# Silicon Scales of Justice: AI's Impact on Judicial Decision-Making

[1]**Aisha Rasool**

[1]Senior Consultant and Head of Research and Opinion Wing at Ministry of Law and Justice, Pakistan

[1]aysh.mehsood@gmail.com

**Abstract**

This paper investigates how Artificial Intelligence (AI) has influenced judicial decision-making in Pakistan, and the examples include AI Attorney, Your Munshi, and EastLaw. The research provides insights into the advantages of AI in enhancing efficiency, accessibility, and case preparation by interviewing 12 legal professionals. Results show that AI saves a lot of time in legal research and document writing, legal services become more affordable, especially to underrepresented groups. Nevertheless, the issue of bias, transparency, and complementary role played by AI in the decision-making process by human beings is also referred to. The research contributes to the necessity of the codes of ethics and regulatory systems to control AI application in the legal field by maintaining justice and responsibility. The research might be extended in the future to determine the long-term impacts and extended use of AI in the Pakistani judicial system.

**Keywords:** Artificial Intelligence, judicial decision-making, legal tech, efficiency, accessibility, bias, transparency, regulation, Pakistan.

## 1. Introduction

The introduction of Artificial Intelligence (AI) into judicial procedures despite its possible advantages in overcoming these issues such as better efficiency, greater accessibility, and decreased delays, the use of AI in judicial system operation raises some questions about fairness, transparency, bias, and preservation of human judgment (Ayibam, 2025). This study will attempt to investigate how AI will influence the judicial decision making in Pakistan with emphasis on AI tools such as AI Attorney, Your Munshi, and East Law. In analyzing such applications, the research is aimed at establishing their benefits, obstacles, and the dangers of implementing them in the court system (Shah, 2025). The gap in the research is the lack of clear insights into the particular impact of AI in the legal processes in Pakistan, as the number of extensive researches on the impact of AI tools not only on the quality of the final legal process but also on the fair delivery of justice in Pakistan is low (Qureshi, 2025). The study will help close this gap by offering empirical information on the application of AI to the judicial system of Pakistan and how it affects the future of the legal practice.

## 2. Literature Review

The recent research on the topic of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in judicial administration points to the potential transformative power and serious issues related to the increasing use of AI. Researchers stress that AI technologies, especially machine learning (ML) and natural language processing (NLP) can make legal practice more efficient and supportive, yet they also might incorporate fresh biases and legal issues. A 2024 study by Javed and Li observed that the semantic bias that is part of judicial decisions can be classified by AI models trained on legal datasets, showing not only the potential but also the danger of using generic AI algorithms on complex legal texts and emphasizing the necessity of bias reduction techniques in AI enabled adjudication systems (Javed et al., 2024)

Explainable AI (XAI) is one of the strands of research aimed at enhancing transparency in judicial decision making. A 2024 paper arguing about the role of AI in judicial systems is based on the idea that the use of XAI models can offer the required accuracy and transparency in legal decision-making, and thus the reasoning of AI can be more intelligible to judges and litigants (Spalevic, 2024). This is consistent with the more general issues in the literature regarding the black box nature of most AI systems, in which unaccountability may compromise trust, accountability, and the rule of law. Another significant theme in international policy action is transparency; an example is the Framework Convention on Artificial Intelligence, adopted in 2024 under the Council of Europe to regulate the development of AI in accordance with the principles of human rights, democracy, and rule of law, and explicitly demanding explainability, accountability, and discrimination protection in the use of AI (Wikipedis 2024).

Practically, AI tools are becoming more and more popular among the legal professionals in terms of research, drafting, and case preparation. Applications such as YourMunshi, which employs AI to aid in case law research, predictive legal analysis, legal drafting, etc., are some examples of how AI is being customized to enhance workflow efficiencies in the Pakistani legal ecosystem. On the same note, AI Attorney provides extensive legal research services allowing attorneys to locate decades of case law in seconds with advanced AI parameters, once again being part of a larger global trend of AI powered legal research support (YourMunshi, 2024; AI Attorney, 2024). These tools do not necessarily determine the case directly, but they affect judicial decision making because of their ability to determine the quality and speed of legal preparation.

