

Legal Tech Revolution and the Future of Judicial Employment

MIRUDHULA PRIYADHARSHINI.T

LABOUR LAW AND ADMINISTRATIVE LAW)

The Tamil Nadu Dr. Ambedkar Law University, School of Excellence in Law

EMAIL ID: mirudhulabh18079@gmail.com

NIVEDHA.A

LABOUR LAW AND ADMINISTRATIVE LAW

The Tamil Nadu Dr. Ambedkar Law University, School of Excellence in Law

EMAIL ID: nivedha290423@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The changing nature of legal profession has taken a high road because of artificial intelligence (AI), machine learning, and automation. Various tasks which were once done by junior lawyers, paralegals, court clerks, stenographers, and legal researchers are now being performed by legal technology systems faster and more efficient than traditional methods. These technologies help courts work more quickly and would reduce delays in pending cases. However, they also create some serious concerns. Automation may reduce job opportunities. This will weaken practical skills, and it raises questions about accountability when technology makes mistakes. It also brings attention to the importance of human judgement in delivering justice.

This article examines the role of legal technology in changing jobs in courts and the legal profession particularly in India. It discusses systems like the Supreme court's SUPACE, the e-court mission mode project and the SUVAS translation tool, along with developments in other countries. This article also discusses on the social and legal impact of automation which includes issues relating to equality and the right to fair procedure under Article 14 and 21 of the constitution of India. Finally, it suggests policy measures to ensure that technological progress improves justice delivery without harming employment opportunities, fairness, or the essential role of human reasoning in law.

KEYWORDS: legal technology, job displacement, AI in judiciary, e-court, automation, access to justice, judicial administration.

1. INTRODUCTION

The traditional picture of a judge working in a court hall surrounded by large stacks of paper files, assisted by court clerks, stenographers, and junior advocates, is steadily transforming into something new. Courts across the world are looking forward towards the digital technology to manage their increasing workloads. Artificial intelligence can now draft any contracts, predict the case outcomes, translation of judgments, and reviewing of large number of legal documents in seconds. In India, the e-Courts Mission Mode Project has introduced filing of cases in online, case tracking, and digital court management. The Supreme Court has also introduced SUPACE to assist judges with case management and SUVAS to translate judgments into regional languages.

These changes are more than just any technological upgrades. They are reshaping the work that is done in the legal system and the job roles involved in it. The real question is no longer whether AI will affect the judiciary because it already has. The more important questions are about who will benefit from AI and who will be left behind. The questions also revolve around the safeguards are needed to keep justice fair and human. Legal technology expert Richard Susskind has observed that AI will not replace lawyers entirely, but lawyers who use AI will replace those who do not. This insight, however, conceals a deeper concern that many legal professionals like court clerks, office staff, junior lawyers, stenographers, and legal researchers perform the routine tasks that AI can now handle in faster and more efficient way.

This article examines how AI and automation are transforming the legal profession and the judiciary, identifies the roles most at risk, and argues for a framework that allows technology to serve justice without displacing human judgment. It also addresses about the ethical and constitutional issues that are raised by AI in judiciary and proposes regulatory measures to which will help to ensure that efficiency gains do not come at the expense of fairness, employment, or equal access to justice.

2. EVOLUTION OF LEGAL TECHNOLOGY IN JUDICIAL ADMINISTRATION

Courts have typically relied on many people to handle daily tasks. Physical case files and manual records and handwritten and typed transcripts and research with law books formed the early base of the judicial system. Stenographers noted everything said in court sessions. Court clerks took care of case filings and moved files around. Junior lawyers and law clerks devoted many hours to searching law books for related judgments and legal rules. These jobs were not just supportive but were key to the smooth running of the justice system.

In India, this system still exists and moves into the 21st century. Subordinate courts relied on manual cause lists, physical stamp papers, and handwritten orders. The Supreme Court and High Courts employ large number of administrative teams to manage the tens of thousands of cases filed every year. Although the system was slow and required many resources which sometimes affected by human error, it also provided employment opportunities to many people.

