VOLUME 6 | ISSUE 1

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF ADVANCED LEGAL RESEARCH

A JURISPRUDENTIAL EXAMINATION OF SUPACE AND SUVAS WITH A COMPARATIVE INSIGHT INTO COMPAS

- Ruthra B[1], Keerthana K[2] & Vikash M[3]

ABSTRACT

The integration of Artificial Intelligence (AI) into judicial processes has generated significant interest in the Indian legal landscape. Among them pioneering initiatives are SUVAS (Supreme Court Vidhik Anuvaad Software), an AI-based translation tool, and SUPACE (Supreme Court Portal for Assistance in Court Efficiency), an AI-driven case management system. These tools aim to improve accessibility, efficiency, and transparency in the judiciary by addressing linguistic diversity and case backlog. In contrast, the United States employs COMPAS (Correctional Offender Management Profiling for Alternative Sanctions), a risk assessment tool that predicts the likelihood of reoffending to guide bail, parole, and sentencing decisions. However, its use has sparked debates over transparency and algorithmic bias.

The importance of this inquiry lies in the intersection of law, technology, and jurisprudence, where the infusion of AI raises critical questions regarding constitutional values, judicial discretion, and the balance between efficiency and justice. While studies have explored AI in global judicial systems, there exists a noticeable research gap in assessing the jurisprudential underpinnings and constitutional implications of India-specific AI tools like SUVAS and SUPACE.

The core aim of this study is to examine the following issues: To what extent can AI tools like SUVAS and SUPACE enhance judicial functioning without undermining judicial independence? How do these tools align with principles of natural justice, constitutional

[1] Student, KMC College of Law Tirupur, India.
[2]Student, KMC College of Law Tirupur, India.
[3]Student, KMC College of Law Tirupur, India.

For general queries or to submit your research for publication, kindly email us at ijalr.editorial@gmail.com

https://www.ijalr.in/

morality, and the philosophy of law in India and a comparative assessment of these tools with COMPAS.The key message is that while SUVAS and SUPACE hold immense promise for democratizing access to justice and easing systemic burdens, their deployment must be guided by constitutional safeguards and jurisprudential scrutiny to ensure that technology complements, rather than compromises, the essence of judicial reasoning.

Keywords: *Artificial Intelligence in Judiciary, SUVAS, SUPACE, COMPAS, Indian Judiciary, Jurisprudence, Judicial Independence, Access to Justice, Constitutional Morality, Legal Technology.*

I. Introduction:

In an era where digital transformation is reshaping governance and institutions globally, the Indian judiciary has also begun to embrace Artificial Intelligence (AI) to enhance both efficiency and accessibility. With more than five crore cases currently pending across different levels of courts, the need for technological intervention has become both necessary and pressing. Recognizing this challenge, the Supreme Court of India has taken proactive steps by introducing AI-powered tools aimed at reducing procedural delays and improving access to justice.

Two landmark initiatives in this direction are SUVAS (Supreme Court VidhikAnuvaad Software) and SUPACE (Supreme Court Portal for Assistance in Courts Efficiency). SUVAS, launched in 2019, is a machine learning-based translation software designed to bridge India's linguistic diversity by translating judgments and legal documents from English into nine regional languages. This initiative strengthens the constitutional promise of equal access to justice, ensuring that litigants and citizens across linguistic backgrounds can engage meaningfully with judicial processes. SUPACE, launched in April 2021, is an AI-assisted research and case management tool that helps judges analyze case files, identify relevant precedents, and generate concise summaries. By reducing the burden of administrative tasks, SUPACE allows judges to devote greater attention to reasoning and adjudication.

On the other hand, the United States has adopted COMPAS (Correctional Offender Management Profiling for Alternative Sanctions), an artificial intelligence–based risk assessment tool. Developed by Northpointe (now Equivant), COMPAS predicts the likelihood of a defendant reoffending by analyzing factors such as criminal history, personal

background, and responses to questionnaires. Its scores are used by courts to inform bail, parole, and sentencing decisions. While COMPAS represents a more outcome-oriented use of AI in the judiciary, its opacity and potential biases have sparked debates around fairness, due process, and equal protection under the law.