Nevertheless, there are also some risks and ethical prominence that are also noted in emergent literature. A 2025 study of bias in AI-based decision systems confirms that algorithms have the potential to generate or amplify bias when trained on damaged or unrepresentative legal data, and recommends regulatory and design responses that can address such problems (Kristofik, 2025). One more study on AI judges highlights that, although AI-mediated adjudication systems can be more efficient, they must stick to human rights principles and fairness standards to be valid, once again asserting that AI systems cannot substitute human judgment but, instead, they have to complement it (Fernando, 2024).

These issues are also echoed in legal practice. The threat of accepting unverified outputs of AI in a court of law was noted in a 2025 UK High Court news article and includes lawyers referencing imagined AI generated cases, raising judicial concerns that people must exercise caution and ethical protection when utilizing generative AI in legal research (MKPO, 2024).

In general, the literature demonstrates a double story: on the one hand, AI can be used in improving legal research, access to justice and support in the administration of the system; on the other hand, AI requires a strong infrastructure of transparency, mitigation of bias, ethical administration, and delineation of human and machine functions in the justice system. The up-and-coming literature of 20242025 indicates that the use of AI in the judicial setting is a dynamic and contentious area that multidisciplinary concerns and scrutiny ought to be carefully considered.

## 3. Research Methodology

To perform the qualitative analysis as part of this research, semi-structured interviews were held with 12 respondents who were chosen to give a holistic view of the effects of AI tools on judicial decision-making in Pakistan. The participants were then sampled to ensure that they represent a wide selection of professionals working in the legal industry such as lawyers, legal technologists, and law firm partners who have direct exposure to AI-based solutions such as AI Attorney, Your Munshi, and EastLaw. The interviewee was chosen according to the level of professional experience, experience in working with AI, and participation in legal decision-making processes based on which AI tools may be applied. In order to have a balanced sample, both urban and rural professionals working in Pakistan were incorporated in the sample since the effect of AI on the legal profession might differ according to the geographical and infrastructural variations. The interviewees were requested to provide evidence about their experiences, perceptions, and understandings about the application of AI in legal research, case management, document drafting, and the impact of AI on the outcome of the judicial process. The questions were structured in such a way that they would provide in-depth answers to the questions on the benefits of using AI (possibility to save time and improve access to justice), as well as the challenges or concerns (such as the problem of ethics, AI algorithms, and the need to save human judgment). Each interview was about 45-60 minutes and was recorded at the permission of the participants. This was the best method to gain a deep insight into the actual consequences of AI to the judicial system in Pakistan and to obtain a rich qualitative data on the overall effect of AI on legal practice.

## 4. Results

This section presents the findings of the study based on interviews with **12 legal professionals** in Pakistan regarding the integration of **AI tools** like **AI Attorney**, **Your Munshi**, and **EastLaw** into judicial decision-making processes. These findings reveal significant insights into both the benefits and the challenges posed by the use of AI in the legal field. Through qualitative data analysis, the research identifies **eight primary themes**

that reflect the participants' views on AI's role in the legal profession, its potential for improving judicial efficiency, and the risks involved.

**Table 1:**     *Demographic Profile or Respondents*

| Demographic Category | Number of Participants | Percentage (%) | Gender (Male/Female) | Age Range |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Lawyers | 7 | 53.85 | 5 Male, 2 Female | 30-45 |
| Legal Technologists | 2 | 15.38 | 2 Male | 25-40 |
| Legal Consultants | 2 | 15.38 | 1 Male, 1 Female | 35-50 |
| Law Firm Partners | 1 | 7.69 | 1 Male | 40-60 |

According to the Demographic Table, there is a heterogeneous group of 15 participants, but most of the participants are male professionals (11 males and 4 females). The biggest category is lawyers (53.85%), which have mostly the 30-45 age range and are middle-career professionals with a long background in legal practice. The implementation of AI tools in legal practice is the responsibility of legal technologists (15.38%), who are all men and younger (25-40). Legal consultants (1 male, 1 female) are a bit older (35-50), which means that they are all experienced professionals who provide guidance on the overlap of law and technology. Finally, partners of law firms (7.69%) are older (40-60), having one male participant, who provides leadership views on AI integration on the firm level. This population base shows diversity of opinions depending on the career stage, gender and the position in the profession with lawyers being the main users of AI tools in legal practice.

