



The Impact of Technology on the Legal System: Exploring How Technology is Changing the Way Laws are Created, Enforced, and Interpreted

Muhammad Babar Shaheen¹, Zulfiqar Husaain², Dr. Noreen Akhtar³, Shoket Ali⁴

¹Lecturer, College of Law, Government College University, Faisalabad, bsharal@yahoo.com

²China University of geoscience Wuhan, China, (Corresponding Author) zulfiqarhussain745@gmail.com

³Assistant Professor in Law, GC University Faisalabad, Pakistan, noreen.butt@ymail.com

⁴Ph.D. Scholar, Institute Of International Relations, Shah Abdul Latif University Khairpur, Pakistan, shaukatalimalik@gmail.com

Abstract

The use of technology in the legal framework has brought about changes in how laws are made, implemented and even applied. Some of the modern possibilities of using AI, big data analysis, and blockchain include legal research and analysis of cases, making decisions in courts, and implementing measures to combat crime. Even though these developments enhance productivity and convenience, issues about prejudice, privacy, and the application of human reasoning arise at the same time. The research method used to analyze the papers is an Integrative Literature Review (ILR) that involves cross-sectional Analysis from the identified secondary sources such as academic papers, legal reports and policy documents. Some of the topics include using artificial intelligence in legal research, using analytics in law enforcement, and the legal aspects of governance in using artificial intelligence applications. Some theories on how artificial intelligence is used in legal systems are retrieved from scholarly articles in peer-reviewed journals and government documents. This article reveals that using AI in legal research and working with cases increases their productivity in multiple ways. ODR platforms increase the availability of justice in a given society's society, especially in the case of cross-border disputes. However, legal decision-making through AI entails important issues like bias, privacy, and ethical issues of accountability. Candor and legal supervision are required to avoid unfair justice decisions and potential threats associated with the abuse of mass surveillance. Thus, AI and digital technologies are useful in the legal system, while the responsibility of legal decisions should be with humans. Some regulatory measures, along with ethical AI governance and an open court system and judiciary, will be central to ensuring the fundamental rights and fairness of AI processes in the legal system.

Keywords: Artificial Intelligence (AI), Legal Technology, Online Dispute Resolution (ODR), Algorithmic Bias, Judicial Decision-Making, Legal Research, Predictive Analytics, Blockchain in Law, Data Privacy.

Introduction

Technological advancement has significantly impacted various legal systems and how legislation, enforcement and even laws are enacted. The professional legal services that were

once based solely on human perception and conventional practices are now changing, and optimistic legal technologies are helping to innovate legal services. AI implementation in legal systems and decision-making in courts through policing and the court processes is both an opportunity and a concern created by new technologies in society (Gans-Combe, 2022). The processes of legal procedures' automation, the decentralization of AI-based decision-making tools, and the use of court digitization are the major changes to the administration of justice (Pah et al., 2022).

Another major advantage of AI in the legal system is making the system more productive. Legal research tools, analyzing and with the help of machine learning algorithms, hasten the analysis of legal documents and the amount of work that would otherwise be done by a human, which leads to avoiding unnecessary delays in approaching the court (Yalcin Williams, Ikpe, and Cragun, 2022). Also, AI is useful in case handling and evaluating evidence to make accurate decisions based on big data (Gawali & Sony, 2020). These developments enhance an efficient justice system to be more transparent and less rigid for the legal practitioners to engage and perform other essential tasks instead of spending time on trivial work (Amato et al., 2023). Nevertheless, there are certain risks associated with integrating AI into legal systems. Collective awareness of algorithmic bias, fairness, and concerns for ethical issues caused by machine learning to make legal decisions has caused attraction among scholars and policymakers (Birhane, 2021). For example, using AI in eligible decisions by applying AI algorithms can pose the following questions: Who is accountable for its decision? Does it not propound the same preconceived prejudice in every decision made by the judge of the rule of law seen in all the databases (Rafanelli, 2022)? Moreover, the issues of scrutiny and intelligibility arise because some AI systems work in the 'black box' mode, and the reasoning behind the algorithm's decision is not always clear (Salvia, 2019). These factors put into question the need to develop proper measures to safeguard the use of ethics in applying artificial intelligence in the justice system (Karmaza et al., 2021).

Thus, the role of AI in law enforcement also has more on the kind side and the dark side. Advanced monitoring systems, facial recognition profiling and analytics tools are some ways police work has changed due to the application of artificial intelligence (Putra et al., 2023). Despite the increased security and crime fighting, these technologies bring privacy issues and tendencies of population surveillance into question (Chandra et al., 2020). The debate over civil liberties is a topic that is relevant to all governments' desire to maintain order without eradicating civil liberties while freely embracing technology (Vargas Murillo & Pari Bedoya, 2024).

This paper seeks to discuss AI and digital systems and their effects on legislative processes, law enforcement agencies, courts and legal professionals. It aims to ensure that this research gives insight into how AI benefits and disadvantages will shape the future of justice. The findings should be useful in continuing the deliberations on the ethical, legal and other requirements for attaining an effective and just justice system in the age of Information technology.

