



ISSN: 2583-7753

# LAWFOYER INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF DOCTRINAL LEGAL RESEARCH

[ISSN: 2583-7753]



Volume IV | Special Issue I

2026

*Special Issue on the International E-Conference on*

***“Law in the Age of Artificial Intelligence: A Fundamental Perspective”***

*Organised by KES’ Shri J. H. Patel College of Law, Mumbai, on 24 January 2026*

*Official Publication Partner: LawFoyer International Journal of Doctrinal Legal Research*

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.70183/lijdlr.2026.v4si1.36>

© 2026 LawFoyer International Journal of Doctrinal Legal Research

*Follow this and additional research works at: [www.lijdlr.com](http://www.lijdlr.com)*

*Under the Platform of LawFoyer – [www.lawfoyer.in](http://www.lawfoyer.in)*

---

*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](mailto: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](#)*

# KES' SHRI. JAYANTILAL H. PATEL LAW COLLEGE

## *About the College*



KES' Shri. Jayantilal H. Patel Law College is committed to nurturing and empowering students through quality legal education. The college provides an inclusive and academically enriching environment that encourages students to excel in their studies, participate in co-curricular activities, engage in research, and develop a strong sense of civic responsibility.

The college is affiliated to the University of Mumbai, approved by the Bar Council of India, NAAC accredited with 'B++' grade, and ISO 9001:2015 certified. It offers programmes including B.A. LL.B., LL.B., LL.M., and specialised diploma courses.

With qualified and experienced faculty, a strong academic environment, moot court training, research activities and modern infrastructure, the institution seeks to prepare responsible, skilled and socially conscious legal professionals equipped to meet the challenges of a rapidly changing world.

The college functions under the aegis of Kandivli Education Society (KES), an institution established in 1936 with a long-standing commitment to quality, inclusivity and value-based education.

|                      |                                      |
|----------------------|--------------------------------------|
| <b>Affiliation</b>   | University of Mumbai                 |
| <b>Recognition</b>   | Approved by the Bar Council of India |
| <b>Accreditation</b> | NAAC accredited 'B++'                |
| <b>Certification</b> | ISO 9001:2015 certified              |

# KANDIVLI EDUCATION SOCIETY

*Established 1936*



Kandivli Education Society (KES), established in 1936, has grown from a small educational initiative into a dynamic educational institution serving thousands of students.

With a legacy of quality, inclusivity and value-based learning, KES has expanded its academic presence across various disciplines. Its educational institutions are committed to providing meaningful learning opportunities and fostering academic, professional and personal development among students.

KES' Shri. Jayantilal H. Patel Law College is one of its prominent institutions dedicated to legal education. Through academic excellence, research, practical learning and co-curricular engagement, the college seeks to empower students with the knowledge, skills and values necessary to contribute meaningfully to society.

## **EDUCATIONAL COMMITMENT**

- Quality and inclusive education
- Value-based learning
- Academic and professional development
- Research and practical learning
- Holistic and future-ready education

# LAW IN THE AGE OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE

## *A Fundamental Perspective*



### **ABOUT THE INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE**

The International Conference on “Law in the Age of Artificial Intelligence: A Fundamental Perspective” provided an academic platform to examine the transformative impact of Artificial Intelligence on law, legal systems, governance and society.

The conference explored emerging legal and ethical questions relating to Artificial Intelligence, including intellectual property, authorship and ownership, liability, data privacy, cybersecurity, criminal justice, evidence law, human rights, ethics and accountability. It addressed the implications of Artificial Intelligence for legal education, commercial law, regulatory frameworks, policy development, research and scholarly communication.

The conference brought together academicians, research scholars, legal professionals and students to present research, exchange ideas and engage in interdisciplinary discussions. It encouraged meaningful academic dialogue and contributed towards the development of effective, ethical and inclusive legal responses to the rapidly evolving Artificial Intelligence landscape.

|                     |                                                                              |
|---------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Conference          | International Conference                                                     |
| Theme               | Law in the Age of Artificial Intelligence: A Fundamental Perspective         |
| Date                | 24 January 2026                                                              |
| Time                | 10:00 AM onwards                                                             |
| Mode                | Online                                                                       |
| Organised by        | IQAC, Student Research Society and Library Committee                         |
| Publication Partner | LawFoyer International Journal of Doctrinal Legal Research [ISSN: 2583-7753] |

## PRINCIPAL'S MESSAGE

*KES' Shri. Jayantilal H. Patel Law College*



It gives me immense pleasure to welcome all academicians, research scholars, legal professionals and students to the International Conference on “Law in the Age of Artificial Intelligence: A Fundamental Perspective.”