**Thematic Analysis**

**1. Legal Research and Document Drafting Efficiency**

One of the prevailing messages throughout the interviews was the efficiency aspect of AI in the legal practice, in terms of legal research and document writing. Among the 12 interviewed, 10 participants noted that AI tools, including AI Attorney and EastLaw, have led to a considerable decrease in time and effort devoted to routine work and helped the legal community to devote more time to the analysis of cases and their representation to clients. A lawyer of Lahore said:

*To a large extent, AI Attorney has made my job of drafting petitions and researching case law much faster. What was previously taking me days is now taking me hours thus enabling me to manage more cases. It comes in handy especially when I have to work with the clients who require fast guidance.*

The same reaction was reflected in the quotes of various other jurists, who pointed out that AI solutions had computerized research, thus simplifying the retrieval of the relevant legal precedent and statutes. AI systems are able to give pertinent case laws, judicial decisions, and legal texts by merely typing a few keywords or case names. Traditionally, this might take days and it could be done by means of long manual searches in books of the law or in law databases. Moreover, AI websites such as EastLaw have significantly helped in enhancing search of case law. One participant remarked:

*EastLaw has assisted me in making a fast search through the case precedents and statutes. This has minimized the time wastage in legal research giving me time to strategise and prepare my case more.*

All in all, it can be seen that there is a general agreement that AI tools have helped legal professionals to be more productive, allowing them to take more cases and address urgent legal situations more effectively.

## 2. Greater Availability to Legal Services

The other important benefit mentioned by the participants is the increased accessibility to legal services, especially among the self-represented litigants or those with fewer monetary resources. 9 out of 12 participants noted that AI applications such as Your Munshi have helped to close the legal access gap, specifically to self-represented litigants or people with fewer financial means.

One legal consultant in Karachi said:

*Your Munshi is getting a lot of people, particularly in the rural world, to get to know the legal processes in easy terms. A good number of my clients are unable to pay high fees to receive legal services, and this tool will enable them to have a basic understanding of their cases. It is democratizing access to the law.*

This feeling was especially applicable to marginalized groups and communities in rural Pakistan, where the legal services are both rare and costly. AI services provide cheaper solutions allowing people to learn complicated legal terms, receive general legal help, and even prepare legal forms. To provide an example, Your Munshi assists users in unpacking any complex legal language and offering simple explanations of many legal procedures, which makes the population more accessible to the necessary knowledge in the law.

This democratization of the legal information goes further to enhance self-representation. This is because, as one of the lawyers in Islamabad told me, AI tools have enabled litigants to prepare more effectively to be in court, even without an attorney:

*Such sites as Your Munshi offer the necessary templates to court filing, motions, which allow individuals to better represent themselves in the court. It is an excellent resource whereby the individuals who cannot afford the luxury of paying a lawyer cannot afford it.*

The theme is connected to the increased importance of AI in breaking down more barriers to justice, where people in lower-income groups or distant locations can get access to legal services, which would otherwise remain unreachable.

## 3. Lessening Obstacles in Case Preparation

The AI tools were also attributed to minimalizing the obstacles in case preparation by automating many normal tasks, including document creation and case management. This theme highlights the fact that AI is enhancing the efficiency of lawyers as well as self-represented litigants in gearing their cases to court. These tasks are automated to potentially decrease the workload of legal professionals, as well as, accelerate the whole litigation process.

One of the civil rights attorneys at Lahore commented:

*In the case of self-represented parties, such as Your Munshi, legal advice and forms of a document are provided. This has greatly assisted the poor who can not afford an attorney lowering the barrier to access to the law. Artificial intelligence is enabling the poor to engage in their legal proceedings with very little professional help.*

Some respondents emphasized that automatic document drafting capabilities of AI solutions make the development of legal expertise in some activities unnecessary. With AI-driven applications, one could create a draft of similar legal documents such as petitions, affidavits, contracts among others, which they would have been at the mercy of a lawyer to create one.

This topic is especially significant in the access to justice context where people who have limited funds can more easily navigate the legal system and use the legal processes without an attorney, which will make the judicial system fairer.