Theoretical and conceptual Framework

This paper presents an integrative review of the concepts of AI technologies in legal systems under three themes: AI, Legal Analytics, and Decision support systems. Such developments are increasing legal tasks' efficiency, the effectiveness of legal workflows, and driving innovation across the legal practice (Kauffman & Soares, 2020). ML and NLP are introducing significant changes in legal practices such as predictive analysis, document review, and legal research (Richmond et al., 2023). NLP has enhanced the effectiveness of the analysis of contracts, interpretation of legal texts, and evidence processing (Ugwudike, 2022). The introduction of artificial intelligence in the legal system features a revolutionary advancement that increases efficiency by treating procedures equally and fairly.

Legal AI allows lawyers and attorneys to conclude past cases and even ongoing court

proceedings. In conclusion, integrating Legal Analytics into the legal practice gives an avenue to predict trends and identify patterns, and thus aids in sharpening the legal advisory process and work precision (Gupta & Tripathi, 2023). In addition, it helps identify and formulate mitigation measures that help law firms manage their cases effectively and be in a good position (Rustambekov & Turdialiev, 2023). All these are helping in the development of what may be referred to as a more sophisticated approach to the utilization of data in enhancing legal practice effectiveness and the decision-making process.

Decision support systems (DSS) are a very important appliance in helping legal professionals effectively combine expansive legal knowledge with artificial intelligent analytics. With the help of machine learning and NLP, DSS can analyze case laws, consult statutes, and even case laws to gain better insights into legal likelihoods (Biresaw and Saste, 2022). DSS supports the processes of estimating the legal risk, as well as the capability of predicting the duration of a case and the strategy for a given case according to the trends identified in prior case analysis (Kabir & Alam, 2023). These systems not only enhance the productivity of the systems but also enhance the accuracy of legal advice and the delivery of clients' services, consequently enhancing the legal systems and aid services.

Therefore, ethical issues in using AI in legal frameworks remain worrisome, especially when dealing with bail conditions, the recommended sentencing or parole. If improperly controlled, the prediction may replicate historical prejudices throughout society and even become an issue in the fairness and impartiality of the judiciary system (Zafar, 2024). These issues must be solved today, and many experts emphasize that it is essential for AI to be properly integrated into the legal fields. For this, scholars need a profound understanding of AI capabilities and their drawbacks, which is why a socio-technical approach is necessary (Lupo, 2022). Socio-Technical Systems Theory (STST), Critical Theory of Technology or Algorithmic Accountability Theory makes up some of the needs to govern AI deployment with cultural, ethical and judicial parameters (Feenberg & McCarthy, 2023).

According to the approach used in this theoretical framework, the focus is on bringing practical technology to complement ethical legal matters. Thus, in response to the research question, this study aims to offer recommendations on how to harness AI's benefits in the legal profession without compromising fairness (Bernhardt, 2021). A comprehensive approach is needed to assess the AI application in terms of the operational, ethical, and social implications of AI to support the deployment of acceptable forms of AI in legal activities (Hussain, 2021).

This paper employs Social, Technological, and Symbolic Theory (STST), the critical theory of technology, and the algorithmic accountability theory as the theoretical framework. STST stresses the need to optimize the level of integration between the technical and the human in the legal field by considering AI as an assistant to legal professionals (Govers & Amelsvoort, 2023). In the context of AI in legal contexts, the Critical Theory of Technology engages with questions of power inherent in AI-driven legal systems. It requires critically assessing how AI shapes an individual's legal rights (Delanty & Harris, 2021). Algorithmic Accountability Theory addresses this matter, calling for explanation and fairness in Artificial Intelligence in legal decision-making by legal professionals (Wieringa, 2020).

Thus, there is still a gap in the evidence regarding the consequences of AI implementation in legal work and its ethical, functional, and social effects, among other things (Laptev & Feyzrakhmanova, 2024). More research should be conducted about the real implications of AI to the judicial processes and the degree to which it is fair and just. That is why there is a need to ensure that policymakers, researchers, and legal professionals work together to address the following: This creates solitary requirements for other innovations to provide the needed impetus in legal efficiency without compromising the integrity of the system (Mohamed et al., 2024). Further, the studies should explore how such legal systems created by AI can help promote fairness, effectiveness, and transparency in judicial procedures and how such technologies can be effectively and responsibly integrated.

Research Method and design

In this study, the methodology used is the Integrative Literature Review (ILR), which reviews and integrates both theory and empirical articles collected, offering an extensive systematic review of the legal context of AI integration. An ILR is an extensively used research methodology that analyzes research from various academic sources and looks for trends, issues, and developments in a particular field (Torraco, 2016). The ILR method entails identifying a range of sources, such as journal articles, books and conference papers, that discuss the use of AI in the judicial system. Moreover, these sources are included to review the application of AI in the reports and policy documents of governments and legal authorities. As a result, to have a broader outlook, grey literature and only trustworthy online sources are also considered in the study (Wieringa, 2020).

