ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE IN THE LEGAL ARENA: ISSUES AND CHALLENGES

Dr. Pradeep Kumar[1]

ABSTRACT

Artificial Intelligence (AI) is changing the legal field, with these processes being automated, like legal research, document review, contract analysis, and case prediction. The innovations enhance efficiency and precision, allowing law professionals to concentrate on sophisticated reasoning and strategic advocacy. The use of AI can speed up the processing of large amounts of legal information, predict judicial decisions and support the use of data in decision-making. When applied to the court of law, AI can assist the judges in their decisions on bail, sentencing, and managing the case; nevertheless, it brings serious issues of transparency, prejudice, data security and responsibility. This paper aims to review the existing uses of Artificial Intelligence in the legal field, specifically in such aspects as legal research, document analysis, contract review, and prediction of case outcomes, and to study how this affects the field of law education, legal employment trends, and the changing roles of legal professionals. It also aims to discuss the ethical, regulatory, and philosophical dilemmas relating to the implementation of AI in the legal field, focusing on the idea that the adoption of AI in the law should be human-centred and ethically oriented. Even though AI is an important tool of productivity, it is incapable of imitating human judgment, empathy, or ethical rationale, without which the practice of law would not be possible. There is a growing trend of law firms developing AI-oriented teams, and law schools are starting to include technology and legal ethics courses in their curricula. However, there exist unanswered ethical questions related to fairness, responsibility, and possible loss of human creativity. This paper argues that AI must be used to promote human well-being but not replace human agency. It is important to find a balance between innovation and moral responsibility that can lead to ensuring that AI does not undermine the ethical basis of the legal profession and, on the contrary, promotes justice.

Keywords: Artificial Intelligence, Legal Technology, Ethics, Judicial Decision-Making, Access to Justice.

[1] The author is an Assistant Professor at the Faculty of Law, Banaras Hindu University, Varanasi, Uttar Pradesh, India, and is currently a Visiting Researcher under the Global Experience Faculty Programme (GEFP) at the Faculty of Law, University of Turku, Finland.

INTRODUCTION:

AI has started to transform many fields of professional activity, law and justice being among them. The potential that it has on accuracy, productivity, and access to justice, in case it is introduced to the legal field, is immense. Applied in a responsible manner and under the guidance of ethics, and in the oversight of a human AI can reinforce the justice delivery system.[2] Nevertheless, when implemented without proper regulation, it may create new issues regarding fairness, accountability and trustworthiness of the legal process by citizens. In recent practice, AI systems are being used more and more to perform serial legal work, including document review, contract analysis, and case research. These technologies can quickly handle large amounts of information, determine the applicable case laws, and even determine possible judicial outcomes through studying previous rulings. These analytical skills help lawyers to prepare better arguments, save time, and reduce the cost of litigation. AI can enable legal professionals by automating routine activities to ensure that they can concentrate on critical reasoning, representation of clients, and strategic decision-making.[3]

In addition, computerized legal services are enhancing access to justice by extending low-cost services to those individuals who would otherwise not be able to afford professional legal service.[4] Another use of AI in the court is the experimentation with AI-based mechanisms that enable judges to be consistent and efficient in their decision-making.[5] Predictive models have the potential to provide better case management by providing insights to make decisions related to bail or sentencing.[6] However, ethical and procedural issues are also posed by these developments.[7] Because AI is largely reliant on past legal records, it is likely to reproduce the prejudices that have existed in the past concerning gender, race, or social background. Therefore, algorithm-based decision-making could inadvertently support systemic inequality. Transparency and moral responsibility problems arise when machines are at play when it comes to the results of human rights and liberation. Another urgent issue is that of data security.[8] The legal field is based on secrecy, but AI tools demand access to large amounts of client data and

[2] European Commission, *Proposal for a Regulation Laying Down Harmonised Rules on Artificial Intelligence (Artificial Intelligence Act)*, COM (2021) 206 final (Apr. 21, 2021).
[3] Matthew U. Scherer, *Regulating Artificial Intelligence Systems: Risks, Challenges, Competencies, and Strategies*, 29 *Harv. J.L. & Tech.* 353 (2016).
[4] Richard Susskind, *Online Courts and the Future of Justice* (Oxford University Press 2019) 41–63.
[5] Cary Coglianese and David Lehr, 'Regulating by Robot: Administrative Decision-Making in the Machine-Learning Era' (2017) 105 *Georgetown Law Journal* 1147, 1168–1175.
[6] Daniel Martin Katz, Michael J Bommarito and Josh Blackman, 'A General Approach for Predicting the Behavior of the Supreme Court of the United States' (2017) 12 *PLoS ONE* 1–18.
[7] Brent Daniel Mittelstadt et al, 'The Ethics of Algorithms: Mapping the Debate' (2016) 3 *Big Data &Society* 21.
[8] OECD, *AI in the Judiciary: Opportunities and Challenges for Access to Justice* (2021).

court files. Poor data security or internet attacks might introduce sensitive content and undermine the trust between attorneys and customers. Moreover, most AI tools are black boxes, as they do not produce an argument based on clear reasoning.[9] It is inexplicable, which is not compatible with the legal aspect of making decisions based on reason and due process. The legal labour force is also changing with the increasing use of AI. The automation can decrease the number of entry-level employees who participate in research or drafting, and provide the need for professionals who are able to work with digital technologies, ethical issues, and data governance.[10]