II. Literature review:

For the purpose of this study, the researcher immersed in various sources, participated in the necessary discussions related to this study, supported the matters mentioned in the article, advocated the principles in this electronic language, and provided quality research. For this, the author has referred to several books, documents, articles, and other sources.

Artificial Intelligence InThe Indian Judiciary: A Comprehensive Review Study – by Uday Shankar and Subham Pandey, IJCRT Volume 13, Issue 1 January 2025:

This article presents a comprehensive analysis of the implementation of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in the Indian Judiciary. It explores the successes, challenges, and limitations of AI compared to traditional legal practices, focusing on critical areas such as case analysis, legal research, evidence management, and decision support. The study emphasizes the importance of understanding public perception and acceptance of AI in the legal system, as well as the need for rigorous testing and bias mitigation in AI software.

Balancing the scales of justice through artificial intelligence– by Uday Shankar and Subham Pandey, JSTOR Vol. 63, No. 2**:**

This article discusses about who take action to define the information necessary to evaluate the general applicability of using artificial intelligence methods in court, utilizing Indian and international cases, while teaching as professors and research scholars at Rajiv Gandhi School of Intellectual Property Law. Through their research, they provide a genuine analysis to the question, "What is artificial intelligence? And how is it used in law enforcement and the legal profession?" by presenting AI systems that reflect current AI technologies and their key operational processes. The technical aspects of AI systems are explained in a language that non-technical individuals can easily understand.

Can Artificial Intelligence Revolutionise India's Judiciary System?– by Ashraf RehmanGLIMS Journal of Management Review and Transformation 4(1) 107–114, 2025:

The article discusses the integration of artificial intelligence (AI) in India's judiciary system and its potential to transform various institutional activities, particularly in the context of micro, small, and medium enterprises (MSMEs). It highlights the introduction of AI tools like SUPACE (Supreme Court Portal for Assistance in Court Efficiency) and SUVAS (Supreme Court VidhikAnuvaad Software), which aim to improve court efficiency and reduce linguistic barriers in legal proceedings. The article emphasizes the need for regulatory frameworks, such as the proposed Personal Data Protection Act, to safeguard individuals' rights and ensure the responsible use of AI in legal contexts.

Artificial Intelligence in the Indian Judiciary: A Systematic Analysis of Potential Applications and Challenges in Addressing Case Backlogs –by Trivedi Vivek, Nilakshi, ASPUR Vol. 01, No. 03 (2024):

This article explores the integration of AI technologies within the Indian legal system to tackle the significant issue of case backlogs, which exceed 40 million pending cases. It highlights various AI applications, including expert systems for procedural guidance, computer vision for evidence analysis, and natural language processing. The paper emphasizes the importance of comprehensive training for legal professionals, robust governance frameworks to mitigate bias, and a phased implementation approach to ensure effective adoption. Ultimately, it argues that while AI can enhance judicial efficiency, it must be part of broader reforms to technologies the Indian justice system.

Artificial Intelligence and the Transformation of Humans, Law and Technology Interactions in Judicial Proceedings-- by Francesco Contini, LawTechHum 2; (2020) 2(1):

The article links the possible disruption of AI in justice administration to the historical development of court technology. The framework integrates Luhmann's technology theory with actor-network theory to examine how the digital environment impacts judicial agency. The study examines the relationship between law and technology to determine the criteria for legal technology application in court processes.

III. Research Questions:

1.Can Algorithmic tools embody the principles of natural justice (audi alteram Partem , nemo judere in causa sua)?

2.To what extent can AI - driven translation be considered a constitutional right under article - 21?

3.Does the rise of AI in court mark a shift from "Humanist jurisprudence to Technocratic jurisprudence"?

4.What are the issues and challenges which would arise while adopting AI in legal industry?

5.How do AI tools like COMPAC in the USA and SUPACE–SUVAAS in India address judicial efficiency and accessibility, and what lessons can they offer each other?

