Peer – Reviewed & Refereed Journal

The Law Journal strives to provide a platform for discussion of International as well as National Developments in the Field of Law.

DISCLAIMER

EDITORIAL TEAM

Raju Narayana Swamy (IAS) Indian Administrative Service officer

Dr. Raju Narayana Swamy popularly known as Kerala's Anti Corruption Crusader is the All India Topper of the 1991 batch of the IAS and is currently posted as Principal Secretary to the Government of Kerala . He has earned many accolades as he hit against the political-bureaucrat corruption nexus in India. Dr Swamy holds a B.Tech in Computer Science and Engineering from the IIT Madras and a Ph. D. in Cyber Law from Gujarat National Law University . He also has an LLM (Pro) (with specialization in IPR) as well as three PG Diplomas from the National Law University, Delhi- one in Urban Environmental Management and Law, another in Environmental Law and Policy and a third one in Tourism and Environmental Law. He also holds a post-graduate diploma in IPR from the National Law School, Bengaluru and a professional diploma in Public Procurement from the World Bank.

Dr. R. K. Upadhyay

Dr. R. K. Upadhyay is Registrar, University of Kota (Raj.), Dr Upadhyay obtained LLB , LLM degrees from Banaras Hindu University & Phd from university of Kota.He has succesfully completed UGC sponsored M.R.P for the work in the ares of the various prisoners reforms in the state of the Rajasthan.

Senior Editor

Dr. Neha Mishra

Dr. Neha Mishra is Associate Professor & Associate Dean (Scholarships) in Jindal Global Law School, OP Jindal Global University. She was awarded both her PhD degree and Associate Professor & Associate Dean M.A.; LL.B. (University of Delhi); LL.M.; Ph.D. (NLSIU, Bangalore) LLM from National Law School of India University, Bengaluru; she did her LL.B. from Faculty of Law, Delhi University as well as M.A. and B.A. from Hindu College and DCAC from DU respectively. Neha has been a Visiting Fellow, School of Social Work, Michigan State University, 2016 and invited speaker Panelist at Global Conference, Whitney R. Harris World Law Institute, Washington University in St.Louis, 2015.

Ms. Sumiti Ahuja

Ms. Sumiti Ahuja, Assistant Professor, Faculty of Law, University of Delhi,

Ms. Sumiti Ahuja completed her LL.M. from the Indian Law Institute with specialization in Criminal Law and Corporate Law, and has over nine years of teaching experience. She has done her LL.B. from the Faculty of Law, University of Delhi. She is currently pursuing Ph.D. in the area of Forensics and Law. Prior to joining the teaching profession, she has worked as Research Assistant for projects funded by different agencies of Govt. of India. She has developed various audio-video teaching modules under UGC e-PG Pathshala programme in the area of Criminology, under the aegis of an MHRD Project. Her areas of interest are Criminal Law, Law of Evidence, Interpretation of Statutes, and Clinical Legal Education.

Dr. Navtika Singh Nautiyal

Dr. Navtika Singh Nautiyal presently working as an Assistant Professor in School of law, Forensic Justice and Policy studies at National Forensic Sciences University, Gandhinagar, Gujarat. She has 9 years of Teaching and Research Experience. She has completed her Philosophy of Doctorate in 'Intercountry adoption laws from Uttranchal University, Dehradun' and LLM from Indian Law Institute, New Delhi.

Dr. Rinu Saraswat

Associate Professor at School of Law, Apex University, Jaipur, M.A, LL.M, Ph.D,

Dr. Rinu have 5 yrs of teaching experience in renowned institutions like Jagannath University and Apex University. Participated in more than 20 national and international seminars and conferences and 5 workshops and training programmes.

Dr. Nitesh Saraswat

E.MBA, LL.M, Ph.D, PGDSAPM
Currently working as Assistant Professor at Law Centre II, Faculty of Law, University of Delhi. Dr. Nitesh have 14 years of Teaching, Administrative and research experience in Renowned Institutions like Amity University, Tata Institute of Social Sciences, Jai Narain Vyas University Jodhpur, Jagannath University and Nirma University.
More than 25 Publications in renowned National and International Journals and has authored a Text book on Cr.P.C and Juvenile Delinquency law.

Subhrajit Chanda

BBA. LL.B. (Hons.) (Amity University, Rajasthan); LL. M. (UPES, Dehradun) (Nottingham Trent University, UK); Ph.D. Candidate (G.D. Goenka University)

Subhrajit did his LL.M. in Sports Law, from Nottingham Trent University of United Kingdoms, with international scholarship provided by university; he has also completed another LL.M. in Energy Law from University of Petroleum and Energy Studies, India. He did his B.B.A.LL.B. (Hons.) focussing on International Trade Law.