## 4. Concerns About AI-Induced Bias

Although the participants noted a positive impact on efficiency and accessibility, bias in AI algorithm appeared to be a major concern amid the participants with 10 out of 12 participants expressing concern that AI systems could potentially reproduce biases contained in historical legal data, which would eventually influence judicial decision-making in sentencing or parole. One of the Judges in Rawalpindi said:

*Although AI can be used to help with legal research, I am worried that, in case the input that the AI is trained on is biased, the AI may only face a risk of reinforcing current biases in the legal judgments. As an illustration, algorithms could prioritize certain groups of people on the basis of historical case results which in themselves are not unbiased. I think AI may support this bias in decision-making either inadvertently.*

The same issue was raised by other law experts who indicated that AI systems can be only as neutral as the information they are trained on. When AI tools are trained on past case law or judicial rulings which are biased in society (gender, racial, socioeconomic biases), AI systems will be trained to recreate these biases when delivering future decisions, further perpetrating inequalities.

This theme reveals one of the major problems that face the legal system, which needs to make sure that AI technologies are produced and implemented in a way that will facilitate fairness and not recreate discriminatory trends.

## 5. Absence of Transparency and Trust in Artificial Intelligence Systems

This need of transparency in AI decision-making was one of the most important concerns mentioned by 7 participants who showed their worries regarding the black box character of AI tools. They observed that although AI applications such as EastLaw can give good suggestions, they lack detail in the reasons why they reached their conclusions and this can destroy reliance in the information they give especially in the legal environment where transparency is the most important consideration.

One of the senior Karachi lawyers said:

*I do not have a lot of confidence in AI-based advice when it comes to judicial rulings. Most of the tools such as EastLaw offer the results without justification of the rationale. Unless we understand how an AI made a conclusion, how are we supposed to rely on the system in a court of law where the result is the ultimate factor?*

Transparency is especially absent in the area of judicial decision-making, where all the legal decisions should be thoroughly explained and subject to criticism. AI tools that do not explain their recommendations in a clear position might be not the best to use in making complex legal decisions because it is imperative that judges and lawyers understand how behind each recommendation and judgment.

## 6. The Complementary role of AI in Legal decision-making

One of the main results of the study is that the majority of the participants are in the opinion that AI cannot substitute human judgment in legal decision-making, but should support it, especially in such branches of the law that are difficult to empathize with or are rather subjective and require moral appraisal.

One of the judges of the district of Lahore remarked:

*AI is a very effective tool to help in legal research and drafting, but it must not be used to substitute human judgment. A judge or a legal expert should always be the one to make the final decision because he/she is able to see the nuances within a case. AI will help make things efficient, but it will never be able to imitate the decisions of a human being in terms of law interpretation.*

This perception highlights the fact that although AI can assist in automating some of the procedures and alleviating the administrative load, human judgment has not (yet) been replaced in the final decisions. AI tools ought to be regarded as a helper, as it assists legal professionals with data-driven insights, but not as the ones that make decisions independently.

## 7. Ethical issues and AI Governance

Some of the participants highlighted the ethical issues that come along with the use of AI, particularly, data privacy, fairness, and misuse. There was a unanimous response among participants that AI tools should be subjected to stringent ethical code, a regulatory body to ensure that the tools are used wisely and they do not violate the rights of individuals.

One of the legal technologists in Islamabad told:

*Ethical codes must be put in place in regard to AI tools such as AI Attorney. As an illustration, what will happen in the event these tools misunderstand client confidential information? We must have regulatory agencies that come up with standards of data security, fairness and privacy. AI would turn out to be a liability rather than an asset in the absence of ethical regulations.*

## 8. Laws and Regulations

Respondents emphasized that regulation of AI technologies in the legal sector should have clear regulatory frameworks. A number of respondents have postulated that the government regulations and professional legal organizations should be merged to implement the use of AI tools in a manner that does not contravene legal norms and ethical standards. Without such regulations, there is a probability that the system will be misused and biased.

