



The Indian Journal for Research in Law and Management

Open Access Law Journal – Copyright © 2026

Editor-in-Chief – Dr. Muktai Deb Chavan; Publisher – Alden Vas; ISSN: 2583-9896

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution- Non-Commercial-Share Alike 4.0 International (CC-BY-NC-SA 4.0) License, which permits unrestricted non-commercial use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium provided the original work is properly cited.

ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE IN MODERN COURTROOMS: OPPORTUNITIES AND CHALLENGES

- Sarisha

ABSTRACT

Integration of AI with the judicial system has emerged as the most transformative and legally complex question in the present time.

This blog examines how AI is being deployed across courtrooms globally from predictive risk-scoring tools in the United States to administrative automation in India and covers both the efficiency gains and the constitutional perils that accompany this shift.

I. INTRODUCTION

“Appellant: Kuldeep Singh Sengar.

Charges: Sections 376/363/366 IPC read with Sections 5(c)/6 POCSO Act.

Analysis complete. Victim's age: school admission records indicate minor status at time of offence weighted probability 67.3%. Alibi defence: CDR data shows appellant's phone towers 14km from crime scene during alleged incident window. Conflicting variable detected. Threat pattern to victim's family: confirmed across multiple data points.

Primary conviction under Section 5(c) POCSO, public servant classification applied.

Sentence: life imprisonment. Bail application: denied. Threat risk to survivor assessed as high.

Continued incarceration recommended.

Processing time: 1.2 seconds. Confidence level: 81%. Human review: optional.”

This is not a courtroom transcript. This is an AI's response when I asked it to assess and deliver the judgement for the Kuldeep Singh Sengar vs. CBI case¹. It's intriguing how its judgment contradicts the original judgment delivered by the division bench dated 23 Dec 2026.

¹ Kuldeep Singh Sengar v. Cent. Bureau of Investigation, Crim. A. No. 53/2020, CrI. M. (Bail) 359/2022, slip op. (Del. High Ct. Dec. 23, 2025).

The day when algorithms decide if a man walks free or faces years and years of imprisonment is no more hypothetical. Globally, AI is being used in a wide range of tasks to make the court work efficiently, from scheduling hearings, maintaining records, drafting, analyzing cases, research, flagging inconsistencies in the evidence, translating judgement and most controversially deciding matters. The question is not whether AI will enter the courtrooms it already has, but at what cost and on what terms. In the context of the Indian judicial system which struggles with backlog, AI has made it faster and transparent. It is believed that now, AI can substitute judges in regular matters but what about complex high stakes matters which require meticulous judicial interpretations and experience. Further, India is still at the nascent stage, while the EU act and AI Basic Act exist in Europe and South Korea respectively, India lacks such intensive artificial intelligence regulations

II. OPPORTUNITIES & ANALYSIS

As of 2024, over five crore cases remained pending across all courts. It is in addressing this backlog that AI's potential is most legitimate and least contested. AI has helped in reducing procedural delays through platforms like LIMBS (Legal Information Management & Briefing System)², SUPACE and SUVAS. But the problem arises with regulations related to the extent to which AI can assist in courtrooms.

The committee chaired by Supreme Court Justice P. S Narsimaha has invited comments and suggestions from stakeholders as well as members of the public on the preliminary draft of 'Regulations for Use of AI in courts, 2026'³. The proposed regulation bar AI-assisting sentencing without mandatory human oversight, furthermore it prevents AI systems from profiling parties or witnesses and dismiss the use of "opaque" and "unexplainable" AI systems in court process. The processing of the personal data under the said regulation is governed through the Digital Personal Data Protection Act 2023⁴. The regulations also involve the concept of Human In the loop which provides that AI systems used must function solely in an assistive capacity and remain strictly subservient to the human judgement and judicial authority⁵. AI can be used for

² Supreme Court of India, LIMBS Project Overview (2021), <https://limbs.sci.gov.in>.

³ Regulations for Use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in Courts, 2026

⁴ Digital Personal Data Protection Act, No. 22 of 2023 (India).

⁵ Supreme Court Committee on Artificial Intelligence, Regulations for Use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in Courts, 2026 (Draft) (India 2026).

administrative purposes, but it cannot be used for risk scoring in court processes which covers assessing flight risk, evaluating bail eligibility or determining the credibility of parties or witnesses.

The key component of the draft regulations is that it adopts responsible AI adoption rather than being restrictive in nature and acknowledges the need of AI in the judicial system.

III. **CHALLENGES: WHERE THE ALGORITHM BECOMES A THREAT**

AI-related risks in the judicial setting are not theoretical; it is well documented through various cases around the world. We can say that AI has a supplementary role in decision making while the decision of the judge prevails but in the near future AI will begin to make decisions singlehandedly which will determine the fate of the criminals. However, in both cases the question of transparency arises. With the increase in technological advancement the opaqueness in AI will rise, and AI may tend to inherit discrimination, historical biases and may just follow patterns blindly instead of scrutinizing the facts of the case.

COMPAS (Correctional Offender Management Profiling for Alternative Sanctions) is an AI-based risk assessment tool used in the U.S. criminal justice system. It generates scores for general recidivism and violent recidivism, which judges and parole officers may use to inform decisions on pre-trial release, sentencing, and supervision levels. AI risk-assessment tools such as **COMPAS** are increasingly influencing judicial decisions. In **Wisconsin**, although judges are not officially supposed to rely on AI scores when sentencing, one judge increased a theft offender's sentence from what would have been 18 months to 2 years after seeing a high COMPAS risk score. In a case in the U.S, a high AI risk score was treated as a factor that justified a harsher sentence. These examples show that AI tools often have a significant influence on judicial decisions, even when judges remain the final decision-makers. However, an investigative report released by ProPublica on COMPAS, found that **Black defendants were nearly twice as likely as white defendants to be misclassified as high risk** when they did not reoffend, while white defendants who did reoffend were more often misclassified as low risk.

Rules are inherently general; justice is inherently particular. The strength of the common law tradition and of the Indian constitutional framework lies in the judge's

capacity to recognize when strict rule-application would produce an unjust result, and to correct it. An AI system instructed to follow rules will produce dangerous results in cases where rules conflict or where exceptional facts demand exceptional reasoning⁶. There is also the question of the digital divide. Courts that deploy AI systems designed for English-language input, or that require litigants to interact with digital interfaces, risk systematically disadvantageous rural, economically marginalized, and linguistically diverse communities.

IV. CONCLUSION

The question is not whether AI belongs in the courtroom; it does, in administrative and research assistance functions. The question is whether AI can be trusted with the exercise of adjudicative power over human lives. The answer, for the foreseeable future, is no.

AI systems that are incomprehensible, data-based, alienating, and disillusioning is particularly apt for India, where access to justice is already unevenly distributed, where the judiciary is trusted as a constitutional guardian for all, and where the legitimacy of judicial outcomes depends on their perceived fairness as much as their legal correctness. Cases involving the liberty, dignity, and rights of persons require a human being who can weigh competing principles, who can be held accountable for their reasoning, and who can be overruled by another human being on appeal. India's 2026 draft regulations⁷ represent a principled beginning.

⁶ Tim Wu, Will Artificial Intelligence Eat the Law? The Rise of Hybrid Social-Ordering Systems, 119 Colum. L. Rev. 2001, 2004 (2019).

⁷ Supreme Court Committee on Artificial Intelligence, Regulations for Use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in Courts, 2026 (Draft) (India 2026).