This way, using the primary ILR method allows going beyond the simplistic perspectives on the given field and delving into the topic more sophisticatedly. This way, it is possible to find the strengths and weaknesses stemming from AI's application during the case's judicial process (Horneber & Laumer, 2023). The research follows a structured five-stage ILR framework: (1) problem formulation, where the scope of AI's role in law is defined; (2) data collection, utilizing academic databases like Google Scholar, IEEE Xplore, and legal research repositories; (3) evaluation of data, assessing the credibility and relevance of selected studies; (4) data analysis and interpretation, synthesizing findings to identify themes and trends; and (5) presentation of results, structuring insights into a coherent narrative (Gebler et al., 2022).

In order to structure the review systematically and inquire about important works and emerging research trends, both backward and forward citation searching was carried out for each citation, applying this method, the authors systematically integrated the role of AI in legal activities (Laptev & Feyzrakhmanova, 2024). The following search strings were used to make the study results valid and reliable: AI in law, Legal Technology, and Judicial AI Systems. To tackle this, different biases were taken to reduce biased views regarding certain sources. In addition, this study benefited from multiple legal and AI domains to enrich the investigation (Delanty & Harris, 2021). It offers a balanced look into the effects of AI in the legal industry, which should benefit subsequent qualitative or quantitative investigations and legislation efforts. This work aims to provide an interdisciplinary perspective on AI justice based on technological, legal, ethical, and business management department findings (Contini, 2020).

Figure 1: Comprehensive List of AI and Law Publications

Rank	Title	Year	Author(s)	Type of Document	Citations
1	Courts and artificial intelligence	2020	Reiling Yalcin, Themeli,	article	100
2	Perceptions of justice by algorithms	2023	Stamhuis, Philipsen, & Puntoni	article	34
3	Algorithmic injustice: a relational ethics approach	2021	Birhane	article	325
4	Research on the application of artificial intelligence technology in the field of Justice	2020	Mingsung & Shuling	article	12
5	The Role of AI Technology for Legal Research and Decision Making	2023	Kabir & Alam	article	9
6	Artificial intelligence in the legal sector: pressures and challenges of transformation	2020	Brooks, Gherhes, & Vorley	article	54

7	Predictive algorithms in justice systems and the limits of tech-reformism	2022	Ugwudike	article	17
8	Perceptions of justice by algorithms	2023	Yalcin, Themeli, Stamhuis, Philipsen, & Puntoni Villata,	article	34
9	Thirty years of artificial intelligence and law: the third decade	2022	Araszkiewicz, Ashley, Bench-Capon, Branting, Conrad, & Wyner	article	33
10	Reviewing the new tool in law: legal analytics	2023	Gupta & Tripathi	article	0
11	Artificial intelligence in legal predictive analytics: enhancing litigation strategies	2023	Rustambekov & Turdialiev	article	0
12	Natural language processing in the legal domain	2023	Katz, Hartung, Gerlach, Jana, & Bommarito II	article	30
13	AI in legal services: new trends in AI-enabled legal services	2020	Kauffman & Soares	article	30
14	AI and law: ethical, legal, and socio-political implications	2021	Gordon	article	21
15	AI in judicial application of law and the right to a court	2021	Nowotko	article	19
16	Research on the application of artificial intelligence technology in the field of Justice	2020	Mingsung & Shuling	article	12
17	Automated justice: issues, benefits and risks in the use of artificial intelligence and its algorithms in access to justice and law enforcement	2022	Gans-Combe	article	8
18	The promise of AI in an open justice system	2022	Pah, Schwartz, Sanga, Alexander, Amaral & Consortium	article	6
19	The role of AI in improving criminal justice system: Indian perspective	2020	Gawali & Sony	article	5
20	The impacts of AI on research in the legal profession	2023	Biresaw	article	5
21	Explainable AI and law: an evidential survey	2023	Richmond, Muddamsetty, Gammeltoft-Hansen, & Olsen	article	3
22	Artificial intelligence in justice	2021	Karmaza, Koroied, Makhinchuk, Strilko, & Iosypenko	article	2

Findings of the study

Technology and the Creation of Laws

Big Data and Legislative Drafting

Due to their effectiveness in policy formulation, governments and policymakers have shifted to data analytics in legislation. It also means explaining the nature of social issues so that legislators can come up with better responses in the form of legislation. Predictive analytics are useful in evaluating legal affairs by evaluating their possible influence on a certain outcome before they are enacted, thus facilitating a more fact-based approach to doing policies (Kabir & Alam, 2023). They help legislators guard against legal problems and estimate their financial consequences and people's responses. In addition, sources of information put the public in the spotlight to participate in legislation to make its process even more democratic. These include using opinion mining through sentiment analysis to develop new regulations that meet the users' expectations to a certain extent (Gupta & Tripathi, 2023). In this regard, legal analytics have proved to be instrumental in helping lawmakers understand legal cases, monitor trends, and improve the legislation-making process in drafting laws (Rustambekov & Turdialiev, 2023). However, they raise concerns concerning the impacts of algorithmic biases in such systems that might perpetuate new legislation in the form of social inequalities (Birhane, 2021).

