# ETHICAL AND LEGAL IMPLICATIONS OF AI JUDGES: BALANCING EFFICIENCY AND THE RIGHT TO FAIR TRIAL

**NAME: ABHIJITH BALAKRISHNAN**

**PROGRAMME: LAW AND TECHNOLOGY IN EUROPE**

**STUDENT NO.: 4953427**

**TOTAL WORD COUNT: 17,447**

**SUPERVISOR: MAJA SAHADŽIĆ**

**SECOND READER: HALEFOM ABRAHA**

**DATE OF SUBMISSION: 28TH JUNE, 2024**

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

## 1. <u>INTRODUCTION</u>

The integration of artificial intelligence (AI) technology into various sectors, including the legal domain, has sparked considerable interest and debate. As AI systems become increasingly prevalent in judicial decision-making processes, there arises a pressing need to examine the multifaceted legal implications of deploying AI judges within judicial systems. This thesis aims to address this imperative by conducting a comprehensive analysis of the legal ramifications surrounding the integration of AI judges, with a focus on upholding principles of justice, fairness, and the rule of law.

The deployment of AI judges represents a paradigm shift in legal proceedings, challenging established notions of judicial impartiality and independence.[1] While AI systems offer potential efficiency gains and consistency in decision-making, they also raise fundamental questions about due process, accountability, and transparency within the legal system.[2] Traditional legal frameworks, grounded in principles of human agency and accountability, may encounter difficulties in adapting to the opacity inherent in many AI algorithms, thereby undermining the rule of law.[3]

The thesis begins by examining the social problem arising from the integration of AI judges into judicial systems. While AI promises efficiency gains and consistency in decision-making, it also raises concerns about fairness, accountability, and transparency.[4] The use of AI judges has the potential to perpetuate biases present in training data, undermine the legitimacy of legal decisions, and challenge established principles of judicial independence and impartiality.[5] Additionally, the lack of transparency in AI decision-making processes complicates public understanding and acceptance, raising questions about the integrity of the legal system.[6]

---

[1] Sonia K Katyal, 'Democracy & Distrust in an Era of Artificial Intelligence' (2022) 151 Daedalus 322 <https://www.jstor.org/stable/48662045> accessed 27 November 2023.
[2] Rebecca Crootof, '"Cyborg Justice" and the Risk of Technological–Legal Lock-In' (2019) 119 Columbia Law Review 233 <https://www.jstor.org/stable/26960742> accessed 27 November 2023.
[3] Aleš Završnik, 'Criminal Justice, Artificial Intelligence Systems, and Human Rights' (2020) 20 ERA Forum 567 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12027-020-00602-0>.
[4] Ashley Deeks, 'The Judicial Demand for Explainable Artificial Intelligence' (2019) 119 Columbia Law Review 1829 <https://www.jstor.org/stable/26810851> accessed 25 April 2024.
[5] Julia Angwin Mattu Jeff Larson,Lauren Kirchner,Surya, 'Machine Bias' (*ProPublica*) <https://www.propublica.org/article/machine-bias-risk-assessments-in-criminal-sentencing> accessed 28 January 2024.
[6] ibid.

Next, we delve into two significant case laws: the SyRI case and the Loomis case, where the application of algorithms was legally contested. We will examine the ramifications of these cases, their contributions to the regulation of AI-driven judicial decision-making systems, and the crucial insights they offer. Specifically, we will explore how these cases influence the legal landscape and provide guidance on managing and implementing AI in the judicial system.Moving forward, we will explore the relevant legislation and guidelines that govern AI systems within the European Union, focusing on the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR), the Artificial Intelligence Act (AI Act), and the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR). We will delve into each of these frameworks to understand how they establish legal standards and protections for the development and deployment of AI technologies. Specifically, we will analyse how the ECHR ensures the protection of fundamental human rights in the context of AI, how the AI Act sets out comprehensive rules for AI system compliance and oversight, and how the GDPR addresses data privacy and security concerns related to AI usage. Through this examination, we will gain a comprehensive understanding of the regulatory landscape for AI in the EU.

The following chapter is dedicated to assessing the adequacy of the existing legal framework in addressing potential issues stemming from the implementation of AI-based judicial decision-making, as highlighted by the aforementioned case laws. The objective of this analysis is to evaluate whether AI systems can be incorporated into judicial decision-making processes without undermining the rule of law and to ascertain if our current legal regime is capable of supporting such integration.

