Contemporary Readings in Law and Social Justice
ISSN: 1948-9137, e-ISSN: 2162-2752
Vol 17(1),2025
Pp 1409 - 1416

Legal Challenges of Artificial Intelligence in the Judiciary – A Comparative Analytical Study of International Experiences

Hafnaoui Medellel, Houssameddine Berrekbia

hafnaoui-medellel@univ-eloued.dz

University of El-Oued

Berrekbia-houssameddine@univ-eloued.dz

University of El-Oued

Abstract:
The article addresses the legal issues arising from the integration of artificial intelligence into the judicial system, focusing on its ethical, legislative, and practical dimensions. It presents how AI is used in analyzing evidence, predicting judgments, and managing case files, then discusses challenges related to legal liability and the lack of clarity in the regulatory framework governing these applications, in addition to the risks of undermining judicial independence and litigants' right to a fair trial. The article emphasizes the need to establish a specific legal framework that ensures transparency, accountability, and human oversight, while taking national particularities into account and strengthening the training of legal actors to keep pace with these transformations.

Keywords: Artificial intelligence; judicial system; algorithmic justice; smart court.

Received: 01/04/2025 **Accepted: 28/05/2025** **Published: 22/07/2025**

Introduction:

In the digital era, the world has witnessed a rapidly accelerating technological revolution, led by artificial intelligence technologies that have penetrated various sectors, including the judicial sector. AI has begun to be used to improve the administration of justice through automating procedures, analyzing evidence, and providing support in issuing judgments. The integration of AI technologies into legal procedures thus constitutes a comprehensive regulatory reform that may radically change traditional judicial practices, thereby altering the ways policies are formulated and decisions are made within the political system.

However, this technical progress raises complex legal and ethical issues that touch the very essence of justice, judicial independence, and individuals' rights. Consequently, the use of AI in the field of justice requires access to sensitive data, including personal data. At the same time, ensuring data security when using AI technologies remains difficult.

This study seeks to analyze the legal challenges associated with using AI in the judicial system and to provide a comparative critical reading of international experiences, with a view to proposing regulatory solutions and recommendations that achieve a balance between technological efficiency and the guarantees of justice.

Problem statement:

"In light of the current technological revolution, how can a balanced legal framework be built to govern the use of artificial intelligence in the judiciary, so as to benefit from the capabilities of these technologies while preserving the fundamental principles of justice and litigants' rights?"

Research objectives:

This question calls for examining several legal aspects related to the use of these technologies, most notably:

- Defining the conceptual and technical framework of artificial intelligence in the judicial field.
- Studying the legal issues resulting from the use of smart systems in the judiciary.
- Analyzing comparative experiences (France, Canada, China) in order to extract different regulatory models.
- Providing practical recommendations for developing effective and balanced legislation.

Methodology:
The study adopts a comparative analytical approach by analyzing legal texts and international documents and reviewing practical practices in some leading judicial systems.

First axis: The legal and technical framework for using AI in the judiciary
First: Definition of judicial AI and its forms
Judicial AI is defined, in the judicial context, as the use of computing technologies based on machine learning and algorithms to analyze legal data, issue recommendations, or even make judicial decisions. Its forms include: assisted AI (which supports the judge without intervening in the decision) and partially autonomous AI (such as systems used in resolving minor disputes).

The essential difference between assisted AI and "governing" AI lies in the degree of autonomy, scope of influence, and the authority granted to each. Assisted AI—such as ChatGPT or voice assistants (e.g., Siri and Google Assistant)—operates within a pre-defined limited framework, providing support in daily tasks without the ability to make independent decisions or influence major systems. As for "governing" AI, it is a hypothetical concept that assumes the possession of self-sovereignty, enabling it to manage entire societal or governmental affairs—such as shaping policies or regulating the economy—without direct human intervention.

Second: Applications of AI in judicial work
AI has become an increasingly influential tool in judicial systems worldwide, as it is used to improve efficiency, reduce human errors, and simplify legal procedures. Its applications in judicial work can be divided into three main stages:

1) Legal adaptation and evidence analysis stage:

This stage mainly relies on the "ROSS Intelligence" platform linked to IBM's "Watson" platform to assist in legal research, as well as tools such as "CaseText" and "Lex Machina." These applications help with:

- **Automated analysis of legal texts:** Natural Language Processing (NLP) algorithms are used to analyze judicial precedents and laws, helping judges and lawyers quickly access relevant information.
- **Examination of digital evidence:** AI is used to analyze large quantities of data, such as audio and video recordings, voice and facial recognition, and detecting document forgery through the analysis of patterns and fine differences, as well as analyzing financial data in fraud and economic crime cases.

