The17th Year Publication, No.1
June 2025

# ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE IN THE LEGAL SYSTEM: REGULATION AND ETHICS

**Marjeta Shaholli***

*Faculty of Social Sciences Albanian University

**Abstract**

Artificial Intelligence (AI) is becoming an essential tool in the legal field, helping lawyers analyze cases, predict legal outcomes, and even automate contracts. While these advancements improve efficiency, they also bring ethical and legal challenges. One major concern is ensuring that AI-based decisions are fair and unbiased, especially in court rulings. If AI systems are not properly regulated, they may reinforce existing biases or make decisions that lack transparency.

This paper explores how AI is changing the legal system and the risks associated with its use. It examines the need for clear regulations to prevent discrimination, ensure accountability, and maintain public trust in AI-driven legal processes. Key solutions include ethical guidelines, transparency requirements, and human oversight to ensure that AI remains a tool that supports, rather than replaces, human judgment.

By reviewing real-world examples and legal policies, this paper aims to highlight how law and technology can work together. The goal is to find a balance between innovation and justice, ensuring that AI benefits society while respecting fundamental legal principles.

**Keywords:** *Artificial Intelligence, Legal System, Regulation, Ethics, Transparency, Accountability*

## Introduction

Artificial Intelligence (AI) is profoundly transforming the legal sector by bringing high efficiency, cost reduction, and increased access to justice. It is being used for a variety of purposes, including the analysis of judicial data, the preparation and automation of legal documents, assistance with legal research, and even the prediction of court outcomes (Surden, 2014; Katz et al., 2017). Technologies such as machine learning and natural language processing (NLP) enable the processing and interpretation of the massive amount of legal information found in case law, legislation, and jurisprudence.

For example, systems like ROSS Intelligence and LexisNexis use AI to help lawyers analyze case law in a significantly shorter time than traditional research methods. Moreover, in some countries, artificial intelligence has been used to assist judges in making decisions regarding parole or determining criminal sentences (Angwin et al., 2016). This signals a significant shift in how justice is delivered and applied.

However, the benefits of AI do not come without challenges. There are serious concerns about objectivity, algorithmic discrimination, lack of transparency in decision-making, and the public oversight of automated systems (Crawford & Calo, 2016). Algorithms often function as "black boxes," where the reasoning behind a decision is not fully understandable, even to those who use them. Documented cases have shown

that these algorithms can reproduce and deepen existing biases in the criminal justice system—for instance, in the case of the COMPAS system in the United States (Dressel & Farid, 2018).

Furthermore, there is a noticeable regulatory gap concerning AI in the legal field. Current laws are not always well-suited to address the unique challenges posed by the use of advanced technology in legal decision-making. This highlights the need to establish regulatory frameworks that not only support technological development but also safeguard fundamental rights, privacy, and equality before the law (European Commission, 2021).

In this context, this paper aims to critically analyze the impact of artificial intelligence on the legal system, focusing on the balance between technological efficiency and the preservation of professional ethics, judicial independence, and justice standards. It examines the practical benefits of AI in the legal system, the challenges it poses, and the need for a comprehensive ethical and regulatory approach, grounded in the principles of European and international law.

**Purpose of the Paper**The purpose of this paper is to conduct an in-depth analysis of the impact of artificial intelligence (AI) on the legal system, highlighting both the practical benefits it brings to the field of justice and the risks and challenges associated with its use, particularly in relation to ethics, transparency, and the fundamental rights of individuals. The paper aims to contribute to the development of a balanced and responsible approach to the integration of AI into legal systems by identifying regulatory gaps and offering recommendations for comprehensive legal frameworks in accordance with European and international law.

**Methodology Used**

This paper is based on an analytical and comparative methodology. First, a theoretical and normative analysis of the use of artificial intelligence in the legal sector will be conducted, examining scholarly literature, relevant policy and legal documents, as well as key jurisprudential cases (such as the COMPAS system case). Second, through a comparative analysis of regulatory models in the European Union, the United States, and other representative countries, the paper will identify best practices for regulating the use of AI in justice. Additionally, a critical and reflective approach will be included regarding the ethics and limitations of AI use in legal relationships and judicial processes.