The use of technology in the legal field began to grow in the 1990s with the introduction of online legal databases. Platforms like the Westlaw and LexisNexis in the United States, and SCC Online and Manupatra in India which made it accessible to search judgments and laws within minutes instead of spending hours away in a law library. The next major change came in the 2010s with AI-based legal tools. Platforms such as ROSS Intelligence, Casetext, and Lex Machina used artificial intelligence and natural language processing to conduct legal research, predict the outcome of the cases, and study patterns in judicial decisions¹. AI-powered document review tools, including LawGeex, Kira Systems, and Relativity, could review thousands of contracts in the time a team of advocates could review only a few dozen, with accuracy rates more than 94 percent².

In India, the e-Courts Mission Mode Project, launched in 2005 which was expanded in later phases, introduced online case filing, digital cause lists, uploading of court orders, and online case tracking in district and subordinate courts³. Virtual courts were first introduced to deal with traffic challan cases and were later expanded during the COVID-19 pandemic to hear many other types of cases. The National Judicial Data Grid (NJDG) also made information on pending court cases available to the public for the first time.

One of the most important recent developments is SUPACE (Supreme Court Portal for Assistance in Courts Efficiency). It uses artificial intelligence to help the judges by collecting and presenting the relevant case information by reducing the time spent on preliminary legal

¹ Robert Ambrogi, *ROSS Cofounder Returns to Legal Tech with Startup Using AI to Surface Judges' Decision-Making Patterns*, **LawSites** (Feb. 2024), <https://www.lawnext.com/2024/02/ross-cofounder-returns-to-legal-tech.html>; Robert Ambrogi, *Analytics, AI and Insights: 5 Innovations That Redefined Legal Research Since 2010*, **Above the Law** (Jan. 2, 2020), <https://abovethelaw.com/2020/01/analytics-ai-and-insights-5-innovations-that-redefined-legal-research-since-2010/>.

² Richard Tromans, *LawGeex Hits 94% Accuracy in NDA Review vs 85% for Human Lawyers*, **Artificial Lawyer** (Feb. 26, 2018), <https://www.artificiallawyer.com/2018/02/26/lawgeex-hits-94-accuracy-in-nda-review-vs-85-for-human-lawyers/>.

³ **e-Courts Mission Mode Project**, e-Committee, Supreme Court of India, <https://ecommitteesci.gov.in/project/brief-overview-of-e-courts-project/> (last visited June 26, 2026); see also **eCourts Mission Mode Project**, Dep't of Just., Gov't of India, <https://doj.gov.in/ecourts-mission-mode-project-2/> (last visited June 26, 2026) ("The eCourts Integrated Mission Mode Project is one of the National e-Governance projects being implemented in District and Subordinate Courts of the Country since 2007.").

research. However, SUPACE does not make any decisions; it only assists judges in their work⁴. Another important tool is SUVAS (Supreme Court Vidhik Anuvaad Software) which uses AI to translate the Supreme Court judgments into nine regional languages⁵. This has made court judgments lot easier for people that do not understand English. Earlier these tasks were carried out only by legal researchers, court assistants, and translators but now these developments show that AI can now perform it more efficiently. Even though these technologies have greatly improved efficiency, but their impact on the employments has received much less attention.

Technology / AI Tool	Legal Tasks Automated	Roles Affected
Automated Document Review (LawGeex, Kira)	Contract analysis, e-discovery	Law clerks, Document Reviewers
AI Legal Research (ROSS, Westlaw Edge)	Case law retrieval, precedent mapping	Junior Associates, Legal Researchers
E-Filing & Case Management Systems	Filing, scheduling, docket management	Court Clerks, Administrative Staff
Speech-to-Text Transcription AI	Court transcription, dictation	Stenographers, Court Reporters
Predictive Analytics (Lex Machina)	Outcome forecasting, risk assessment	Senior Associates, Litigation Support
Legal Chatbots (DoNotPay, ROSS)	Client intake, basic legal queries	Receptionists, Junior Counsel

The table above shows key legal-tech developments to the roles that they directly affect. This mapping shows a clear trend. Every new legal technology reduces the human worker's need to perform routine, information based, and administrative tasks in the legal profession.

3. JOB DISPLACEMENT IN THE JUDICIARY

Job displacement because of AI and automation means workers losing their job roles due to machines or software performing the same tasks in faster, cheaper and more accurate way. In

⁴ *E-Courts in India*, **Grokopedia**, <https://grokopedia.com/page/E-courts-In-India> (last visited June 26, 2026).

