LawFoyer International Journal of Doctrinal Legal Research

[ISSN: 2583-7753]

Volume 4 | Issue 1

2026

After careful consideration, the editorial board of LawFoyer International Journal of Doctrinal Legal Research has decided to publish this submission as part of the publication.

In case of any suggestions or complaints, kindly contact (info.lijdlr@gmail.com)

To submit your Manuscript for Publication in the LawFoyer International Journal of Doctrinal Legal Research, To submit your Manuscript Click here

ALGORITHMIC ONLINE DISPUTE RESOLUTION AND THE FUTURE OF NEUTRALITY: CAN DIGITAL PLATFORMS REPLACE HUMAN ARBITRATORS?

Kriti Agrawal[1]

I. ABSTRACT

The increasing institutionalisation of Online Dispute Resolution (ODR) reflects a structural transformation in contemporary systems of alternative dispute resolution. While early models of ODR were largely confined to facilitating communication, document exchange, and procedural coordination, recent platforms increasingly deploy algorithmic systems capable of predicting dispute outcomes, recommending settlements, and, in limited contexts, autonomously resolving disputes. This technological evolution raises fundamental concerns for arbitration law, particularly in relation to the principle of neutrality, which has historically derived its legitimacy from human judgment, ethical responsibility, and procedural accountability. This paper undertakes a doctrinal and socio-legal examination of whether algorithmic ODR systems can meaningfully satisfy the legal and constitutional requirements of arbitral neutrality. Drawing upon Indian arbitration jurisprudence, statutory obligations under the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996, and international instruments such as the UNCITRAL Technical Notes on Online Dispute Resolution, the paper critically interrogates the widely held assumption that algorithmic decision-making is inherently objective or impartial. It demonstrates that neutrality in arbitration is not merely the absence of bias, but a normative construct shaped by discretion, contextual reasoning, transparency, and accountability. The paper further argues that claims of algorithmic neutrality are largely illusory, as such systems remain deeply influenced by human design choices, institutional incentives, and historically contingent datasets. The delegation of adjudicatory functions to opaque digital systems is shown to undermine due process guarantees, particularly the requirement of reasoned decision-making and the availability of meaningful judicial review. While recognising the efficiency and accessibility gains offered by ODR, the paper concludes that algorithmic systems cannot replace human arbitrators without eroding the normative foundations of arbitral justice. A carefully regulated hybrid framework, preserving substantive human oversight, is proposed as the only legally sustainable model for the future of digital arbitration.

II. KEYWORDS

Online Dispute Resolution; Arbitration; Algorithmic Decision-Making; Neutrality; Due Process

---

[1] 8th Semester Student Pursuing BBA.LLB from Maharashtra National Law University, Chhatrapati Sambhajinagar (India). Email: Kritiagrawal2512@gmail.com

III.   INTRODUCTION AND RESEARCH PROBLEM

Arbitration occupies a distinctive position within the architecture of dispute resolution, operating as a private yet legally binding mechanism whose authority flows from party consent, procedural fairness, and enforceability under law. Unlike adjudication before courts, arbitration is premised on the idea that parties may tailor both the forum and the decision-maker, thereby, preserving the autonomy while remaining embedded within a legal framework that guarantees fairness and enforceability. Central to this legitimacy is the principle of neutrality, which requires that disputes be resolved by an independent and impartial adjudicator capable of applying legal norms through reasoned judgment.

Neutrality in arbitration is not merely a formal attribute but a substantive condition of legitimacy. It reflects a commitment to even-handedness, openness to argument, and the capacity to evaluate evidence without predisposition. The arbitrator's neutrality is further reinforced through statutory disclosure requirements, challenge mechanisms, and judicial oversight, all of which presuppose a human decision-maker capable of ethical reflection and accountability.[2]

The emergence of Online Dispute Resolution was initially perceived as a logistical development rather than a jurisprudential one. Early ODR models focused primarily on digitising procedural aspects of dispute resolution such as electronic filing, asynchronous communication, and virtual hearings without altering the human character of adjudication. These developments were welcomed as efficiency-enhancing tools that reduced transaction costs while preserving the normative foundations of arbitration.

Contemporary ODR platforms, however, represent a qualitatively different transformation. Increasingly, digital systems are designed not merely to assist human arbitrators but to analyse large datasets, predict dispute outcomes, recommend settlements, and, in some instances, generate binding resolutions with minimal or no human intervention. This shift raises a profound doctrinal concern. Arbitration is not a mechanical exercise in rule application rather it involves evaluative reasoning, contextual interpretation, and normative discretion. Reducing neutrality to computational consistency or statistical optimisation risks reconstituting arbitration as a technocratic process divorced from its ethical and jurisprudential foundations.