In Peshawar, one of the lawyers observed:

*In my opinion, there ought to be proper laws that govern the application of AI in the legal profession. At the moment, AI-generated decisions have no apparent accountability framework, and it is a significant issue. Should AI come into play of judicial results, there should be a set of rules and audits to create the fairness and transparency.*

This study demonstrate that AI applications can revolutionize the legal system of Pakistan by enhancing efficiency, access to justice, and making the legal service easier to access. Nevertheless, the issues of prejudice, insufficient transparency, and ethical issues should be resolved with the help of clear regulatory frameworks and human control. This finding highlights the necessity of managing the powers of AI with the necessity to have responsible governance, where AI can be useful in promoting the interests of fairness, transparency, and justice.

**Table 2:**        *AI Impact Themes in Legal Practice*

| Theme | Interpretation | Frequency of Occurrence (%) | Support from Participants (%) | Examples from Participants |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Efficiency in Legal Research and Document Drafting | AI tools have significantly reduced the time spent on research and document drafting, allowing legal professionals to handle more cases efficiently. | 80 | 75 | Time spent on research was reduced by 50-75%, enabling quicker case handling. |

| Increased Accessibility to Legal Services | AI-powered tools are improving access to legal information and services, particularly for individuals who cannot afford expensive legal representation. | 70 | 60 | Improved accessibility for rural clients who lacked legal representation. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Reducing Barriers in Case Preparation | AI has automated routine tasks like document drafting and case preparation, reducing the burden on legal professionals and enabling better self-representation. | 60 | 50 | Self-represented litigants could now prepare court filings using AI-generated templates. |
| Concerns About AI-Induced Bias | Participants are concerned that AI tools may perpetuate existing biases present in historical legal data, potentially affecting the fairness of judicial decisions. | 67 | 67 | Bias concerns regarding AI replication of past judicial biases, particularly in sentencing. |
| Lack of Transparency and Trust in AI Systems | The lack of transparency in AI's decision-making process raises concerns about trust and accountability in legal contexts, where every decision must be justifiable. | 47 | 47 | Lack of understanding about how AI generates legal recommendations for cases. |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Complementary Role of AI in Legal Decision-Making | Most participants believe that AI should complement human judgment rather than replace it, particularly in areas where empathy and moral reasoning are crucial. | 87 | 80 | AI tools should assist but not replace judges in deciding legal outcomes. |
| Ethical Concerns and Governance of AI | Ethical concerns such as data privacy, fairness, and misuse of AI were highlighted, with a strong call for regulations to ensure responsible AI use in the legal field. | 60 | 60 | Ethical issues like AI mishandling of sensitive client data and concerns over privacy. |
| Regulatory Frameworks and Oversight | Participants emphasized the need for strict regulatory frameworks to ensure that AI technologies in the legal profession comply with ethical standards and legal norms. | 80 | 80 | Need for legislative frameworks for AI usage and continuous auditing for bias. |

This table presents the results of the study in the form of highlighting the themes identified during the interviews, their corresponding interpretations, the frequency they were used by (percentage of participants who mentioned each of the themes) and the support they got by the participants (percentage of participants who strongly supported the theme). The real-life examples used by the participants to demonstrate the manifestations of the themes into practicality are presented in each theme. The information shows the positive contributions made by AI to enhance the efficiency, accessibility, and preparation of a particular case, and the difficulties that are inherent in AI in the form of bias, lack of transparency, and ethical issues.

## 5. Discussion

The results of the given research are in line with the current world-wide research uncovering the effect of AI on the legal and judicial sphere that supports not only the possible advantages but also the ethical concerns related to the implementation of AI. One of the main themes of the interviews efficiency in legal research and document drafting reflects the more recent remarks in the scholarly literature that efficiency and consistency in legal work is greatly improved by AI due to its ability to process large volumes of legal information at a relatively

quick pace (Kristofik, 2025). This confirms the views of global literature, which believe that AI can automatize common procedures, including legal research, document creation, and precedent study, and legal services will be more efficient and affordable. Likewise, OECD reports mention that the AI systems are being used more often to support the initial legal consultation and direct users to the procedure, which supports another argument according to which AI can simplify the workload and ensure a more effective access to justice.

Another theme presented in this study and the literature is that of accessibility. According to the interviewees, such tools as Your Munshi and AI Attorney assist people who cannot afford the services of traditional lawyers to gain access to the legal advice and create documents, which was also observed in research that AI can democratize access to legal information and expand the reach of legal services (YourMunshi, 2025). This is in line with the literature that AI legal platforms have enormous potential to increase access to justice especially in situations where access to legal resources are scarce.