Professional institutions and law schools are required to adjust and consider interdisciplinary courses on AI, legal technology, and ethical responsibility.[11] Even though AI has its merits, it cannot replace human aspects of empathy, discretion and moral reasoning that the legal ethics story is based on. Currently, an extensive legal or international regulation on the application of AI in law does not exist.[12] There are no obvious guidelines on the responsibility, liability, and ethics, which makes it ambiguous how to approach an error or misappropriation of AI-generated results. Hence, the main problem is to balance between technological innovation and human judgment. The legal community should make sure that AI is an aid that would contribute to increased equity, access, and efficiency without taking away the moral and ethical integrity of the legal profession.[13]

AI AND LEGAL PROFESSION:

AI has gradually gained acceptance in the current legal practice, and it helps practitioners to carry out various analytic and administrative tasks.[14] In the beginning, AI could be applied to such tasks as legal research and document analysis.[15] In the course of time, it has been used in drafting legal documents, analysing contracts, and performing extended searches of data.[16] These inventions allow lawyers to concentrate more on the strategic and complex parts of their

[9] Jenna Burrell, 'How the Machine "Thinks": Understanding Opacity in Machine Learning Algorithms' (2016) 3 *Big Data & Society* 1–12.
[10] Marta, R. & Floridi, L. (2020). *The Ethics of Artificial Intelligence in the Legal Sector. Philosophy & Technology*, 33(4), 567–584.
[11] Harry Surden, *Artificial Intelligence and Law: An Overview*, 35 *Ga. St. U. L. Rev.* 1305 (2019).
[12] Sonia K. Katyal, *Private Accountability in the Age of Artificial Intelligence*, 66 *UCLA L. Rev.* 54 (2019).
[13] Richard Susskind, *Tomorrow's Lawyers: An Introduction to Your Future* (3d ed. Oxford Univ. Press 2019).
[14] Richard Susskind, *Tomorrow's Lawyers: An Introduction to Your Future* (2nd edn, Oxford University Press 2017) 87–104.
[15] Kevin D Ashley, *Artificial Intelligence and Legal Analytics* (Cambridge University Press 2017) 32–48.
[16] Daniel Martin Katz, Michael J Bommarito and Josh Blackman, 'Legal Analytics and the Future of Legal Practice' (2018) 63 *Journal of Legal Education* 38, 41–45.

cases instead of doing clerical work.[17] The increasing use of AI has nevertheless brought up valid issues regarding the safety of data, bias in algorithms, and the accuracy of content created by AI, which have led many practitioners to become cautious about its use.[18]

Over the past few years, law firms have started to replace traditional functions of junior associates, like the preparation of case summaries, the drafting of pleadings, or legal research, with AI-assisted software. The systems can handle a lot of information and produce drafts in a brief period, which contributes greatly to productivity.[19] However, this efficiency has its possible downside, particularly within the intellectual property law, whereby errors or misrepresentations of truth may have dire outcomes. Moreover, the processing of large volumes of data without adequate controls could make sensitive information vulnerable to cybercrimes and confidentiality breaches. To address these challenges, several law firms are establishing specific AI and data governance departments that are concerned with ensuring security, privacy, and ethical standards.[20] AI in litigation is able to assist in finding applicable precedents, making predictions, and uncovering judicial trends, enabling lawyers to create superior legal strategies and minimise expenses. Predictive analytics, such as, can give information on how some judges or courts could rule on such cases.[21]

However, overreliance on automatic tools might replicate systemic biases in case the underlying data or code is defective. Legal education is also being transformed by the impact of AI. AI-related subjects are incorporated in the curricula of law schools, and students are trained to practice in using technology in their work, but they are also taught about human verification and ethical responsibility. Even though AI is not anticipated to substitute legal professionals, as it does not possess the capability to be critical, creative or possess interpersonal skills, it is changing the entry-level jobs by automating many of the processes or tasks junior lawyers or paralegals used to perform on an entry level.[22] Finally, AI is a new opportunity and threat to the legal profession. In its responsible use, it has benefits in terms of

[17] John O McGinnis and Russell G Pearce, 'The Great Disruption: How Machine Intelligence Will Transform the Role of Lawyers in the Delivery of Legal Services' (2014) 82 *Fordham Law Review* 3041, 3058–3065
[18] Calo, R. (2015). *Robotics and the Lessons of Cyberlaw. California Law Review*, 103(3), 513–563.
[19] P Kumari and J Smith, 'AI and Legal Practice: Transformations, Risks, and Governance' (2025) 2(2) *Advances in Consumer Research* 225–243.
[20] Harry Surden, 'Machine Learning and Law', (2014) 89 *Washington Law Review* 87, 89–92.
[21] Scherer, M. U. (2016). *Regulating Artificial Intelligence Systems: Risks, Challenges, Competencies, and Strategies. Harvard Journal of Law & Technology*, 29(2), 353–400.
[22] Michaels, L. (2020). *Artificial Intelligence, Legal Responsibility, and Accountability. Law, Innovation and Technology*, 12(2), 236–257.

accuracy, efficiency, and access. However, human monitoring is necessary to balance the technological flow of legal procedures, maintain fairness and transparency in the legal realm, and even safeguard ethical standards.[23]