The research problem addressed in this paper therefore centres on whether algorithmic ODR platforms can genuinely replicate the neutrality traditionally secured through human arbitrators, or whether such delegation fundamentally compromises the legitimacy of arbitral justice. This question assumes particular significance in the Indian legal context, where arbitration operates within a constitutional framework that

---

[2] Arbitration and Conciliation Act, No. 26 of 1996, § 12 (India)

prioritises fairness, reasoned decision-making, and access to justice under Article 21[3]. As ODR platforms gain institutional acceptance through court-annexed programmes, arbitral institutions, and policy initiatives, the inquiry is no longer whether technology can assist arbitration, but whether it can legitimately replace the human arbitrator without undermining the doctrinal and constitutional foundations of the arbitral process.

This transformation also reflects a broader jurisprudential shift in how authority is exercised within private justice systems. Arbitration has historically been legitimised through the personalization of decision-making that is the attribution of responsibility to an identifiable adjudicator whose neutrality may be scrutinised, challenged, and, if necessary, judicially reviewed. Algorithmic ODR disrupts this model by diffusing decision-making authority across layers of software design, data selection, and platform governance. The resulting opacity challenges traditional accountability mechanisms embedded within arbitration law.

Moreover, the increasing reliance on algorithmic systems coincides with the institutional push to mainstream ODR as a solution to judicial backlog and access-to-justice deficits. In India, this policy orientation has been explicitly endorsed by the judiciary, which has encouraged the use of technology-driven dispute resolution mechanisms[4]. While such endorsement enhances the legitimacy of ODR, it simultaneously heightens the constitutional responsibility to ensure that these systems conform to minimum standards of fairness, transparency, and neutrality. The research problem must therefore be understood not merely as a technological concern but as a question of legal theory and constitutional governance.

A. Research Objectives

The primary objective of this research is to examine the compatibility of algorithmic decision-making with the principle of neutrality as understood in arbitration law. The paper seeks to analyse how neutrality has been conceptualised, operationalised, and safeguarded under Indian arbitration jurisprudence, and to assess whether these safeguards can be meaningfully translated into algorithmic systems.

A further objective is to critically evaluate the internal logic of algorithmic ODR platforms, including their reliance on data-driven predictions and optimisation techniques, and to examine how such logic reshapes traditional understandings of adjudicatory discretion. The paper also aims to assess the implications of algorithmic adjudication for procedural fairness, transparency, and judicial review.

Finally, the research aspires to contribute to broader debates on artificial intelligence governance by situating algorithmic ODR within established legal and constitutional

---

[3] INDIA CONST. art. 21

[4] Afcons Infrastructure Ltd. v. Cherian Varkey Constr. Co. (P) Ltd., (2010) 8 S.C.C. 24 (India)

principles, rather than treating it as a purely technological innovation. By integrating arbitration doctrine with constitutional and administrative law perspectives, the paper seeks to develop a normative framework capable of guiding the future regulation of digital arbitration.

B. Research Questions

This paper is guided by several interrelated questions:

1. How is neutrality conceptualised and enforced within arbitration law, particularly under the Indian statutory framework?

2. What forms of decision-making are employed by algorithmic ODR platforms, and how do these differ from human adjudication in terms of discretion and accountability?

3. Can algorithmic systems satisfy legal requirements of independence, impartiality, and reasoned decision-making?

4. What risks do algorithmic opacity and embedded bias pose to procedural fairness and effective judicial review?

5. Finally, should algorithmic systems be permitted to replace human arbitrators, or should their role remain confined to supportive and facilitative functions within the arbitral process?

C. Research Hypotheses

The paper proceeds on the hypothesis that algorithmic systems are structurally incapable of fully satisfying the doctrinal requirements of arbitral neutrality due to their dependence on opaque design choices, optimisation objectives, and historically conditioned datasets. It further hypothesises that algorithmic opacity undermines due process by weakening the requirement of reasoned decision-making and constraining effective judicial review. The paper also assumes that the complete replacement of human arbitrators by algorithmic systems raises serious constitutional concerns under Article 21, rendering such replacement legally and normatively unsustainable.