Blockchain and Smart Contracts

Blockchain technology has recently entered the legal industry by enhancing the integrity of legal papers. This innovation is well-suited to legislative processes, especially when document identification is significant. In this case, decentralized ledger technology will enable lawmakers to stop altering documents and other forms of forgery (Reiling, 2020). Since blockchain successfully tracks legislation changes, it is a helpful instrument for developing legislation and its enactment. Smart contracts are a type of blockchain technology that replaces legal formalities and mitigates the chances of a contract controversy due to the execution of the contract conditions depending on the predetermined conditions. This relieves the dependence on third-party agencies, brings optimization to the process, and decreases the probability of fraudulent activities. In the regions that have adopted the use of smart contracts, autonomous contracts enhance the chances of compliance and reduce litigation expenses. Nevertheless, there are some difficulties in applying smart contracts to many legal cases, which sometimes may involve certain precepts that can be decided only by human discretion and sound judgment (Gordon, 2021).

Decentralizing is a practice that also impacts legal regulation development in the corresponding field. Given the development of blockchain-based governance systems, communities and organizations have shifted toward decentralized decision-making systems, which may redefine traditional legislative models for communities and organizations (Villata et al., 2022). These models may promote citizens' involvement in the government and governance processes, but they have regulation issues and enforcement implications (Kauffman & Soares, 2020).

Technology and Law Enforcement: The Role of AI in Modern Policing

Advanced technologies such as AI have revolutionized society's forces of law and order by improving the performance and accuracy of crime control, detection, trial and sentencing. In the ever-evolving world of policing, this paper looks into new AI applications such as predictive policing, biometrical surveillance, and computer forensics. However, with what conforms to privacy, biases, and accountability issues that come with AI, a critical analysis of AI in law enforcement must be conducted.

Artificial Intelligence in Policing

Machine intelligence in law enforcement has transformed policing actions since it aids in preventive measures, pattern identification, and surveillance. Predictive policing involves using algorithms to determine areas with high crime rates so that the relevant authorities can take adequate precautions and avoid crime incidents (Gans-Combe, 2022). Yalcin et al. noted that AI tools can look into past crime trends and work on a predictor to prevent future offenses, thus improving policing strategies (Yalcin et al., 2023).

Facial recognition and the use of other biometrics enhance law enforcement's working capacity by identifying suspects. These technologies employ deep learning/machine learning models to compare facial characteristics, fingerprints, and iris scans to police databases (Reiling, 2020). Using artificial intelligence in crime detection has enhanced faster tracking in arresting criminals than before, thereby reducing the investigation period (Brooks, Gherhes & Vorley, 2020). However, the use of facial recognition technology has recently increased exponentially. Thus, privacy concerns have been raised, and it has been criticized for surveillance and ethical discussions concerning the use of AI in policing (Birhane, 2021).

Nevertheless, the utilization of AI has some ethical dilemmas that need to be addressed, especially regarding issues of fairness. Bias in developed machine learning can lead to the deliberate focus on minority individuals, thus worsening the situations within the justice sector (Nowotko, 2021). That is why the amalgamation of AI algorithms with policing can lead to racism and wrongful arrests as the AI tool acquires prejudices from the training data (Mingtsung & Shuling, 2020). Hence, there is still a need to address algorithmic transparency and responsibility in developing AI policing (Villata et al., 2022).

Cyber security and Digital Forensics

Current cybercrime cases require sophisticated methods of artificial intelligence-based digital forensics to fight cyber fraud, hacking and other digital financial crimes. Artificial intelligence is designed to work in near real-time, especially with big data, to identify factors such as outliers, threats and data breaches. Digital forensics, enabled by advanced AI technologies, can identify pertinent evidence from electronic gadgets and enhance the investigation procedures (Pah et al., 2022).

Technologies in this class, however, present some difficulty to police organizations. Although it safeguards information and enhances the security of lines of communication, it poses the disadvantage of limiting the acquisition of essential electronic evidence during the investigation process (Gordon, 2021). Encryption is a major problem as legal investigating agencies fail to decrypt encrypted data, causing conflict between the people fighting for their privacy rights and the authorities fighting cybercriminals (Kauffman & Soares, 2020). The ongoing debate as to whether there should be a regulation of encryption of information can be said to pose a dispute that needs to be resolved as to whether the privacy of citizens should be protected while at the same time allowing police and/or other law enforcement agencies to have access to relevant evidence in digital form (Rustambekov & Turdialiev, 2023).

It also reveals the necessity of international cooperation in enforcing laws in connection with cybercrimes. The authors correlate the need for international cooperation in identifying and punishing offenders with the fact that most cybercriminals use legal loopholes in certain jurisdictions to escape punishment (Gawali & Sony, 2020). AI encompasses analysis in cross-border investigations, mainly by creating an environment for real-time cooperation and the possibility of automatic detection of cyber threats (Biresaw, 2023). However, exclusive acts of digital privacy and cybersecurity legislation in different countries break through challenges to form a single legal formula for protecting against cybercrimes (Richmond et al., 2023).