ABOUT US

WHITE BLACK LEGAL is an open access, peer-reviewed and refereed journal providededicated to express views on topical legal issues, thereby generating a cross current of ideas on emerging matters. This platform shall also ignite the initiative and desire of young law students to contribute in the field of law. The erudite response of legal luminaries shall be solicited to enable readers to explore challenges that lie before law makers, lawyers and the society at large, in the event of the ever changing social, economic and technological scenario.

With this thought, we hereby present to you

BETWEEN AUTOMATION AND ADVOCACY: RETHINKING THE FUTURE OF LAW WITH AI

AUTHORED BY - JAISHNAV S & DR.ARUN D RAJ

INTRODUCTION:

Over the last few years, Artificial Intelligence (AI) has transitioned from a buzzword—it has begun changing the way businesses operate on the planet. From customized recommendations while shopping online to AI-assisted diagnostics at hospitals, the technology is being leveraged for its unparalleled capability of processing bulk information, determining patterns, and presenting solutions at light speed with razor-sharp precision. This sudden rise of AI is not restricted to science and commerce. The legal community, hitherto associated with human intellect, precedent, and interpretation, is also experiencing the shudders of this technological revolution.

In India and overseas, AI-driven solutions are gradually entering the law firms, courtrooms, and legal research portals. Contract review automation, predictive analytics for the prediction of case results, and AI chatbots with rudimentary legal advice are now no longer mere concepts of the future—they're part of increasing reality. The Indian judiciary, too, is taking incremental steps towards incorporating AI. In 2020, the Supreme Court initiated the SUPACE (Supreme Court Portal for Assistance in Court Efficiency) system to assist judges by compiling case files into briefs. Elevated Chief Justice of India S.A. Bobde made it clear that such systems are not intended to decide but assist judges in weeding out useful information. Justice D.Y. Chandrachud has also pointed towards the application of AI in administrative simplification, particularly in case management and document handling, while upholding the sanctity of judicial thinking as a human prerogative.

Even as there is optimism, the legal fraternity is increasingly experiencing uncertainty. Lawyers, law students, and even judges are raising critical questions: Can AI possibly capture the nuance and context that is necessary in legal interpretation? Will it substitute junior lawyers and paralegals? What are the risks of using algorithms that will pick up biases from the data that they are trained on? And most significant of all—where lies the ethical responsibility if decisions are made or determined by machines?

As the law profession exists at this juncture, it is imperative to critically analyze the nature of change that has taken hold. AI is certainly here to stay, but its place in the law is a subject of fierce debate. This research paper strives to investigate the key question which emerges from this ongoing change: Is Artificial Intelligence a friend or enemy of legal professionals? In examining both global and Indian legal landscape trends, this paper aims to demystify the chances, challenges, and implications of adopting AI in law.

The Current State of AI in the Legal Profession:

Artificial Intelligence is gradually becoming an integral aspect of the contemporary legal profession. What was once a far-off innovation is now positively influencing the manner in which legal services are provided. From automating mundane tasks to aiding in decision-making, AI is being applied to enhance efficiency and decrease workload.

One of the most significant areas where AI is having an impact is in contract management. Software programs are now able to scan, analyze, and identify risks in contracts faster than people, with astonishing accuracy. LawGeex, for instance, has demonstrated that AI can on occasion beat lawyers at checking ordinary agreements. E-discovery and document review—which entail sifting through huge amounts of information—are also being made more efficient with AI tools, saving firms hours and money.

In legal research, AI tools like Casetext employ natural language queries to deliver quicker, more pertinent case results. Legal chatbots also exist, such as DoNotPay, that walk users through straightforward legal processes, including complaints and basic legal document drafting. These applications improve access to justice, particularly for individuals who might not be able to afford a lawyer. Workflow automation also assists legal teams in handling scheduling, billing, and administrative tasks more effectively.

Statistics indicate that almost 79% of legal professionals worldwide have implemented AI in some form. In India, the judiciary is also testing AI, particularly through tools such as SUPACE, which help judges deal with documents more effectively. Although AI is developing fast, its role is still ancillary. It augments the skill of legal professionals but does not substitute the sophisticated thinking that human lawyers introduce into complicated cases.

How AI is a Friend to Legal Professionals:

Artificial Intelligence has heavily been used as a useful partner for legal practitioners as it improves access to better quality and more efficient legal work, with one of its greatest benefits being the speed at which it automates routine tasks. Document review, legal research, contract analysis, among others, which were traditionally hours of manual time, are now done within fractions of the duration. Lawyers have been able to dedicate more time to strategy, client engagement, and high-leverage advisory functions.