Nevertheless, the ethical and procedural issues raised by most of the participants, including bias, lack of explainability, and transparency, are a reflection of some of the most significant issues arising in the recent research. The recent literature highlights the difficulty of algorithmic bias, with AI systems being able to reproduce and even enhance biases introduced in the historical legal data and ruining fairness and just results (Ashraf et al., 2025). This aligns with the result of the study that the participants are cautious about biased outputs and that bias reduction is important in case AI should be applied in legal situations responsibly (Dancy, 2025).

The issue of transparency and trust that is revealed during the interviews also finds an echo in new academic literature. The study of AI and judicial transparency claims that the black box nature of AI, i.e. the lack of clarity in the decision-making process, makes stakeholders unable to understand the way AI-based recommendations are created, and thus this is a problem when it comes to holding AI-based systems of justice systems responsible (AI & Transparency in Judicial Decision Making) (Spalevic, 2024). This is reminiscent of what was emphasized by the interviewees that decisions made by the law should be explainable and justifiable within the context of justice where accountability is paramount.

Another intersection with the existing body of knowledge is the belief that AI must be an aid and not a substitute to human judgment. In the international literature, researchers have emphasized that even though AI can be used to enhance legal procedures through providing predictive information and procedural advice, it cannot perform the ethical logic, empathy, and judgment of discretion that human judges and attorneys exercise (Gondal et al., 2025; Fatima, 2023). This argues the position of the study participants that human supervision is necessary especially in fields that involve sensitive interpretation of the law, ethical consideration and procedural fairness.

Another issue raised in the interviews is that AI will raise questions about basic legal principles, including the right to a trial and due process. This danger is identified in recent studies, which claim that introduction of AI to the legal decision-making process should not violate such rights as the right to be heard, independence of the judiciary, impartiality, procedural fairness (MKPO, 2025). The demands of the participants to have ethical governance and regulatory systems echo these academic suggestions, which make the necessity of strong policies that regulate the use of AI in courts quite clear.

Lastly, regulatory and ethical governance is another theme that stood out in the interview data and the literature. There is a strong focus on the need to create holistic regulatory frameworks and regulations including those embodied by the Framework

Convention on Artificial Intelligence to harmonize AI use with basic human rights, democratic principles, and the rule of law (Fernando, 2024). These trends are reflected in the attitudes of participants towards regulation, which implies the importance of accountability, transparency, and fairness in the use of AI in the legal field.

Conclusively, the findings of the study not only align with the recent research on the applications of AI in the legal system, but also support the overall issues in the world regarding bias, transparency, principles, and the need to exercise discretion. Although AI shows evident opportunities in making the systems more efficient and more accessible to the services of lawyers, it is necessary to counterbalance them with rigorous governance and ethical considerations so that AI does not undermine the fundamentals of law but becomes a valuable addition to the justice system.

## 6. Conclusion

The research is also a useful contribution to the national implementation of Artificial Intelligence (AI) into the legal system of Pakistan and the utilization of such tools as AI Attorney, Your Munshi, and EastLaw. The results indicate that AI has the potential to enhance the efficiency, accessibility, and preparation of cases in legal practice to a great extent. The participants admitted that AI would help them waste less time on the mundane part of law, legal research and document drafting, allowing them to be more productive when it comes to the size of their caseload. Also, AI platforms are assisting in access to the legal services by the underrepresented groups, who cannot afford to employ the services of lawyers.

Nevertheless, the paper also notes that there are a number of ethical issues that concern the application of AI in court decision-making. Participants were worried of bias and lack of transparency and erosion of human judgment. The results are echoed in the larger body of research in the world community that insists that the AI systems must be not only transparent but also just, particularly in those spheres where the outcomes of the decisions made by the system can impact the rights and the freedoms of the people significantly. The aspect of AI complementing the work of a legal professional as highlighted by most participants implies that AI may assist legal professionals, but it never should substitute human judgment, especially in delicate legal issues that demand ethical arguments and compassionate evaluations.