IV. Research Methodology:

The study adopts a doctrinal research method supplemented by comparative analysis, drawing on case law, policy documents, and jurisprudential theories of justice, discretion, and technology. By situating these tools within broader debates on legal positivism, realism, and critical legal studies, the paper examines whether they serve merely as procedural aids or signal a transformative jurisprudential shift.

V. Algorithmic Natural Justice:

Natural justice has historically been the bedrock of fair adjudication. Its core principles—audi alteram partem (hear the other side) and nemo judex in causa sua (no one should be a judge in his own cause)—form the procedural safeguards that ensure legitimacy in decision-making. With the growing integration of Artificial Intelligence (AI) tools in judicial and quasi-judicial processes, such as SUVAS/SUPACE, a pressing question arises: can algorithms embody natural justice, or do they threaten it? This inquiry links directly with Lon Fuller's theory of the "inner morality of law," which emphasizes clarity, consistency, and fairness as prerequisites for any morally legitimate legal system.

The principle of **audi alterampartem** demands that every party be given an opportunity to be heard. In a human-driven courtroom, this is safeguarded through notice, representation, and

cross-examination. However, when decisions or risk assessments are made by opaque algorithms, this safeguard faces serious challenges.

SUVAS (Supreme Court VidhikAnuvaad Software), which translates judicial documents using AI, does not yet directly adjudicate cases, but it influences accessibility. If translation errors distort legal meaning, affected parties may be unable to present their side fully, raising indirect concerns about audi alteram partem. Similarly, SUPACE (Supreme Court Portal for Assistance in Courts Efficiency), which curates case material, could filter or prioritize documents in ways that unintentionally limit what the judge considers—again shaping what "hearing the other side" actually means.

The maxim **nemo judex in causa sua** is intended to prevent partiality, ensuring that no one judges a matter in which they have an interest. Algorithms, at first glance, seem impartial—machines cannot possess personal bias. However, bias can be embedded in their training data, coding, or deployment.

In India, as SUPACE and related tools grow, concerns arise about whether algorithmic curation of case law might privilege certain precedents or perspectives. If an algorithm is trained on historical judgments reflecting entrenched biases, it risks reinforcing them rather than correcting them. Here, nemo judex in causa sua is challenged, since the algorithm—shaped by historical biases—becomes both the product and the arbiter of those biases.

Despite many challenges, AI need not be rejected outright. Instead, jurisprudence must adapt it. Judicial systems could implement "explainable AI" (XAI) models, where the reasoning behind algorithmic outcomes is accessible to litigants. Procedural safeguards, such as allowing parties to challenge algorithmic outputs, can reinforce audi alteram partem. Independent audits of datasets and algorithms can help ensure compliance with nemo judex.

In India, the Supreme Court has emphasized SUPACE as assistive rather than adjudicatory. This framing itself aligns with Fuller's morality, as it ensures that the final judgment remains a human responsibility bound by natural justice.

VI. AI, Language, and Constitutional Rights:

The relationship between artificial intelligence (AI), language, and constitutional rights is an emerging frontier of jurisprudence. Language has always been central to justice—law is

written, argued, and decided through linguistic expression. Yet, in a multilingual country like India, linguistic barriers often act as barriers to justice. The integration of AI-driven translation tools such as SUVAS (Supreme Court VidhikAnuvaad Software) directly implicates constitutional guarantees under Article 21 and Article 14, and resonates with Ronald Dworkin's theory of rights. These developments call for a deeper inquiry: can AI-powered linguistic tools transform access to justice into a truly universal right?

Article 21 of the Indian Constitution, interpreted expansively by the Supreme Court, protects not only the right to life and liberty but also the right to access justice. In **Hussainara Khatoon v. State of Bihar** :A series of petitions were filed on behalf of under trial prisoners in Bihar who had been kept in jail for years without trial, some for periods longer than the maximum sentence for their alleged offences. The Supreme Court, led by Justice P.N. Bhagwati, held that the "right to speedy trial" is an essential part of the fundamental right to life and personal liberty under Article 21. Prolonged detention without trial was deemed unconstitutional.