D. Research Methodology

This study adopts a doctrinal legal research methodology grounded in the analysis of statutory provisions, judicial decisions, and international legal instruments governing arbitration and Online Dispute Resolution. Primary emphasis is placed on the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996, along with key decisions of the Supreme Court of India interpreting principles of neutrality, impartiality, and procedural fairness.

Comparative reference is made to international materials, particularly the UNCITRAL Technical Notes on Online Dispute Resolution and emerging global standards on digital adjudication. Secondary sources, including peer-reviewed journal articles, scholarly

monographs, and interdisciplinary literature on artificial intelligence governance, are employed to situate doctrinal findings within broader theoretical debates on neutrality, discretion, and technological authority.

E. Literature Review

Scholarship on Online Dispute Resolution has largely celebrated its capacity to enhance efficiency, scalability, and access to justice. Early theorists conceptualised ODR primarily as a logistical and procedural evolution of dispute resolution, focused on communication, negotiation, and settlement facilitation rather than a transformation of adjudicatory authority (see, for example, Ethan Katsh and Janet Rifkin, *Online Dispute Resolution: Resolving Conflicts in Cyberspace*). These foundational accounts emphasised convenience and cost-reduction while largely assuming continuity in adjudicatory values.

Parallel developments in critical scholarship on algorithmic governance have painted a more cautionary picture. Scholars have demonstrated how algorithmic systems concentrate power, entrench structural inequalities, and obscure the normative choices embedded within technical design. Influential works have described algorithmic decision-making as a 'black box' that exercises authority without offering intelligible or contestable explanations (see, inter alia, Cathy O'Neil, *Weapons of Math Destruction*; Virginia Eubanks, *Automating Inequality*; Frank Pasquale, *The Black Box Society*).

Despite these contributions, arbitration scholarship has remained comparatively insulated from debates on algorithmic governance. Existing arbitral literature continues to presuppose a human decision-maker and largely addresses technology only in terms of procedural efficiency, virtual hearings, or case management, rather than the delegation of substantive adjudicatory authority to algorithms. The relative absence of sustained engagement with algorithmic decision-making in mainstream arbitration scholarship underscores a significant gap that this paper seeks to address.

Much of the existing literature continues to presuppose a human arbitrator, while discussions of artificial intelligence often overlook the specific normative demands of adjudication. Indian legal scholarship, in particular, has yet to systematically engage with the implications of algorithmic ODR for statutory and constitutional principles governing arbitration. This paper seeks to bridge this gap by bringing arbitration doctrine into sustained dialogue with contemporary critiques of algorithmic authority.

Beyond early ODR theorists, contemporary scholarship has increasingly interrogated the normative implications of automated decision-making. Scholars such as Mireille Hildebrandt have argued that algorithmic governance threatens the foundational legal principle of contestability by rendering decisions inscrutable to those subject to them.[5]

---

[5] Mireille Hildebrandt, *Law as Computation in the Era of Artificial Legal Intelligence* 95–110 (Routledge 2018).

This concern is particularly salient in arbitration, where party autonomy presupposes informed consent to both procedure and adjudicator.

Comparative arbitration scholarship further reveals a reluctance to cede substantive adjudicatory authority to non-human agents. While jurisdictions such as the European Union have embraced AI-assisted dispute resolution, regulatory frameworks consistently emphasise human oversight and the right to explanation. These developments suggest an emerging global consensus that efficiency gains cannot justify the erosion of adjudicatory legitimacy. Indian scholarship, however, has yet to comprehensively situate algorithmic ODR within this comparative and theoretical landscape, a gap this paper seeks to address.

F.   Research and Analysis

1.   Neutrality as a Normative Foundation of Arbitration

Neutrality constitutes the normative core of arbitration. The Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 embeds this principle through disclosure obligations, challenge mechanisms, and judicial supervision. Section 12 [6] requires arbitrators to disclose any circumstances likely to give rise to justifiable doubts as to independence or impartiality, reflecting an understanding that neutrality encompasses both actual bias and the appearance of bias.

Judicial interpretation has reinforced this substantive conception of neutrality. In TRF Ltd v Energo Engineering Projects Ltd (2017) 8 SCC 377[7], the Supreme Court specifically examined whether a person rendered statutorily ineligible to act as an arbitrator under Section 12(5) of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996, read with the Seventh Schedule, could nonetheless nominate another arbitrator. The Court held that such ineligibility extends to the power of appointment itself, reasoning that a person who is disqualified from acting as an arbitrator cannot be permitted to influence the constitution of the arbitral tribunal. This decision underscores that neutrality and impartiality are not merely procedural formalities but foundational conditions of arbitral legitimacy. Subsequent jurisprudence has built upon this principle, affirming that arbitration derives its authority not solely from party consent but from structurally embedded guarantees of fairness, independence, and equality.

