Sudarshan Research Journal, 2025;3(6): Page No: 9-17

SUDARSHAN RESEARCH JOURNAL

ISSN: 2583-8792 (Online)

Journal home page: https://sudarshanresearchjournal.com/

Review Paper

DOI: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.16791590

Artificial Intelligence in Judicial Adjudication

Shivani

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received: 31/05/2025

Revised: 04/06/2025

Accepted: 15/07/2025

Published: 20/07/2025

Keywords:

Artificial Intelligence, Judicial Adjudication, Automation Bias, Transparency, Accountability.

ABSTRACT

The integration of Artificial Intelligence (AI) into judicial adjudication presents a paradigm shift in the legal landscape, offering the promise of enhanced efficiency, accuracy, and accessibility in the justice delivery system. AI's capacity to process vast datasets, identify patterns, and assist in decision-making can potentially reduce human error and expedite legal processes. However, its adoption also raises significant concerns regarding automation bias, lack of transparency, algorithmic discrimination, and challenges to due process and fundamental rights. These issues demand rigorous ethical, legal, and regulatory safeguards to ensure fairness, accountability, and public trust in AI-assisted adjudication. Drawing upon developments in India and global experiences, this study examines the potential and limitations of AI in judicial decision-making, with a focus on transparency, explainability, oversight mechanisms, and alignment with constitutional and human rights standards. It argues that the responsible deployment of AI in the judiciary must strike a balance between technological efficiency and the irreplaceable value of human judgment.

Introduction

The government's ability to ensure an efficient, effective, open, and responsive administration is crucial to governance, which is broadly described as the "activity or manner of managing a state." Considering India's size and diversity, governing it poses especially tough challenges. Government in India has always faced slow, outdated processes and bureaucratic hurdles, but recent attempts to incorporate newer technologies are revitalizing the system. To this end. There has been ongoing dialogue in recent years on the best ways to use AI to enhance effective governance

Three key trends emerged during the examination conducted in this study. First, while there is considerable interest in the idea of using algorithms across all states, the technical abilities and implementation differ greatly. In adopting algorithms in sectors like education and agriculture, Andhra Pradesh and Karnataka seem to take more initiative than other states. Second, the private sector, which works with the government through agreements or contracts, is mainly responsible for creating most of the AI technology that is currently being used. Lastly, much of the technology that is central to discussions about AI and governance in India has already been applied in other countries, particularly the United States, the United Kingdom, and China. Even if India may consider adopting some of this technology, it would be wise to first examine some of the technical, legal, and ethical issues that have arisen in these countries and find ways to address them before implementing the technology in Indian governance. To map the direction of technology development in India soon and provide a regulatory model readily available after the technology is in use, this report, unlike the other case studies, focuses significantly on applications of AI in other regions

Review of Literature

The scholarly discourse on Artificial Intelligence (AI) in judicial adjudication reflects a growing recognition of its

Author Address: Former Student, LL. M.,Bhagat Phool Singh Mahila Vishwavidyalaya University, Khanpur, Sonipat, Haryana

Relevant conflicts of interest/financial disclosures: The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

transformative potential alongside its inherent risks. Early literature (Susskind, 2019; Remus & Levy, 2016) focused on the automation of routine legal tasks, predicting an eventual extension into judicial reasoning. Subsequent works (Ashley, 2017; Surden, 2020) examined AI's ability to process large datasets, identify legal precedents, and assist in case outcome prediction. Studies such as Zhang (2021) and Altera's et al. (2016) demonstrated the feasibility of AI-assisted predictive analytics in judicial contexts, while highlighting risks of algorithmic bias and lack of explain ability. Indian literature (Mehta, 2021; Vidhi Centre for Legal Policy, 2022) emphasizes the country's unique challenges, including infrastructural gaps, digital literacy disparities, and constitutional safeguards. Comparative research from jurisdictions like China's "Smart Courts" and Estonia's AI-based small claims adjudication provides insights into operational models, benefits, and ethical constraints. The consensus in the literature underscores the need for transparent, accountable, and human-supervised AI systems to preserve fairness, due process, and public trust.

Research Objectives

The primary objectives of this study are:

1. To examine the scope, benefits, and risks of integrating Artificial Intelligence into judicial adjudication.
2. To analyse existing models of AI-assisted adjudication in India and select foreign jurisdictions.
3. To evaluate ethical, legal, and constitutional concerns, including automation bias, transparency, and accountability.
4. To propose a balanced framework for the responsible adoption of AI in judicial processes that safeguards due process and fundamental rights.