**Hypothesis**

The central hypothesis of this paper is:

"The use of artificial intelligence in the legal system can enhance efficiency and access to justice, but in the absence of an appropriate regulatory and ethical framework, it risks undermining the principles of justice, human rights, and equality before the law."

**Research Question**

The central question guiding this paper is:

**"How can artificial intelligence be integrated into the legal system without compromising the fundamental principles of justice, and what are the most appropriate regulatory mechanisms to achieve this balance?"**

**AI in the Legal System: Applications and Benefits**

The development of Artificial Intelligence (AI) is fundamentally transforming the way the legal system

operates by providing tools that enhance efficiency, improve access to justice, and reduce human error in judicial processes. AI applications have become widespread across many areas of legal work, including legal research, document review, case outcome prediction, and decision-making assistance.

1. **AI in Legal Research and Document Review**

AI tools are increasingly used for large-scale analysis and processing of legal data. These tools employ advanced algorithms to filter information, identify relevant precedents, and optimize the time required for legal research. Systems such as ROSS Intelligence and LexisNexis use natural language processing to analyze thousands of pages of documents within seconds. This technology significantly reduces administrative burden and improves the quality of legal services (Calo, Kerr, & Paredes, 2021).

2. **Predicting Judicial Outcomes**

The use of machine learning models to analyze historical legal data has led to the development of tools that can predict the outcomes of legal cases with a certain degree of probability. This is useful for lawyers and clients during strategic decision-making. However, predictive analytics require ethical oversight to avoid overreliance on technology. According to Binns (2020), predictive analysis can increase transparency but also demands ethical regulation to prevent algorithmic bias.

3. **Automation of Contract Drafting and Analysis**

AI tools are revolutionizing contract drafting by enabling the automatic identification of risky or unbalanced clauses. These systems can detect inconsistencies, problematic provisions, and clauses likely to lead to disputes. Automating contract analysis not only speeds up the process but also significantly reduces costs and errors associated with manual review (AI Now Institute, 2020).

4. **Judicial Decision-Making Assistance**

While legal decision-making must remain fundamentally human, AI can assist judges and legal panels through data analysis, comparisons of similar decisions, and the ranking of key factors. These systems do not replace legal judgment but reinforce it through informational support. The Brookings Institution (2021) notes that AI can help standardize judicial decisions and reduce certain forms of inconsistency or bias in the judiciary.

5. **Enhancing Access to Justice through AI Services**

One of the most beneficial impacts of AI on the legal system is the increased access to justice for individuals who cannot afford legal representation. AI-based legal aid platforms offer basic legal advice, help with filling out forms, and legal guidance free of charge or at minimal cost. These tools are particularly valuable for marginalized and vulnerable groups. According to the OECD (2019), integrating such technologies contributes to greater equity in access to the legal system and empowers citizens to defend their rights.

**Challenges and Ethical Issues of AI in Law**

The use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in the legal system has brought significant advancements, but it has also raised a number of ethical, legal, and societal challenges. As technology becomes increasingly embedded in legal decision-making, the need for a clear regulatory and ethical framework becomes essential

to preserve the integrity and fairness of judicial processes.

1. **Algorithmic Inequality and Discrimination**

One of the major risks of using AI in legal decision-making is the potential reinforcement of existing biases embedded in training data. Due to their statistical nature, algorithms may produce decisions that discriminate against marginalized groups based on race, gender, social status, or ethnicity. These forms of discrimination are often invisible and difficult to challenge in court. Binns (2020) argues that the lack of transparency in how algorithms are trained and developed makes algorithmic injustice harder to detect and correct.

2. **The "Black Box" Problem in Algorithmic Decision-Making**

Many AI algorithms—particularly those based on deep learning—are non-explainable and operate as closed systems or "black boxes." This makes it difficult to understand the rationale behind a given decision, thereby undermining the principle of transparency and the citizens' right to understand the process that led to a legal decision affecting them directly. According to the AI Now Institute (2020), this lack of explainability makes AI a risk to the legitimacy of the judicial system, rendering decisions less contestable and less acceptable to the parties involved.

3. **Legal Responsibility and the Lack of Regulatory Framework**

A critical challenge remains the question: Who is accountable for an incorrect decision made by an AI system? In the absence of a clear responsibility structure, legal gaps may emerge, creating a risk of denying individuals the right to appeal. According to a report by the Brookings Institution (2021), it is urgent to clearly define the boundaries of liability among technology developers, institutions that implement AI, and individuals affected by such decisions.