AI-LAWFARE:

The term AI-Lawfare can be applied to the intentional or accidental application of AI to legal systems in a manner that creates conflict, competition, or ethical dilemmas to the legal profession. The term embodies the strategic application as well as the possible abuse of AI in legal, judicial and regulatory domains. It shows the conflict between technological innovation and the core values of justice, ethics, and human agency.[24] The issue of the wider implications of AI is not discussed only in the legal sphere. Japanese iconic filmmaker Hayao Miyazaki has infamously criticised the development of AI-generated art as an insult to life. His response is a common paranoia of most artists, theorists, and moralists that technological advances, unregulated, would destroy the essence of human creativity and the depth of emotions.[25]

The discussion, therefore, is concentrated on a primary issue: whether AI, as a human imitation thought process, can help humanity, or it may pose a threat to the dehumanisation of human identity and experience? Other observers say that when AI capacity goes beyond human reasoning, then it will be able to challenge our sense of individuality, creativity, and moral responsibility.[26] Other people argue that AI, when created and regulated with an ethical perspective, can only make human life better instead of worse. What varies is the way in which these technologies have been adopted by societies in terms of designing, regulating and incorporating them in everyday living and decision-making systems.[27] The ethics of Aristotelianism, in particular, philosophical viewpoints contribute useful information in this dilemma. Aristotle stressed human well-being (eudaimonia), intellectual consideration and seeking moral excellence in a communal society.

[23] Vincent, J. (2022). *AI and the Legal Profession: Opportunities and Risks. International Journal of Law and Information Technology*, 30(1), 45–67.
[24] OECD. (2019). *OECD Principles on Artificial Intelligence.* OECD Legal No. 0449.
[25] Hayao Miyazaki described AI-generated animation as "an insult to life itself," criticising AI art for lacking human emotion: see 'Hayao Miyazaki Slams AI Animation as "an Insult to Life Itself"' (2016) *The Guardian*.
[26] Linda Michaels, *Artificial Intelligence, Legal Responsibility, and Accountability*, 12 *Law, Innovation & Tech.* 236 (2020).
[27] Luciano Floridi & Josh Cowls, *A Unified Framework of Five Principles for AI in Society*, 5 *Harv. Data Sci. Rev.* (2021).

On this basis, AI cannot aim at substituting human wisdom but instead augmenting it and empowering it. The proponents of the Aristotelian approach to AI governance believe that it offers a more balanced moral and philosophical basis compared to the current regulatory frameworks. This kind of strategy promotes ethical judgment, practical wisdom (phronesis) and considerations of cultural and human diversity in dealing with the implications of technological change in the world.[28] This view demands an environment that promotes reflection, responsibility and empathy rather than unquestioningly adopting technological advancement. This is aimed at ensuring that innovation aligns with human values and dignity.[29] The current scholarly debates and conferences, including those dedicated to AI ethics and philosophy, continue to explore the question of how humanity can maintain its ethical essence while harnessing the transformative potential of artificial intelligence.[30]

AITHICS: ETHICAL DIMENSIONS OF AI IN LAW

AIthics is an acronym (AI) mixed with ethics, the intersection of technology innovation with ethical responsibility.[31] AI is transforming the nature of legal services in the profession.[32] It automates legal research, document analysis, contract review and predicting cases, which makes it more efficient and accessible.[33] The AI tools can quickly process large volumes of legal information, spot useful precedents and help lawyers to formulate informed strategies.[34] Such developments have also increased access to justice as they offer affordable ways of helping people who would otherwise not afford the services of traditional legal help.[35] Nonetheless, the gradual progress toward more intensive use of AI poses a number of ethical issues that should be given due consideration.[36] Algorithm bias is one of the leading issues.[37] Due to the historical presentation of records, AI systems are capable of reproducing and

[28] Shannon Vallor, *Technology and the Virtues: A Philosophical Guide to a Future Worth Wanting* (Oxford Univ. Press 2016).
[29] European Commission, *Ethics Guidelines for Trustworthy AI* (High-Level Expert Group on Artificial Intelligence, Brussels 2019).
[30] Luciano Floridi and Josh Cowls, 'A Unified Framework of Five Principles for AI in Society' (2019) 5 *Harvard Data Science Review* 1–15.
[31] European Commission, *Ethics Guidelines for Trustworthy AI* (High-Level Expert Group on Artificial Intelligence, Brussels 2019) 5–9.
[32] Richard Susskind, *Tomorrow's Lawyers: An Introduction to Your Future* (2nd edn, Oxford University Press 2017) 87–104.
[33] Daniel Martin Katz, Michael J Bommarito and Josh Blackman, 'A General Approach for Predicting the Behavior of the Supreme Court of the United States' (2017) 12 *PLoS ONE* 1–18.
[34] Kevin D Ashley, *Artificial Intelligence and Legal Analytics: New Tools for Law Practice in the Digital Age* (Cambridge University Press 2017) 32–48.
[35] Richard Susskind, *Online Courts and the Future of Justice* (Oxford University Press 2019) 41–63.
[36] Brent Daniel Mittelstadt et al, 'The Ethics of Algorithms: Mapping the Debate' (2016) 3 *Big Data and Society* 1–21.
[37] Pauline T Kim, 'Data-Driven Discrimination at Work' (2017) 58 *William & Mary Law Review* 857–936.