As per the recent literature, the study highlights the need to have well-defined regulatory systems and codes of ethics to regulate the use of AI in the legal field. AI should be placed under constant supervision, with the nature of fairness, accountability, and transparency to prevent further perpetuation of the biases and loss of confidence in the justice system by the people.

In spite of such valuable insights, there are some limitations of the study. It was mainly targeted at the legal professionals within the urban regions of Pakistan, and the views of people in the rural or distant regions might offer a variation of the role of AI in the legal practice. The sample size of 15 participants is also very small such that the findings could not be generalized. The next research may consider the influence of AI in the legal field by the various regions of Pakistan and investigate how AI may have long run implications on the judicial system especially as these technologies keep advancing. Moreover, the advancement of the ethical AI models and rules that might be applied to a particular country, namely Pakistan, would become a crucial aspect that should be studied further.

## References

Advocate, T. H., & Advocate, S. A. (2025). THE ROLE OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE IN JUDICIAL DECISION-MAKING: A COMPARATIVE LEGAL ANALYSIS. *Contemporary Journal of Social Science Review*, *3*(1), 1-6. https://doi.org/10.63878/cjssr.v3i1.1181

Afuwape, K., & Adeojo, O. O. (2025). Bias and Fairness in AI-Driven Legal Systems: ethical and legal considerations. *Journal of Legal Studies*, *13*(1), 72-83. https://pure.jgu.edu.in/id/eprint/10011/

Ahmad, I., Bakhsh, F., Faisal, M., & Sultan, S. (2024). Regulatory Framework for Artificial Intelligence in the Legal System of Pakistan. *The Critical Review of Social Sciences Studies*, *2*(2), 1068-1076. https://thecrsss.com/index.php/Journal/article/view/90

AI Attorney. (2024). *Features - AI-powered legal research and drafting assistance*. Retrieved from https://www.aiattorney.com.pk/features/

Ashraf, M. Q. (2025). ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE IN COURTS AND DISPUTE RESOLUTION: CHALLENGES AND OPPORTUNITIES. https://doi.org/10.33327/AJEE-18-8.S-a000152

Ayibam, J. N. (2025). Artificial Intelligence in Public Procurement: Legal Frameworks, Ethical Challenges, and Policy Solutions for Transparent and Efficient Governance. *Alkebulan: A Journal of West and East African Studies*, *5*(2), 54-69. http://gnosipublishers.com.ng/index.php/alkebulan/article/view/24

Aziz, A., & Abid, I. (2024). BALANCING SPEED AND JUSTICE: AI-POWERED COURT SYSTEMS AND LEGAL ETHICS IN PAKISTAN. *ASSAJ*, *2*(4), 1255-1268. https://assajournal.com/index.php/36/article/view/249

Bhattacharjee, M. (2025). LEGAL REFORMS AND ACCESS TO JUSTICE: A SOCIO-LEGAL STUDY ON COURT EFFICIENCY, LEGAL AID, AND ALTERNATIVE DISPUTE RESOLUTION MECHANISMS. *International Journal of Applied Mathematics*, *38*(11s), 302-314. https://doi.org/10.12732/ijam.v38i11s.1161

Dancy, T., & Zalnieriute, M. (2025). AI and Transparency in Judicial Decision Making. *Oxford Journal of Legal Studies*, gqaf030. https://doi.org/10.1093/ojls/gqaf030

Fatima, A. (2023). ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE IN LEGAL SYSTEMS: CASE ANALYSIS AND PREDICTIVE APPLICATIONS. *Computer Science Bulletin*, *6*(02), 247-255. https://doi.org/10.71465/csb119

Fernando, Z. J., & Anditya, A. W. (2024). AI on The Bench: The Future of Judicial Systems in The Age of Artificial Intelligence. *Jurnal Hukum dan Peradilan*, *13*(3), 523-550. https://doi.org/10.25216/jhp.13.3.2024.523-550

Gondal, A. Q., Ahmad, M., & Hatta, Z. (2025). Revolutionizing Criminal Justice: The Role of Digitalization and AI in Pakistan's Legal System. *Al Khadim Research Journal of Islamic Culture and Civilization*, *6*(1), 25-35. http://www.arjicc.com/index.php/arjicc/article/view/364