Research Methodology

This research adopts a qualitative, doctrinal, and comparative methodology. Primary sources include constitutional provisions, judicial decisions, and statutory frameworks relevant to AI and judicial processes. Secondary sources comprise academic journals, books, policy reports, and government publications. A comparative analysis is undertaken to evaluate AI-based adjudication models in jurisdictions such as China, Estonia, and the United States. The research also incorporates insights from interdisciplinary studies on AI ethics, computer science, and human rights law to contextualize technological and legal dimensions. The methodology relies on descriptive, analytical, and prescriptive approaches to assess both theoretical propositions and practical implications

Data Analysis

Given the conceptual nature of the study, "data" refers to documented case studies, pilot projects, statistical reports, and qualitative evaluations of AI implementation in judicial systems. The analysis identifies recurring themes such as efficiency gains, reduction of backlog, risk of automation bias, and limitations in explainability. Comparative findings reveal that while jurisdictions like China have achieved operational efficiency, they face criticisms regarding transparency and state control. Estonia's limited-scope AI adjudication offers a more cautious, rights-sensitive model. In the Indian context, initiatives such as the Supreme Court's "SUPACE" (Supreme Court Portal for Assistance in Courts Efficiency) demonstrate potential in research assistance but stop short of autonomous decision-making. The analysis supports the conclusion that AI's optimal role in adjudication lies in decision-support rather than decision-substitution, ensuring that human judges retain final authority.

Sectors Incorporating Ai Use In India:

Key AI technologies are being studied and in some cases are being used by police worldwide. This includes drones, robotic officers, self-driving police cars, voice recognition, facial recognition, and predictive analytics as well. Our research in this field showed that India's technological growth is still very early. Many projects are still just ideas and do not have the skills needed to fully include AI solutions for policing [1]. At the same time, India is developing projects that will offer the data and groundwork necessary to support AI solutions in police work. Significant uses of AI in Indian law enforcement consist of:

Predictive Analysis

India has advanced in utilizing big data analysis and algorithms to manage large volumes of data to develop predictive policing models. By March 2018, predictive policing technologies are expected to be available in five states: Kerala, Odisha, Maharashtra, Haryana, and Tripura. By the end of 2018, this technology is projected to be found in all 50 states. Implementing predictive policing programs requires the use of enhanced and advanced data gathering techniques. The National Crime Records Bureau is reportedly teaming up with the Hyderabad-based Advanced Data Research Institute (ADRIN) to create the necessary technology for executing predictive policing strategies.

Police officials have presented strong reasons for adopting predictive policing strategies, and effective steps are being taken in all states to ensure trustworthy data gathering systems. The National Crime Records Bureau conducted a workshop on data analysis, dashboard creation, and using

artificial intelligence in policing in May 2017. The importance of evidence-driven predictive policing approaches was highlighted by N. Ramachandran, President of the Indian Police Foundation, who also stressed that India should aim to be a global leader in predictive policing. The Special Commissioner of Delhi Police emphasized the need to combine control room data and social media tools with CCTV footage during the event. A trend in state projects has been towards expanded and more detailed data collection that could assist AI solutions. One example is the 30,000 CCTV cameras that the Telangana Police reportedly installed with support from the community. With funding from the National e-Governance plan, the Crime and Criminal Tracking Network and Systems were initiated in India in 2013. The project's aim was to connect around 15,000 police stations, district and state police headquarters, and automated services to create a national criminal tracking database. It has the potential to improve the gathering of the quantity, quality, and type of data necessary for predictive policing, despite being initially planned for completion by 2012.

To assist in the registering of criminal identification, tracking, and searches for missing persons, law enforcement in Rajasthan launched a pilot project with Staqu, an AI start-up, in 2017. The aim of the project was to create the application ABHED (artificial intelligence-based human face detection). This application utilizes machine learning and is designed to work with the CCTNS . According to Etihsam Zaidi, a senior analyst at Gartner, the shift towards predictive policing may be impacted by the fact that the Indian police force has greater access to existing data storage systems like Hadoop and NoSQL, which allow for the swift storage and handling of large amounts of incoming data. Balsingh Rajput, superintendent of police (SP) cyber for Maharashtra, stated that the police force is developing predictive techniques. By using advanced technology and data analysis, they are trying to forecast criminal intentions.

The Indian Space Research Organization and the Delhi Police have started working together on methods for predicting crime. The Crime Mapping, Analytics and Predictive System is a project being developed that will allow police officers to access up-to-date information at crime scenes, reducing the need to go back to police stations to file reports. The online software can collect data from the Dial 100 hotline of the Delhi Police and uses clustering methods to identify crime 'hotspots' spatially with satellite images from ISRO. Therefore, similar to PredPol, this software helps the Delhi Police to foresee when and where crimes might take place and to send police teams for planned responses. Currently, crime mapping is done every 15-day s.