In **Anita Kushwaha v. PushapSudan** :The case arose out of a dispute involving territorial jurisdiction between newly created states after the bifurcation of Bihar. It brought into focus whether citizens were deprived of access to courts. The Supreme Court held that "access to justice" forms aintegral facetof Article 21 and is equally safeguarded under Articles 14 and 19.The Court clarified that justice must be affordable, effective, and accessible.

Here, language emerges as a silent barrier. Many litigants cannot understand English—the dominant language of higher judiciary in India. Their inability to comprehend judgments or file documents in their mother tongue deprives them of meaningful participation in the legal process. SUVAS, launched in 2019, addresses this by using AI to translate judgments and legal documents into multiple Indian languages. By bridging linguistic divides, SUVAS operationalizes Article 21, ensuring that justice is not merely available but also intelligible to citizens.

Article 14 enshrines the principle of equality before law and equal protection of laws. If language barriers exclude a section of citizens from understanding judicial decisions, it results in a de facto inequality.

The Constitution recognizes India's linguistic diversity through its Eighth Schedule, but in practice, courts often function in English or dominant regional languages, marginalizing linguistic minorities.

Here, AI tool SUVAS become instruments of constitutional equality. By enabling translation across languages, they democratize access and reduce the asymmetry between those proficient in English and those who are not. For instance, a litigant from Tamil Nadu or Assam should not be disadvantaged simply because a Supreme Court rulling is issued in English. Ensuring equal linguistic accessibility aligns with Article 14's jurisprudential mandate.

Ronald Dworkin's theory of rights emphasizes that individual rights are "trumps" against utilitarian calculations. Rights are not to be compromised for collective efficiency; they represent fundamental claims of fairness and inclusivity. Applied here, the right to linguistic access in the judicial system is not merely a matter of convenience but a moral entitlement rooted in dignity and fairness.

When AI-driven tool SUVAS make judgments accessible in multiple languages, they embody Dworkin's vision of rights. They ensure that linguistic minorities—often marginalized in legal processes—are treated with the same respect as dominant groups. Justice, in this view, is not only about outcomes but also about participation and inclusivity in the process.

The deployment of SUVAS reflects a broader trend: the state's use of AI to actualize constitutional promises. It suggests a move toward a technological reading of fundamental rights—where digital tools are not external to rights but integral to their fulfilment . The jurisprudential shift is significant. It redefines access to justice not merely as physical access to courts but as linguistic and cognitive access, mediated by AI.

Still, it raises doubts about where responsibility lies. If a mistranslation denies justice, who is accountable—the coder, the judiciary, or the state? Such dilemmas point toward the need for jurisprudence of algorithmic accountability, ensuring that AI-driven inclusivity does not inadvertently become exclusionary.

VII. Humanist vs. Technocratic Jurisprudence: A Contemporary Debate:

The rise of artificial intelligence (AI) in judicial systems has revived one of the oldest debates in jurisprudence: the clash between humanist jurisprudence and technocratic jurisprudence. This tension is not simply about technology; it is about the very philosophy of law—whether law is a living institution rooted in values and human dignity, or a mechanistic framework reducible to rules and algorithms.

Humanist jurisprudence views law as more than a set of rules. It emphasizes morality, values, and judicial discretion in the pursuit of justice. Ronald Dworkin's theory of "law as integrity" exemplifies this view. According to Dworkin, judges must interpret law in its best moral light, ensuring that decisions cohere with principles of fairness and equality. Law, in this sense, is not a static command but a moral enterprise.

Similarly, **Eugen Ehrlich's notion of the "living law"** highlights how real legal norms emerge from social practices rather than codified statutes. This school values the human element—the ability of judges to respond empathetically to unique circumstances, recognizing law as a living reflection of society.