⁵ Advait Sri Krishna Datta Mamidanna, *Artificial Intelligence in the Indian Judiciary: SUPACE, SUVAS, and the Limits of Assistive Automation*, **Dr. Syama Prasad Mookerjee Research Foundation** (Feb. 12, 2026), <https://spmrf.org/artificial-intelligence-in-the-indian-judiciary-supace-suvas-and-the-limits-of-assistive-automation/>.

the legal field this can be better understood as labour substitution where technology replaces human work, and it proves to be more efficient and cost-effective.

Richard Susskind's framework is useful here⁶. Instead of questioning whether AI will replace lawyers entirely, he suggests identifying new legal works and task to lawyers to perform. Work that involves complex human judgment like arguing cases in the court, judicial reasoning, strategic advice, and ethical decision-making which are very difficult to automate because of its requirement for creativity, empathy, and contextual understanding. However, a large portion of legal work, especially at junior and administrative levels which consists of routine tasks like document review, citation checking, legal research, transcription, data entry, and scheduling can be performed by AI in a precise way.

An important point that is often overlooked is that the entry-level legal jobs are not just any low skill positions, but they offer training for future lawyers. Junior associates doing document review, law clerks preparing research notes, and court clerks managing case files are not only completing their routine work, but they are also learning about legal reasoning, building professional experience, and developing an understanding on the operation of the justice system. When these roles are replaced by AI then its consequences greater beyond job losses. It also affects the career path of future legal profession.

Law Clerks and Junior Advocates

Law clerks and junior advocates have traditionally carried out document review, legal research, drafting support, and communication with clients. Today, AI tools can perform much of this work with greater accuracy than many junior human reviewers⁷. Research by the National Legal Research Group found that AI-assisted legal research using Casetext CARA A.I. is 24.5% faster than traditional research methods and can save lawyers 132 to 210 hours every year⁸. As AI takes over these routine tasks, the role of law clerks is becoming smaller and is increasingly limited to work that requires human judgment and interaction. In many law firms, this may not be enough reason to justify hiring of a full-time law clerk.

Junior Associates of Law Firms

⁶ Richard Susskind & Daniel Susskind, *The Future of the Professions: How Technology Will Transform the Work of Human Experts* (2015).

⁷ **LawGeex**, *Comparing the Performance of Artificial Intelligence to Human Lawyers in the Review of Standard Business Contracts* 3 (2018), <https://images.law.com/contrib/content/uploads/documents/397/5408/lawgeex.pdf> (AI achieved 94% accuracy in NDA review versus an average of 85% for experienced lawyers).

⁸ *The Real Impact of Using Artificial Intelligence in Legal Research* 2 (Casetext & Nat'l Legal Research Grp. 2018), <https://www.lawnext.com/wp-content/uploads/2018/09/The-Real-Impact-of-Using-Artificial-Intelligence-in-Legal-Research-FINAL2.pdf>.

Junior associates have been traditionally responsible for the legal research, preparing of basic legal documents, and case files management. AI can now perform more of this work in a quick manner and also at a lower cost. As a result, several large law firms in the United Kingdom and the United States have already reduced the recruitment of the junior lawyers⁹. Even though the Indian legal sector is still less automated, the platforms like the SCC Online and Manupatra are slowly introducing AI-assisted research tools, and similar other changes are expected in the future.

Court Clerks

The e-Courts Project to handle many tasks that the court clerks previously performed, including case filing, preparing cause lists, maintaining records, and tracking court orders it has been digitised. The National Judicial Data Grid (NJDG) now automatically provides real-time information about the status of cases which is a task that earlier required manual updating by the court clerks¹⁰. Because of these digital systems improvements continue to grow, the need for clerical staff, especially in the subordinate courts where most clerks work, is expected to decrease.

Stenographers

Stenographers in courts are among the legal professionals that will be more affected by AI. Their job in the court is to record everything said during proceedings. The Modern AI speech-to-text systems which can even identify different speakers during court hearings can be achieved with the accuracy rates of over 95% under controlled conditions¹¹. Even though, human stenographers may still be needed in important or sensitive cases to check accuracy, AI can handle transcription in routine hearings and can reduce the need for stenographers in many lower courts.

Legal Researchers

Legal researchers are responsible for finding, reading, and summarising judgments and laws. This is one of the tasks best suited for AI. AI based legal research tools can search a large

⁹ How Do You Effectively Use AI for Legal Research?, **Thomson Reuters Legal Blog** (Oct. 7, 2025), <https://legal.thomsonreuters.com/blog/how-to-effectively-use-ai-for-legal-research/>.

