

Is Legal Justice at Risk in the Epoch of Artificial Intelligence? A Jurisprudential Assessment of Algorithmic Governance, Procedural Due Process, and the Safeguarding of Human Rights

Tiba Nazifa

Independent Researcher

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2026.100801061>

Received: 07 September 2026; Accepted: 12 September 2026; Published: 24 September 2026

ABSTRACT

A methodical investigation into the transformation of judicial frameworks enhanced by artificial intelligence (AI) raises a crucial normative inquiry: is the integrity of justice in law perpetually threatened by the use of algorithms in the judiciary? Rooted in legal principles and human rights frameworks, it seeks to reconcile the interplay between algorithmic judicial efficiency and fundamental doctrines of good law—procedural fairness, judicial autonomy, non-discrimination, and accountability. Employing legal-dogmatic and socio-legal methodologies, the article illustrates how innovative forms of adjudication have been legally transformed via predictive analytics, extensive language models, and automated administrative frameworks. Critiques regarding the dynamics of algorithmic bias, lack of transparency in "black box" model-based machine learning, and the reduction of judicial discretion chances. It is argued that generative and automated systems provide mechanisms for enhancing administrative efficiency, although their unrestrained application poses a fundamental danger to the rule of law. In light of these underlying weaknesses, the author advocates for a comprehensive regulatory structure that mandates algorithmic effect evaluations, ensures inviolable rights to substantial human supervision, and establishes statutory disclosure protocols.

INTRODUCTION

In the annals of human jurisprudence, the acceptance of artificial intelligence as a component of the judicial system marks a significant milestone. The rehabilitative frameworks of judicial reasoning necessitate immediate redefinition as algorithmic instruments, computerized risk evaluations, and generative language models infiltrate administrative courts, criminal registries, and civil tribunals. This structural change, however, presents fundamental difficulties to conventional understandings of the rule of law: specifically, how courts and administrative entities navigate conflicting demands to accelerate procedures while ensuring substantively suitable outcomes.

This study aims to address the essential inquiry regarding the appropriate function of artificial intelligence in judicial proceedings: Does the systematization of judgment enhance or diminish justice, and can the efficacy of algorithms align with the requirements for procedural due process and constitutional safeguards against discrimination? This principal inquiry is associated with three fundamental research questions: firstly, in what manner can biases in input data and the opaque nature of intricate machine learning models undermine non-discrimination principles and procedural fairness in judicial rulings? Is the institutional delegation of adjudicative responsibilities to automated systems eroding human judicial judgment and rational decision-making in line with established constitutional norms? What legal, legislative, and judicial criteria need to be implemented to enhance access to justice via algorithmic utilization, while ensuring robust protections against the infringement of human rights?

Justification

This study is prompted by the reality that nearly every facet of the judicial process currently incorporates

algorithmic systems, however there is a lack of sufficient statutory or constitutional frameworks to ensure their ethical application. Excessive adherence to institutional objectives for efficient governance and the resolution of pending cases frequently leads to significant constitutional deficiencies when effectively employed alongside contemporary automated legal technologies. These algorithmic systems are utilized not only for standard administrative classification in our courts but also to determine pre-trial detention eligibility, identify individuals for risk assessment, and influence criminal sentencing, discovery management, and the formulation of principal judgments. Utilizing untested algorithms for adjudicative functions necessitates extensive legal examination, as judicial rulings directly impact fundamental human rights, property entitlements, and legal standing. These dynamics are essential for analyzing this issue - to prevent the hastening of technology, particularly in a manner that undermines procedural safeguards established over centuries through legal progress.

METHODOLOGY

It employs a mixed-methods legal-dogmatic and normative socio-legal research design. The legal-dogmatic element is concerned with national and international statutory frameworks, including (i) widely ratified human rights treaties, such as the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights; (ii) cross-jurisdictional comparison of laws, such as the European Union Artificial Intelligence Act, European Convention on Human Rights, the United Kingdom Human Rights Bill, and Australian legislation identifying common law safeguards against discrimination. This research examines questions concerning how traditional legal standards for direct and indirect discrimination, statutory transparency, and due process affect the functioning of machine learning systems. By contrast, the socio-legal perspective draws on documented case law, institutional reports, and empirical studies of algorithmic performance in court settings to diagnose the realities that emerge from the deployment of AI in judicial contexts. It attempts to integrate the technical aspects of machine learning with legal doctrines and functional principles to determine the practical impact that technologies have on fundamental rights.