In practical terms, humanist jurisprudence emphasizes contextual reasoning. For instance, when adjudicating cases on privacy rights or equality, judges often balance legal texts with constitutional morality, thereby going beyond strict literalism. This approach maintains law's connection with human dignity and social justice.

In contrast, technocratic jurisprudence emphasizes precision, rule-based logic, and predictability. Rooted in legal positivism, it sees law as a system of rules that must be applied mechanically, independent of ethical or social perspectives. This approach resonates with Roscoe Pound's critique of "mechanical jurisprudence", where judges act as technicians applying precedents without engaging in moral reasoning.

AI-driven legal tools—such as predictive algorithms for bail or sentencing, or automated legal research platforms—embody this technocratic vision. By processing vast amounts of legal data and applying it to new cases, algorithms promise consistency, speed, and efficiency. They minimize subjective discretion, aiming to reduce human error and bias.

Yet, critics argue that such mechanistic predictability risks hollowing out the humanistic dimension of law. If justice is reduced to algorithmic outcomes, law may lose its moral compass, becoming an exercise in computational logic rather than a pursuit of fairness.

Rather than viewing these approaches as irreconcilable, a jurisprudential synthesis is possible. Pound's critique of mechanical jurisprudence did not reject rules altogether but insisted that rules must be applied with sensitivity to social needs. Similarly, Ehrlich's "living law" does not abandon legal structure but emphasizes the human context of its application.

The challenge, then, is to design AI tools that respect both efficiency and morality. For example, developing explainable AI (XAI) could align technocratic predictability with the humanist demand for transparency and fairness. Judicial oversight of AI outputs ensures that machines assist but do not replace the moral reasoning of judges.

This balanced approach resonates with Dworkin's idea of integrity—decisions must not only follow rules but also be justified in terms of principle. AI can provide the data and consistency, while human judges infuse the moral and constitutional values that preserve law's legitimacy.

VIII. Challenges in AI-Driven Legal Ecosystems:

The adoption of artificial intelligence (AI) in judicial systems is often celebrated as a step toward modernization. From predictive analytics to translation software such as SUVAS and case-management tools like SUPACE, AI promises speed, efficiency, and uniformity in adjudication. Yet beneath these promises lie significant ethical, constitutional, and infrastructural challenges. These challenges are not merely technological—they strike at the core of jurisprudence, testing long-standing principles of legality, clarity, and the law's role in society.

A. V. Dicey emphasized that the rule of law requires legality, equality before law, and protection of individual rights. AI systems, however, often operate as "black boxes," where the reasoning behind outputs is hidden from both litigants and judges. This undermines the principle of legality, which demands that state power—including judicial power—must be transparent, foreseeable, and contestable.

For instance, when predictive algorithms such as the COMPAS risk assessment tool in the United States influenced sentencing decisions, defendants were unable to challenge the methodology because it was proprietary. Such opacity clashes with Dicey's vision: law cannot be truly legal if its operation is inaccessible to those governed by it. In India, while tools like SUPACE are described as assistive rather than determinative, the same risk persists if litigants cannot know how algorithms filtered evidence or prioritized precedents.

Lon Fuller argued that the "inner morality of law" requires rules to be clear, consistent, and public. AI tools often fail on these counts.Algorithms use technical models that are incomprehensible to laypersons, and sometimes even to experts. A judgment influenced by such outputs risks losing legitimacy if parties cannot understand how outcomes were derived. Machine learning models evolve through training data. If the model updates without transparency, similar cases may yield inconsistent outputs, undermining predictability in law. Fuller insisted that legal rules must match their application. If an AI tool is designed to promote fairness but embeds hidden biases, it betrays the very principles it was meant to uphold. Thus, algorithmic opacity is not a minor technical flaw—it is a direct violation of Fuller's jurisprudential conditions for a functioning legal system.One of the central challenges in AI-driven ecosystems is algorithmic bias. If historical judgments used to train AI reflect systemic discrimination, the algorithm may reproduce those inequalities at scale.