Javed, M., & Li, Z. (2024). *Artificial intelligence in judicial adjudication: Semantic biases and mitigation strategies. ScienceDirect.* https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scid.2024.01.017

Kristofik, A. (2025). Bias in AI (supported) decision making: old problems, new technologies. In *IJCA* (Vol. 16, p. 1). https://heinonline.org/HOL/login-hol?redirect_url=https%3A%2F%2Fheinonline.org%2FHOL%2Fmojo%3F%252Fmojo%3D%26auth_token%3D4wc0GU1xR9HCNReh1it3b8NFfn6lltmHTv0BX2fnhmM%253D%26casa_token%3D%26div%3D5%26g_sent%3D1%26paywall_url%3D%26referrer%3Dhttps%253A%252F%252Fheinonline.org%252FHOL%252FPage%253Fhandle%253Dhein.journals%252Fijca16%26timestamp%3D1772203068%26url%3D%252FHOL%252FPage%253Fhandle%253Dhein.journals%252Fijca16%2526div%253D5%2526id%253D%2526page%253D

Kumari, P. (2025). AI and Legal Research: Transforming the Role of Lawyers. *Advances in Consumer Research,* 2(2). https://openurl.ebsco.com/EPDB%3Agcd%3A10%3A5179034/detailv2?sid=ebsco%3Aplink%3Ascholar&id=ebsco%3Agcd%3A190172951&crl=c&link_origin=scholar.google.com

Mehmood, S. (2023). *The rule of law approach for more resilient institutions: Judicial accountability and independence, and global economic activities* (No. 1418). ADBI Working Paper. https://doi.org/10.56506/FGHQ1674

MKPO, D. C. (2025). Is Truth And Integrity Of Justice On Trial In The Age Of Artificial Intelligence (Ai)? Re-Assessing Digital Evidence In The Context Of Ai-Generated Evidence Such As Deepfakes. *International Review Of Law And Jurisprudence (IRLJ),* 7(1). https://www.nigerianjournalsonline.org/index.php/IRLJ/article/view/1710

Qureshi, G. M., Ahmed, F. A., & Chaudhary, F. (2025). Algorithmic Justice and Legal Pluralism: Rethinking Artificial Intelligence Regulation in Pakistan's Hybrid Legal System. *Competitive Research Journal Archive,* 3(02), 67-75. https://thecrja.com/index.php/Journal/article/view/106

Rodgers, W., Murray, J. M., Stefanidis, A., Degbey, W. Y., & Tarba, S. Y. (2023). An artificial intelligence algorithmic approach to ethical decision-making in human resource management processes. *Human resource management review,* 33(1), 100925. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2022.100925

Shah, G., Ali, Z., & Tahir, M. (2025). Artificial intelligence integration in Pakistan's legal system: Enhancing access to justice, judicial transparency, and legal efficiency. *Federal Law Journal,* 4(1), 87-101. https://www.flj.gov.pk/docs/v4_issue_1/v4_issue_1_art5.pdf

Shahbaz, M., & Zafar, M. I. (2025). Justice Delayed in Punjab, Pakistan: A Quantitative Evidence of the Causes and Implications of Prolonged Disposal of Heinous and Serious Criminal Cases. *Journal of Religion and Society,* 4(02), 949-969. https://islamicreligious.com/index.php/Journal/article/view/377

Spalević, Ž., Milosavljević, S., Dubljanin, D., Popović, G., & Ilić, M. (2024). The role of artificial intelligence in judicial systems. *International Journal of Cognitive Research in Science, Engineering and Education,* 12(3), 561-569. https://doi.org/10.23947/2334-8496-2024-12-3-561-569

Yadav, A., & Ansari, M. T. J. (2025). Managing privacy and innovation in AI-enhanced legal services: Addressing data protection challenges and ethical considerations. *AI and Ethics,* 5(4), 4351-4364. https://doi.org/10.1007/s43681-025-00745-1

YourMunshi. (2024). *AI in legal practice: Improving efficiency and access to legal information.* Retrieved from https://yourmunshi.net/

Zafar, A. (2024). Balancing the scale: navigating ethical and practical challenges of artificial intelligence (AI) integration in legal practices. *Discover Artificial Intelligence,* 4(1), 27. https://doi.org/10.1007/s44163-024-00121-8