¹⁰ **National Judicial Data Grid (NJDG)**, https://njdg.ecourts.gov.in/njdg_v3/ (last visited June 26, 2026).

¹¹ Lourdes M. Fuentes, *Lessons from Legal Research's Past for the GenAI-Powered Legal Technology of Tomorrow*, **ABA Law Technology Today** (Sept. 18, 2024), https://www.americanbar.org/groups/law_practice/resources/law-technology-today/2024/lessons-from-legal-researchs-past-for-the-genai-powered-legal-technology-of-tomorrow/.

number of legal databases within seconds, identify relevant judgments, and prepare organised research summaries. The use of SUPACE in the Supreme Court shows that AI can effectively assist with legal research. As these technologies continue to improve, the demand for full-time legal researchers is likely to decrease across all levels of the judiciary.

Broader trends

The overall effect of these changes is a major change in judicial employment. Several trends can already be seen or are likely to happen soon:

- Shrinking entry-level jobs: Fewer routine tasks means fewer starting jobs for new lawyers, which may affect diversity in the profession's entry path.
- Legal services based on Gig: AI instead of full-time staff allows legal work to be outsourced to freelancers or automated platforms.
- Growth of legal-tech startups: Investment in legal technology is gradually increasing and creating new businesses but it largely affects the job opportunities by concentrating money and power in tech companies rather than human resources.
- Demand for hybrid professionals: The legal field now needs people with understanding in both law and technology. This creates higher demand for technology skilled lawyers, and this disadvantages those that are trained only in traditional legal subjects.

The benefits provided by AI cannot be ignored. It can make legal services a lot cheaper, and it can also speed up court processes and provide access legal information for the people who were denied it due to cost and complexity. SUVAS shows how AI can provide court judgments in different languages which helps people who do not understand English. But a digital divide exists. People living in rural and poor areas and small towns might not have more reliable internet or skills to use these tools. Further, losing affordable the junior lawyers and law clerks can take away real access to legal help instead of making it better.

4. ETHICAL, CONSTITUTIONAL AND SOCIAL CONCERNS

Algorithmic Bias and Discrimination

Artificial intelligence systems work by learning from the data. This means that the quality, fairness, and neutrality of the data to determine about the AI whether it produces a fair or unfair results. In the legal system, AI tools that predict outcomes of cases, estimate regarding the chances a person to commit any other offence, or to assist judges in giving a sentence by the use of past court decisions and legal records. The problem is that if these past decisions

contain any bias based on race, caste, class, gender, religion, or geographical location, the AI will learn those and repeat the same biases. In many cases, this happens without any proper realisation.

For example, if an AI system is trained in using past bail decisions which show people from poor economic backgrounds or certain communities are denied bail more often, the AI may learn that these people are more likely to be at risk. The biggest concern is that the bias is hidden inside the AI system. As AI system is based on algorithmic models and statistical patterns that are complex it makes it more difficult to identify, understand, or challenge.

This is not just any issue that is theoretical. It has already happened in the United States with a tool called COMPAS. Courts in several American states used COMPAS to predict about the probability of a defendant was likely to commit another offence. These predictions were used to help make decisions regarding bail, sentencing, and parole. In 2016, an investigation by ProPublica found that COMPAS was almost twice as likely to mistakenly identify Black defendants as possible future criminals in comparison to white defendants¹². This became one of the most well-known examples of algorithmic bias existence in the justice system. It also showed that AI can cause serious harm to thousands of people before such bias is discovered.

In India the risk is even greater because the access to courts and legal services is already unfair and unequal. Factors like the caste discrimination, poverty, language barriers, and geographical location affect the people's ability to obtain justice. When AI systems are trained on India's historical legal data are introduced without any proper checks then they may repeat and strengthen these existing inequalities in society instead of correcting them.

To reduce these risks in the system every AI system used to assist judges or courts in India should be regularly checked by independent experts to identify any bias. The data used to train the AI and the way it works should be made transparent. Most importantly, judges should always have the power to reject or override any AI recommendations whenever they believe it is necessary and it is bias against his judgment. Human judgment should always remain the final authority in any judicial decision-making.