Beyond ethical hurdles, AI in the judiciary faces practical and sociological limitations. Roscoe Pound distinguished between "law in books" and "law in action," highlighting that the effectiveness of law depends on its actual operation in society. AI adoption reveals this gap vividly.

Many lower courts in India lack the infrastructure to integrate AI tools. Litigants in rural areas, already marginalized, risk further exclusion if AI becomes central to court functioning. Judges, lawyers, and clerks require training to use AI effectively. Without this, AI may slow proceedings rather than streamline them. Implementing and maintaining AI systems demands significant resources. If only higher courts can afford these tools, the principle of equal access to justice is jeopardized. These infrastructural hurdles illustrate that the law's sociological function—to meet societal needs in practice—remains unmet if technology is unevenly distributed.

Addressing these challenges requires embedding jurisprudential principles into AI design and deployment. Algorithms used in courts must be explainable, enabling litigants to contest outcomes, thereby preserving Dicey's principle of legality. Independent reviews of training data can identify and mitigate biases, aligning with Fuller's demand for congruence between law's purpose and application. The judiciary must ensure equitable distribution of AI tools, bridging the digital divide so that law in action reflects constitutional ideals.AI should remain advisory. Final responsibility for adjudication must rest with judges, preserving human accountability in the delivery of justice.

IX.AI-Driven Judicial Innovations: A Cross-National Analysis of COMPAS (USA) and SUPACE–SUVAS (India):

Both India's SUPACE/SUVAS and the U.S.'s COMPAS share the common aim of enhancing judicial efficiency through AI. They reduce manual effort and provide data-driven support to judges, helping address backlogs or decision-making challenges. All three systems reflect the judiciary's attempt to harness technology for improving access to justice.

Their divergence is rooted in purpose and range. SUPACE is an analytical tool that assists judges by reading case files, generating briefs, and providing relevant precedents—without making judicial decisions. SUVAS focuses on language translation, enabling judgments to be translated into multiple Indian languages to enhance accessibility.

COMPAS, on the other hand, is a predictive tool that generates risk scores to guide bail, parole, and sentencing decisions. Unlike SUPACE and SUVAS, it directly influences outcomes in criminal justice.

Another difference is in transparency and bias. SUPACE and SUVAS are controlled and supervised by the judiciary itself, with emphasis on assistance, not adjudication. COMPAS, developed by a private company (Northpointe), has been criticized for algorithmic opacity and racial bias, especially after the State v. Loomis case. Thus, Indian tools remain facilitator, while the U.S. tool directly shapes judicial discretion.

The comparison is relevant because both India and the U.S. face judicial backlogs, resource constraints, and concerns of fairness. India has over 5 crore pending cases, which motivated the adoption of SUPACE and SUVAS. In the U.S., the focus is more on criminal justice reform and reducing subjective bias in sentencing decisions, which led to COMPAS's

deployment. By comparing these, we understand how jurisdictional priorities shape AI adoption.

The purpose of this comparison is to highlight how AI serves different judicial functions in different countries. In India, the focus is on efficiency, accessibility, and multilingual justice. In the U.S., it is more about risk prediction and aiding sentencing decisions. The analysis aims not to label one as "better," but to show how AI tools evolve differently under constitutional, cultural, and legal frameworks.

This comparison is undertaken from a jurisprudential perspective, evaluating AI not merely as technology but as part of the legal ecosystem. From an Indian lens, AI is an enabler of access to justice (Article 21) and linguistic equality (Articles 14 & 19). From an American lens, AI like COMPAS is viewed through due process and equal protection challenges under the Constitution. Thus, the perspective emphasizes that while both nations use AI, their legal traditions and constitutional commitments determine what role AI is allowed to play in the justice system.

X. Conclusion:

SUPACE and SUVAS illustrate how AI can enhance judicial efficiency while ensuring that judgment-giving remains a human responsibility, preserving discretion and accountability. SUVAS, in particular, strengthens constitutional equality and access to justice by breaking language barriers. Unlike the U.S.'s market-driven AI tools, India's government-led approach is cautious, focusing on structural issues like backlog and inclusivity. Together, these initiatives mark an important step in modernizing the judiciary while upholding jurisprudential values of fairness, equality, and access to justice, provided AI remains an aid, not a substitute, for human judgment.