2) Assistance in issuing judgments:

Several countries have pioneering experiments in employing AI in the judicial field. For example, China launched the "Smart Court" system, and Estonia adopted the "AI Judge" project. These experiences highlight AI's significant potential to improve the efficiency of the judicial system and reduce court case backlogs.

- **Legal foundations of the smart court:**

- The idea of the smart court in the Chinese experience is based on Article 7 of the Electronic Litigation Law issued in 2021, which authorizes courts to adopt AI systems to assist in case management. This framework is complemented by Article 12 of the Supreme People's Courts Regulation, which provides for using "smart systems" to analyze judicial precedents. However, these texts lack detailed operational controls, opening the door to divergent interpretations in implementation.

- **The AI Judge system:**

Estonia's "AI Judge" project is based on the E-Court Act issued in 2019, which allows the use of AI to decide small financial claims (up to €7,000) without human intervention. The system is based on:

○ **Article 12:** granting automated systems the authority to make judicial decisions within a limited scope.

○ **Article 5(3):** requiring that algorithms be auditable by an independent body.

○ **EU Guidance 1937/2019 on trustworthy AI:** imposing conditions for transparency and accountability.

This system operates by analyzing judicial precedents (training on thousands of prior judgments in similar disputes) and by electronically processing claims through a digital platform, analyzing them, and issuing a judgment within 48 hours, with the possibility of appeal: affected parties may challenge the decision before a human judge within 15 days (pursuant to Article 18 of the law).

3) Court administration:

This is done through case-management systems, automatic scheduling of hearings, and the use of chatbots to serve citizens (such as the DoNotPay system in the United States).

- **Scheduling automation:** Systems such as "CourtAlert" use artificial intelligence to manage hearing dates and notify the relevant parties.

- **Organizing judicial files:** Converting paper records into digital form through Optical Character Recognition (OCR), and automatically classifying documents to facilitate retrieval.

- **Assistance with court procedures:** Chatbots respond to citizens' inquiries about legal procedures. The "DoNotPay" system (a "robot lawyer") helps users with simple appeals such as traffic tickets.

Third: The international and national legislative framework

1) Presentation of international experiences and analysis of legislative frameworks

Through the attached table below, international experiences will be presented according to specific criteria to facilitate comparison and analysis of legal systems: Algeria, France, China, and Canada.

Criterion	France	Canada	China	Algeria
Approach	Restrictive and regulatory	Proactive and ethical	Development-oriented and experimental	Conservative and cautious

Regulatory / legislative texts	Article 33 of the 2019 Digital Justice Law	Directive on Automated Decision-Making	General government guidelines without a unified law	No specific legislative texts to date
Transparency level	High *(restrictions on judicial prediction algorithms)*	Medium *(mandatory impact assessment procedures)*	Low *(lack of transparency and limited right to access algorithms)*	Not implemented *(absence of smart digital judicial platforms)*
Policy priority	Protecting judicial values and human rights	Balancing innovation and accountability	Speeding up litigation and improving efficiency	Caution regarding technological risks and privacy
Oversight of smart systems	Independent oversight bodies	Technical committees under the federal government	Centralized government oversight without societal participation	Under traditional judicial authority, without technical oversight

Analysis of the table:

France represents a cautious model that places litigants' rights at the forefront and focuses on ensuring transparency and explain ability. Canada seeks to achieve a balance between technological progress and legal responsibility through ethical impact assessment prior to deployment. China emphasizes results and speed, with a relative sacrifice of principles such as accountability and privacy, which raises human-rights challenges. Algeria has not yet institutionally adopted judicial AI technologies, but there are initial efforts to digitally modernize judicial administration, along with clear legislative caution about granting machines any role in issuing judgments. The Algerian situation therefore represents a transitional phase that requires gradual regulation that takes the local context into account and aligns with constitutional principles and national judicial values.

2) Absence or weakness of legislation regulating the use of AI

The world faces a major legislative challenge in keeping pace with the rapid development of AI technologies, as a clear gap is emerging between technological progress and the regulatory frameworks governing it. Most countries are still at an early stage of developing comprehensive AI legislation, creating an unclear regulatory environment, which can be summarized as follows:

- The absence of specialized AI legislation, with reliance on older laws not designed specifically for these advanced technologies.
- Fragmentation of regulatory efforts among several government bodies without sufficient coordination.
- The absence of clear ethical standards for the use of AI, especially in sensitive areas such as privacy, discrimination, and accountability.

3) Positions of international bodies regarding AI regulation

Council of Europe and the European Union:

The Council of Europe and the EU have adopted an advanced position on regulating AI, working to develop unified European standards focused on protecting human rights and providing ethical guidance for the development and use of AI technologies. They also maintain ongoing dialogue with member states, the private sector, and civil society to ensure a balance between innovation and protection.