The Joint Commissioners create the reports, which they then pass on to the Special Commissioners, who forward them to the police chiefs. They then use three methods to analyse the data available and conduct their monitoring operations. A "crime prediction" is the first approach, allowing the police to identify gangs in certain areas in real-time. This system analyses large amounts of data from several crime databases as part of a project called the Enterprise Information Integration Solution. The second approach is called "neighbourhood analysis," which mainly involves grouping hotspots through algorithmic assessment of spatial data.

A third approach known as proximity analysis would allow for the assessment of details regarding suspects, victims, witnesses, and others who were near the crime scene and use that data to examine any changes that happened just before or after the incident. With the help of IIM Ranchi, the Jharkhand police force is also working to create a data analytics system. The approach relies on advanced algorithms and behavioural science, which will aid in predicting crime, particularly in areas affected by Naxal violence. In India, the success of predictive policing methods has not been assessed yet.

Speech and Facial recognition

A new collaboration has been formed between Best Group and the Israeli security and AI research company Cortica to examine the large amounts of data collected from CCTV cameras placed in public areas. Improving safety in public areas such as streets, bus stops, and train stations is a main objective of this initiative. The Punjab Artificial Intelligence System (PAIS), which turns criminal records into digital format and streamlines research through features such as facial recognition, was created by the Punjab Officers in partnership with Staqu. By using facial recognition, police can gather information about a suspect. If an officer identifies a suspect, he takes a picture of him. The image is then put into a mobile app, which checks the digital picture against the previously stored image. Furthermore, the app will promptly send the person's criminal background to the officer's phone.

Education

Our study shows that decision-making, student services, tracking student progress, and tailored learning are the areas where AI is most often used in education. Even though India has many languages, it seems that most solutions in this area do not focus on language. The method that is used the most among these solutions appears to be machine learning.

Decision making - HTC Global Services, a service company based in the US, is focusing on introducing products into the Indian education market. This online tool will help students make better decisions when selecting courses and electives in colleges. This application will effectively use the same algorithms that help users pick products on online shopping sites by using AI and machine learning to examine past data.

Student Service - This includes solutions to issues like admissions inquiries, which are mostly manual and time-

consuming for both students and staff. Vishal Sethi, the Global Practice Head for AI and Data Science, has mentioned that they are preparing to launch an algorithm that can accurately read students' facial expressions to assess their understanding.

Student Progress Monitoring - To enable personalized tracking of children and offer individual attention to their development, the government in Andhra Pradesh, led by Chandrababu Naidu, is planning to collect information from various databases and analyse the data using Microsoft's Machine Learning Platform. This will help lessen the rate of school dropouts.

Personalized Learning - Ek-step is an open-source learning tool that uses APIs. The platform includes gamified apps available on Google Play. As of 2016, it was reportedly used in over 10,000 government schools in Karnataka. Moreover, the platform is available in 18 states and 5 languages. Co-Impact, a group of leading global philanthropists that includes the Rockefeller Foundation and the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, recently announced that it will soon collaborate with the EkStep Foundation. The government also aims to work with EkStep to expand the platform nationwide. According to CEO Shankar Maruwada, this project can grow in the future, even though currently, only teachers need a mobile or IoT device to access the content. Using artificial intelligence to organize and filter relevant content for each learner would surely be helpful for such a project. It may either turn into a smart content platform that serves as a teaching aid or be used to develop an ITS model utilizing the existing platform.

Defence

Our research showed that AI is mainly used in the defence sector for gathering information, monitoring, scouting, robotic soldiers, cyber protection, analysing risky areas, and smart weapon systems. Defence is the only sector we investigated where the use of independent systems is clearly being thought about. Still, many of these projects are in the planning and testing phases, and it is uncertain how much the different parts of the government believe in and support them.

Intelligence, Surveillance and Reconnaissance - The Indian army has started using unmanned autonomous vehicles for scouting jobs, such as finding naval mines in coastal regions and watching over territorial waters to look for intruders. To conduct aerial scouting and monitoring, various unmanned flying vehicles have been developed, like the recently tested Rustom-248, which can operate in both manual and autonomous settings. Daksh is a robot built by the DRDO that can be controlled from 500 meters. Its main job is to deploy explosives, like PackBot, which is used by the US army. The growth of this technology has also been supported by partnerships with private companies. For example, Crone Systems, an AI company from New Delhi, has analysed seasonal data for signs of border crossings and can algorithmically estimate the chances of border crossings at specific times. Innefu Labs is working with the Border Security Force and Central Reserve Police Force to track social media posts to help predict the timing and location of disturbances and send in the needed personnel.