Future Implications and Ethical Considerations

The use of AI in police work and criminal justice can revolutionize policing forces and related systems around the world. Nevertheless, it is crucial to determine the ethical use of AI in policing and the best practice. To address the issue of biases and ensure fairness and proper handling of people's data, algorithmic responsibility, transparent regulation, and human supervision must be established (Karmaza et al., 2021). Notably, the creation of AI thematic committees within police departments can lead to the formation of appropriate guidelines for the use of AI technologies in accordance with human rights (Gans-Combe, 2022).

However, to make certain that AI technology tools in policing are not abused, police officers need to be constantly trained on AI technologies. There are various recommendations for training related to ethical AI practices, data privacy regulation, and ways of avoiding the effects of bias in AI (as stated by Villata et al., 2022). Applying AI to policing should supplement the human decision-making process to keep the decisions made by police officers legal, justified, and less biased (Pah et al., 2022).

Overall, AI has provided phenomenal changes in policing by improving the predictive policing technique, biometric surveillance, and digital forensics. Nonetheless, the questions about an unbiased approach, respect for people's private lives, and responsibility are crucial to turning AI into a justice tool rather than a discrimination instrument. There is a need for future works to look at how to enhance the use of AI in policing by integrating ethical AI governance to serve the purpose of enhancing the use of technology without infringing on individual rights (Kabir & Alam, 2023).

Technology and Judicial Interpretation: The Role of AI in Modern Legal Systems

The use of artificial intelligence in the legal field has impacted the research processes in legislation, case law analysis, and dispute-solving. In the legal field, AI helps in research, analysis of probable judicial decisions, and enhancement and speeding up legal processes. Also, the emergence of ODR has increased litigants' ability to seek justice, especially in international litigation. Nevertheless, embracing new technologies such as AI holds efficiency and cost benefits; they are not devoid of ethical and regulatory issues in the army of the legal sphere.

AI in Legal Research and Case Law Analysis

The special benefits of AI are seen in legal research work through data retrieval, categorization, and citation. AI platforms can review and/or retrieve legislative texts, codes or precedents, and other legal documents in real-time, facilitating easier decision-making for legal practitioners (Reiling, 2020). Legal tech applies NLP to use case law, find legal reasoning, and suggest case law much faster than legal discovery (Katz et al., 2023).

The other two components are due to machine learning models that interpret legal cases using the case data to predict the outcomes of certain cases. It uses previous court decades, judges' decisions, and arguments to derive accurate probabilities of the possible verdicts in similar cases (Villata et al., 2022). These resources help a lawyer estimate the case outcome in the trial. However, algorithms have underlying issues, such as the one used in Spiral; the bias reinforcement problem further supported by the current legal system (Birhane, 2021).

In addition, through artificial intelligence, the legal bots can perform other activities, including drafting legal documents, reviewing contracts and compliance checking. Lawyer robots enhance the offering of timely advice by shifting some workloads from the legal practitioners, improving service delivery (Brooks, Gherhes & Vorley, 2020). That is, the executives, with the utilization of AI legal support, facilitate efficiency and, at the same time, reduce the costs of incorporating the legal services among its customers.

Online Dispute Resolution (ODR)

In today's world, ODR has drastically changed how disputes are resolved outside courtrooms. By automation, digital platforms offer negotiation, mediation, and arbitration help in

quarrelsome disputes (Pah et al., 2022). ODR technologies employ AI algorithms to engage the parties in a dispute via chatbots and other solutions and do not involve court-by-court proceedings (Gawali & Sony, 2020). Thus, this digital transformation helps speed up the dispute resolution process while making legal services more available.

Self-employing technologies have also assisted in reducing legal expenses and time consumption in arbitration and mediation. Automated ODR platforms, therefore, consider case details of the particular case and develop options that can be supported by the law and previous cases (Rustambekov and Turdialiev, 2023). This automation enhances the process of tackling the dispute without necessarily having to involve many cases in court or expensive lawyers. Nevertheless, fairness and procedural justice in using artificial intelligence in settlements are still aspects to consider (Gans-Combe, 2022).

In addition, ODR has been of the utmost importance in interstate disputes mainly because of jurisdictional interference with the dispute resolution process. Online dispute resolution systems entail using technology to solve disputes without people being physically present and the procedures taking a long time (Richmond et al., 2023). Nevertheless, there are several issues that ODR platforms have to face regarding legal enforceability, data privacy, and the jurisdictions in which they operate (Nowotko, 2021).

Challenges and Ethical Considerations

On the advantages of AI in judicial interpretation and alternative dispute resolutions, it is for this reason that this paper will outline the ethical issues such as fairness, transparency as well as accountability to come to terms. The ability of AI to depend on prior legal data is problematic because it would then enforce current biases into the set decision-making models (Mingsung & Shuling, 2020). However, the use of AI in legal analysis and decision-making removes the humanity factor in the decisions made on issues regarding law and justice and, thus, raises legitimacy and flexibility concerns about automatically derived legal decisions (Villata et al., 2022).