Accountability for AI Errors

One of the biggest concerns about using AI in courts is deciding who is responsible when AI makes a mistake that harms someone. In the traditional justice system, there is a clarity

¹² Julia Angwin, Jeff Larson, Surya Mattu & Lauren Kirchner, *Machine Bias*, **ProPublica** (May 23, 2016), <https://www.propublica.org/article/machine-bias-risk-assessments-in-criminal-sentencing>.

regarding the accountability. Judges can be held accountable for their decisions, and affected parties have effective legal remedies. When AI is used, the accountability decision becomes more difficult to address. Is responsibility should be held by the software developer, the court administration that introduced the system, the judge who relied on its recommendations, or the lawyer who used AI-generated information without verifying it?

The case of *Mata v. Avianca, Inc.* explains this problem at the level of legal practice. A lawyer used the ChatGPT to research and prepare case citations for a court filing. The ChatGPT generated several citations that were entirely false and fabricated. The lawyer submitted these to the court without any proper verification. The court imposed serious penalties on the lawyers that were involved¹³. The case clearly established that the lawyers remain solely responsible for verifying the accuracy of any AI-generated material before submitting it in court. However, it did not resolve is the bigger question on the methods to be used by the courts to prevent such errors systematically, or for the redressal which is to be provided to individuals for the harmed that is caused by AI-assisted judicial decisions.

Indian courts have consistently held that decisions that are affecting the personal liberty cannot be made mechanically, and a human decision-maker must always involve for the question of accountable¹⁴. Still, India still lacks a comprehensive legal structure that clearly decides the responsibility when AI systems cause harm during judicial proceedings. As AI use in courts continues to expand, the need for filling this gap becomes increasingly necessary.

Constitutional Concerns

The use of AI in the judiciary raises important constitutional issues. Article 14 of the Constitution of India guarantees equality before the law and equal protection of the laws¹⁵. If AI systems give different types of results to people that are in similar situations due to the hidden bias in their algorithms and it may violate the Article 14. Unlike the human bias, which affects not only a few numbers of cases, but the AI bias can affect thousands of cases across different courts, by making it more difficult to detect and correct any errors.

Article 21 protects the right to life and personal liberty. It has been widely interpreted by the Supreme Court to include the right to a fair trial and access to justice¹⁶. In the case of *Maneka Gandhi v. Union of India*, the Court held that any procedure that affects the personal liberty

¹³ *Mata v. Avianca, Inc.*, No. 22-cv-1461 (PKC), 2023 WL 4114965 (S.D.N.Y. June 22, 2023).

¹⁴ *Jasbir Singh v. State of Punjab*, (2006) 8 S.C.C. 294 (India).

¹⁵ INDIA CONST. art. 14.

¹⁶ INDIA CONST. art. 21.

should be fair, just, and reasonable¹⁷. If courts rely on AI systems whose reasoning cannot be understood or challenged by the parties before them, then the judicial process would not be fair under the constitutional.

Natural justice and Human Judgment

The use of AI in courts raises important concerns about natural justice. The principle of audi alteram partem which means that every person must have a fair chance to present their case and challenge anything that affects them in a court decision. When an AI system influences a court decision, but its reasoning cannot be understood or questioned, this natural right will be affected. The principle of nemo iudex in causa sua means that the legal decisions should be free from any bias. AI which is trained on any biased data may produce results that are unfair.

In the case of *A.K. Kraipak v. Union of India*, the Supreme Court held that natural justice is an essential factor for fair decision-making¹⁸. The Court had also given its clarity on the technology that should be used to help judges but cannot be used to replace the human judgment in cases which involves the fundamental rights¹⁹. Human qualities like the empathy, moral reasoning, and understanding of the individual circumstances must remain essential specifically in criminal, family, and constitutional cases.

Social and Economic Concerns

The increasing use of AI systems in the legal profession raises important social and economic issues. Jobs like the office clerks, court clerks, legal transcriptionists, and junior associates are the more likely to be affected by the automation. Many of these workers who enter the legal profession are the first in their families. Without any proper training programmes and new job opportunities, AI may reduce one of the few accessible ways to build a legal career.

Another concern is that there is no equal sharing of benefits from the AI. The Large law firms and courts that are well funded can afford to use any advanced AI tools more easily than any small law firms and legal aid organisations. This could create a two-tier justice system where wealthy clients would receive better AI-supported legal services while poorer and marginalised communities have less access to legal help that is affordable²⁰. To prevent this visible difference, the governments should invest in open-source AI tools for courts and

¹⁷ *Maneka Gandhi v. Union of India*, (1978) 1 S.C.C. 248 (India).