Artificial Intelligence is transforming the way societies function and is increasingly influencing legal systems, governance, professional practices and education. These developments bring significant opportunities as well as complex legal, ethical and social challenges.

This conference provided a valuable platform for intellectual exchange and interdisciplinary dialogue on emerging issues such as data privacy, intellectual property, liability, criminal justice, human rights, ethics and the governance of Artificial Intelligence. The scholarly contributions and discussions during the conference encouraged deeper understanding and promoted responsible approaches to the use of Artificial Intelligence.

I extend my best wishes to all the speakers, researchers, presenters, participants and members of the organising team for a meaningful and intellectually enriching conference.

---

**DR. VIRAL DAVE**

*I/c. Principal*

*KES' Shri. Jayantilal H. Patel Law College*

## ORGANISING COMMITTEE

*International Conference on Law in the Age of Artificial Intelligence*



**I/c. Principal**

Dr. Viral Dave

**Convenor**

Mr. Mahavir Mandot

**Co-Convenors**

Dr. Shweta Vijendra Pathak

Ms. Priyanka Khakhadia

Ms. Deepanshi Chandarana

---

*Organised by IQAC, Student Research Society and Library Committee*

*KES' Shri. Jayantilal H. Patel Law College, Mumbai*

*Papers presented at the conference are published in the Special Issue of the LawFoyer International Journal of  
Doctrinal Legal Research [Volume IV, Special Issue I, 2026]*

---

# AI, SOCIETY AND THE FUTURE OF LEGAL EDUCATION

---

Ms. Surabhi Vinod Daga<sup>1</sup>

## I. ABSTRACT

*Artificial Intelligence is rapidly changing the legal world. Earlier, AI was mainly used for office work such as managing files, searching cases, or preparing documents. Today, it is becoming a powerful tool that can assist in legal thinking, predict outcomes of cases, and support decision-making. This transformation is not only changing the legal profession but also influencing society and the future of legal education. Although AI has made legal information easier to access, questions related to justice, fairness, ethics, and human responsibility still remain important. This paper argues that the biggest challenge before law schools is not simply teaching students how to use technology, but preparing them for a future where lawyers and intelligent machines will work together. The study introduces the concept of "Algorithmic Advocacy," which means lawyers of the future must understand both law and technology. When AI performs research and complex legal analysis, the true value of a lawyer will depend more on human qualities such as ethical judgment, emotional understanding, creativity, and critical thinking. The paper further explains that traditional methods of legal education are no longer enough in the digital age. Future law schools must create practical and interdisciplinary learning spaces where students can work with AI tools, analyse algorithmic bias, and understand the relationship between technology, society, and justice. The study concludes that AI should not be viewed as a replacement for lawyers, but as a partner that can help build a faster, smarter, and more accessible justice system. To achieve this, legal education must evolve with the changing realities of the modern world.*

## II. KEYWORDS

Artificial Intelligence, Legal Education, Algorithmic Bias, Access to Justice, AI Governance.

---

<sup>1</sup> Ph.D Student, Adv. Ramkrishnaji Rathi Law College, Ph.D Research Centre, Washim, Affiliated to Sant Gadge Baba Amravati University, Amravati (India).Email: [surbhidaga35@gmail.com](mailto:surbhidaga35@gmail.com)

### III. INTRODUCTION

The history of legal education has always been closely connected to the evolution of society. From the traditional gurukul-style transmission of legal ethics to the modern Langdellian case method introduced at Harvard Law School in the nineteenth century, law schools have continuously adapted to social and technological transformation. However, the emergence of Artificial Intelligence (AI) marks a disruption unlike any previous change. For the first time in legal history, machines are capable not merely of storing legal information, but of generating arguments, drafting contracts, predicting outcomes, and analyzing judicial patterns within seconds.