Robot Soldiers - A laboratory associated with DRDO, called the Centre for Artificial Intelligence and Robotics (CAIR), has been developing a project to create a Multi Agent Robotics Framework (MARF). This aims to promote the creation of various robots that can work together as a team, similar to human soldiers, using a multi-layered AI-powered structure. Robots that have already been made include a Robot Sentry, a Snake Robot, and a Wheeled Robot with Passive Suspension. The US aims to develop both unmanned and manned smart teamwork in combat roles and autonomous convoy operations by 2025, pointing to the direction of the technology and the possibility that there may be more "robot warriors" than humans.

Cyber Defence - The government's use of AI is improving and broadening cybersecurity skills. For example, CDAC is partnering with IIT Patna on a project to create AI-powered cyber forensic tools that can be used by law enforcement, the government, and intelligence agencies. The Indian government has hired Innefu to analyse data from intelligence organizations to identify threat patterns and predict future events using their latest product called Prophecy.

Risk Analysis As stated in a report from the Défense Research and Development Organization (DRDO), AI is being utilized in risk-terrain analysis in these ways:

1. Military Geospatial Information System: This helps in making terrain trafficability maps (often called Going Maps or GMs) based on five main layers, which include soil, slope, moisture, land use, and landform. The maps are created in a three-tier structure once they have been merged.
2. Terrain Feature Extraction System: This system allows for the classification of land uses by training a multilayer perceptron and then producing different themes afterward.
3. Terrain Reasoner System: This helps decision-makers to develop alternative paths for accomplishing a set mission,
4. Terrain-Matching Systems: These are smart tools that involve complex case-based reasoning combined into one cohesive system.

Intelligent Weapon System - A modified Pilotless Target Aircraft (PTA) Lakshya-II that had been effectively tested multiple times, as confirmed by DRDO in February 2018, became India's first "armed drone." According to DRDO, it has completed 9 successful flights with an accuracy of 20 meters.

Challenges in Incorporation of Artificial Intelligence in India

India's social, economic, and regulatory situations create specific challenges that should be recognized and considered when creating policies and using technology, despite the country's wonderful potential for the growth of artificial intelligence in governance.

Improved skills and better knowledge of new technologies To successfully use AI-based solutions, the government needs to boost its capabilities. This also needs more openness to, knowledge of, and capability with information technologies—qualities that those responsible for putting the solution into action, such as teachers, police officers, or government workers, may not possess. Since the creation of AI-driven solutions for governance is mainly sought through partnerships with the private sector, much of this skill-building may need to come from there.

Infrastructure- Our study shows that the necessary infrastructure has not yet been established for the effective and coordinated use of AI-driven solutions. To create algorithmic models that accurately reflect the variety of social and economic situations in India that would need to be used in predictive policing, the inputs available as training data in law enforcement are not diverse or coherent enough. Infrastructure issues in education include a lack of internet access and availability of IoT devices. As of 2016, only 31% of people in India had internet access. Among 444 million people, 269 million in urban areas use the internet (60% of the population), while only 163 million in rural areas use it (17% of the population, based on the 2011 census). The then defence minister Nirmala Sitharaman pointed out that the lack of a strong technology infrastructure is a key obstacle to using AI in this field.

Trust -Real concerns about possible cultural unease come from each society that has adapted to using traditional tools instead of algorithmic models, especially intelligent models, across various sectors. Local police officers and educators have received training and hands-on experience using methods that are not linked to AI or knowledge from it. In many cases, their training and experience don't even include using ICTs.

Legal and Ethical Challenges

The variety of regulatory issues is broad, just as the possible applications of AI are across different sectors. We need to consider the specific challenges related to each sector and the different uses of the technology when creating rules for AI because there is no "one size fits all" solution. Therefore, even though we have categorized ethical and legal matters under general topics, how each matter is applied differs from sector to sector. For example, in predictive policing, due process might relate to "reasonable suspicion," while in autonomous weapons systems, it could involve ignoring the requirements of International Humanitarian Law (IHL), which applies during armed conflicts. Accountability is the final aspect of governance that we need to focus on.

All basic rights, including the needs for substantial and procedural due process outlined in Article 21, the right to equality in Article 14, and the freedom of speech and expression in Article 19, as well as legal rights like the right to information, come into play whenever a government agency performs a "public function." The legal discussion about how basic rights apply to private individuals is, at most, divided. Thus, the level of responsibility, accountability, oversight, and liability taken on by private companies using AI in industrial or healthcare fields might be less than the constitutional standards for due process or transparency.