¹⁸ *A.K. Kraipak v. Union of India*, (1969) 2 S.C.C. 262 (India).

¹⁹ *State of Maharashtra v. Prafulla B. Desai*, (2003) 4 S.C.C. 601 (India).

²⁰ Rebecca Wexler, *Life, Liberty, and Trade Secrets: Intellectual Property in the Criminal Justice System*, 70 *Stan. L. Rev.* 1343, 1347 (2018).

improve affordable technology in underserved areas. The proper training programmes should be provided for the workers whose jobs are affected by automation.

5. THE FUTURE OF LEGAL PROFESSIONS

The question is not about whether AI will completely replace advocates and legal officers, but it is about which parts of legal work AI can do, which parts it will change, and which parts will always require humans²¹.

The main work of the judges cannot be replaced by AI. Deciding of cases requires human judgment, balancing of different interests, and taking moral responsibility for decisions. AI systems cannot do this, and the legal system that is based on the rule of law should not allow any machine to make final judicial decisions. In the same way, work which includes arguing for cases, giving legal advice, and complex contracts handlings requires creativity, understanding the clients' needs, and considering the facts of each and every case. AI cannot fully replace these specific human skills²².

there will be greater impacts of AI on supporting the legal work, like the legal research, document drafting, administrative work, and record management. These are the areas that large job changes are likely to happen, and policymakers should give more attention to it.

New roles created by legal technology

Even though, AI replaces some existing tasks, but it also creates new types of legal jobs that did not exist before:

- Legal Data Analysts: People who study AI-generated legal data to help with the case strategy and litigation planning.
- AI Compliance Officers: these are lawyers who ensure laws, rules, and ethical standards are followed by AI systems.
- Legal Technologists: Experts who connect the law and technology and helps the law firms and courts to use and manage legal-tech tools.
- Cyber Law Experts: these are lawyers that deal with data protection, cybercrime, and digital rights.

²¹ Richard Susskind, *Tomorrow's Lawyers: An Introduction to Your Future* (3d ed. 2023); see also Richard Susskind, *Online Courts and the Future of Justice* (2019).

²² Richard Susskind, *Tomorrow's Lawyers: An Introduction to Your Future* 45–67 (3d ed. 2023) (discussing the limits of automation in advocacy and strategic legal counsel).

- Digital Evidence experts: Professionals that handles the digital evidence in the court, including the collecting, checking, and presenting of the electronic records.

These new roles need both the legal knowledge and technical skills. However, the current legal education does not always provide this combination in their courses²³. Because of this, law schools must change and prepare students to work in a legal system that heavily depends on technology.

A balanced approach

The appropriate response for the rise of legal technology is not a complete acceptance or complete rejection for AI systems. However, it requires a more balanced approach of using the benefits of AI while also protecting the jobs, their professional values, and the importance of human judgment in judiciary. This also means investing in training programs for the workers that are affected by the AI and creating rules to ensure transparency and accountability in AI systems that are used in judiciary. Additionally, to update the legal education to include technology skills, and making sure that decisions about using of the legal technology also considering its impact on employment before it is introduced.

6. CONCLUSION

The legal technology revolution is not a complete solution to all the problems in the judicial system, and it is not a threat that it will completely replace it. Instead, it is bringing a major change in the way legal work is carried out. It offers many benefits, like improving the efficiency, making legal services more efficient accessibility, and increasing accuracy in the tasks which involves handling large amount of information. However, it also creates more important challenges that are often overlooked which includes job losses, less learning opportunities for young legal professionals, and concentration of advanced legal technology in large and well-funded institutions.

The main argument in this article is that AI should be used only as a supporting tool for human assistance. It should always work under the supervision of human and within a clear legal and regulatory structure. AI should not replace human judgment, moral responsibility, practical training and experience which are very essential for the delivering of justice. The

²³ Robert Ambrogi, *Analytics, AI and Insights: 5 Innovations That Redefined Legal Research Since 2010*, **Above the Law** (Jan. 2, 2020), <https://abovethelaw.com/2020/01/analytics-ai-and-insights-5-innovations-that-redefined-legal-research-since-2010/> (noting the growing market demand for legal professionals with combined legal and technological competencies).

use of the legal technology will continue to accelerate but the question is how it is to be regulated and managed.