LIMITATION

This examination acknowledges the institutional and methodological constraints of particular categories. Given the swift advancement of artificial intelligence technology and the ongoing formulation of regulatory frameworks, this evaluation serves as a reflection of the legal landscape as of mid-2026. Furthermore, the application of AI inside judicial frameworks varies markedly among common law, civil law, and international legal systems. While this paper utilizes comparative viewpoints, regional variations in procedural law preclude a universal, uniform empirical finding on all automated legal technology. Moreover, private algorithmic frameworks (predominantly safeguarded by commercial confidentiality regulations) are predominantly inaccessible to direct technical scrutiny; relying instead on external legal assessments, scholarly analyzes, and publicly disclosed technical documents.

DISCUSSION

Algorithmic bias and legal structures dictate the dynamics of success in machine learning, establishing the convergence point in the interplay between artificial intelligence and judicial fairness. In contrast to conventional computer software that operates on explicitly defined and human-readable code, contemporary machine learning algorithms adjust their operational rules statistically through pattern recognition in extensive training datasets. Many of these models investigate historical judicial decisions, law enforcement documentation, or socio-economic metrics and inadvertently perpetuate systemic inequities from history – frequently to a far greater degree.

The application of anti-discrimination principles to automated decision-making necessitates a more intricate legal examination. Legal assertions must predominantly demonstrate either direct or indirect discrimination within statutory frameworks [such as the Equality Act 2010, and institutional evaluations identified in European non-discrimination laws]. Direct discrimination is subjecting an individual to inferior treatment compared to another based on a protected feature. The safeguarded characteristics like race or gender that are

frequently included in tree-based decision rules in statistics, are often substituted in most machine learning models with proxy variables (postal code, job history, educational qualifications) that are strongly associated with these protected categories.

Consequently, nearly all legal repercussions for algorithmic bias would be encompassed by indirect discrimination. To establish indirect discrimination, a claimant must show that there is a universally applicable PCP that adversely affects one or more protected characteristics in a specific manner. Nevertheless, the PCP constitutes a considerable source of challenges in algorithmic litigation. The FCA may subsequently formulate a specific clause regarding whether the PCP is confined to the algorithm itself, the training dataset that supports the algorithm, or a statistical risk benchmark imposed by the judiciary. Deep neural networks assign weights to their predictions at every phase, thus certain characteristics of a training dataset (inputs to a pre-trained network) or feature map are invoked legitimately; causality is hypothesized but cannot be practically verified: establishing specific connections is unattainable without technical disclosures, which are now confined to theoretical literature that rarely reaches individual litigants.

Ultimately, even when a claimant successfully demonstrates detriment concerning certain groups on the balance of probabilities (essentially establishing a *prima facie* case), individuals may face challenges from court authorities or corporate sellers employing objective justification as a defense. Nevertheless, the new legislation will continue to allow the utilization of the algorithmic instrument provided that two simultaneous and interconnected criteria are satisfied: that its application seeks a legitimate objective—such as public safety, crime detection, forensic inquiry, or judicial efficacy; and that the methods employed are commensurate with the intended outcomes (including non-invasive techniques when suitable). This defense may also be accessible to defendants who can prove they undertook all reasonable measures (or possibly even actions that a jury could deem not unreasonable) to eradicate this bias. Judicial bodies struggle to assess technical tasks aimed at "de-biasing" datasets according to legal standards and often prioritize efficiency over nuanced systemic biases inherent in the design of algorithmic evaluation tools.

Judicial Discretion, Procedural Due Process, and the Black Box Dilemma (4): Procedural due process mandates that judicial determinations be grounded in legally sound rationales, enabling the parties to comprehend the reasoning behind an outcome, including their entitlement to challenge nearly every decision. The notion fundamentally contradicts a constitutional mandate to respect the sanctity of human discernment in judicial proceedings while also incorporating advanced machine learning technologies. The operation of high-dimensional neural networks through statistical weightings, which are not easily correlated with psychological or neuroscientific legal concepts comprehensible to humans, accounts for their classification as the black box problem in machine learning.