Traditionally, legal education relied upon memorization, extensive reading, case analysis, and the gradual development of reasoning skills. Students spent countless hours summarizing judgments, preparing notes, researching precedents, and understanding procedural technicalities. These activities were considered essential for developing a legal mind. Yet, the rise of generative AI systems and other legal AI platforms has radically transformed the meaning of legal work itself. A task that once demanded several days of human effort can now be completed within minutes through algorithmic assistance.

This transformation has generated both excitement and fear within academic and professional circles. Some scholars argue that AI will democratize legal services by making justice affordable and accessible. Others fear that excessive dependence on automated systems may weaken human reasoning, reduce empathy, and create dangerous algorithmic biases within the justice system. The debate is therefore not merely technological; it is deeply philosophical and societal.

The modern legal-technology discourse increasingly reflects the view that AI is unlikely to eliminate lawyers altogether, but that lawyers who can use AI responsibly and critically may gain a professional advantage over those who cannot. In the context of legal education, this means that law schools must not only teach legal doctrine, but also train students to understand, question, and supervise intelligent legal technologies.



This maxim captures the central reality of the modern legal profession. The challenge before legal education is not whether AI should be accepted or rejected. Instead, the challenge is how law schools can prepare students to work responsibly alongside intelligent systems while preserving the ethical and human foundations of justice.

### **A. Research Problem**

The central research problem addressed in this paper is whether legal education can meaningfully integrate Artificial Intelligence without weakening human judgment, ethical reasoning, empathy, and constitutional values that remain essential to the administration of justice.

### **B. Research Objectives**

1. To examine the impact of Artificial Intelligence on legal education, legal pedagogy, and the changing nature of legal work.
2. To analyse the risks of automation bias, algorithmic injustice, and over-dependence on AI-generated legal reasoning.
3. To suggest curricular reforms that can prepare future lawyers to use AI responsibly while preserving human-centred justice.

### **C. Research Questions**

1. How is Artificial Intelligence transforming legal education and the professional role of lawyers?
2. Can legal education preserve human judgment, empathy, and ethical responsibility while integrating AI tools?
3. What reforms are required in legal pedagogy to address algorithmic bias, automation dependence, and the future of legal practice?

### **D. Research Methodology**

This paper adopts a doctrinal and analytical research methodology. It relies on constitutional principles, judicial decisions, statutory concepts, secondary legal literature, and comparative case-study analysis. The discussion draws upon Indian constitutional jurisprudence, including principles of dignity, fairness, and reasonableness, along with comparative examples such as the COMPAS controversy and institutional developments such as the SUPACE project in the Indian judiciary.

The study is not based on empirical field data; rather, it evaluates legal, ethical, and educational issues through doctrinal analysis of case law, legal scholarship, and contemporary developments in AI-assisted justice systems.

#### **IV. TRANSFORMATIVE ROLE OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE IN LEGAL EDUCATION**

##### **1. Goodbye, Busywork: Allowing Future Lawyers to Focus on Real Thinking**

For many years, law students and junior lawyers spent excessive time on repetitive tasks such as checking citations, formatting documents, and searching through lengthy case files. Artificial Intelligence now performs these tasks within seconds with greater speed and accuracy. This allows future lawyers to focus on important human skills such as critical thinking, ethical reasoning, advocacy, and client counseling. AI is not replacing legal intelligence; it is helping legal professionals use their intelligence more effectively.

##### **2. Small Voices, Stronger Arguments; AI in Modern Legal Practice**

Traditionally, large law firms had an advantage because they could afford large research teams and expensive legal resources. Small lawyers and legal aid organizations often struggled to compete. Artificial Intelligence is reducing this gap by providing affordable access to advanced legal research and drafting tools. Today, even a single lawyer can access information and research capabilities once available only to powerful firms. AI therefore promotes fairness and strengthens access to justice.

##### **3. The Professor Never Sleeps: AI as a 24/7 Mentor or Law Students**

Legal education is often stressful and difficult for students due to complex subjects and academic pressure. Artificial Intelligence acts as a personal learning assistant by explaining difficult concepts, generating practice questions, and conducting mock legal discussions. Students can learn at their own pace without fear of judgment. This creates a more interactive, confident, and accessible learning environment for future legal professionals.