4. **Risk of Over-Reliance on AI**

While AI can support informed decision-making, there is a risk that legal professionals might rely excessively on these systems, weakening critical judgment and human flexibility. This could lead to a "robotization" of justice, where legal decisions are subjected to algorithmic logic rather than contextual human evaluation. The OECD (2019) warns that advanced technologies should not replace legal and ethical interpretation, but rather serve as supportive tools.

5. **Protection of Personal Data and Privacy**

   AI operates through the analysis of massive datasets, including sensitive personal information. This raises major concerns about individuals' privacy and legal security. In the European Union, the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR, 2016/679) sets high standards for the use of personal data, including the right to explanation and the right not to be subject to automated decisions. However, the practical implementation of these standards in AI systems remains a challenge—especially in the legal context, where data accuracy and security are crucial.

**Regulatory Framework and Policy Recommendations**

While Artificial Intelligence (AI) offers tremendous potential to enhance efficiency, speed, and access to justice, it is essential to establish a sustainable and comprehensive regulatory framework. This framework must ensure that the use of AI aligns with fundamental human rights, ethical principles, and legal norms,

while preventing potential negative impacts on decision-making and equality.

### 1. Challenges of Current Regulation and Normative Gaps

Existing legislation—such as data protection laws (e.g., the GDPR)—addresses important aspects like privacy and fair data processing, but does not fully cover the complexity of AI applications in the legal field. In many jurisdictions, the absence of detailed standards on transparency, accountability, and algorithm auditing creates legal uncertainty. As the Brookings Institution (2021) notes, the lack of a clear legal architecture may undermine public trust and compromise the legitimacy of AI-assisted decisions.

### 2. The Role of Policymakers in Setting Ethical and Legal Standards

Policymakers play a crucial role in building a trustworthy regulatory framework for AI. They must collaborate with legal experts, ethicists, engineers, and civil society representatives to ensure a balance between innovation and the protection of fundamental rights. The OECD (2019) emphasizes the importance of involving all stakeholders in developing national AI strategies, in order to avoid technocratic decisions that may overlook social and legal implications.

### 3. Guidelines for Algorithmic Transparency and Accountability

An effective framework should include clear provisions on algorithm explainability. AI-assisted decisions must be auditable, documented, and verifiable. The AI Now Institute (2020) recommends the creation of "accountability mechanisms" that allow citizens to understand and challenge decisions that affect their rights. This includes building AI systems based on the principle of "explainability by design."

### 4. Limiting Full Automation in Legal Decision-Making

Full automation of judicial decisions should be avoided. In matters affecting fundamental rights, human involvement is essential for interpreting context, assessing circumstances, and exercising compassion or legal discretion. The Brookings Institution (2021) stresses the need to prohibit the use of AI in final decisions without the intervention of judges or qualified professionals.

### 5. Human Oversight and Institutional Control

Even when AI use is limited to decision-making support, active oversight by qualified professionals must be ensured. This includes continuous training for judges and prosecutors on AI, as well as the creation of specialized bodies for the ethical and technical auditing of automated systems. The integration of AI should not undermine institutional autonomy or replace legal judgment.

## Conclusion

Artificial Intelligence (AI) represents one of the most significant technological developments of the 21st century, with the potential to profoundly transform the legal system. Its application in this field has brought notable improvements in efficiency, speed, and access to justice. From automating legal research to predictive analytics and contract drafting assistance, AI is reshaping how justice is conceived and implemented (Calo et al., 2021; Binns, 2020).

However, these technological advancements are not without risks. There is an inherent tension between the benefits of efficiency and the need to preserve the fundamental principles of justice, including impartiality, accountability, and respect for human rights. Issues such as algorithmic "black boxes," systemic

bias in training data, lack of transparency, and legal responsibility gaps are just a few of the serious concerns that must be addressed (AI Now Institute, 2020; Brookings, 2021).

The development of a comprehensive regulatory framework is essential. This framework should include rules for algorithm auditing and explainability, clear mechanisms for human oversight, and strict limitations on the full automation of legal decision-making. According to the OECD (2019), transparency must be a foundational principle for the development of AI in the public sector, ensuring that decisions affecting fundamental rights and freedoms can be reviewed and challenged.