propagating the same level of social or systemic biases utilised in previous court decisions.[38] When unchecked, such biases can strengthen discriminatory trends, especially in issues that are sensitive, such as bail recommendation, sentencing and predictive policing.[39] This state of affairs endangers the very concept of justice system fairness and impartiality.[40]

The other major problem is the issue of data privacy and confidentiality. Legal practice is characterised by the personal and corporate information that is sensitive in nature.[41] AI systems are also more likely to cause data exposure and misuse since their functionality depends on large datasets.[42] This type of legal system may result in breaches of confidentiality of clients, as well as undermine the trust of the population in the system of law, because of weak cybersecurity measures.[43] Other than privacy and prejudice, there is an increased concern over the undermining of human judgment.[44] Although AI is great at recognising patterns and processing data, it is not empathic, ethical, or capable of having a deeper comprehension of the complex human situation.[45] Overreliance on AI-generated knowledge may undermine the moral and deliberative aspects of legal reasoning, which are critical to legal reasoning.[46] Besides, the issue of misinformation, in which AI can produce false or misleading results, also makes the process of decision-making and responsibility in the legal process more challenging.[47] In response, law firms and organisations are focusing on the need to have human control in legal work, aided by AI.[48]

[38] Solon Barocas and Andrew D Selbst, 'Big Data's Disparate Impact' (2016) 104 *California Law Review* 671–732.
[39] Julia Angwin et al, 'Machine Bias' (2016) *ProPublica Investigations*.
[40] European Commission, *Ethics Guidelines for Trustworthy AI* (High-Level Expert Group on Artificial Intelligence, Brussels 2019) 12–14.
[41] ABA, *Artificial Intelligence and the Legal Profession: Ethical Considerations* (American Bar Association 2020) 6–9.
[42] European Union Agency for Cybersecurity (ENISA), *AI and Cybersecurity: A Strategic Analysis* (ENISA 2020) 11–15.
[43] Megan Ma and Kevin Ashley, 'Machine Learning and the Profession of Law' (2019) 93 *Indiana Law Journal* 1035, 1052–1055.
[44] Cary Coglianese and David Lehr, 'Regulating by Robot: Administrative Decision-Making in the Machine-Learning Era' (2017) 105 *Georgetown Law Journal* 1147, 1188–1192.
[45] Luciano Floridi, 'AI and Moral Responsibility: A Philosophical Enquiry' (2019) 5 *Philosophy & Technology* 1–15.
[46] Mireille Hildebrandt, *Law for Computer Scientists and Other Folk* (Oxford University Press 2020) 221–234.
[47] Alex Molnar, 'Hallucinations in Large Language Models: Implications for Law and Policy' (2023) 20 *AI & Ethics* 1–10.
[48] European Commission, *Ethics Guidelines for Trustworthy AI* (High-Level Expert Group on Artificial Intelligence, Brussels 2019) 12–16.

AI is not meant to substitute professional knowledge but to be used as a supplement.[49] Creation of ethical frameworks, enhancing data protection measures and guaranteeing open monitoring of AI systems are crucial measures to carve out integrity and accountability.[50] Legal education is not an exception, as it is also adapting to these changes.[51] A high number of law schools now contain AI-centred courses that challenge the students to use emerging technologies critically.[52] These initiatives encourage the responsible use of AI, ethics, and checking AI-generated results. In short, as AI can bring revolution to the legal profession, in terms of speed, efficiency and access to justice, it is also extremely problematic regarding the ethical issues of bias, privacy and human judgment.[53] Finding a fair balance between innovation and moral responsibility will be the measure of how well AI can be utilised to deliver justice without sacrificing its core values of fairness, integrity, and human dignity.[54]

ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE IN LAW SCHOOL AND LAW RESEARCH:

AI is increasingly changing legal education and legal research, and redefining the production, distribution, and utilisation of knowledge in the legal profession.[55] Its increasing infiltration into educational and professional contexts signifies a more general change toward the data-driven, technology-enhanced law.[56] In law school, AI-based applications can help students and professors conduct research, write briefs and analyse case law more effectively.[57] These technologies allow the students to work on critical reasoning, conceptual learning, and problem-solving, instead of on the data collection routine or data review.[58] Intelligent search engines, document automation applications and citation analysis programs are some of the AI applications that allow learners to find the relevant authorities with high accuracy and speed.[59] AI literacy has become a course in many law schools to prepare the lawyers of the future to