Privacy and Security - Every application of artificial intelligence brings up the issue of privacy and security regarding data collection and usage. Since AI can be used in numerous situations that affect how people find information online, it may have serious negative impacts on the right to free speech. The widespread nature of AI systems and their ability to monitor behaviour could cause a "chilling effect" on the right to free speech. This could lead to self-censorship and changes in behaviour in public places. Video surveillance, facial recognition, and sentiment analysis techniques limit freedom of speech while also infringing on the right to privacy.

The reliance on algorithms in law enforcement and defence stems from the gathering and storage of large amounts of information about the victim, suspect, criminal, and other factors relating to each crime, along with the creation of records. This data can be collected through traditional means, such as compiling criminal records, or via more visible surveillance techniques, including the use of body cameras. It is widely accepted that ongoing mass surveillance and the collection of public behaviour may result in changed behaviour and can be used to suppress opposition or shift the power dynamic between the state and individuals. It is crucial that data collection is conducted according to Indian privacy laws, including surveillance, and using the least intrusive methods possible.

The privacy and monitoring system also need to be current and align with worldwide human rights standards. According to Article 17 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR), which India has acknowledged and signed, personal details are safeguarded from "illegal" and "random" intrusions. According to the UN High Commissioner's Report, a law allowing a monitoring action must

1. be publicly available;
2. aim for legitimate objectives;
3. clearly define the limits of this interference; and
4. provide suitable compensation if the law is misused.

The "nature of that right" must never be undermined by any rule that infringes upon the Right to Privacy.

In various decisions, the US Supreme Court pointed out that the Fourth Amendment does not protect physical characteristics, movements, or public behaviours. The Supreme Court decided in United States v. Knotts that tracking a suspect with an electronic beeper was not considered a Fourth Amendment search. However, modern monitoring abilities exceed what many police officers working together could do in the past. Five justices decided in United States v. Jones (related to tracking a single suspect for twenty-eight days) that extended monitoring of a person's public actions might be seen as a Fourth Amendment search.

This reasoning is based on the "mosaic theory" of privacy, which argues that although each individual data point might not have constitutional protection, the Fourth Amendment's promise of privacy is endangered by the gathering of different data sets. India needs to consider how the mix of various data sets, new collection techniques, and new data types may affect the right to privacy as it starts to look at monitoring issues regarding data collection practices that are essential for the use of artificial intelligence.

Liability

All citizens of India must have their basic rights respected by the government. Whether the developer or person in charge of the solution is a government worker, as long as the government has been involved in the development or use of the solution, it should be examined according to the full range of basic rights listed in Part I.426 This is because whenever a government allows an action that is "financially, functionally, or administratively" overseen by them, it can be held responsible for that action as stated in Part III of the Indian Constitution.

Responsibility, Supervision and Assessment

The algorithmic "black box" that takes inputs and gives useful outputs is an important part of artificial intelligence. In many ways, the many possible uses of algorithms in governing could lead to what Frank Pasquale calls a "Black Box Society," where daily life is shaped by unclear (or "black-boxed") algorithms. When the "values and priorities that the coded rules apply are hidden within black boxes," it becomes hard to ensure responsibility.

Creating effective responsibility and assessment standards, however, remains challenging due to the metaphorical "black box" that changes inputs into measurable outputs. This might not be a suitable example of the algorithm's success. For instance, PredPol's success is often linked to the fact that police have discovered more crimes in the areas the algorithm marks as "high risk."

This assessment, however, overlooks the truth that more crimes are located in specific areas because more police are present there. Moreover, when AI is used for decision-making, so that the individual impacted by the technology is always informed about how it is being used to make decisions that could affect their daily lives.

Transparency- Lessons can be learned about sharing information from the Loomis case in the US, where the Court recognized four key transparency needs:

1. The inputs themselves;
2. How the algorithm assesses these inputs;
3. Whether combinations of certain factors, like race, gender, or financial status, might be used as variables; and
4. The basic assumptions made by the computer scientists who designed the algorithms.

The courts in India have not yet set a clear set of rules for sentencing, allowing the judge wide leeway in the case, which makes the problem worse. If algorithms were to be used, this could lead to the inclusion of many unrelated factors that could unfairly affect the defendant. Therefore, before using algorithms for sentencing, there are various calls for creating a consistent sentencing policy to ensure that the decision-making input into the algorithm.

Redress

Everyone affected by a decision made by or for the government should have the right to contest it in court based on constitutional rules. Using AI to make choices can lead to problems in two main ways. First, the way inputs are changed into outputs is often "black-boxed," meaning that even the creator of the algorithm might not fully understand how it reached a specific result. Second, although the government is ultimately responsible, it is still not clear what a private sector developer is expected to do. It is uncertain how courts and legal standards will address issues of accountability, responsibility, and redress to ensure that government actions are not used to minimize or overlook harm, considering the potential complexity of partnerships between the public and private sectors, and the chance that they may private businesses will hold most of the information about how the technology works, and there is a shortage of legal examples regarding the rules of AI.