Within this context, it is crucial to preserve the central role of human judgment, especially in cases involving legal interpretation, moral evaluation, or sensitivity to cultural and social context. Automation must not diminish the social sensitivity of justice or replace assessments grounded in experience and professional conscience (Sunstein, 2018; Tucker et al., 2018).

Fulfilling this mission requires a collaborative and interdisciplinary approach: responsible policymakers, well-prepared legal professionals, ethically aware engineers, and an informed civil society must work together to ensure that AI is used fairly and inclusively. Only in this way we can build a legal system where technology does not replace justice but serves to it.

In conclusion, AI is not an end in itself, but a tool—and like any powerful tool, it requires regulation, oversight, and ethical awareness to ensure its potential is realized without compromising fundamental rights and freedoms. Only through a clear and just legal framework can the justice system benefit from AI without undermining the values that make it a pillar of democracy.

**Bibliography**


1. AI Now Institute. (2020). *AI and the Contracting Process: A Report on the Risks and Opportunities*. https://ainowinstitute.org/reports.html
2. AI Now Institute. (2020). *Algorithmic accountability policy toolkit*. New York University. https://ainowinstitute.org
3. Angwin, J., Larson, J., Mattu, S., & Kirchner, L. (2016). *Machine Bias: There's software used across the country to predict future criminals. And it's biased against blacks*. ProPublica. https://www.propublica.org/article/machine-bias-risk-assessments-in-criminal-sentencing
4. Binns, R. (2020). *Human judgment in algorithmic loops: Contestability, transparency and accountability*. ACM Computing Surveys, 53(6), 1–37. https://doi.org/10.1145/3412661
5. Binns, R. (2020). *Human judgment in algorithmic loops: Individual justice and automated decision-making*. Regulation & Governance, 14(1), 15–35. https://doi.org/10.1111/rego.12240
6. Brookings Institution. (2021). *AI in the judiciary: Promises and pitfalls*. https://www.brookings.edu
7. Brookings Institution. (2021). *Governing AI in the public sector: Risk, responsibility, and regulation*. https://www.brookings.edu
8. Calo, R., Kerr, I., & Paredes, A. (2021). *Robot rules: Regulating artificial intelligence*. Cambridge University Press.
9. Crawford, K., & Calo, R. (2016). *There is a blind spot in AI research*. Nature, 538(7625), 311–313. https://doi.org/10.1038/538311a
10. Dressel, J., & Farid, H. (2018). *The accuracy, fairness, and limits of predicting recidivism*. Science Advances, 4(1), eaao5580. https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.aao5580

11. European Commission. (2021). *Proposal for a Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council laying down harmonised rules on artificial intelligence (Artificial Intelligence Act)*. COM/2021/206 final. https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX-%3A52021PC0206

12. Katz, D. M., Bommarito, M. J., & Blackman, J. (2017). *A general approach for predicting the behavior of the Supreme Court of the United States*. PLOS ONE, 12(4), e0174698. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0174698

13. OECD. (2019). *Access to justice and the use of technology: OECD policy roundtables*. https://www.oecd.org/gov/access-to-justice.htm

14. OECD. (2019). *Artificial Intelligence in society*. OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/eedfee77-en

15. OECD. (2019). *Digital transformation and access to justice*. OECD Policy Roundtables. https://www.oecd.org/governance

16. Regulation (EU) 2016/679 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 27 April 2016 on the protection of natural persons with regard to the processing of personal data. *Official Journal of the European Union*, L 119, 1–88. https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX-%3A32016R0679

17. Sunstein, C. R. (2018). *#Republic: Divided democracy in the age of social media*. Princeton University Press.

18. Surden, H. (2014). *Machine learning and law*. Washington Law Review, 89(1), 87–115.

19. Tucker, J. A., Guess, A., Barberá, P., Vaccari, C., Siegel, A., Sanovich, S., Stukal, D., & Nyhan, B. (2018). Social media, political polarization, and political disinformation: A review of the scientific literature. *Political Science Research and Methods*, 36(1), 1–22. https://doi.org/10.1017/psrm.2018.23.