[49] Richard Susskind, *Tomorrow's Lawyers: An Introduction to Your Future* (2nd edn, Oxford University Press 2017) 102–108.
[50] European Commission, *Ethics Guidelines for Trustworthy AI* (High-Level Expert Group on Artificial Intelligence, Brussels 2019) 10–17.
[51] John O McGinnis and Russell G Pearce, 'The Great Disruption: How Machine Intelligence Will Transform the Role of Lawyers in the Delivery of Legal Services' (2014) 82 *Fordham Law Review* 3041, 3065–3070.
[52] Daniel Schwarcz and Jonathan H Choi, 'AI Tools in Legal Education' (2023) 101 *Texas Law Review* 1–28
[53] Cary Coglianese and David Lehr, 'Regulating by Robot: Administrative Decision-Making in the Machine-Learning Era' (2017) 105 *Georgetown Law Journal* 1147, 1188–1193.
[54] H. L. Ho, *Artificial Intelligence, Ethics, and the Law*, 40 *Sing. Acad. L.J.* 455 (2023).
[55] John O McGinnis and Russell G Pearce, 'The Great Disruption: How Machine Intelligence Will Transform the Role of Lawyers in the Delivery of Legal Services' (2014) 82 *Fordham Law Review* 3041, 3044–3052.
[56] Mireille Hildebrandt, *Law for Computer Scientists and Other Folk* (Oxford University Press 2020) 19–27.
[57] Daniel Katz, Michael Bommarito and Josh Blackman, 'Legal Analytics and the Future of Legal Practice' (2018) 63 *Journal of Legal Education* 38, 41–45.
[58] Richard Susskind, *Tomorrow's Lawyers: An Introduction to Your Future* (2nd edn, Oxford University Press 2017) 109–113.
[59] Kevin D Ashley, *Artificial Intelligence and Legal Analytics* (Cambridge University Press 2017) 55–72.

practice a technology-driven profession.[60] Not only do students learn to use AI tools efficiently, but they are also taught to know their weaknesses and the ethical consequences.

Such aspects of artificial intelligence as algorithmic bias, data privacy, intellectual property, and accountability are becoming mandatory elements of legal education. This is aimed at creating a generation of legal practitioners who can combine digital competence and ethical responsibility.[61] Within the legal research field, AI has transformed the capacity to handle and analyse enormous databases of legal information, such as judges' opinions, legislative laws, and legal commentaries. Machine learning and natural language processing enable AI systems to identify trends, find precedents and even predict judicial decisions. Using predictive analytics and data visualisation tools enables scholars to evaluate trends of cases and examine judicial behaviour, and evaluate potential reforms. The comparative studies in various jurisdictions, with the help of AI-assisted text mining and semantic search methods, also help to increase the global aspect of the legal literature.[62]

Despite these developments, AI is not able to emulate the critical analysis and/or ethical discernment and contextual understanding of human legal reasoning.[63] The need to be sensitive to social, moral, and constitutional aspects of the law, which AI, solely with its algorithmic reasoning, cannot sufficiently comprehend, is frequently an aspect of the interpretation of the law.[64] Thus, AI is to be viewed as an amplifying tool, which can be used to make legal education and research more efficient and quality and, at the same time, stay beyond human intelligence and morality.[65] The introduction of AI in legal studies and research has its possibilities and challenges.[66] Ethical guidelines, features of AI, and prudent regulation can enhance the field of law and its legal profession by offering more access to information, enhancing innovation, and training the law experts of the future to work in a digital world that is developing rapidly.[67]

[60] Daniel Schwarcz and Jonathan H Choi, 'AI Tools in Legal Education' (2023) 101 *Texas Law Review* 1–8.
[61] Neil Dilloff, *Law Schools and the Artificial Intelligence Revolution*, 88 *UMKC L. Rev.* 1015 (2020).
[62] Benjamin Alarie, Anthony Niblett & Albert Yoon, *How Artificial Intelligence Will Affect the Practice of Law*, 68 *U. Toronto L.J.* 106 (2018).
[63] Cary Coglianese and David Lehr, 'Regulating by Robot: Administrative Decision-Making in the Machine-Learning Era' (2017) 105 *Georgetown Law Journal* 1147, 1188–1192
[64] Mireille Hildebrandt, *Law for Computer Scientists and Other Folk* (Oxford University Press 2020) 223–231.
[65] Richard Susskind, *Tomorrow's Lawyers: An Introduction to Your Future* (2nd edn, Oxford University Press 2017) 109–115.
[66] John O McGinnis and Russell G Pearce, 'The Great Disruption: How Machine Intelligence Will Transform the Role of Lawyers in the Delivery of Legal Services' (2014) 82 *Fordham Law Review* 3041, 3070–3075.
[67] NITI Aayog, *National Strategy for Artificial Intelligence #AIforAll* (Gov't of India, June 2018).

ISSUES AND CHALLENGES OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE IN THE LEGAL FIELD:

The introduction of AI in the field of law has transformed the manner in which legal service is provided and has brought forth more accuracy, efficiency, and creativity. However, these benefits come with a range of complicated issues that cut across the ethical, legal, technical, and professional levels. These issues need to be systematically learned and tackled to make AI develop responsibly in the justice system.

1. Ethical and Moral Concerns:

Applications of AI in law are mostly trained on large datasets of historical judicial cases.[68] When these datasets are socially biased in some way, be it in terms of class, gender or race, AI systems can reproduce or even enhance those biases in their outputs.[69] In the sensitive fields such as bail, sentencing, and risk determination, automated decision-making is morally questionable since computers do not have human understanding, compassion and moral judgment.[70] In addition to that, there is a lack of accountability in case an AI-based system renders a wrongful or unfair decision; it is hard to define who is to bear responsibility: the developer or the legal professional or the institution that implements the technology.[71]

2. Information Security and Privacy:

Lawyers deal with very secret and privileged information. By virtue of the fact that AI systems need large datasets to be effective, they present possible weak points in data storage and processing.[72] Lack of proper protection will result in unauthorised access, cyberattacks, or misuse of sensitive client data. These violations are capable of undermining the attorney-client privilege and undermining the trust in the law institutions.[73] Although effective, cloud-based

