monitoring committees - probably wise given how new this territory is. The Draft Digital India Act has been sitting in someone's inbox since 2023, though industry insiders expect it to address algorithmic transparency eventually.

REGULATORY FRAMEWORK RECOMMENDATIONS

Inculcating Ethical Precepts in Law –

[14] *State of Punjab v Gurmit Singh* (1996) 2 SCC 384

Transparency: People affected by AI decisions deserve explanations. If an algorithm influences bail decisions or case outcomes, its reasoning shouldn't be proprietary secrets locked away in corporate vaults.

Anti-Bias and Fairness: India's complexity makes this particularly tricky. Our algorithms need to account for linguistic diversity, caste dynamics, regional variations, and economic disparities; otherwise, they'll systematically disadvantage certain groups.

Accountability: The buck has to stop somewhere. When AI systems make errors, we can't have endless finger-pointing between officials, developers, and data providers.

Data Protection: Judicial information is inherently sensitive. Attorney-client communications are privileged. AI systems handling such data need bulletproof security and privacy protections.

Human Oversight: Technology should augment human judgment, not replace it. Judges and lawyers bring contextual understanding that algorithms currently lack.

Specific Recommendations For India-

Legislation: Our current legal framework resembles Swiss cheese when it comes to AI, full of holes. We need either comprehensive AI legislation or major amendments to existing laws covering algorithmic liability and redress mechanisms.

Policy and Ethical Guidelines: NITI Aayog's responsible AI framework is thoughtful but toothless. Converting these principles into binding regulations would provide much-needed clarity for developers and users.

Inclusion and Capacity Building: Most lawyers and judges I encounter admit they don't understand AI. We need targeted education programs that explain both capabilities and limitations in practical terms.

Independent Oversight: Self-regulation by tech companies isn't sufficient for something as critical as the justice system. An independent AI regulator with real enforcement powers makes sense.

Regular Audit and Monitoring: Algorithmic audits should be routine, not exceptional. Public reporting requirements would help build trust and catch problems before they become systemic.

Protection of Fundamental Rights: Every AI deployment affecting legal outcomes should undergo constitutional scrutiny. Rights impact assessments shouldn't be optional extras.

Public Engagement: The legal profession and civil society need genuine involvement in shaping how AI gets integrated into our justice system. This is about legitimacy as much as efficiency.

CONCLUSION

Introduction of AI into international and Indian legal systems provides thrilling opportunities—and serious responsibilities. When wisely used, AI has the potential to democratise access to justice, speed up legal proceedings, and uncover latent insights within the sea of texts that constitute law. Yet without strenuous ethical and regulatory frameworks, it may perpetuate bias, chip away at transparency, and spread responsibility. India’s developing jurisprudence, reflected in seminal verdicts on privacy and reasonableness, creates a normative bedrock for ethical innovation. The way forward will need a synthesis of legal reform, professional vigilance, technological expertise, and unflinching adherence to the ageless values that animate the law: justice, equality, and dignity.