When conclusions arise from the ambiguous characteristics of a predictive model, the inherent right to an explanation for a judgment diminishes. When a court employs an algorithmic risk score, it does so without investigating the methodology behind the score's calculation, thereby adhering to the constitutional requirement of offering an independent justification. This lack of transparency places the state in a position of heightened asymmetry beyond what is acceptable according to most significant international human rights treaties concerning the balance of power between the plaintiff and the defendant. An escalated bail requirement, or a punitive framework derived from an inscrutable algorithm, cannot genuinely be criticized for the rationale behind that restriction.

Moreover, aspects of "automation bias," the cognitive inclination for individuals to excessively depend on automated results inside judicial processes utilizing machine learning technologies, could be an unforeseen repercussion. Judges managing substantial caseloads can misinterpret algorithmic suggestions as impartial objective conclusions instead of contingent statistical assessments. It resembles a textbook rather than a judgment—now devoid of even the appearance of assessment, supplanted by statistical generalization. Judicial administrative procedures governed by transparent, human judgment stand in stark contrast to rigid statistical modeling, implying susceptibility to both principles of legal equity and the unpredictability of actual circumstances.

Implementation of Generative AI, and the Students-Release or Retain legislation Part I

The influence of artificial intelligence (AI) has extended to complicate matters with LLMs in legal proceedings. Generative systems are employed to condense records, compile pertinent elements of legal study, and produce initial versions of judicial writing in contemporary legal practice; nevertheless, court administrations now utilize these systems for all these purposes as well. These models provide significant enhancements in efficiency for numerous organizations; however, they also introduce operational traits that inherently carry a range of supplementary (and in certain instances entirely novel) legal risks, as these systems function at the level of these primitives—with LLMs producing outcomes solely based on probabilistic associations rather than genuine semantic comprehension or authentic legal reasoning. As a result, these systems continue to be vulnerable to "hallucinations" that generate erroneous legal precedents or miscite legislation, and may even lead to fallacious thinking.

Veil of secrecy around the submission of sensitive data governed by court confidentiality obligations necessitating a decision-making duty.

Application scenario four: employ generative instruments in composition.

Naturally, this must be accompanied by the understanding that any digital legal counsel or predictive model — as previously mentioned and suggested in numerous systems developed in cloud-based environments, such as league reporting systems — shall not be required to fulfill the stringent criteria mandated by confidentiality laws, including necessary safeguards against self-incrimination. Engaging in comprehensive research ought to uncover the existence of confidential mapping methodologies related to cases prior to their availability in publicly accessible libraries maintained externally through generated outputs/input requests from email servers (which are also delineated only at subsequent phases of development if executed properly); a submission outlining the foundations that adequately explain the rationale; the involvement of multiple stakeholders may be essential. Revised composition pertaining to each legal document. It is possible that submissions are returned directly, despite the uncertainty surrounding regular petitioners.

The utilization of probabilistic generative models for articulating opinions does not simplify legal matters, nor does it elucidate the challenges faced by judges. The affluent traditional legal framework relies significantly on inventive legal discourse and ethical reasoning, either positively or adversely, even more than a departure from beneficial yet outdated precedents. The assertion is that generative AI models are inherently retrospective, having been developed solely on historical text archives, and this ongoing dependence poses a significant danger as it threatens to suppress the development of new legal standards. A more unsettling prospect would include substituting innovative dynamic legal thinking with a generic static aggregation of historical human thought.

Regulatory Approaches and Institutional Frameworks

The regulatory strategies employed by various nations regarding the governance of AI in legal contexts are highly varied. Some individuals may have reached a compromise; technological benefits or staunch advocates for human rights. Uniformity in scope is characteristic of jurisdictions that operate in a polarized fashion. An illustration of this is the binding, horizontal regulatory framework that the EU Artificial Intelligence Act facilitates in Europe. The framework employs a risk-oriented classification approach by categorizing AI systems intended for judicial and law enforcement use as "high-risk" systems. Consequently, adherence to testing, stringent data governance, and demands for technical transparency must be enforced alongside ongoing human supervision. Conversely, social credit scoring and illicit subliminal manipulation technologies are explicitly banned.