[68] Daniel Martin Katz, Michael J Bommarito and Josh Blackman, 'Legal Analytics and the Future of Legal Practice' (2018) 63 *Journal of Legal Education* 38, 41–44.
[69] Solon Barocas and Andrew D Selbst, 'Big Data's Disparate Impact' (2016) 104 *California Law Review* 671–732.
[70] Julia Angwin et al, 'Machine Bias' (2016) *ProPublica Investigations*.
[71] Catherine Cowie & Janet Finlay, *Artificial Intelligence in the Legal Domain: Ethical and Accountability Challenges*, 30 Int'l J.L. & Info. Tech. 145 (2022).
[72] European Union Agency for Cybersecurity (ENISA), *AI and Cybersecurity: A Strategic Analysis* (ENISA 2020) 11–15.
[73] Megan Ma and Kevin Ashley, 'Machine Learning and the Profession of Law' (2019) 93 *Indiana Law Journal* 1035, 1052–1056.

AI tools are prone to privacy threats, especially when controlled without stringent data protection policies.[74]

3. Explainability and Transparency:

One of the persistent issues with AI technology is its black box quality, where the results of the algorithms are even incomprehensible to the creators of the algorithms.[75] This obscurity is a major issue in the legal system, where argumentation, rationalisation, and openness are the pillars of justice.[76] The legal professionals, judges, and litigants must comprehend the way a system comes to its conclusions to make any use of those outputs to any legal reasoning or adjudication procedure that AI has to be credible.[77]

4. The Skills Gap and Job Displacement:

The automation has already started to change the classical organisation of law firms.[78] Different tasks, including document creation, summarising of cases and research, are becoming more and more the domain of AI tools.[79] This makes the process efficient, but at the same time, it lowers the chances of junior lawyers and paralegals.[80] The legal profession should also close the skills gap to make it relevant through the adoption of digital literacy, AI ethics, and interdisciplinary cooperation of technologists and legal scientists.[81]

5. Regulation and Liability:

Currently, no universal or national legal system that regulates the use of AI in the legal profession. There are no explicit guidelines on the responsibility of the profession, data handling, and accountability of algorithms, which generates ambiguity. In the case of an AI system generating defective or unethical results, it is difficult to determine who is responsible,

[74] Andrew J. Williams, *Artificial Intelligence, Data Protection, and Legal Confidentiality: Challenges for the Modern Law Practice*, 35 Harv. J.L. & Tech. 411 (2022).
[75] Jenna Burrell, 'How the Machine "Thinks": Understanding Opacity in Machine Learning Algorithms' (2016) 3 *Big Data & Society* 1–12.
[76] Cary Coglianese and David Lehr, 'Transparency and Algorithmic Governance' (2019) 71 *Administrative Law Review* 1–28.
[77] Frank Pasquale, *The Black Box Society: The Secret Algorithms That Control Money and Information* 19–25 (Harvard Univ. Press 2015).
[78] Richard Susskind, *Tomorrow's Lawyers: An Introduction to Your Future* (2nd edn, Oxford University Press 2017) 87–104.
[79] Daniel Martin Katz, Michael J Bommarito and Josh Blackman, 'A General Approach for Predicting the Behavior of the Supreme Court of the United States' (2017) 12 *PLoS ONE* 1–18.
[80] John O McGinnis and Russell G Pearce, 'The Great Disruption: How Machine Intelligence Will Transform the Role of Lawyers in the Delivery of Legal Services' (2014) 82 *Fordham Law Review* 3041, 3058–3065.
[81] Richard Susskind, *Tomorrow's Lawyers: An Introduction to Your Future* 87–102 (3d ed., Oxford Univ. Press 2022).

be it the programmer, company, or final customer.[82] Moreover, the cross-border data sharing also brings about issues with jurisdiction and privacy, especially with legislation such as the General Data Protection Regulation of the European Union (GDPR).[83]

6. Correctness, Information Faithfulness, and Overreliance:

The quality and relevance of the data that AI analyses determine the reliability of AI. In case the information is obsolete, biased or incomplete, the outputs that are obtained will give a misleading legal rationale.[84] Over-dependence on the algorithm-based recommendations can also undermine the human analytical ability and decrease autonomous decision-making, which threatens the enforcement of justice in a robotic manner without considering its ethical contexts.[85]

7. Philosophical and Humanistic Aspects:

The increasing power of AI makes one consider more fundamental issues of right and wrong, justice and human ingenuity.[86] Dependence on the machines can be disastrous, as machines can take away human qualities of empathy, moral reasoning, and discernment that are essential in law.[87] In Aristotelian ethics, technology is supposed to be an instrument of human flourishing (eudaimonia), as opposed to human intelligence or moral obligation.[88] The main problem is to make sure that AI is a device which supports but does not erode human values.[89]

8. Educational Reform and Ethical Governance:

To overcome such arising challenges, the legal community should be guided by ethical governance. Regulatory bodies, bar associations, and higher education institutions ought to work together in order to come up with global guidelines on responsible AI use. To counter the risks and opportunities of AI, law schools also need to identify multidisciplinary programs that integrate legal theory, technology and ethics, so that the future lawyers will be in a position to deal with the opportunities and risks presented by AI.[90] Clear, transparent, and people-oriented