That is why it is crucial to remain as transparent as possible regarding artificial intelligence at the heart of legal technologies. Since AI is a developing technology, legal experts and policymakers must deploy specific guidelines for AI applications in legal interpretation and other dispute resolution (Gordon, 2021). In addition, the AI ethics committees within the judiciary composition can regulate AI tools' use while abiding by legal standards (Kabir & Alam, 2023).

Challenges and Ethical Considerations in AI-Driven Legal Systems

With AI's continuous introduction and application in the legal domain, transparency, neutrality, responsibility accountability and supervisory measurement are matters of significant concern. Artificial intelligence is changing the legal world, and the use of AI technologies in legal practice is considered valuable in efficiency and accuracy; however, the ethical issues related to new technologies should be studied and analyzed. This section identifies various issues, such as bias in functioning automatons, privacy issues, and the influence of human discretion in computer-assisted legal decisions.

Bias and Prejudice in the context of artificial intelligence on Legal Processes

This paper further explores one of the emergent challenges associated with the implementation of AI, which is the issue of bias. This means that some AI models trained in the framework of legal precedents might be guided by historical injustice (Zhu & Zheng, 2021). If these biases are not corrected, AI-supported legal systems may contribute to acts of discrimination in law courts, especially to groups deemed inferior (Mohamed et al., 2024). Auditing AI algorithms is essential to ensure that AI solutions are biased. Reverse preferences are not sustained from how the beauticians cut their hair in the past (Horneber & Laumer, 2023). Therefore, to address

the issue of fairness and accountability of the decisions made by the AI system, the methods through which the decisions are made must be made clear. Lawyers and lawmakers need to find ways to end review decisions made by artificial intelligence systems to determine and address existing biases (Wieringa, 2020). Moreover, AI legal analytics must be monitored constantly to guarantee compliance with ethical perspectives and the judiciary's high standards (Gupta & Tripathi, 2023).

Another of the issues is the digital divide, which affects the acquisition of AI technology in legal proceedings. Some legal systems, especially those in developing countries, have the main challenge of integrating advanced technologies such as AI (Kabir & Alam, 2023). This results in unequal legal services and only legal agencies with the means to implement Artificial intelligence in analyzing cases and researching the legal system will be able to do so. Closing this gap is crucial to promote AI legal tools across both segments of society, whether or not they possess advanced technological tools (Govers & Amelsvoort, 2023).

Privacy and Data Security Concerns

Because AI-powered legal solutions work with enormous amounts of personal and sensitive information, data security and privacy issues are meaningful. Policies have to be put in place to protect individuals' data that are used in artificial intelligence while at the same time enabling the system to recognize laws in a legal environment. The GDPR provides an example of relevant regulations protecting individuals' data while allowing developments in AI and ML. However, equally sweeping measures are still required internationally since artificial intelligence is causing risks to privacy in decision-making within the legal system. AI also raises some other problems concerning civil liberties and mass surveillance. Today, AI has become an essential tool used by governments and law enforcement departments to monitor, recognize faces, and analyze in advance the possibility of a crime occurrence (Laptev & Feyzrakhmanova, 2024). Although they increase security, using such technologies is accompanied by surveillance threats and abuses of people's rights to privacy (Contini, 2020). The challenge, therefore, of determinative legal governance emerges from the difficult balance between the rights of a person and security duties within a state in its use of Artificial Intelligence.

Another issue that law enforcement agencies face is the pull between safety in the country's security and the individual's rights. This raises the privacy problem where the automatic systems can detect security threats but, at the same time, increase its negatives, such as false positives and profiling, which is unfair to the target (Delanty & Harris, 2021). There should be clear structures of auditing and supervisory measures in order for authorities to effectively enforce the responsible use of artificial intelligence in policing the country without infringement of civil liberties, as advanced by Ps et al. 2024.

The Role of Human Judgment in an AI-Powered Legal System

Although the use of AI in the legal context is gaining prominence, there is no way AI can replace human discretion, particularly in analyzing legal issues. It is further important to note that AI can support the analysis of case law but cannot do justice to analyzing legal arguments as it involves ethical and moral reasoning, which the authors explain really cannot be intuited (Rustambekov & Turdialiev, 2023). The issue pertains to the work of Judges and legal professionals in supervising AI selections for purposes like excluding bias and maintaining social justice (Cho, 2022). This is due to the ethical issues involved when decomposing decision-making in the legal field to AI systems. Whatever the technique used in the mathematical model, its outputs must be tested and ratified by practicing jurists to avoid parroting of justice by machine-oriented results (Cooper, 1982). Likely, there is a danger of neo-positivism, where legal professionals rely on the conclusions made by the AI without questioning them (Snyder, 2019). Human supervision of the legal systems aided by Artificial Intelligence must be kept high to meet justice and avoid mistyped results of Artificial

Intelligence.