In the concluding chapter, we explore various strategies for the safe incorporation of AI into judicial decision-making. This includes utilising AI as a tool to assist judges in legal research and implementing explainable AI systems that provide transparency in their decision-making processes. The focus will be on identifying practical and secure methods to leverage AI in the judiciary while ensuring adherence to legal principles and maintaining public trust.

A review of existing literature highlights the need for a comprehensive examination of the legal implications of deploying AI judges. While scholars have discussed theoretical

aspects and ethical considerations,[7] the legal ramifications and practicality of AI judges remain under explored. Existing literature often overlooks crucial questions surrounding due process, accountability, and the nature of legal decision-making in the context of AI judges. By prioritising technical capabilities over legal and ethical considerations, scholars risk neglecting fundamental principles of justice and fairness.

Building on the identified gap in scholarship, this thesis formulates a research objective aimed at addressing the legal implications of deploying AI judges and try to find practical solutions for the use of AI in judicial design making. Through doctrinal analysis, the thesis seeks to provide a comprehensive understanding of the challenges and opportunities associated with AI judges. Doctrinal analysis will involve examining existing legal frameworks and scholarly literature to identify relevant legal principles and concepts.

The thesis adopts a perspective that prioritises the protection of fundamental rights, the rule of law, and principles of justice and fairness. By evaluating the impact of AI judges through this lens, the thesis aims to contribute to informed policy-making and decision-making in the legal domain. Ultimately, the thesis seeks to address the complex legal and ethical questions raised by the deployment of AI judges, the readiness of the current EU legal regime, what are the possible risks that we need to watch out for and thus, ensuring that AI technologies are deployed responsibly and ethically within the legal system.

---

[7] Francesca Rossi, 'Building Trust in Artificial Intelligence' (2018) 72 Journal of International Affairs 127 <https://www.jstor.org/stable/26588348> accessed 25 April 2024.

## 2.  <u>LEGAL IMPLICATIONS OF USING AN AI JUDGE</u>

Artificial Intelligence (AI) is a field focused on creating machines capable of performing tasks that typically require human intelligence. It encompasses two main research areas: one based on rules, logic, and symbols, providing explainable solutions but limited to scenarios with foreseeable outcomes, and the other based on examples, data analysis, and correlation, suitable for addressing ill-defined problems but requiring vast amounts of data and offering less explainability with a small margin of error. These approaches are increasingly merged to maximize their benefits and minimize their drawbacks. Recent advancements in AI, driven by improved algorithms, increased computing power, and abundant data, have led to successful applications in various domains, such as speech-to-text, image interpretation, and more, enabling AI systems to tackle real-life scenarios with uncertainty. Despite the current proliferation of consumer-oriented AI applications, the true potential of AI, known as enterprise AI, lies in augmenting human capabilities and facilitating informed decision-making across diverse professional fields, including healthcare, education, finance, and others, by leveraging vast amounts of data. The synergy between AI and human intelligence yields optimal results, with enterprise AI offering decision-support systems to professionals navigating complex data-driven decisions.[8]

In the implementation of AI judges, a multitude of legal factors come under scrutiny, each playing a pivotal role in ensuring the integrity and fairness of judicial processes. Transparency emerges as a cornerstone, as the opacity of AI decision-making algorithms challenges the traditional notion of open justice and public scrutiny. Concurrently, accountability becomes a pressing concern, as the attribution of responsibility for AI-generated decisions becomes blurred, potentially undermining the accountability mechanisms inherent in the rule of law. Moreover, the spectre of bias looms large, with the risk of AI systems perpetuating and even exacerbating existing societal prejudices, thereby compromising the principle of equal justice under the law. These developments raise profound questions about the compatibility of AI judges with democratic principles, the right to a fair trial, and the broader legal framework governing judicial proceedings. As such, a comprehensive examination of these legal

---

[8] Francesca Rossi, 'Building Trust in Artificial Intelligence' (2018) 72 Journal of International Affairs 127 <https://www.jstor.org/stable/26588348> accessed 25 April 2024.

factors is essential to ensure that the implementation of AI judges upholds fundamental rights, strengthens the rule of law, and preserves the integrity of the legal system.