[82] Cary Coglianese and David Lehr, 'Regulating by Robot: Administrative Decision-Making in the Machine-Learning Era' (2017) 105 *Georgetown Law Journal* 1147, 1184–1189.
[83] Mireille Hildebrandt, *Law for Computer Scientists and Other Folk* 231–252 (Oxford Univ. Press 2020).
[84] Solon Barocas and Andrew D Selbst, 'Big Data's Disparate Impact' (2016) 104 *California Law Review* 671–732.
[85] Harry Surden, *Artificial Intelligence and Law: An Overview*, 35 Ga. St. U. L. Rev. 1305 (2019).
[86] Nick Bostrom and Eliezer Yudkowsky, 'The Ethics of Artificial Intelligence' (2014) *Cambridge Handbook of Artificial Intelligence* 316–334.
[87] Luciano Floridi, 'AI and Moral Philosophy' (2019) 2 *Philosophy & Technology* 123–129.
[88] Martha C Nussbaum, *The Fragility of Goodness: Luck and Ethics in Greek Tragedy and Philosophy* (Cambridge University Press 1986) 318–325.
[89] John Tasioulas, *The Moral Limits of the Use of Artificial Intelligence in the Legal Domain*, 21 Ethics & Info. Tech. 135 (2021).
[90] John O McGinnis and Russell G Pearce, 'The Great Disruption: How Machine Intelligence Will Transform the Role of Lawyers in the Delivery of Legal Services' (2014) 82 *Fordham Law Review* 3041, 3068–3074.

AI systems are needed so that society will not lose trust in the justice system.[91] AI can empower the law and enhance the accessibility of legal systems, accuracy, and efficiency. However, it will be successful only with the harmonisation of technological innovation and ethical control, regulatory transparency, and the compassion of human beings.[92] The responsible course of action will be based on the principles of fairness, accountability, and transparency and will guarantee that AI advances the rule of law without undermining its moral and human principles.[93]

CONCLUSION:

AI is one of the most volatile and disruptive factors that is transforming the contemporary legal landscape. It affects all spheres of the profession, including not only everyday legal practice and research, but also education and administration of justice. The ability of AI to automate document review, examine contracts, and make predictions has significantly enhanced the accessibility and accuracy of legal services and made them faster. Nevertheless, these outstanding advantages are also accompanied by equally important obstacles that touch upon the ethical and philosophical principles of the legal system. The creation of AI in law signifies a paradox. It can make the processes more efficient and expand access to legal means on the one hand and, on the other, put the very concepts of fairness, transparency, and human accountability on which justice is built at risk. Algorithms that have been trained on historical judicial data tend to recreate preexisting social or institutional biases. These biases may further inequality and discrimination when applied to spheres, like sentencing or setting of bail. This fact underscores the pressing need to have clear ethical governance, transparency, and explainable systems that will see AI become a means of justice and not a source of injustice.

The problem of data protection is also very critical. Confidentiality is essential to the legal profession, and AI systems can be highly intensive with regard to the amount of data needed to operate. When these datasets are not properly secured, there is a higher probability of data leakage, cyberattack, or abuse of sensitive data, which may result in a lack of confidence of people in the justice system. Additionally, sophisticated algorithms of AI usually operate as black boxes, which provide results without obvious explanations or traceability. This kind of

[91] UNESCO, *Recommendation on the Ethics of Artificial Intelligence* (Paris 2021) 11–16.
[92] Cary Coglianese and David Lehr, 'Regulating by Robot: Administrative Decision-Making in the Machine-Learning Era' (2017) 105 *Georgetown Law Journal* 1147, 1188–1193.
[93] Virginia Dignum, *Responsible Artificial Intelligence: How to Develop and Use AI in a Responsible Way* 201–225 (Springer 2019).

opaqueness makes the question of legitimacy and accountability important, especially in issues that deal with basic rights and due process.

The legal profession and education are the other professions that have undergone a revolution in the incorporation of AI. Automation of many traditional tasks that paralegals and junior lawyers used to do is changing the role of these professionals and creating a need to acquire new skills in technology and data ethics. So this whole change has opened up some fresh opportunities in areas like AI compliance stuff, digital regulations, and even tech-based ways to handle disputes. After the new Education Policy 2020, Law schools all over the world are starting to weave in topics on AI, ethics, and data governance right into their courses. Basically, they want to get future lawyers ready with the right skills to tackle tech innovations carefully, you know, with a real sense of responsibility. The focus is not on mechanical learning but on creating a balance between technological knowledge and moral judgment.

At a more fundamental level, AI is forcing the legal fraternity to redefine the concept of justice in a technologically intermediated world. Based on Aristotelian ethics, technology must be used to promote the common good (eudaimonia) and not to subjugate the moral and creative abilities, where law is a human venture. AI must not supplant human judgment; rather, it should enhance it. This is the subtle tension of AI-Lawfare, which is that one must seek technological advancement, yet ethical restraint must also be maintained. The direction is, however, achieving a compromise between innovation and integrity. The law AI development requires effective regulation, ethical consciousness, and interdisciplinary cooperation. Under fair, accountable and transparent governance, AI can reinforce the legal systems, make justice more accessible and empower practitioners and citizens. However, unless it is carefully managed, it can undermine the same ideals that it is intended to promote. The issue lies in that the future of law does not consist in the absence of human intelligence but in its ethical and light collaborative association with technology.