REFERENCES:

1. Artificial Intelligence for Legal System: Jurisprudence in the Digital Age – Routledge, 2025.

2. AI and the Law: A Critical Overview – Springer, 2024.

3. Legal Tech and AI: Transforming the Judiciary – Oxford University Press, 2023.

4. AI in Legal Practice: Challenges and Opportunities – Cambridge University Press, 2022.

5. The Future of Law: AI and the Judiciary – Harvard Law Review, 2023.

6. AI & Indian Judicial System – IJCRT, 2025.

7. Artificial Intelligence in Administration of Justice in India: Challenges and Opportunities – The Law Brigade Publisher, 2022.

8. Artificial Intelligence Inroads into the Indian Judicial System – Taylor & Francis, 2022.

9. Algorithmic Accountability in the Judiciary – DAKSH India, 2022.

10. AI and the Indian Judiciary: The Need for a Rights-based Approach – The Hindu Centre, 2024.

11. Greening the Justice System: Assessing the Legality, Feasibility, and Potential of AI in Advancing Environmental Sustainability within the Indian Judiciary – Frontiers in Political Science, 2025.

12. Smart Automation and Artificial Intelligence in India's Judicial System: A Case of Organised Irresponsibility? – Digital Futures Lab, 2023.

13. AI-powered Indian Judiciary - A Boon or a Bane – IJIRT, 2024.

14. Artificial Intelligence for Legal System: Jurisprudence in the Digital Age – Routledge, 2025.

15. Artificial Intelligence in the Courtroom: Transforming Indian Judiciary for the Future – Dr. Kiran Shrimant Kakade, 2023.

16.Artificial Intelligence and the Law - Kevin D. Ashley.

17.AI in the Judiciary: A Global Perspective - John Zeleznikow, Daniel Martin Katz.

18.Jurisprudence in the Age of AI,R. K. Gupta.

19.The Ethics of AI in Legal Systems , Laura K. Donohue.

20.Artificial Intelligence for Legal System: Jurisprudence in the Digital Age, R.K. Gupta, Sandeep Singh Malik, et al.

21.AI PORTAL SUPACE, available https://www.drishtiias.com/daily-news-analysis/ai portal-supace.

22. Impact of Artificial Intelligence on the Legal Industry: Advantages, Challenges, and Ethical Implications, 2023 - Sharma B.

23. The Role of AI Technology for Legal Research and Decision Making. Title of the Journal, 2023 - Kabir MS, Alam MN.

24. AI for Improving Justice Delivery: International Scenario, Potential Applications & Way Forward for India. Informatica, 2023, 47(5) - Srivastava SK.

25. Intelligence in the Judiciary: Uses and Threats. EGOV-CeDEM-ePart 2022, 183 - Rocha C, Carvalho J. Artificial.

26. Artificial Intelligence in Administration of Justice in India: Challenges and Opportunities, 2022 - Ghanghash MS.

27.Digitalization-The New Era of Indian Judiciary, 2022 - Tiwari RK, Singh A.

28.The Legal Singularity: How Artificial Intelligence Can Make Law Radically Better (2023) - Benjamin Alarie, Anthony Niblett, Albert Yoon.

29. Artificial Intelligence, Human Rights, Democracy, and the Rule of Law: A Primer (2021) - David Leslie, Christopher Burr, Mhairi Aitken, Josh Cowls, Michael Katell, Morgan Briggs.

30.Hussainara Khatoon & Ors. v. Home Secretary, State of Bihar, AIR 1979 SC 1369; 1979 SCR (3) 532; 1980 (1) SCC 98 — Supreme Court of India (9 March 1979)

31.Anita Kushwaha v. Pushap Sudan, Transfer Petition (Civil) No. 1343/2008 – Supreme Court of India, Order dated 12 August 2016 (Bench: A.K. Sikri, N.V. Ramana)