## V. REGULATORY RECOGNITION OF AI IN LEGAL EDUCATION: THE BCI CIRCULAR

The need for reform in legal education is no longer only an academic suggestion; it has also received regulatory recognition in India. The Bar Council of India has issued a circular directing universities and Centres of Legal Education to incorporate emerging technology subjects such as blockchain, electronic discovery, cyber-security, robotics, Artificial Intelligence, and bio-ethics into legal education curricula. This development is important because it shows that technological literacy is now being treated as part of professional legal training rather than as an optional or external skill.

This regulatory direction supports the central argument of the present paper. If future lawyers are expected to work with AI-assisted research tools, digital evidence, automated document review, and technology-driven dispute systems, law schools must prepare them to understand both law and technology. However, merely adding AI as a subject will not be sufficient. Legal education must go further by teaching students how to verify AI-generated legal content, identify algorithmic bias, question automated conclusions, and preserve ethical responsibility in technologically mediated legal practice.

Therefore, the BCI circular should be understood as a starting point, not the final model of reform. The paper's proposed reforms—interdisciplinary learning spaces, algorithmic-bias training, simulation-based assessment, and human-in-the-loop legal reasoning—are consistent with this regulatory direction but also extend it. They aim to ensure that AI education in law schools does not become limited to technical awareness, but develops responsible, critical, and justice-oriented legal professionals.

## VI. THE CHANGING NATURE OF LEGAL WORK

1. **Shift from Manual Work to AI Assistance:** Earlier, lawyers and law students spent long hours researching cases, drafting documents, and reviewing contracts. AI now performs many of these tasks quickly and efficiently.
2. **Danger of Automation Bias:** Blind trust in AI-generated outputs can create serious legal risks. AI systems may contain hidden biases, factual errors, or inaccurate interpretations of law.

3. **Rise of the “Augmented Lawyer”:** The future lawyer will combine human intelligence with technological tools. AI can assist legal work, but human lawyers remain essential for ethical judgment, empathy, and constitutional understanding.
4. **Need for Reform in Legal Education:** Traditional legal education focused heavily on memorization and repetitive drafting. Modern legal education must emphasize analytical thinking, technological understanding, and practical problem-solving.
5. **Transformation of Legal Expertise:** Legal expertise is no longer limited to finding information. The modern lawyer must critically interpret, evaluate, and strategically apply AI-generated legal content.
6. **Changing Methods of Evaluation:** Since AI can instantly generate essays and summaries, law schools must redesign examinations to focus on oral advocacy, negotiation, simulations, and practical legal skills.
7. **Redefining Legal Thinking:** AI is not only changing how lawyers work but also redefining what it means to “think like a lawyer” in the digital age.

## VII. THE EXPERIENCE GAP IN AI -BASED LEGAL EDUCATION

### A. The “Calculator Generation” of Lawyers

1. **When AI Does the Thinking for Students:** Just as students who depend completely on calculators often struggle with mental math, law students who rely entirely on AI may lose the ability to think like lawyers. AI can summarize cases, draft contracts, and generate arguments within seconds, but legal expertise is not built through shortcuts. It is built through struggle, repetition, mistakes, and deep reading.
2. **The Death of Legal Instinct:** Great lawyers develop a “gut instinct” after spending years reading files, identifying loopholes, and observing courtroom strategy. If AI performs all beginner-level work, future lawyers may know how to use software but may not know how to identify hidden legal problems on their own.
3. **The Silent Crisis in Indian Legal Education:** In India, legal learning traditionally happens through internships, chamber practice, and

courtroom exposure. The danger is that students may graduate with polished AI-generated assignments but without practical legal understanding.

## **B. From Human Lawyers to “Robotic Justice”**

1. **Can a Machine Understand Human Pain:** AI understands patterns, not emotions. It can identify legal provisions, but it cannot feel fear, poverty, humiliation, or trauma. A machine may say, “the rule requires eviction,” but a human lawyer sees a struggling mother trying to protect her family.
2. **The Danger of Emotionless Legal Education:** If students are trained only to trust machine-generated answers, they may slowly stop viewing clients as human beings and start treating them as files, statistics, or data points. This creates the risk of producing emotionally disconnected lawyers.
3. **Justice Is Not Mathematics:** The Indian constitutional system is grounded in equality, dignity, liberty, and social justice, principles reflected in Articles 14 and 21 and developed through constitutional interpretation.<sup>2</sup> Courts do not merely apply rules mechanically; they interpret law according to human realities. Legal education must therefore protect empathy as much as efficiency.