Bias and Discrimination

According to both international human rights law and the Indian Constitution, there are two possible ways that discrimination can happen. Every state must protect the life and freedom of its citizens because this is essential for maintaining the rule of law, as per Indian legal tradition. There should be no discrimination based on beliefs, political views, caste, religion, or creed.

A person faces direct discrimination when they are treated worse than another person in a similar situation based on one of the prohibited criteria in the relevant Convention. An indirect form of discrimination occurs when a policy, rule, or requirement seems to be "neutral" at first glance but negatively impacts the groups that need protection from one of the illegal bases for discrimination. The Delhi High Court clearly embraced this concept in the case of

Madhu Kanwar v. Northern Railway, even though constitutional courts worldwide have recognized it positively.

When using AI in governance, it is crucial to be aware of developing supposedly neutral algorithms that might indirectly discriminate against a specific group because these algorithms categorize, or sort people based on characteristics that may not accurately reflect the group. This awareness is particularly important in a diverse country like India, where discrimination and mistreatment often arise from differences in identity.

Due Process of Law

In 2016, the Wisconsin Supreme Court investigated whether it was acceptable to use risk assessment tools like COMPAS during sentencing. Eric Loomis, who was found driving the getaway car in a drive-by shooting, was classified as high risk for reoffending by the COMPAS system. His score may have been negatively affected by his status as a registered sex offender. While the Court acknowledged some limits on the use of COMPAS for sentencing, it did not rule that these limits infringed upon constitutional due process rights.

Loomis argued that the program breached the due process clause of the constitution for three main reasons.

1. Accuracy- The private nature of the program kept him from accessing his scores, which violated his right to a fair trial based on accurate information. The Court noted that he was able to check the algorithm's correctness because it was created using information from a survey he completed and from public records.
2. Personalized Sentencing: By taking traits from larger groups, it compromised his right to a customized sentence. The Court agreed that this due process argument would be valid if these inferred traits were the only factors considered when deciding the sentence.
3. Gender Bias: Flawed gender-based judgments were used by the software to decide the length of the sentences. The Court disagreed, stating that if using gender improved accuracy, it was favourable to both the defendant and the institutions, rather than serving a biased aim.

The ideas brought up in the case highlight important ethical concerns regarding the use of algorithms in the risk assessment process, even though they were specifically related to applying artificial intelligence in sentencing. The principles of natural justice must be upheld according to Indian legal traditions to achieve the most just outcomes. The Indian Constitution does not specifically mention "due process of law" in its text. However, it can be inferred through a creative interpretation of Article 21, which is what the courts have tried to do. Since the concept of non-arbitrariness discussed in E.P. Royappa v. UOI has been integrated into the Constitution, it is widely recognized that Maneka Gandhi v. UOI established due process within the legal framework. According to the Court, no law could set a procedure for taking away life and personal freedom under Article 21; instead, the process had to be one that is not arbitrary, unfair, or unreasonable.

The 'innocent until proven guilty' rule in law enforcement can result in some guilty individuals not facing consequences. Still, it shows the fundamental belief of the creators of our Constitution that letting go of someone who might have committed a crime due to insufficient proof poses less risk to our community and our constitutional system than wrongfully convicting an innocent person or making them stay in prison for too long. In many ways, a judge's personal views have been used to determine what is fair. However, integrating Indian ideas of fairness into computer programs and adjusting them for different cases is not simple. This is especially true since computer programs are often designed to prioritize supposed efficiency over fairness.

The challenge is to make sure that the possible efficiency of machine learning in the criminal justice system does not compromise human judgment in upholding procedural fairness. In predictive policing, "due process" might relate to concerns about "reasonable suspicion," whereas it refers to a breach of international humanitarian law in the case of autonomous weapons systems.

The group making administrative decisions is obligated to use judgment to assess each choice against the rules to which they must comply and the standards they are obligated to maintain. This duty also includes a responsibility to avoid improperly restricting one's ability to use discretion. The decision-maker should be willing to listen to the opinions of various stakeholders and consider their suggestions. Similar issues may arise regarding the use of AI in education. It is vital that the teacher keeps discretion throughout their interactions with each student and does not replace the emotional bond between a student and teacher. Through the idea of reasonableness or "feasibility" in international humanitarian law, the basic requirement in domestic administrative systems has been integrated into the idea of international law.