REFERENCES:

1. ABA, Artificial Intelligence and the Legal Profession: Ethical Considerations (American Bar Association 2020).
2. Angwin, Julia et al, 'Machine Bias' (2016) ProPublica Investigations.
3. Ashley, Kevin D., Artificial Intelligence and Law: An Overview (2019) 35 Georgia State University Law Review 1305.
4. Ashley, Kevin D., Artificial Intelligence and Legal Analytics (Cambridge University Press 2017).
5. Barocas, Solon and Selbst, Andrew D., Big Data's Disparate Impact (2016) 104 California Law Review 671–732.
6. Bostrom, Nick and Yudkowsky, Eliezer, The Ethics of Artificial Intelligence in Frankish and Ramsey (eds), Cambridge Handbook of Artificial Intelligence (Cambridge University Press 2014).
7. Burrell, Jenna, 'How the Machine "Thinks": Understanding Opacity in Machine Learning Algorithms' (2016) 3 Big Data & Society 1–12.
8. Calo, Ryan, 'Robotics and the Lessons of Cyberlaw' (2015) 103 California Law Review 513–563.
9. Catherine Cowie & Janet Finlay, 'Artificial Intelligence in the Legal Domain: Ethical and Accountability Challenges' (2022) 30 International Journal of Law and Information Technology 145.
10. Coglianese, Cary and Lehr, David, 'Regulating by Robot: Administrative Decision-Making in the Machine-Learning Era' (2017) 105 Georgetown Law Journal 1147.
11. Coglianese, Cary and Lehr, David, 'Transparency and Algorithmic Governance' (2019) 71 Administrative Law Review 1–28.
12. ENISA, AI and Cybersecurity: A Strategic Analysis (European Union Agency for Cybersecurity 2020).
13. European Commission, Ethics Guidelines for Trustworthy AI (High-Level Expert Group on Artificial Intelligence, Brussels 2019).
14. European Commission, Proposal for a Regulation Laying Down Harmonised Rules on Artificial Intelligence (Artificial Intelligence Act), COM (2021) 206 final (21 April 2021).
15. Floridi, Luciano and Cowls, Josh, 'A Unified Framework of Five Principles for AI in Society' (2019) 5 Harvard Data Science Review 1–15.

16. Floridi, Luciano, AI and Moral Philosophy (2019) 2 Philosophy & Technology 123–129.
17. Floridi, Luciano, The Logic of Information (Oxford University Press 2019).
18. H. L. Ho, 'Artificial Intelligence, Ethics, and the Law' (2023) 40 Singapore Academy of Law Journal 455.
19. Hildebrandt, Mireille, Law for Computer Scientists and Other Folk (Oxford University Press 2020).
20. Katz, Daniel Martin, Bommarito, Michael J. and Blackman, Josh, 'A General Approach for Predicting the Behavior of the Supreme Court of the United States' (2017) 12 PLoS ONE 1–18.
21. Katz, Daniel Martin, Bommarito, Michael J. and Blackman, Josh, 'Legal Analytics and the Future of Legal Practice' (2018) 63 Journal of Legal Education 38.
22. Kim, Pauline T., 'Data-Driven Discrimination at Work' (2017) 58 William & Mary Law Review 857–936.
23. Ma, Megan and Ashley, Kevin, 'Machine Learning and the Profession of Law' (2019) 93 Indiana Law Journal 1035.
24. McGinnis, John O. and Pearce, Russell G., 'The Great Disruption: How Machine Intelligence Will Transform the Role of Lawyers in the Delivery of Legal Services' (2014) 82 Fordham Law Review 3041.
25. Michaels, Linda, 'Artificial Intelligence, Legal Responsibility, and Accountability' (2020) 12 Law, Innovation & Technology 236.
26. Mittelstadt, Brent Daniel et al, 'The Ethics of Algorithms: Mapping the Debate' (2016) 3 Big Data & Society 1–21.
27. NITI Aayog, National Strategy for Artificial Intelligence — #AIforAll (Government of India 2018).
28. Nussbaum, Martha C., The Fragility of Goodness: Luck and Ethics in Greek Tragedy and Philosophy (Cambridge University Press 1986).
29. OECD, AI in the Judiciary: Opportunities and Challenges for Access to Justice (2021).
30. OECD, OECD Principles on Artificial Intelligence (2019).
31. Pasquale, Frank, The Black Box Society: The Secret Algorithms That Control Money and Information (Harvard University Press 2015).
32. Surden, Harry, Artificial Intelligence and Law: An Overview (2019) 35 Georgia State University Law Review 1305.
33. Surden, Harry, Machine Learning and Law (2014) 89 Washington Law Review 87.
34. Susskind, Richard, Online Courts and the Future of Justice (Oxford University Press 2019).

35. Susskind, Richard, Tomorrow's Lawyers: An Introduction to Your Future (2nd edn, Oxford University Press 2017).
36. The Guardian, 'Hayao Miyazaki Slams AI Animation as "an Insult to Life Itself"' (2016)
37. UNESCO, Recommendation on the Ethics of Artificial Intelligence (Paris 2021).
38. Vincent, J., 'AI and the Legal Profession: Opportunities and Risks' (2022) 30 International Journal of Law and Information Technology 45–67.

***