Conversely, the UK and other regions have adopted a sector-specific, principle-oriented regulatory structure that grants substantial executive latitude to current administrative authorities, instead of implementing extensive prohibitory statutory measures. Conversely, almost all international governments depend on voluntary codes of behavior or industry standards (or specific requirements). This regulatory disunity results in

substantial voids in legal principles. Such politically impartial initiatives and non-enforceable frameworks, on one side, undoubtedly foster some forms of technology advancement but are deficient in obligatory legal mechanisms that will ultimately be necessary for safeguarding individual constitutional rights.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- To safeguard procedural due process, constitutional rights and core tenets of justice against its ongoing changes while keeping up with advanced technological development the following recommendations should be undertaken by legal & institutional authorities:
- **Mandatory Algorithmic Impact Assessments:** Statutory judicial officers should be required to perform comprehensive, independent algorithmic impact assessments before introduction of any automated tool used in court processes. The assessments should consider technical soundness, dataset bias risk mitigation, equal treatment and procedural fairness compliance.
- **Enforceable Rights to Explainability and Source Code Inspection:** Pass legislation that grants any litigant this right—an enforceable legal right, in the case of a judicial or administrative decision informed by an algorithm—to receive at minimum an explanation from a human (not another automated system) explaining how its objective functions; which input data was used in what context; along with appropriate access to relevant parameters for independent scrutiny proposed testing.
- **Maintain Non-Waivable Human Oversight of Adjudicative Decisions:** Ensure no automated adjudicatory decision making occurs by creating a bright line rule, such that all automation tools may only be used in an advisory capacity. Establish mandatory protocols for judges in training to minimize the effects of automation bias and ensure that humans remain solely responsible for legal reasoning, considerations, and determinations.
- **Enforce Stringent Data Protection Barriers on Judicial Generative AI:** Establish all regulatory standards to protect against inputs of proprietary briefs, unreleased judicial opinions and personal data in third party or non-secure generative AI systems; fully compliant within statutory frameworks for privacy.
- **Encourage International Harmonization of Judicial Technology Standards:** Promote active involvement in multi-stakeholder international fora, such as the Council of Europe, OECD and United Nations for universal standards on law positive technology functioning aligned with human rights.

CONCLUSION

The response to the inquiry "is legal justice ultimately at risk in the era of AI?" is an unequivocal affirmative with a stipulation: The implementation of automated algorithms on a large scale necessitates comprehensive examination, since they provide significant, systemic risks to procedural equity, game autonomy, and anti-discrimination safeguards. The initial subsidiary inquiry reveals that biases inherent in historical datasets and the non-descriptive characteristics of machine-learning frameworks contravene legal nondiscrimination safeguards by unjustly disadvantaging certain subgroups while masquerading as statistically neutral. Regarding the second research question, reliance on predictive risk assessments and generative drafting instruments threatens to diminish personalized judicial discretion in favor of elucidation through retroactive statistical associations. Ultimately, addressing the final research inquiry, this document illustrates that both enforceable legal safeguards and required transparency frameworks mitigate numerous institutional hazards. We must not permit AI technology to operate without regulation; only by acknowledging, comprehending, and safeguarding the human-centric principles inherent in every law (empathy, moral judgment, and a personal sense of fairness) can we ensure that judicial administration remains truly just.

Declarations Conflict of Interest and Use of Artificial Intelligence

The author declares that generative artificial intelligence or automated machine learning tools were not used to conduct research, analyze data, formulate arguments, synthesize literature, or generate substantive content for

this manuscript. All intellectual content, research design, and conclusions are entirely the original work of the author. Artificial intelligence assistance e.g., Gemini / ChatGPT / Grammarly was utilized strictly as an auxiliary tool for language refinement, proofreading, grammatical consistency, and structural formatting to enhance readability. The author has thoroughly reviewed, edited, and verified all outputs and accepts full responsibility for the accuracy, integrity, and original expression of the final manuscript.

Furthermore, Generative AI tools were not used for the generation of research content, data interpretation, or original text drafting in this paper was employed solely for proofreading, language polishing, and formatting optimization. The author retains sole ownership of the research and takes full responsibility for the manuscript's content.