Another important part of the obligation to use discretion is the chance to allow for changes in one's policies. Therefore, in the case of fully autonomous weapons systems, a state may violate the need to use judgment on a case-by-case basis if it tries to determine what would be "acceptable" usage in all situations and to model actions on this strict guideline. Two primary reasons explain why it is correct and fair to uphold the duty to exercise discretion freely. The first is grounded in the rights of the individuals affected in each specific situation. The second reason comes from the understanding that sound executive decisions cannot be rigid in a constantly changing environment. It is the foundation of the trust in any administrative relationship and the basis of the reciprocal relationship between parties engaged in acts of warfare.

Suggestions and Conclusion

In conclusion, the integration of artificial intelligence (AI) into governance in India presents both significant opportunities and formidable challenges. As the nation seeks to enhance efficiency, effectiveness, and responsiveness in public administration, AI technologies offer innovative solutions across various sectors, including law enforcement, education, and defence. However, the journey towards successful implementation is fraught with obstacles that must be navigated carefully.

AI systems are increasingly being used in judicial decision-making, particularly in the areas of risk assessment and sentencing. These systems use complex algorithms to analyse data and make predictions about the likelihood of recidivism or other outcomes. However, there are concerns about the potential biases in these systems, which could lead to discriminatory outcomes.

One of the key challenges in the use of AI in judicial adjudication is the problem of automation bias. This refers to the tendency of humans to trust the decisions made by machines, even when they are flawed. This can lead to a lack of critical thinking and a failure to scrutinize the decisions made by AI systems.

To address these concerns, it is essential to ensure that AI systems are transparent and accountable. This can be achieved through the development of explainable AI systems that provide clear and transparent decision-making processes. Additionally, there is a need for greater oversight and regulation of AI systems to ensure that they are fair and unbiased.

The integration of AI in judicial adjudication has the potential to revolutionize the judicial process, but it also raises important ethical and legal concerns.

The disparities in technical capabilities among states, reliance on private sector partnerships, and the lessons learned from international experiences underscore the need for a tailored approach that considers India's unique socio-economic landscape. The challenges of inadequate infrastructure, trust issues, and the necessity for skill development further complicate the rollout of AI solutions. Moreover, legal and ethical concerns, particularly regarding privacy, accountability, bias, and due process, must be addressed to ensure that the deployment of AI technologies aligns with constitutional values and human rights.

As India moves forward in its AI governance journey, it is imperative to foster a collaborative environment among government agencies, private sector developers, and civil society. Establishing clear regulatory frameworks, promoting transparency, and ensuring that ethical considerations are at the forefront of AI applications will be crucial for building public trust and achieving sustainable outcomes. By learning from global best practices while remaining cognizant of local contexts, India can harness the transformative potential of AI to create a more just, equitable, and effective governance framework that benefits all citizens.