## **C. The “Copy-Paste Lawyer” and the Death of Creativity**

1. **AI Can Repeat the Past, But Cannot Create the Future:** Artificial Intelligence generates answers from existing judgments and old patterns. It can imitate legal reasoning, but it cannot imagine revolutionary constitutional ideas that change society.
2. **Why Great Legal Revolutions Needed Human Courage:** Important legal developments in India happened because lawyers challenged accepted norms instead of repeating them. Constitutional progress was created through imagination, moral courage, and creative advocacy not automated predictions.

---

<sup>2</sup> INDIA CONST. arts. 14, 21; *Maneka Gandhi v. Union of India*, (1978) 1 SCC 248; *Justice K.S. Puttaswamy v. Union of India*, (2017) 10 SCC 1.

3. **The Rise of Intellectual Laziness:** The biggest danger is not that AI will replace lawyers; it is that students may stop thinking independently. If law students simply copy AI-generated arguments, legal education may slowly become a culture of intellectual dependency rather than innovation.

## VIII. AI AND THE “TWO-CLASS JUSTICE SYSTEM”

Artificial Intelligence is transforming the legal sector by making legal services faster and cheaper. AI chatbots and legal platforms can help people understand rights, draft applications, and solve minor disputes. In a country like India, where many people cannot afford lawyers, AI appears to improve access to justice.

However, this technological progress may also create a dangerous social divide. Poor and middle-class citizens may increasingly depend on automated legal systems, while wealthy individuals continue hiring experienced human lawyers for personalized advice, courtroom advocacy, and strategic litigation.

This may lead to a “two-class justice system”:

1. AI-based justice for ordinary citizens
2. Human-centered justice for elite groups

For example, a poor worker fighting a salary dispute may only receive automated legal guidance through an app, while a large corporation can hire top advocates and legal teams. Both may approach the same legal system, but the quality of representation will not be equal.

### A. Can AI Understand Justice?

1. **AI: The New Face of Law:** Artificial Intelligence is changing the legal world at an extraordinary speed. From constitutional law to criminal trials, from contract drafting to civil disputes, AI can now research cases, predict judgments, review contracts, and analyze thousands of documents within minutes. This technological revolution has created an important question – can AI truly understand justice, or is it only capable of applying legal rules mechanically?
2. **Justice Is Not Just Data:** Justice is more than statutes, precedents, and algorithms. A judge does not only read law books; a judge also understands

emotions, morality, social realities, and human suffering. In criminal law, courts examine intention, motive, and remorse. In constitutional law, judges protect dignity, liberty, and equality. In contract and civil law, fairness, coercion, and social inequality are often considered beyond written clauses. AI may identify legal patterns, but it cannot genuinely feel empathy, compassion, or ethical responsibility. Therefore, AI can imitate legal reasoning, but it cannot fully experience justice.

3. **The Fear of “Algorithmic Injustice”:** One of the biggest dangers of AI is hidden bias. Since AI learns from past legal data, it may reproduce historical discrimination already present within society. This problem is known as “algorithmic injustice.” The COMPAS controversy in the United States became a significant example of the risk that AI-based criminal risk-assessment tools may reproduce or intensify racial bias within the justice system.<sup>3</sup> The incident proved that technology may appear neutral while silently carrying human prejudice within its algorithms.

## B. Indian Constitutional Vision of Justice

Indian constitutional philosophy requires justice to remain humane, fair, and reasoned rather than mechanical. In *Maneka Gandhi v. Union of India*, the Supreme Court held that procedure under Article 21 must be just, fair, and reasonable, thereby expanding the constitutional meaning of personal liberty. Similarly, *Justice K.S. Puttaswamy v. Union of India* recognized privacy, dignity, and individual autonomy as essential constitutional values in the digital age. These principles show that legal decision-making cannot be reduced to data processing alone. Even where AI assists legal research or administrative efficiency, constitutional justice requires human interpretation, moral responsibility, and sensitivity to lived social realities.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> Julia Angwin et al., *Machine Bias: There’s Software Used Across the Country to Predict Future Criminals. And It’s Biased Against Blacks*, PROPUBLICA (May 23, 2016).