The United Nations and international organizations:

The United Nations and its specialized organizations, such as UNESCO, seek to strengthen global dialogue on

AI ethics and develop international guiding principles to ensure that AI is used to achieve sustainable development goals and to bridge the digital gap between developed and developing countries in the field of AI.

Second axis: Legal and judicial challenges of AI and their impact on justice
Even with the use of AI, the human judge remains the final decision-maker in most current judicial systems. Legislation regulates judges' liability through special disciplinary mechanisms that preserve judicial independence while ensuring accountability in cases of error. Here, several legal and judicial challenges arise in relation to AI use—most importantly: can a judge be held accountable for an error resulting from relying on the recommendations of an AI system? The answer depends on the degree of the judge's independence in evaluating the system's outputs and making the decision.

First: The issue of legal liability and judicial errors
Using systems that make decisions raises significant questions about legal responsibility in the event of error. With complex algorithms, it becomes difficult to identify the responsible party when an error occurs—whether the developer, the operating entity, or the judge who relied on the system.

1) The judge's liability:
Under civil law, liability is linked to the existence of fault, damage, and a causal relationship between them. However, proving these elements becomes difficult when the decision results from interaction between human and machine. In this context, some studies propose adopting a model of "shared liability" between the developer and the user, or requiring developers to take out mandatory insurance covering errors arising from their algorithms.

2) Liability of AI developers:
Liability may shift to developers or producing companies if it is proven that the error resulted from defects in design or programming, biased training data, or insufficient security testing. Under the current legal system, rules of tort or contractual liability can be applied to developers, since AI may be treated as a product subject to product liability for defects—an approach that some comparative systems (such as the European Union) have begun to consolidate through revising the European directive on product liability.

3) The issue of AI's own liability:
The central dilemma is whether the system itself can bear liability. Currently, AI systems lack "legal personality," which would enable them to assume responsibility or possess legal capacity. Legal personality requires independent will and the ability to assume obligations—qualities that current AI does not possess, despite its development.

Second: The impact of AI on fundamental judicial principles
1) The principle of judicial independence:
It is necessary to distinguish between technical support for the judge and interference with the judge's discretionary authority. The more judges rely on algorithmic recommendations, the greater the risk of limiting the independence of judicial decision-making. The principle of separation of powers also requires that the judiciary remain free from subtle technological influences. The Council of Europe has indicated in its recommendations on AI and justice the need to respect judicial independence and ensure that all decisions remain explainable in human terms.

2) The principle of equality before the law:
AI systems rely on historical data, making them susceptible to reproducing patterns of bias embedded in that data. According to reports by the European Commission, systems trained on biased data may lead to discrimination against certain social groups, violating the principle of equality before the law. Some bodies therefore propose adopting "algorithmic justice," which requires testing systems for neutrality and their impact on marginalized groups before judicial deployment.

Third: Ethical and privacy challenges
1) Violation of privacy when analyzing personal data

The judicial system faces an acute ethical dilemma in balancing the benefits of big-data analytics against the protection of individual privacy:

- **Expansion of data collection scope:** Systems may exceed what is strictly necessary for judicial analysis by collecting and processing enormous volumes of personal data that are not directly relevant to the case.

- **Risks of hacking and misuse:** The likelihood of privacy violations increases as the volume of collected data grows, especially where data-protection safeguards are weak in some judicial systems.

- **The issue of informed consent:** Data are often collected and analyzed without full understanding or explicit consent from the individuals concerned.

Proposed solutions:

- Applying the principle of **data minimization** (collecting only the minimum necessary data).

- Strengthening **encryption** and **digital security** techniques.

- Establishing **strict regulatory frameworks** governing the use of data in judicial analysis.

2) Algorithmic bias and unintended discrimination
Studies show that AI systems may entrench forms of discrimination despite developers' intentions. Systems can reflect biases present in past judicial decisions, leading to the repetition of discrimination against certain groups. Algorithms may also rely on **proxy variables** that produce indirect discrimination that is difficult to detect. As a result, prediction accuracy can vary across demographic groups, affecting the fairness of outcomes.

Accordingly, it is necessary to conduct **regular algorithm audits** to detect bias, diversify development teams to represent different groups, and apply **algorithmic fairness tests** prior to deployment.

3) Loss of the human element in adjudication
Excessive reliance on AI affects essential human dimensions of judicial work because systems fail to capture the unique psychological and social complexities of each case. This can cause citizens to lose trust in justice when they feel they are being judged by a "machine," especially if statistical outputs override ethical and equitable considerations.