India is at an important stage of this transition. Projects like the e-Courts Project, SUPACE, and SUVAS shows that the judiciary is still active in adopting the modern technology. However, the consequences of these changes on the employment, constitutional rights, and access to justice has not yet received sufficient attention from both the policymakers and the legal institutions. It is important to address the issues immediately, before the use of AI system surpasses the ability of legal system to regulate it.

6.1.POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation 1: AI only as a Support Tool

AI systems that are used in courts and legal work should only support the judges and advocates, not replace them. Judges and advocates must always retain the final authority in all their decisions. This rule should be written into law and also included in court guidelines from the High Courts and Supreme Court²⁴.

Recommendation 2: A Legal Framework for the AI in Judiciary

India needs a clear law to regulate the use of AI in courts and the legal profession. This law should ensure that there is transparency in AI system and their designing and training. It should also require about the regular and independent checks to identify any bias and set clear rules about the responsibility when an AI system causes harm. To also create an independent authority to regulate the use of the legal technology.

Recommendation 3: Training and Skill Development

Bar councils, judicial academies, law associations, and government agencies should provide training programmes for legal professionals whose jobs will be affected by the AI. These programmes should help office clerks, court clerks, stenographers, and junior advocates to learn about the new skills like the using AI tools, data analysis, cyber law, and handling of the digital evidence.

Recommendation 4: Reforming Legal Education

²⁴ Richard Susskind, *Tomorrow's Lawyers: An Introduction to Your Future* 190–205 (3d ed. 2023) (arguing that human accountability must remain central to the deployment of AI in legal decision-making); cf. *Mata v. Avianca, Inc.*, 678 F. Supp. 3d 443, 455 (S.D.N.Y. 2023) (holding that attorneys remain responsible for verifying the accuracy of AI-generated legal authorities before submitting them to the court).

Law schools should update their courses to include about the legal technology, AI, data analysis, and cyber law. The Bar Council of India and National Law Universities should provide training on technology as a compulsory part for both undergraduate and postgraduate courses in legal education instead of just offering it only as an optional subject.

Recommendation 5: Assessing the Impact on Jobs

Before the courts or judicial institutions introduce any new AI systems, they should study about these systems and their probability in affecting jobs opportunities. Decisions about the buying and the usage of legal technology should consider the possible loss of jobs and to include plans to help workers transform into new job roles.

Recommendation 6: Constitutional Limits on the Use of AI

The Supreme Court and High Courts should clearly define the constitutional limits on the usage of AI in the justice system through important judgments or court guidelines. The AI systems should be limited to Articles 14 and 21 of the Constitution and the principles of natural justice. This will also help to ensure that AI does not affect the equality, fairness, or human responsibility in judicial decision-making²⁵.

REFERENCES

Cases

- A.K. Kraipak v. Union of India, (1969) 2 S.C.C. 262 (India).
- Jasbir Singh v. State of Punjab, (2006) 8 S.C.C. 294 (India).
- Maneka Gandhi v. Union of India, (1978) 1 S.C.C. 248 (India).
- Mata v. Avianca, Inc., 678 F. Supp. 3d 443 (S.D.N.Y. 2023).
- McConnell Dowell Constructors (Aust) Pty Ltd v. Santam Ltd & Others (No 1) [2016] VSC 734 (Austl.).
- State of Maharashtra v. Prafulla B. Desai, (2003) 4 S.C.C. 601 (India).

Books

- Michael Legg & Felicity Bell, Artificial Intelligence and the Legal Profession (2020).
- Richard Susskind, The Future of Law: Facing the Challenges of Information Technology (1996).

²⁵ **INDIA CONST.** arts. 14, 21; see also *Maneka Gandhi v. Union of India*, (1978) 1 S.C.C. 248 (India) (establishing that the procedure contemplated under Article 21 must be just, fair, and reasonable).

- Richard Susskind, Online Courts and the Future of Justice (2019).
- Richard Susskind, Tomorrow's Lawyers: An Introduction to Your Future (3d ed. 2023).
- Richard Susskind & Daniel Susskind, The Future of the Professions: How Technology Will Transform the Work of Human Experts (2015).