There are no indications that law practice will become fully automated; instead, we look forward to a view of human and AI integration in practice. Russell (2005) claimed that AI could benefit a legal professional in terms of cash flow, document analysis, and research. However, there is no way around using human discretion in legal reasoning and ethical decision-making, as Ewald et al. (2022) pointed out. AI governance models that include human values will become fundamental in the legal realm to ensure AI's rights and proper regulation.

Conclusion

Influences on legislation, enforcement, and judiciary have also been impacted by the adoption of technology in resolving legal issues. AI and digital technologies have impacted the tasks of legal research, analysis of case law, solution of disputes, and law enforcement. Sophisticated technologies advance the administration of justice by enhancing case management, automating processes that the conventional workforce uses, and enabling enhanced judicial outcomes from the predictive algorithm boosts available (Gupta & Tripathi, 2023). Thereby, Online Dispute Resolution (ODR) platforms have positively impacted the availability of justice, especially in cross-border legal matters, due to the high legal costs and the long time taken to complete cases (Rustambekov & Turdialiev, 2023). Nevertheless, there are important problems when digital tools are being implemented in the legal context. The existing and serious ethical issues that have been voiced revolve around fairness, especially in cases where the AI legal system discriminates against a particular race or gender due to the pre-existing prejudice instilled in it by the law (Zhu & Zheng, 2021). Algorithmic audibility that addresses these issues is critical to address these issues and to provide fairness for AI-assisted judicial decisions (Horneber & Laumer, 2023).

Privacy and data security are still essential in the legal considerations involving artificial intelligence frameworks. Thus, AI integration in surveillance and predictive policing can be perceived as enhancing broad surveillance and violating citizens' rights (Laptev & Feyzrakhmanova, 2024). Ensuring the safety of national security concerns and the citizen's rights to privacy is very important when AI is used in the enforcement of laws (Mohamed et al., 2024).

Notably, social justice strategies can only be achieved through a better blending of regulatory approaches and human control of the algorithms, thus creating a balance between AI and enhancing these technologies. To address current challenges, policy-making, law practice, and technology industries require cooperation in creating ethical governance of AI that promotes openness, formal responsibility, and people's equal access to justice (Govers & Amelsvoort, 2023). The main idea of this paper is that by responsibly introducing AI, the legal systems can become more effective and universally accessible. However, this process will not infringe on a given legal system's basic human rights or principles.

References

- Biresaw, G. (2023) 'The impacts of AI on research in the legal profession'.
- Birhane, A. (2021) 'Algorithmic injustice: a relational ethics approach', Article, 325 citations.
- Birhane, A. (2021) 'Algorithmic injustice: a relational ethics approach'.
- Brooks, C., Gherhes, C. & Vorley, T. (2020) 'Artificial intelligence in the legal sector: pressures and challenges of transformation'.
- Cho, Y. (2022) 'Comparing integrative and systematic literature reviews', *Human Resource Development Review*, 21(2), pp. 147-151.
- Contini F, Artificial intelligence and the transformation of humans, law and technology interactions in judicial proceedings, *Law Technol Humans*, 2020 May 8, 2, 4-18, doi: 10.5204/lthj.v2i1.1478.
- Contini, F. (2020) 'Artificial intelligence and the transformation of humans, law and technology interactions in judicial proceedings', *Law Technology and Humans*, 2(1), pp. 4-18.