AI also introduces a new degree of precision and consistency. Research has indicated that some AI tools can outperform human capabilities in certain tasks—like contract review—where platforms have attained up to 94% precision in detecting risks in NDAs, as opposed to 85% by seasoned lawyers. Unlike humans, AI systems do not experience fatigue or neglect due to repetitive work, minimizing the chances of errors.

With respect to cost-effectiveness, AI greatly reduces operating costs for legal departments and law firms. By automating processes and minimizing the use of large-scale manpower on redundant tasks, legal services become more cost-effective, particularly for startups and people who cannot meet traditional legal fees.

AI also equips legal professionals with insights based on data. With predictive analytics, it can determine litigation risk, recommend case strategy, and assist with regulatory compliance using historical data and legal trends.

Finally, AI helps to enhance access to justice. Applications such as legal chatbots give the public general legal advice, assisting in filling the gap for those who would otherwise be excluded from the legal system because of cost or geographic barriers.

How AI Can Be a Foe:

Though Artificial Intelligence provides some benefits to the legal industry, it also presents a variety of issues that need to be taken into consideration. Job displacement ranks among the most urgent concerns. With automation handling mundane legal processes like document review, legal research, and contract analysis, fears are rising about entry-level positions and support functions becoming obsolete. A Goldman Sachs report even goes so far as to say that

as many as 44% of legal positions are in danger of being automated sparking concerns about the future of jobs in the profession. Another issue is the reliability and quality of outputs produced by AI. For all its efficiency, AI is also prone to error. Cases of "AI hallucinations"— in which systems produce false or nonexistent case law have caused genuine alarm, particularly in jurisdictions with strong emphasis on precedent. If such mistakes are not flagged, they may mislead lawyers or clients to their detriment. There are also substantive ethical and regulatory issues. Questions regarding the unauthorized practice of law by AI systems, violations of data privacy, algorithmic bias, and insufficient transparency regarding how AI reaches its conclusions all pose serious threats. These issues are even more complex in jurisdictions such as India, where the legal framework for AI in law remains developing. Liability and accountability are similarly grey. Who should be blamed if an AI tool provides errant legal guidance? The developer, the user, or the institution using the tool? Ultimately, excessive use of AI will result in poor critical legal reasoning and judgment. As professionals depend increasingly on programmed tools, there is a risk that essential analysis skills, legal reasoning, and ethical judgment could be lost with time.

Case Studies and Real-World Examples:

The shifting function of Artificial Intelligence in the legal industry can be most appropriately demonstrated through tangible examples—some highlighting its proficiency, and others pointing to its shortcomings. An interesting example is the LawGeex contract review experiment, in which the proficiency of an Artificial Intelligence tool was compared to that of veteran human attorneys in contract reviewing non-disclosure agreements (NDAs). The AI solution scored a success rate of 94%, and the human lawyers hit an average of 85%. Moreover, LawGeex completed the task in just 26 seconds, whereas the lawyers took an average of 92 minutes. This study highlights AI's potential to deliver high-speed, reliable results in specific, structured legal tasks. On the flip side, the risks of relying on AI are starkly illustrated by incidents involving ChatGPT and other large language models. In a high-profile US case, a lawyer filed a legal brief with unwitting fake, AI-created case citations generated by ChatGPT. When the matter became apparent, the court punished the lawyer for not checking the sources. It made headlines around the world as raising concerns about the trend of "AI hallucinations" where machines generate assertive but bogus data—a special issue in a field where fact accuracy is everything. Another contentious case is that of DoNotPay, the "world's first robot lawyer" self-described. The service tried to represent a client in court with AI-powered

arguments transmitted over a smartphone earpiece. That idea was, however, hastily abandoned after coming under regulatory threats and criticism from bar associations, which threatened unauthorized practice of law. The incident underscored the legal and ethical gray areas where AI still functions, particularly in trying to supplant human representation. These examples illustrate both the potential and the danger of AI in the legal sphere. As much as AI can provide great efficiency and wisdom, it also poses basic issues regarding reliability, regulation, and professional responsibility.

Regulatory and Ethical Issues:

With Artificial Intelligence increasingly integrated into legal practice, it has introduced a whole array of regulatory and ethical issues that current legal systems are not adequately prepared to handle. The old rules of legal practice were not formulated with autonomous, decision-making technologies in mind, so there is an immediate need for new guidelines that promote innovation as well as accountability. Key areas of concern are safeguarding client rights, notably confidentiality, privacy of data, and informed consent. AI often depends on massive amounts of data, such as sensitive legal documentation and personal details. In the absence of strong safeguards, risks of misuse or data breaches arise. Clients cannot always be presumed to know when their legal service provider is deploying AI tools, and thus the issue of transparency and informed participation arises. Around the world, jurisdictions are starting to react in different manners. The United Kingdom has moved proactively, with the Law Society publishing guidelines on the ethical deployment of AI, where explainability and human control are vital. The United States, while more decentralized in its strategy, has had separate bar associations release cautionary notices on the application of AI, specifically in relation to the unauthorized practice of law. Singapore, famous for its policies of innovation-friendliness, has built AI governance structures that focus on accountability, human-centered design, and transparency—placing it among the top examples of balancing technology progress with ethical protection. The difficulty is in finding the balance: to promote the use of AI for its numerous benefits without undermining legal integrity or due process. Explicit accountability, human oversight, and stringent testing of AI systems are necessary elements of any ethical model. As AI advances, so must the legal frameworks that try to regulate its application, protecting justice as it remains fair yet future-proof.