References

1. Javed, K., & Li, J. (2024). Artificial intelligence in judicial adjudication: Semantic biasness classification and identification in legal judgement (SBCILJ). *Heliyon*, *10*(9).
2. Martinho, A. (2025). Surveying Judges about artificial intelligence: profession, judicial adjudication, and legal principles. *AI & SOCIETY*, *40*(2), 569-584.
3. Xu, Z. (2022). Human judges in the era of artificial intelligence: challenges and opportunities. *Applied Artificial Intelligence*, *36*(1), 2013652.
4. Sourdin, T. (2018). Judge v Robot? Artificial intelligence and judicial decision-making. *University of New South Wales Law Journal, The*, *41*(4), 1114-1133.
5. Liu, Y., & Zhong, Y. (2021, October). On the Application of Artificial Intelligence Technology in the Field of Judicial Adjudication. In *2021 3rd International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Advanced Manufacture* (pp. 1029-1032).
6. Khokhar, M. A., Anees, A., & Gujjar, M. W. (2025). From Judges to Algorithms: The Future of Corporate Adjudication in AI-Driven Courts. *The Critical Review of Social Sciences Studies*, *3*(2), 1794-1811.
7. Coglianese, C., & Dor, L. M. B. (2020). AI in Adjudication and Administration. *Brook. L. Rev.*, *86*, 791.
8. Cortez, E. K., & Maslej, N. (2023). Adjudication of artificial intelligence and automated decision-making cases in Europe and the USA. *European Journal of Risk Regulation*, *14*(3), 457-475.
9. Zhang, R. (2022, December). The application and regulation of artificial intelligence technology in judicial adjudication. In *Proceedings of the 2022 International Conference on Artificial Intelligence, Internet and Digital Economy (ICAID 2022)* (Vol. 7, p. 349). Springer Nature.
10. Aini, G. (2020). A summary of the research on the judicial application of artificial intelligence. *Chinese Studies*, *9*(01), 14.
11. Huan, X. (2025). The Influence of Artificial Intelligence's Participation in Judicial Adjudication on the Application of Law and Its Normative Path——From the Perspective of Digital Court Construction. *Journal of Sociology and Education*, *1*(3).
12. Assaf, F. (2019). A brief meditation on artificial intelligence, adjudication and the judiciary. *Bar News: The Journal of the NSW Bar Association*, (Summer 2019), 10-12.
13. S. Goudarzi, and N. Khaniejo, "The Centre for Internet and Society AI and Governance" *Springer,* March 18, 2018, *available at* <https://cis-india.org/internet-governance/files/ai-in-governance.> (last visited on Jan. 15th, 2020).
14. [1] C. Malek, "Robocops and predicting crime: Dubai Police plan an artificial intelligence future" *Springer,* 24th Jan 2018, *available at* <https://www.thenational.ae/uae/robocops-and-predicting crimedubai- police-plan-an-artificial-intelligence-future-1.698034> (last visited on April 14th, 2020).
15. S. Das, "How predictive analytics helps Indian police fight crime" *IILS,* 24th March 2018, *available at* <http://www.computerworld.in/feature/how-predictive-analytics-helps-indian-police-fight-crime.> (last visited on Jan. 15th, 2020)
16. Ministry of Home Affairs, "National Workshop on Crime Data Analytics" available at <http://pib.nic.in/newsite/ PrintRelease.aspx?relid=161769.> (last visited on Jan. 18th, 2020) Press Information Bureau, Special Service and Features, "CCTNS Digital Police Portal launched to fast-track Criminal Justice System in the Country", Oct. 6 2017, available at<http://pib.nic.in/newsite/printrelease.aspx?relid=171422.> (last visited on March 21st 2020).
17. Indo-Asian News Service, "Alwar Police Is Using An AI Programme To Register Criminal

Offences"May302017,availableat <https://www.firstpost.com/tech/news-analysis/alwar-police isusing- an-ai-programme-to-register-criminal-offences-3703601.html.> (last visited on March 19th, 2020).

18. [1] K.P Singh, "Preventing crime before it happens: How data is helping Delhi Police." *Hindustan Times,* Jan. 18th, 2017, *available at* <https://www.hindustantimes.com/delhi-news/delhi-police-is-usingprecrimedata-analysis-to-send-its-men-to-likely-trouble-spots/storyhZcCRyWMVoNSsRhnBNgOHI.html.>(last visited on June 23rd, 2021)
19. A.Y Halevy, N. Ashish, D. Bittonand M. Carey, "Enterprise information integration: successes, challenges and controversies", *ACM SIGMOD international conference on Management of data*, pp. 778-787, June 2005.
20. R. Shekhar, "Predictive policing to nail criminal minds", *Times of India,*19thJune2016,*availableat*<https://timesofindia.indiatimes .com/city/delhi/Predictive-policing-to-nail-criminal-minds/ articleshow/52824404.cms.> (last visited on April 17 th 2020)
21. S. Moorthy, "HTC Global sets sights on education space" *Hindu Businessline,*December10th2018,*availableat*<https://www.thehi ndubusinessline.com/info-tech/htc-global-sets-sights-on-educationspace/ article9989540.ece.> (last visited on December 15th 2020).
22. [1]A.P. Chowdhury, "AI and robotics is revolutionizing Defense sector, Indian Army takes credence" *Analytics India,*17th April 2017, availableat<https://analyticsindiamag.com/ai-roboticsrevolutionizing-defencesector-Indian-army-takes-credence/.> (last visited on May 1st, 2021).
23. M.J. Philomina, & S. Amutha, "Information and communication technology awareness among teacher educators" 6 *International Journal of Information and Education Technology*, 603 (2018).
24. G. Bhatia, "Horizontality under the Indian Constitution: A Schema." *Wordpress,* 11th Sept 2015, *availableat*<https://indconlawphil.wordpress.com/2015/05/24/horizontality-under-the-indian constitution-aschema/.> (last visited at March 21st, 2020).
25. J. Tashea, "Courts Are Using AI to Sentence Criminals. That Must Stop Now" Wired, 12th April 2017, available at <https://www.wired.com/2017/04/courts-using-ai-sentence-criminals-must-stopnow/.>(last visited on April 15th 2020).
26. Dalmia Cement (Bharat)Ltd v UOI (1996) 10 SCC 104.

HOW TO CITE THIS ARTICLE: Shivani. (2025). Artificial Intelligence in Judicial Adjudication. Sudarshan Research Journal, 3(6), 9–17. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.16791590.