## a. <u>Transparency and Trust</u>

As Artificial Intelligence (AI) becomes increasingly integrated into our daily lives, concerns surrounding its fairness, alignment with human values, and transparency in decision-making have come to the forefront. The ability of AI to make significant decisions and its reliance on vast amounts of data raise questions about how data is handled and the potential for discriminatory outcomes. Issues such as the opaque nature of some AI approaches, the possibility of biased decisions, and the accountability for undesirable results further compound these concerns. Without addressing these questions, widespread trust in AI adoption and utilisation remains elusive. Despite the recognition of AI's potential benefits by enterprises, many still harbour fears regarding liability issues and lack the necessary skills to harness AI's capabilities fully.[9]

In response to these challenges, various high-level principles for AI governance have emerged, emphasising the importance of trust and transparency. IBM, among others, advocates for AI systems that augment human intelligence rather than replace it, highlighting the centrality of trust in fostering adoption. Transparency in data policies and decision-making processes is deemed essential for building trust and ensuring accountability in AI governance. By adhering to principles that prioritise transparency, AI developers and policymakers can mitigate concerns about fairness, bias, and accountability, thereby fostering greater trust in AI systems among users and stakeholders. Ultimately, transparency serves as a cornerstone of responsible AI governance, enabling the realisation of AI's potential benefits while upholding ethical and societal values.[10]

Since the late 2010s, there has been a notable increase in efforts to address ethical and governance challenges related to the use of AI in the public sector. In the UK, a comprehensive framework based on principles of fairness, accountability, trustworthiness, and transparency has gained traction and was even applied during the COVID-19 crisis. Policymakers are increasingly rallying around such frameworks, and ethics researchers are developing tools to operationalise these principles in practice.

---

[9] ibid.
[10] ibid.

This progress in the public sector may outpace that of the private sector, as there is a greater willingness to adopt less cutting-edge models to enhance transparency and explainability, particularly in high-stakes decision-making or regulated sectors. These frameworks have the potential to establish a public ethos for AI, embedding societal values into technological systems that have become integral to government administration. By prioritising fairness, accountability, and transparency, public sector AI can foster trust and mitigate the tendency for blame-shifting observed in various contexts, ultimately enhancing public acceptance of AI technologies.[11]

Den Bosch emphasises the critical role of trust in human-machine interactions, particularly in the context of AI governance. Trust is defined as assured reliance on the character, ability, strength, or truth of someone or something. Prudent trust is highlighted as a competitive advantage that enhances the efficiency and effectiveness of teams and organisations. Trust exists at multiple levels, including between individual humans, between humans and computer automation, and even between different cultures. In human-machine interactions, trust is influenced by various factors such as integrity, intent, abilities, and results of the trustee. The trustor's propensity to trust is shaped by their biases, beliefs, and experiences. High trust leads to faster decision-making and lower costs, while low trust breeds suspicion and negative effects. The author stresses the importance of striking a balance between absolute trust, which may lead to complacency, and no trust, which hinders opportunities and invites exploitation.[12]

In the realm of AI governance, trust is essential for the responsible deployment and utilisation of AI technologies. People are more likely to trust automation when they have confidence in its ability to perform tasks effectively and when they feel they can control the machine system. However, trust barriers can arise due to differences in input processing and outputs between humans and machines, as well as cognitive disparities and resentment as machines learn and retain information faster and better than human counterparts. Therefore, fostering trust in AI governance is crucial for ensuring the acceptance, effectiveness, and ethical use of AI technologies. Transparent processes,

---

[11] Helen Margetts, 'Rethinking AI for Good Governance' (2022) 151 Daedalus 360 <https://www.jstor.org/stable/48662048> accessed 25 April 2024.

[12] Eric Van Den Bosch and others, 'Human-Machine Decision-Making and Trust' (Strategic Studies Institute, US Army War College 2017) <https://www.jstor.org/stable/resrep12117.14> accessed 25 April 2024.

clear accountability mechanisms, and a commitment to fairness and integrity are essential for building and maintaining trust in AI systems. Without trust, the full potential of AI capabilities may not be realised, and challenges in adoption and implementation may persist. Hence, trust-building efforts should be integral to AI governance frameworks to foster collaboration, innovation, and societal benefit.[13]

### b. <u>Bias</u>

The utilisation of AI in judicial decision-making poses a notable risk, particularly concerning the potential for bias. A prominent example of this concern surfaced when ProPublica released startling revelations regarding the COMPAS algorithm.[14] It was revealed that the algorithm exhibited racial bias, disproportionately impacting the African American community. This revelation underscored the inherent dangers of relying on AI systems in legal contexts, as they have the capacity to perpetuate and even amplify existing biases within society. Such instances highlight the critical importance of implementing robust safeguards and oversight mechanisms to mitigate the risk of bias in AI-driven judicial processes. Additionally, it emphasises the need for continuous scrutiny and evaluation of AI systems to ensure fairness, transparency, and accountability in legal decision-making.