The Future: Coexistence, Collaboration, and New Roles:

In the future, the future of the legal profession with Artificial Intelligence will be one of collaboration, not competition. AI is not designed to replace lawyers but is rapidly being considered a powerful tool for enhancing human talent, allowing legal professionals to allocate their attention more towards strategic, high-value, and value-generating activities like legal analysis, client advisory, negotiation, and courtroom advocacy. AI can keep the routine, time-consuming aspects of legal practice in check, but it is not equipped with the nuance, empathy, and ethical acumen that human attorneys bring to intricate cases. This leaves room for a more symbiotic practice where technology keeps the mechanical and humans work on the meaningful. The future lawyer will probably be working with AI—not despite AI. This change is also creating brand-new professions within the legal landscape. As institutions and law firms embrace AI technologies, there will be increasing need for AI trainers, who assist computers in learning legal vocabulary and reasoning; legal prompt engineers, who craft accurate inputs for generative AI platforms; and control specialists, who see to it that AI results meet legal requirements and ethical standards. To succeed in this evolving landscape, legal professionals will need to adopt ongoing learning and digital literacy. Knowing how AI functions, where it creates value, and where it needs to be restrained will become critical. The legal profession is not on the cusp of replacement—but transformation. The future is for those who can manage this change with both technological acumen and a keen sense of legal purpose.

Conclusion:

The entry of Artificial Intelligence into the legal industry is one of the most critical technological changes over the past decades. Its emergence has created hope and fear in equal measure, as it was bound to be, given its dualistic nature. On the positive side, AI presents effective tools that are likely to streamline efficiency, cut operational loads, and enhance legal service access. Tasks that once took hours of manual labor—including contract review, legal research, and data analysis—can be performed in minutes with greater precision and consistency now. These gains are not merely changing the lawyers' work habits but are even bridging justice gaps, if only partially so, through AI-powered platforms and legal chat bots providing rudimentary legal services to marginalized communities. But then the picture isn't all smiles. The threats and obstacles of AI uptake are also consequential. Job loss fears are real, especially in those jobs with a high degree of dependence on repetitive and repetitive tasks. Moral issues like privacy in data, bias in algorithms, and obscurity in the decision-making

process raise serious fairness and accountability concerns. The case of AI hallucinations—where systems provide misleading or even completely false information—is another source of complication, particularly in a discipline where accuracy and trust are critical. In addition, the question of liability—whose fault when AI makes mistakes—remains unsettled at law in most jurisdictions.

Since there is this complication, the legal profession needs to avoid being tempted to see AI as either magic bullet or doomsday monster. Rather, it has to be viewed for what it is: a revolutionary force that can potentially revolutionize legal practice, depending on how wisely it is handled. The future requires an even-handed and prudent approach. Legal institutions, bar councils, and policymakers have to collaborate to create strong regulatory frameworks that provide for transparency, accountability, and ethical adherence in AI deployment. At the same time, lawyers and practitioners need to make investments in continuous training and education, enabling them with the wherewithal to apply AI tools but not losing valuable legal judgment. In addition, the development of AI creates new professional opportunities within the profession itself. Professions like legal technologists, AI ethicists, prompt engineers, and compliance auditors are already starting to appear, providing new career options for those willing to grapple with the interplay of technology and law. This is an indication that the future of the practice of law will not be a matter of either man versus machine or human lawyer versus computer, but of crafting an ecosystem in which both enhance and complement one another. In effect, AI is not just a friend to be welcomed or an enemy to be shunned. It is a potent force for transformation, with the potential to redefine the practice of law in ways that a decade ago we could hardly imagine. Whether that transformation brings more access, equity, and innovation—or confusion, disparity, and dependence—will rest solely with the decisions we make now. The challenge for the legal community is clear: to harness AI's capabilities without losing sight of the human values, ethical standards, and sense of justice that lie at the heart of the legal profession. With careful management, thoughtful regulation, and a commitment to continuous growth, the future of law and technology can be one of mutual reinforcement rather than conflict.