<sup>4</sup> *Maneka Gandhi v. Union of India*, (1978) 1 SCC 248; *Justice K.S. Puttaswamy v. Union of India*, (2017) 10 SCC 1.

## IX. CAN AI REPLACE HUMAN JUDGES?

AI can certainly improve efficiency by reducing case pendency, simplifying legal research, and improving access to justice. However, justice is not merely about speed; it is also about wisdom, morality, and conscience. Machines may become powerful legal assistants, but the final moral authority of law must remain with humans.

### A. Case Study: AI-Hallucinated Case Law and the Indian Judiciary

A recent development in India has made the debate on AI in judicial work more urgent. In 2025 and 2026, Indian courts began encountering pleadings and orders that referred to fabricated, non-existent, or AI-hallucinated precedents. This problem showed that AI does not merely create abstract ethical risks; it can directly disturb the integrity of adjudication when its output is accepted without verification.

The most significant example is *Pooja Ramesh Singh v. Jammu and Kashmir Bank Ltd.*, decided by the Supreme Court of India on 2 July 2026. In that case, the Court found that the National Company Law Tribunal had relied upon non-existent, fake, and hallucinated material as precedent, and that the error had also escaped scrutiny before the appellate tribunal. The Supreme Court set aside the orders of the NCLT and NCLAT, holding that a decision based on fake or hallucinated material is no decision in the eyes of law. The Court further declared that there must be zero tolerance for the Bar and the Bench in citing, referring to, or relying upon such material as legal precedent.

This ruling is directly connected to the present paper's concern regarding automation bias and the decline of independent legal reasoning. If students, lawyers, tribunals, or judges accept AI-generated citations without checking their existence and relevance, legal education may produce what may be called a "copy-paste lawyer"—a professional who can generate polished legal text but cannot verify its truth. The danger is not only factual inaccuracy; it is the weakening of legal instinct, professional responsibility, and trust in the justice system.

The Supreme Court's response also supports the idea of a human-in-the-loop model. The Court clarified that AI may assist adjudication, but adjudicatory control must remain with human decision-makers at every stage. It also directed the Bar Council of



India to deliberate on the issue of advocates submitting fake and hallucinated material before courts as precedent. This shows that AI governance in law cannot be left only to software design. It must also be supported by professional discipline, ethical training, citation verification, and institutional accountability.

The Supreme Court's institutional approach is also visible from its White Paper on Artificial Intelligence and Judiciary – November 2025 and the later draft framework on the use of AI in courts. The White Paper reflects the judiciary's recognition that AI may assist court administration and legal research, while the draft Regulations for Use of Artificial Intelligence in Courts, 2026 indicate that AI may be used for supportive functions such as research, drafting, translation, transcription, and case management, but not for judicial decision-making itself.

Therefore, the AI-hallucination controversy strengthens the central argument of this paper. Legal education must train students not merely to use AI, but to question it, verify it, and reject it where necessary. The future lawyer must possess technological literacy as well as traditional legal discipline: the ability to read original judgments, check citations, identify false authorities, and preserve the integrity of legal reasoning. Without such training, AI may increase speed but weaken justice.

### **B. Case Study: The COMPAS AI Controversy**

In the United States, courts used an algorithmic risk-assessment tool known as COMPAS, or Correctional Offender Management Profiling for Alternative Sanctions, to assess the likelihood of future offending. The controversy became prominent after ProPublica's 2016 investigation reported concerns that COMPAS risk scores reflected racial disparities in criminal justice outcomes.<sup>5</sup>

ProPublica reported that Black defendants were more likely to be wrongly classified as higher risk, while white defendants were more likely to be wrongly classified as lower risk. This finding created a major debate on whether AI-based risk assessment can remain neutral when it is trained on historically unequal criminal justice data.<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup> Julia Angwin, Jeff Larson, Surya Mattu & Lauren Kirchner, *Machine Bias: There's Software Used Across the Country to Predict Future Criminals. And It's Biased Against Blacks*, PROPUBLICA (May 23, 2016).

<sup>6</sup> Id.