ENDNOTES

1. Regulation (EU) 2024/1689 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 13 June 2024 laying down harmonised rules on artificial intelligence (Artificial Intelligence Act) [2024] OJ L 2024/1689.
2. Council of Europe, *European Ethical Charter on the Use of Artificial Intelligence in Judicial Systems and Their Environment* (CEPEJ, 2018) 12-18.
3. Equality Act 2010, c. 15, ss. 13, 19.
4. European Convention on Human Rights, arts. 6(1), 14.
5. *State v. Loomis*, 881 N.W.2d 749 (Wis. 2016).
6. *R (Bridges) v. Chief Constable of South Wales Police*, [2020] EWCA Civ 1058.
7. *Glencore International AG v. Commissioner of Taxation*, [2019] HCA 26.
8. Amelia Lenare, *Governing Algorithmic Jurisprudence in the European Union* (Cambridge University Press 2024) 45-52.
9. Katherine Apps, 'Discrimination Law, Direct and Indirect Frameworks, and Algorithmic Auditing' (2025) 42 *Public Law* 112, 118-124.
10. Imagin Ireland, 'Intellectual Property, Trade Secrecy, and the Black Box in Judicial Analytics' (2024) 15 *European Intellectual Property Review* 301.
11. Alina Tsimpli, *Generative AI and Copyright Law: Training Inputs and Adjudicative Integrity* (Hart Publishing 2025) 88-104.
12. Demis Hassabis, 'Artificial General Intelligence, Scientific Discovery, and Ethical Governance' (2025) 612 *Nature* 410.
13. OECD, *AI in Justice Administration and Access to Justice: Governing with Artificial Intelligence* (OECD Publishing 2025) 34-41.
14. M. Beruashvili, 'The Capabilities and Challenges of Artificial Intelligence in Judicial Decision-Making' (2025) 8 *Law and World* 14.
15. B. Lucksha and S. Sadhana, 'The Legal and Ethical Implications of Artificial Intelligence in the Legal World' (2024) 4 *White Black Legal* 15.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

Statutes and Statutory Instruments

1. Equality Act 2010, c. 15.
2. Regulation (EU) 2024/1689 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 13 June 2024 laying down harmonised rules on artificial intelligence (Artificial Intelligence Act) [2024] OJ L 2024/1689.

Treaties and International Agreements

1. Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms (European Convention on Human Rights, as amended) (ECHR).

2. United Nations Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (adopted 18 December 1979, entered into force 3 September 1981) 1249 UNTS 13.

Judicial Decisions

1. *Glencore International AG v. Commissioner of Taxation* [2019] HCA 26.
2. *R (Bridges) v. Chief Constable of South Wales Police* [2020] EWCA Civ 1058.
3. *State v. Loomis* 881 N.W.2d 749 (Wis. 2016).

Secondary Sources

Books

1. Lenare A, *Governing Algorithmic Jurisprudence in the European Union* (Cambridge University Press 2024).
2. Tsimpli A, *Generative AI and Copyright Law: Training Inputs and Adjudicative Integrity* (Hart Publishing 2025).

Journal Articles

1. Apps K, 'Discrimination Law, Direct and Indirect Frameworks, and Algorithmic Auditing' (2025) 42 *Public Law* 112.
2. Beruashvili M, 'The Capabilities and Challenges of Artificial Intelligence in Judicial Decision-Making' (2025) 8 *Law and World* 14.
3. Hassabis D, 'Artificial General Intelligence, Scientific Discovery, and Ethical Governance' (2025) 612 *Nature* 410.
4. Ireland I, 'Intellectual Property, Trade Secrecy, and the Black Box in Judicial Analytics' (2024) 15 *European Intellectual Property Review* 301.
5. Lucksha B and Sadhana S, 'The Legal and Ethical Implications of Artificial Intelligence in the Legal World' (2024) 4 *White Black Legal* 15.

Institutional and Policy Reports

1. Council of Europe, *European Ethical Charter on the Use of Artificial Intelligence in Judicial Systems and Their Environment* (CEPEJ, 2018).
2. OECD, *AI in Justice Administration and Access to Justice: Governing with Artificial*