2.   The Architecture of Algorithmic Online Dispute Resolution

Algorithmic ODR platforms operate through computational models trained on historical dispute data[8]. These systems identify patterns, calculate probabilities, and generate recommendations or determinations based on predefined criteria. While such systems

---

[6] Arbitration and Conciliation Act, No. 26 of 1996, § 12 (India).
[7] TRF Ltd. v. Energo Eng'g Projects Ltd., (2017) 8 S.C.C. 377 (India).
[8] Ethan Katsh & Orna Rabinovich-Einy, *Digital Justice: Technology and the Internet of Disputes* 118–132 (Oxford Univ.   Press 2017)

promise consistency and efficiency, they fundamentally reconfigure adjudicatory discretion.

In algorithmic ODR, discretion is not exercised at the moment of decision but is embedded ex ante in design choices relating to data selection, weighting of variables, and optimisation objectives. This relocation of discretion from adjudicator to designer introduces new forms of power that are largely insulated from legal scrutiny. Unlike human arbitrators, algorithms lack the capacity to depart from precedent in light of novel facts or to engage in moral reasoning informed by context.

3.   The Illusion of Algorithmic Neutrality

The claim that algorithmic systems are inherently neutral rests on a misconception[9]. Algorithms do not eliminate bias; they operationalise it in less visible forms. Training data often reflect historical inequalities and institutional practices, which are reproduced and amplified through automated systems. Moreover, design choices made by developers inevitably reflect normative assumptions about efficiency, fairness, and desirable outcomes.

In arbitration, where neutrality depends on transparency and reasoned justification, such opacity is deeply problematic. Algorithmic neutrality thus emerges as an illusion, one that masks discretionary choices behind technical complexity while depriving parties of meaningful insight into the basis of decisions.

4.   Due Process, Reasoned Awards, and Judicial Review

Indian arbitration law places significant emphasis on reasoned awards as a safeguard of procedural fairness[10]. Courts have consistently held that intelligible reasoning is essential to ensure that parties understand the basis of the decision and to enable effective judicial review. Algorithmic systems that generate outcomes without comprehensible explanations undermine this safeguard.

The inability to interrogate algorithmic reasoning constrains judicial supervision and weakens remedies against arbitrariness[11]. This poses a direct challenge to the legitimacy of algorithmic adjudication within the existing legal framework.

The erosion of explainability in algorithmic ODR also has systemic consequences for judicial review. Courts reviewing arbitral awards are concerned not merely with outcomes but with the rational process by which conclusions are reached. If the reasoning process is embedded within proprietary algorithms shielded by trade secrecy, judicial

---

[9] Frank Pasquale, *The Black Box Society: The Secret Algorithms That Control Money and Information* 139–156 (Harvard   Univ. Press 2015).
[10] Associate Builders v. Delhi Dev. Auth., (2015) 3 S.C.C. 49, 71–72 (India)
[11] Bharat Broadband Network Ltd. v. United Telecoms Ltd., (2019) 5 S.C.C. 755, 770–71 (India)

oversight risks becoming illusory. This undermines the delicate balance arbitration law seeks to maintain between finality and fairness.

Furthermore, the inability to interrogate algorithmic reasoning compromises the effectiveness of challenge procedures under the Arbitration and Conciliation Act. Disclosure obligations under Section 12 presuppose an identifiable arbitrator capable of introspection and explanation. Algorithmic systems, lacking legal personality or ethical consciousness, cannot meaningfully comply with such obligations.

IV.   CONSTITUTIONAL IMPLICATIONS UNDER ARTICLE 21

Although arbitration is consensual, it does not operate in a constitutional vacuum. The Supreme Court has consistently interpreted Article 21 of the Constitution to encompass procedural fairness, reasoned decision-making, and the right to a fair hearing. In *Olga Tellis v Bombay Municipal Corporation* (1985) 3 SCC 545, the Court authoritatively held that any procedure affecting life or personal liberty must be 'just, fair, and reasonable,' thereby embedding principles of natural justice within Article 21.

This constitutional understanding has informed the Court's approach to alternative dispute resolution mechanisms, including arbitration. While arbitration is founded on party autonomy, judicial decisions have repeatedly emphasised that arbitral proceedings must conform to basic standards of natural justice, equality of parties, and procedural due process. The legitimacy of arbitration, therefore, rests not solely on consent but on compliance with minimum constitutional norms of fairness and non-arbitrariness.