Explanation of the Case: This case became important because it revealed that AI does not think morally like humans. AI learns from old data and past patterns. If society or past legal systems contain discrimination, AI may silently repeat the same injustice in a digital form. This problem is known as “algorithmic injustice.” The COMPAS controversy proved that justice cannot depend only on statistics and predictions. In criminal law, judges also examine intention, remorse, human circumstances, and fairness things that machines cannot emotionally understand. AI may calculate risk quickly, but it cannot feel empathy or constitutional morality.

### C. Case Study: AI in the Indian Judiciary – SUPACE Project

The Supreme Court of India introduced an Artificial Intelligence tool known as SUPACE, or the Supreme Court Portal for Assistance in Court Efficiency. SUPACE has been described as an AI-based system designed to help identify relevant precedents and understand the factual matrix of cases. It was introduced as an assistive research tool and not as a substitute for judicial reasoning or adjudicatory authority.<sup>7</sup>

The introduction of AI into the Indian judiciary created an important debate:

If AI begins influencing judicial research and decision-making, can technology truly understand justice in the same way as human judges?

Explanation of the Case: The SUPACE project demonstrates both the power and limits of AI in law. It shows how AI may assist judges and researchers in locating precedents, organising factual material, and reducing manual workload. At the same time, such tools must remain subject to human verification because legal reasoning involves interpretation, discretion, and constitutional judgment.<sup>8</sup> However, justice is not only about speed or data analysis. Indian courts often consider morality, dignity, social realities, and constitutional values while deciding cases.

---

<sup>7</sup> Press Information Bureau, Government of India, *Technology as an Enabler of Justice, Not a Substitute for Judgement* (Feb. 11, 2026).

<sup>8</sup> Id.; Press Information Bureau, Government of India, *Use of Artificial Intelligence in Judiciary*.

For example, in criminal law, judges examine intention, remorse, and mental condition. In constitutional law, courts balance liberty, equality, and privacy. These human elements cannot be fully understood through algorithms.

Therefore, the Indian judiciary adopted a cautious approach by treating AI as a judicial assistant rather than a digital judge.

#### **D. Constitutional Connection**

The constitutional principles discussed above become particularly relevant in the context of SUPACE. Since SUPACE is designed as an assistive tool for judicial research and case management, its legitimacy depends on maintaining clear human control over interpretation and decision-making. AI may help judges identify precedents, organise factual material, and reduce administrative delay, but it cannot independently determine fairness, proportionality, dignity, or constitutional morality. Therefore, the SUPACE project reflects India's cautious and balanced approach toward AI in law. It demonstrates that technology may strengthen efficiency and access to justice only when it remains subordinate to human judicial responsibility. The final understanding of fairness, morality, and justice must remain with human judges, not algorithmic systems.

### **X. SUGGESTIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

To address the challenges created by Artificial Intelligence in legal education and justice delivery, the following reforms are necessary:

- 1. Introduction of AI-Literacy in Legal Curriculum:** Law schools should introduce compulsory courses on Artificial Intelligence, legal technology, algorithmic bias, data protection, and digital ethics. These subjects should not be treated as optional technical additions, but as essential parts of modern legal education. Students must understand how AI tool's function, where they may fail, and how their outputs should be legally verified.
- 2. Training in Verification and Responsible Use of AI:** Legal education must train students to verify AI-generated research, citations, arguments, and case summaries before relying on them. The future lawyer should not become a passive user of technology, but a critical evaluator of machine-generated legal

content. This will reduce the risk of automation bias and intellectual dependency.