The case of the COMPAS algorithm developed by Northpointe serves as a poignant example of the potential harm AI systems can inflict on society, outweighing their purported benefits. The notion that computers could accurately predict the likelihood of defendants committing future crimes appears promising in theory, promising a fairer and more discerning criminal justice system. However, the crucial caveat lies in ensuring the accuracy of these predictions. A single miscalculation can have dire consequences: on one hand, a dangerous criminal might evade incarceration, posing a threat to public safety, while on the other hand, an individual could unjustly face harsher sentencing or prolonged parole.

The real-life implications of flawed AI assessments became evident in the case of Paul Zilly, whose sentencing hearing in Barron County, Wisconsin, unfolded against the backdrop of his COMPAS scores. Convicted of a relatively minor offense involving the

---

[13] ibid.
[14] Julia Angwin Mattu Jeff Larson,Lauren Kirchner,Surya, 'Machine Bias' (*ProPublica*) <https://www.propublica.org/article/machine-bias-risk-assessments-in-criminal-sentencing> accessed 28 January 2024.

theft of a lawnmower and tools, Zilly found himself at the mercy of Northpointe's software, which deemed him a high risk for future violent crime and a medium risk for general recidivism. Despite the prosecution's recommendation of a year in county jail and supervised support for rehabilitation, Judge James Babler's reliance on Zilly's AI-generated risk assessment led to a drastic departure from the agreed plea deal. Overturning the proposed sentence, Babler imposed a two-year term in state prison followed by three years of supervision, significantly altering Zilly's fate based on algorithmic predictions.[15]

The exponential growth of data in recent years, with 90% of the world's data being generated in just the last two years, underscores the prevalence of big data. However, the rapid velocity of data collection often results in incomplete, unstructured, and messy datasets originating from various unstandardised sources. While aggregated big data offers valuable insights and opportunities for analytics, datasets used in decision-making are frequently plagued by incompleteness, bias, or lack of context, rendering them susceptible to misleading conclusions. Manual cleansing of extremely large datasets is impractical, necessitating automated processes such as merging databases, verifying information, and standardising structures. Careful attention is required during this process, as oversights could fundamentally alter the nature and interpretation of the data. Statistical outliers, initially deemed errors, may actually provide valuable insights, while data points may lose context or remain incomplete, resulting in a lack of true accuracy in raw data representation.[16]

AI is often employed to streamline time-consuming, routine tasks that are low-risk for bias and unlikely to significantly alter outcomes. However, as AI is increasingly used to tackle complex problems, the risk of bias escalates. Translating multifaceted issues into standardised solutions oversimplifies the unpredictable nature of these problems. Neera Jain, a Purdue professor, points out that humans excel at recognising nuances that automation cannot capture. This underscores a significant gap in AI's ability to make complex decisions that traditionally rely on context-specific considerations. Creating a fair AI model for assessing individuals uniformly is challenging. The

[15] ibid.
[16] Ruby Isley, 'Algorithmic Bias and Its Implications: How to Maintain Ethics through AI Governance' [2022] N.Y.U. American Public Policy Review <https://nyuappr.pubpub.org/pub/61cuny79/release/2> accessed 16 May 2024.

selection of factors deemed significant by developers can drastically affect outcomes. Incomplete data and unforeseen variables complicate predictions, and biases often become evident only after deployment. Addressing these biases retroactively is necessary but complex. There is no universal standard for fairness, and biases can vary significantly across individuals and contexts. Fixing discrimination in AI is an ongoing process, akin to addressing discrimination in society at large.[17]

### c. <u>Accountability</u>

Another critical factor influenced by the implementation of AI in judicial decision-making is accountability. AI systems, by their nature, can obscure the chain of responsibility in legal outcomes, complicating the identification of who is ultimately accountable for decisions. When a judge relies on an AI-generated risk assessment or sentencing recommendation, it raises questions about whether the judge, the AI developers, or the data scientists who trained the algorithm should be held responsible for any errors or biases. This diffusion of accountability can undermine public trust in the justice system, as it becomes challenging to address and rectify wrongful decisions. Ensuring transparency in how AI decisions are made, understanding the sources of data, and maintaining human oversight are essential to preserving accountability in judicial processes and preventing a loss of confidence in the legal system.