The increasing integration of Online Dispute Resolution into court-annexed programmes and state-endorsed frameworks heightens these constitutional concerns. Where algorithmic ODR systems are institutionalised, encouraged, or operationalised through judicial or governmental initiatives, their functioning may amount to 'State action' within the meaning of Article 12 of the Constitution. In such contexts, the procedural architecture of ODR platforms becomes subject to Article 21 scrutiny.

Delegating adjudicatory authority to opaque algorithmic systems within state-linked dispute resolution frameworks risks undermining procedural fairness, transparency, and access to effective remedies. The absence of intelligible reasoning and the limited scope for contesting algorithmic outcomes pose serious challenges to the constitutional requirement of fair procedure. Consequently, algorithmic ODR systems integrated into court-annexed or state-endorsed mechanisms cannot be insulated from constitutional review merely by characterising arbitration as private or consensual. Procedural fairness under Article 21 remains a non-derogable constraint on the design and deployment of such systems.[12]

---

[12] Maneka Gandhi v. Union of India, (1978) 1 S.C.C. 248, 281 (India)

Delegating adjudicatory authority to algorithmic systems without adequate safeguards risks creating a parallel justice infrastructure operating beyond meaningful constitutional scrutiny. This raise concerns analogous to those encountered in administrative law, where automated decision-making has been criticised for diluting accountability and reason-giving obligations. Arbitration cannot be exempt from these constitutional standards merely because it is formally consensual.

V.   SUGGESTIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The integration of algorithmic systems into Online Dispute Resolution necessitates a normative reorientation rather than a purely technological response. Arbitration has historically drawn its legitimacy from a balance between party autonomy and procedural justice. Any attempt to automate adjudicatory functions must therefore be evaluated against these foundational commitments.

Algorithmic systems should be expressly confined to supportive and facilitative roles within arbitration. Their use may be justified in case management, information organisation, and settlement facilitation, but substantive adjudicatory authority must remain anchored in human judgment. Comparative regulatory frameworks underscore the importance of this distinction. For instance, Article 22 of the European Union's General Data Protection Regulation recognises limits on decisions based solely on automated processing and affirms a right to meaningful information about the logic involved in such decision-making, reflecting an emerging international commitment to algorithmic transparency and explainability.

International practice in technology-assisted dispute resolution further illustrates the value of procedural safeguards. The Singapore Convention on Mediation (2019), together with Singapore's broader approach to technology-enabled dispute resolution, emphasises party autonomy, transparency, and enforceability while preserving human oversight in consensual settlement processes. Similarly, ethical frameworks such as the European Ethical Charter on the Use of Artificial Intelligence in Judicial Systems (adopted by the European Commission for the Efficiency of Justice in 2018) stress principles of transparency, non-discrimination, and human control over automated systems in adjudicatory contexts.

Drawing from these comparative models, domestic arbitration law should mandate transparency, explainability, and human accountability as minimum conditions for the deployment of algorithmic tools. Judicial oversight must evolve to permit scrutiny not only of arbitral outcomes but also of the technological processes influencing those outcomes. Finally, institutional capacity-building is essential to ensure that arbitrators, judges, and practitioners possess the technical literacy necessary to engage critically with

algorithmic systems. Without such safeguards, efficiency gains risk being achieved at the cost of arbitral legitimacy and procedural justice.

Without such measures, arbitration risks devolving into a technocratic exercise detached from its normative foundations.

In addition, arbitral institutions should develop ethical guidelines specifically addressing the use of algorithmic tools. These guidelines must clarify responsibility allocation when algorithmic recommendations influence outcomes and ensure that arbitrators remain answerable for final decisions. Regulatory intervention may also be necessary to mandate algorithmic audits and bias assessments, particularly where platforms operate at scale.

At a policy level, India should engage proactively with international norm-setting initiatives on ODR governance to avoid regulatory fragmentation. A coherent national framework would not only enhance legitimacy but also position India as a leader in responsible digital arbitration.

VI.   CONCLUSION

Algorithmic Online Dispute Resolution represents a critical inflection point in the evolution of arbitration, marking a shift not merely in procedural form but in the underlying conception of adjudicatory authority itself. While digital platforms undeniably enhance accessibility, speed, and cost-efficiency, this paper has demonstrated that the increasing delegation of decisional functions to algorithmic systems raises profound doctrinal, ethical, and constitutional concerns. Neutrality in arbitration, far from being a mechanical or statistical condition, is a normative ideal rooted in human judgment, contextual sensitivity, and moral responsibility attributes that cannot be fully replicated through automated decision-making processes.