3. **Reform in Examination and Evaluation Methods:** Since AI can now generate essays, summaries, and research drafts within seconds, traditional written assignments alone are no longer sufficient to test legal ability. Law schools should give greater importance to oral advocacy, client counselling, negotiation exercises, drafting simulations, courtroom problem-solving, and viva-based assessment. These methods will test reasoning, ethics, communication, and practical judgment more effectively.
4. **Human-in-the-Loop Safeguards in Judicial AI Tools:** AI tools used in the judiciary, including systems such as SUPACE, must remain assistive rather than decision-making authorities. Judicial officers should retain final responsibility for interpretation, reasoning, and adjudication. AI-generated outputs should be subject to human review, transparency checks, and periodic audits to prevent hidden bias or mechanical decision-making.
5. **Institutional Audits and Transparency Standards:** Courts, law schools, and legal institutions using AI tools should adopt transparency and accountability standards. These may include disclosure of AI use, regular bias audits, data-quality review, and safeguards against discriminatory outcomes. Where AI influences legal research or administrative decision-making, affected persons should be able to understand the role played by such technology.
6. **Regulatory Guidelines by BCI and UGC:** The Bar Council of India and the University Grants Commission should consider issuing specific guidelines on the use of Artificial Intelligence in legal education and legal training. Such guidelines may prescribe minimum AI-literacy standards, ethical rules for AI-assisted academic work, responsible-use policies, and curricular requirements for law schools. This will ensure that legal education keeps pace with technological change while maintaining professional responsibility and academic integrity.
7. **Protection Against a Two-Class Justice System:** AI-based legal services should not become a substitute for quality human legal assistance for poor and vulnerable persons. Governments, legal aid authorities, and law schools

should ensure that AI tools are used to support legal aid, not to create inferior justice for those who cannot afford lawyers. Technology must reduce inequality in access to justice rather than reproduce it in digital form.

Therefore, the future of AI in law must be guided by a balanced model: technological efficiency on one side and human responsibility on the other. Legal education, judicial institutions, and regulatory bodies must work together to ensure that AI strengthens justice without replacing the human conscience at the heart of law.

## **XI. CONCLUSION**

The rise of Artificial Intelligence does not simply signal a change in legal tools—it signals a quiet reordering of the entire legal imagination. Law, which once depended on human memory, slow reasoning, and layered interpretation of precedent, is now entering a phase where speed and computation are no longer human advantages. Yet, this does not mean the lawyer is fading; it means the role is being redefined at a deeper level.

In this emerging reality, the lawyer is no longer just a legal technician but a “meaning-maker” in a system where machines generate answers but cannot fully understand consequences. AI may predict outcomes, draft arguments, and process massive legal data, but it cannot grasp the moral weight of justice, the lived experience behind a dispute, or the societal impact of a judgment. The courtroom of the future may be assisted by algorithms, but it will still demand human conscience to decide what is fair, not just what is correct.

This shift places legal education at a critical crossroads. It is no longer enough to train students to know the law; they must be trained to question how the law is produced, processed, and influenced by machines. The most important legal skill of the future may not be recall or drafting, but judgment under technological uncertainty—knowing when to trust AI, when to challenge it, and when to completely reject its conclusions.

As the modern legal-tech industry increasingly suggests, “AI will not replace lawyers. But lawyers who use AI will replace lawyers who don't. Legal education's duty is no

longer just to teach the law, but to teach the machine.” This idea captures the transition, but not the final destination.

Because ultimately, the future of law is not a competition between human and machine. It is a test of balance. If law becomes fully automated, it risks becoming efficient but emotionally empty. If it remains purely human without technological adaptation, it risks becoming slow and inaccessible. The real future lies somewhere in between a legal system where intelligence is shared, but responsibility remains human.

## **XII. BIBLIOGRAPHY**

1. Anthony Chase, *The Birth of the Modern Law School*, 23 Am. J. Legal Hist. 329 (1979).
2. Anirudh Wadhwa, *Artificial Intelligence and the Future of Legal Education in India*, 14 Indian J.L. & Tech. 45 (2022).
3. INDIA CONST. arts. 14, 21.
4. Shamnad Basheer, *Artificial Intelligence, Ethics and the Indian Legal System*, 6 Indian L. Rev. 88 (2021).
5. *Kesavananda Bharati v. State of Kerala*, (1973) 4 SCC 225 (India).
6. *Navtej Singh Johar v. Union of India*, (2018) 10 SCC 1 (India).
7. The Indian Contract Act, No. 9 of 1872, INDIA CODE (1872).
8. *Maneka Gandhi v. Union of India*, (1978) 1 SCC 248.
9. *Justice K.S. Puttaswamy v. Union of India*, (2017) 10 SCC 1.
10. ProPublica, *Machine Bias: There's Software Used Across the Country to Predict Future Criminals. And It's Biased Against Blacks* (May 23, 2016).
11. Press Information Bureau, Government of India, *Use of AI in Judiciary / AI Tools in Legal Research Assistance: LegRAA and SUPACE*.