It is therefore necessary to preserve a central role for the human judge in decision-making, while developing **explainable AI** systems that provide a human-centered context, and training judges to balance technical inputs with human considerations.

Fourth: Legal proposals and recommendations to ensure AI justice
Existing laws are not designed to keep pace with the complexities of AI. Most current legislation addresses AI within older legal frameworks (contract law, civil liability, data protection), creating significant divergence in approaches between states (from strict regulation to a lack of regulation).

The basic legislative framework:
A foundational AI law should be adopted to define concepts and legal definitions and set general principles (transparency, accountability, non-discrimination), along with the establishment of a national authority to regulate AI. Amendments should also be introduced to the law of evidence to set standards for admitting AI-derived evidence and to affirm special rules for "algorithmic proof," by codifying the concept of the **legal probative value** of system outputs.

2) A graduated liability regime:

- Developer liability for technical defects.
- Operator liability for misuse.
- Judge liability for the final assessment.

Conclusion

Harnessing AI in the service of justice represents a historic opportunity to modernize the judiciary and achieve greater efficiency, but it must occur within a strict legal and ethical framework. Technical progress must not come at the expense of sacrificing individuals' rights or undermining judicial independence. This highlights the need for flexible, evolvable legislation capable of protecting judicial values and ensuring algorithmic justice that contributes to building a safe and trustworthy legal future.

Key recommendations include:

- Establishing a dedicated ethical framework for AI use in the judiciary, with effective enforcement mechanisms.
- Multi-level governance: creating independent oversight bodies at both national and international levels.
- A technical–human balance: adopting a hybrid model that preserves human values while benefiting from technical efficiency.
- Empowering judicial skills: developing specialized training programs for judges on managing interaction with smart systems.
- Comprehensive data protection: adopting a "security by design" approach throughout all stages of judicial-system development.

References

1. Vasiliy A. Laptev & Daria R. Feyzrakhmanova, "Application of Artificial Intelligence in Justice: Current Trends and Future Prospects," *Human-Centric Intelligent Systems*, (2024) 4:394–405, pp. 395–396.
2. Clement Guitton & Vlada Druta, "Adoption of Artificial Intelligence in the Judiciary: A Comparison of 28 Advanced Democracies," *Discover Artificial Intelligence*, Vol. 5, Article No. 169, 2025.
3. Stuart Russell & Peter Norvig, Artificial Intelligence: A Modern Approach, 3rd Edition, p. 36; and A. M. Turing, "Computing Machinery and Intelligence," *Mind*, Vol. 49, pp. 433–460.
4. European Commission, Proposal for a Regulation Laying Down Harmonised Rules on Artificial Intelligence, 2021.
5. Richard Susskind, Online Courts and the Future of Justice, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019, p. 368.
6. C. Shi, T. Sourdin & B. Li, "The Smart Court – A New Pathway to Justice in China?" *International Journal for Court Administration*, published 11 March 2021, p. 4.
7. C. Shi, T. Sourdin & B. Li, "The Smart Court – A New Pathway to Justice in China?" *International Journal for Court Administration*, 2021. https://doi.org/10.36745/ijca.367
8. Official websites: Supreme People's Court of China (http://www.court.gov.cn) and Ministry of Justice of China (http://www.moj.gov.cn).
9. White Paper on the Application of Internet Technology in Judicial Practice, Beijing Internet Court Anniversary Series, 2019. Accessed 22/08/2025.
10. Official Journal of the European Union, L 305, 26.11.2019, pp. 17–56.
11. Algorithmic Justice League, "AI and Judicial Systems: Comparative Legal Perspectives," 2023; and OECD Digital Government Studies, "AI in the Judiciary: Risks and Regulations," 2022.
12. Directive on Automated Decision-Making.
13. Luo Q. & Yang G., "Promoting the QQ Tribunal," *People's Court News*, 2015. Accessed 1 September 2023.

14. Algerian Ministry of Justice, Report on the Digitalization of the Justice Sector, 2023, published on the official website; and the official speech of the Director General for Modernization at the Ministry of Justice during the National Symposium on Digital Justice, Algeria, December 2022.
15. Yunfei Ge & Quanyan Zhu, "AI Liability Insurance With an Example in an AI-Powered E-Diagnosis System," New York University, Brooklyn, NY 11201, USA, 2023, pp. 2–3.
16. Articles 12 and 13, Directive (EU) 2024/2853 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 23 October 2024 on Liability for Defective Products and Repealing Council Directive 85/374/EEC, *Official Journal of the European Union*.
17. Articles 05 and 06, ibid. (same reference as above).