The presumption that algorithms are inherently neutral or objective obscures the reality that such systems are deeply shaped by human choices at every stage of their development. From data selection and model training to institutional deployment and commercial incentives, algorithmic systems inevitably reflect normative assumptions that remain largely invisible to disputing parties. This opacity is especially problematic in arbitration, where legitimacy flows not only from consent but from the perceived fairness and reasoned nature of the adjudicatory process. An arbitral system that cannot adequately explain how outcomes are reached risks undermining confidence in both the process and its results.

In the Indian context, these concerns acquire particular constitutional salience. Article 21 of the Constitution has been consistently interpreted to encompass procedural fairness, reasoned decision-making, and protection against arbitrary adjudication. As arbitration increasingly functions as a parallel system of justice rather than a purely private

mechanism, it cannot remain insulated from these constitutional expectations. Algorithmic ODR platforms that operate without transparency, accountability, or meaningful avenues for challenge risk falling short of these foundational requirements. The shift toward automation therefore necessitates not only technological innovation but also doctrinal recalibration.

At the same time, this paper does not advocate a rejection of algorithmic tools within dispute resolution. To do so would ignore the genuine benefits that digital systems offer, particularly in expanding access to justice and reducing procedural burdens. Instead, the analysis supports a carefully structured hybrid model in which algorithmic systems perform supportive and facilitative functions such as case triage, procedural management, and non-binding settlement recommendations while decisional authority remains firmly vested in human arbitrators. Such a model preserves efficiency gains without compromising the ethical and legal foundations of arbitration.

Crucially, retaining human oversight ensures that arbitral decision-making remains responsive to the particularities of individual disputes. Legal conflicts are rarely reducible to data points alone; they are embedded within social, commercial, and relational contexts that demand interpretive judgment. Human arbitrators bring to the process not only legal expertise but also the capacity for empathy, proportionality, and normative reasoning qualities that are central to the delivery of substantive justice. Algorithmic systems, by contrast, operate within predefined parameters that may struggle to accommodate nuance or evolving legal standards.

Ultimately, the future of arbitration depends upon its ability to integrate technological innovation without surrendering its normative core. The legitimacy of arbitration has always rested on a delicate balance between autonomy, fairness, and accountability. Algorithmic ODR, if uncritically adopted, threatens to disrupt this balance by prioritising efficiency over justice. However, when deployed as a tool of augmentation rather than replacement, technology can strengthen arbitration by enhancing consistency, accessibility, and procedural integrity.

The challenge, therefore, lies not in choosing between humans and machines, but in delineating their respective roles within a principled legal framework. Preserving this distinction is essential to ensuring that arbitration remains a credible, just, and constitutionally consonant mode of dispute resolution in the digital age. Only by reaffirming the centrality of human judgment can arbitration continue to command trust in an era increasingly defined by automation.

VII. REFERENCES

A. Cases

1. TRF Ltd v Energo Engineering Projects Ltd (2017) 8 SCC 377.
2. Olga Tellis v Bombay Municipal Corporation (1985) 3 SCC 545.

B. Statutes

1. Arbitration and Conciliation Act 1996.
2. Constitution of India, art 21.
3. Constitution of India, art 12.

C. Books

1. Ethan Katsh and Janet Rifkin, Online Dispute Resolution: Resolving Conflicts in Cyberspace (Jossey-Bass 2001).
2. Cathy O'Neil, Weapons of Math Destruction (Crown Publishing 2016).
3. Virginia Eubanks, Automating Inequality (St Martin's Press 2018).
4. Frank Pasquale, The Black Box Society (Harvard University Press 2015).

D. International Instruments and Reports

1. UNCITRAL, Technical Notes on Online Dispute Resolution (adopted 2016, published 2017).
2. United Nations Convention on International Settlement Agreements Resulting from Mediation.
3. European Union, General Data Protection Regulation, art 22.
4. Council of Europe, European Commission for the Efficiency of Justice, European Ethical Charter on the Use of Artificial Intelligence in Judicial Systems (2018).

E. Secondary Literature

1. Mireille Hildebrandt, 'Law as Computation in the Era of Artificial Legal Intelligence' (2018) 68 University of Toronto Law Journal 12.
2. Additional peer-reviewed journal articles and interdisciplinary literature on algorithmic governance and dispute resolution as cited throughout the text.