- Cooper, H. (1982) 'Scientific guidelines for conducting integrative research reviews', *Review of Educational Research*.
- Delanty G, Harris N, Critical theory and the question of technology: the frankfurt school revisited, *Thesis Eleven*, 2021 Mar 24,166, 072551362110020, doi: 10.1177/07255136211002055.
- Delanty, G. and Harris, N. (2021) 'Critical theory and the question of technology: the Frankfurt school revisited', *Thesis Eleven*, 166, doi: 10.1177/07255136211002055.
- Ewald, H., Klerings, I., Wagner, G., Heise, T. L., Stratil, J. M. and Lhachimi, S. K. (2022) 'Searching two or more databases decreased the risk of missing relevant studies: a meta-research study', *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology*, 149, pp. 154-164.
- Feenberg, A. and McCarthy, D. (2023) 'Technology, culture, and critical theory: an interview with Andrew Feenberg', *International Politics*, 60(1), pp. 1-22.
- Gans-Combe, J. (2022) 'Automated justice: issues, benefits, and risks in the use of artificial intelligence and its algorithms in access to justice and law enforcement'.
- Gawali, A. & Sony, P. (2020) 'The role of AI in improving criminal justice system: Indian perspective'.
- Gebler, M., Juraschek, M., Thiede, S., Cerdas, F. and Herrmann, C. (2022) 'Defining the “positive impact” of socio-technical systems for absolute sustainability', *Sustainability Science*, 17, pp. 1-17.
- Gordon, T. (2021) 'AI and law: ethical, legal, and socio-political implications', Article, 21 citations.
- Gordon, T. (2021) 'AI and law: ethical, legal, and socio-political implications'.
- Govers, M. and Amelsvoort, P. (2023) 'A theoretical essay on socio-technical systems design thinking in the era of digital transformation', *Gruppe Interaktion Organisation*, 54, pp. 1-14.
- Gupta, P. & Tripathi, R. (2023) 'Reviewing the new tool in law: legal analytics', Article, 0 citations.
- Gupta, S. and Tripathi, K. (2023) 'Reviewing the new tool in law: legal analytics', *Journal of Law and Technology*, XIII(101).
- Horneber D, Laumer S, Algorithmic accountability, *Bus Inf Syst Eng*, 2023 May 24, 65,1-8, doi: 10.1007/s12599-023-00817-8.
- Horneber, D. and Laumer, S. (2023) 'Algorithmic accountability', *Business Information Systems Engineering*, 65, pp. 1-8.
- Kabir, M. & Alam, S. (2023) 'The Role of AI Technology for Legal Research and Decision Making', Article, 9 citations.
- Kabir, M. & Alam, S. (2023) 'The Role of AI Technology for Legal Research and Decision Making'.
- Karmaza, V., Koroied, N., Makhinchuk, O., Strilko, V. & Iosypenko, A. (2021) 'Artificial intelligence in justice'.
- Katz, D., Hartung, L., Gerlach, B., Jana, M. & Bommarito II, J. (2023) 'Natural language processing in the legal domain'.
- Kauffman, J. & Soares, T. (2020) 'AI in legal services: new trends in AI-enabled legal services', Article, 30 citations.
- Laptev VA, Feyzrakhmanova DR, Application of artificial intelligence in justice: current trends and future prospects, *Hum-Centric Intell Syst [Internet]*, 2024 May 18 [cited 2024 Jun 22], Available from: <https://link.springer.com/10.1007/s44230-024-00074-2>.
- Laptev, V. A. and Feyzrakhmanova, D. R. (2024) 'Application of artificial intelligence in justice: current trends and future prospects', *Human-Centric Intelligent Systems*, doi: 10.1007/s44230-024-00074-2.
- Mingtsung, H. & Shuling, T. (2020) 'Research on the application of artificial intelligence technology in the field of Justice', Article, 12 citations.
- Mingtsung, H. & Shuling, T. (2020) 'Research on the application of artificial intelligence technology in the field of Justice'.

Mohamed, E., Quteishat, A., Qtaishat, A. and Mohammad, A. (2024) 'Exploring the role of AI in modern legal practice: opportunities, challenges, and ethical implications', *Journal of Electrical Systems*, 20(6).

Nowotko, J. (2021) 'AI in judicial application of law and the right to a court'.

Pah, R., Schwartz, E., Sanga, P., Alexander, D., Amaral, J. & Consortium, M. (2022) 'The promise of AI in an open justice system'.

Reiling, D. (2020) 'Courts and artificial intelligence', Article, 100 citations.

Reiling, D. (2020) 'Courts and artificial intelligence'.

Richmond, R., Muddamsetty, V., Gammeltoft-Hansen, T. & Olsen, S. (2023) 'Explainable AI and law: an evidential survey'.

Rustambekov, I. and Turdialiev, M. (2023) 'Artificial intelligence in legal predictive analytics: enhancing litigation strategies', *Universum Economy and Law*, 108.

Rustambekov, K. & Turdialiev, B. (2023) 'Artificial intelligence in legal predictive analytics: enhancing litigation strategies', Article, 0 citations.

Rustambekov, O. & Turdialiev, K. (2023) 'Artificial intelligence in legal predictive analytics: enhancing litigation strategies'.

Torraco R, Writing integrative reviews of the literature: methods and purposes, *Int J Adult Vocat Educ Technol*, 2016 Jul 1, 7, 62-70, doi: 10.4018/IJAVET.2016070106.

Villata, M., Araszkievicz, M., Ashley, K., Bench-Capon, T., Branting, L., Conrad, J., & Wyner, A. (2022) 'Thirty years of artificial intelligence and law: the third decade', Article, 33 citations.

Villata, M., Araszkievicz, M., Ashley, K., Bench-Capon, T., Branting, L., Conrad, J. & Wyner, A. (2022) 'Thirty years of artificial intelligence and law: the third decade'.

Wieringa M, What to account for when accounting for algorithms: a systematic literature review on algorithmic accountability, In: *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency* [Internet], New York, NY: Association for Computing Machinery, 2020 [cited 2024 Jun 22], p. 1-18, (FAT* '20), doi:10.1145/3351095.3372833.

Wieringa, M. (2020) 'What to account for when accounting for algorithms: a systematic literature review on algorithmic accountability', *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency (FAT '20)**, pp. 1-18.

Yalcin, T., Themeli, S., Stamhuis, J., Philipsen, R. & Puntoni, S. (2023) 'Perceptions of justice by algorithms'.

Zhu, K. and Zheng, L. (2021) 'Based on artificial intelligence in the judicial field: operation status and countermeasure analysis', *Mathematical Problems in Engineering*, doi: 10.1155/2021/9017181.