Journal Articles and Working Papers

- Sanjeeva Naik Jain, Legal Research and Methodology, 14 J. Indian L. Inst. 487 (1972).
- Inderpreet Kaur & Chetna Girish Puri, Impact of Artificial Intelligence on Legal Industry, 4 Int'l J.L. Mgmt. & Human. 346 (2021).
- Robert S. Cass, Of Artificial Intelligence and Legal Reasoning, U. Chi. Pub. L. & Legal Theory Working Paper No. 18 (2001).
- Brittany S. Taylor, The Ethical Implications of Artificial Intelligence in the Law, 55 Gonz. L. Rev. 217 (2019).
- Rebecca Wexler, Life, Liberty, and Trade Secrets: Intellectual Property in the Criminal Justice System, 70 Stan. L. Rev. 1343 (2018).

Reports and Institutional Publications

- Casetext & National Legal Research Group, The Real Impact of Using Artificial Intelligence in Legal Research (2018), <https://www.lawnext.com/wp-content/uploads/2018/09/The-Real-Impact-of-Using-Artificial-Intelligence-in-Legal-Research-FINAL2.pdf>.
- LawGeex, Comparing the Performance of Artificial Intelligence to Human Lawyers in the Review of Standard Business Contracts (2018), <https://images.law.com/contrib/content/uploads/documents/397/5408/lawgeex.pdf>.
- Ministry of Law and Justice, Government of India, eCourts Mission Mode Project: Phase III Report (2023).
- OECD, Artificial Intelligence in Society (2019).
- Ilaria Pietropaoli et al., Use of Artificial Intelligence in Legal Practice (British Institute of International and Comparative Law, 2023).

Webliography

- Robert Ambrogi, Analytics, AI and Insights: 5 Innovations That Redefined Legal Research Since 2010, Above the Law (Jan. 2, 2020), <https://abovethelaw.com/2020/01/analytics-ai-and-insights-5-innovations-that-redefined-legal-research-since-2010/>.
- Robert Ambrogi, ROSS Cofounder Returns to Legal Tech with Startup Using AI to Surface Judges' Decision-Making Patterns, LawSites (Feb. 2024), <https://www.lawnext.com/2024/02/ross-cofounder-returns-to-legal-tech.html>.
- Julia Angwin, Jeff Larson, Surya Mattu & Lauren Kirchner, Machine Bias, ProPublica (May 23, 2016), <https://www.propublica.org/article/machine-bias-risk-assessments-in-criminal-sentencing>.
- Department of Justice, Government of India, eCourts Mission Mode Project, <https://doj.gov.in/ecourts-mission-mode-project-2/> (last visited June 26, 2026).
- e-Committee, Supreme Court of India, e-Courts Mission Mode Project, <https://ecommitteesci.gov.in/project/brief-overview-of-e-courts-project/> (last visited June 26, 2026).
- Lourdes M. Fuentes, Lessons from Legal Research's Past for the GenAI-Powered Legal Technology of Tomorrow, ABA Law Technology Today (Sept. 18, 2024), https://www.americanbar.org/groups/law_practice/resources/law-technology-today/2024/lessons-from-legal-researchs-past-for-the-genai-powered-legal-technology-of-tomorrow/.
- Advait Sri Krishna Datta Mamidanna, Artificial Intelligence in the Indian Judiciary: SUPACE, SUVAS, and the Limits of Assistive Automation, Dr. Syama Prasad Mookerjee Research Foundation (Feb. 12, 2026), <https://spmrf.org/artificial-intelligence-in-the-indian-judiciary-supace-suvas-and-the-limits-of-assistive-automation/>.
- National Judicial Data Grid, https://njdg.ecourts.gov.in/njdg_v3/ (last visited June 26, 2026).
- Supreme Court of India, SUPACE: Supreme Court Portal for Assistance in Courts Efficiency, <https://main.sci.gov.in> (last visited June 26, 2026).
- Thomson Reuters, How Do You Effectively Use AI for Legal Research?, Thomson Reuters Legal Blog (Oct. 7, 2025), <https://legal.thomsonreuters.com/blog/how-to-effectively-use-ai-for-legal-research/>.
- Richard Tromans, LawGeex Hits 94% Accuracy in NDA Review vs 85% for Human Lawyers, Artificial Lawyer (Feb. 26, 2018),

<https://www.artificiallawyer.com/2018/02/26/lawgeex-hits-94-accuracy-in-nda-review-vs-85-for-human-lawyers/>.