The importance of accountability and explainability in using AI for judicial decision-making is paramount, particularly when considering the variations in legal systems across different countries. In the realm of law, explanations serve as a crucial tool for holding decision-makers accountable. This is especially evident when considering judges, who are required to provide reasoned explanations for their decisions, ensuring that higher courts can review and potentially invalidate decisions that lack sufficient reasoning. This requirement, consistent across jurisdictions such as the United States, United Kingdom, France, and Germany, underscores the role of explanations in maintaining the integrity of legal outcomes and guiding future decision-making. However, the obligation to provide explanations varies depending on the nature and impact of the decision. For instance, minor judicial decisions or highly discretionary rulings might not necessitate detailed reasoning. Similarly, in some cases, such as divorce and adoptions in France, the requirement for explanations can be waived to

---

[17] ibid

protect privacy. The case of jury decisions further complicates the issue of accountability, as juries in the United States and the United Kingdom are generally not required to explain their verdicts, a practice justified by concerns over potential biases and the need to maintain public confidence in the legal system.[18]

When it comes to AI in judicial decision-making, the need for explainability becomes even more critical. AI systems, which translate complex sociological issues into structured algorithms, must be transparent in their decision-making processes to ensure accountability. The controversy surrounding Northpointe's COMPAS algorithm highlights the risks of lacking transparency, as the algorithm was found to be racially biased against Black individuals. This example illustrates how the absence of explainability can lead to significant injustices, undermining trust in both the AI system and the judicial decisions it influences. The use of AI in judicial decision-making raises significant challenges regarding accountability and explainability. As AI systems are integrated into the legal process, ensuring that their decision-making processes are transparent and can be scrutinized becomes essential. The legal obligation to provide explanations, whether through traditional human decision-makers or AI systems, serves as a fundamental safeguard against errors and biases. Moreover, the complexity and variability in legal systems necessitate a nuanced approach to implementing AI, one that respects the existing standards for accountability and enhances the fairness and accuracy of judicial outcomes. As AI continues to evolve, maintaining rigorous standards for explainability will be crucial in preserving the integrity and trustworthiness of judicial decision-making processes.[19]

**d.  Rule of Law**

The integration of AI in judicial decision-making has a profound impact on the rule of law, marked by both promising benefits and significant risks. AI can enhance the consistency, efficiency, and speed of legal processes, potentially reducing human errors and biases, thus reinforcing principles of fairness and equality before the law. For instance, AI systems can process and analyse vast amounts of legal data quickly, aiding judges in making more informed decisions. However, these advancements come with considerable challenges that threaten to undermine the rule of law. A core issue is the

---

[18] Finale Doshi-Velez and others, 'Accountability of AI Under the Law: The Role of Explanation' (2017) abs/1711.01134 CoRR <http://arxiv.org/abs/1711.01134>.

[19] ibid.

lack of transparency and comprehensibility of AI systems. Technologies like COMPAS, used in the Loomis case, illustrate these concerns. COMPAS is proprietary software that operates as a "black box," meaning its internal workings are not accessible or understandable to judges, defendants, or even the software developers themselves. This opacity contradicts the fundamental principles of the rule of law, which require that laws be accessible and intelligible. The complexity of AI's mathematical calculations and the mutating capabilities of algorithms are beyond human cognitive comprehension, making it difficult to explain or challenge AI-generated decisions.[20]

Furthermore, the rule of law emphasises predictability and fairness, but AI systems can inadvertently introduce biases and discrimination. Data sets used to train AI models often reflect existing social biases, which can lead to discriminatory outcomes. The Loomis case highlighted concerns about racial bias, as studies showed that COMPAS disproportionately classified minority offenders as higher risk. Such biases undermine the principles of equality before the law and non-discrimination, core elements of the rule of law as emphasised by the Venice Commission. AI also poses a threat to the traditional legal protections and the balance of power within the judicial system. The presumption of innocence and the right to a fair trial are challenged when AI predicts recidivism or criminal behaviour, effectively judging individuals on potential future actions rather than proven conduct. Additionally, the use of AI by the judiciary raises questions about judicial independence. Judges may feel pressured to rely on AI-generated risk assessments, fearing to go against what is perceived as an objective, scientific tool, thus compromising their autonomy. The right to contest decisions, a cornerstone of the rule of law, is significantly weakened by the use of opaque AI systems. The complexity and proprietary nature of AI technologies hinder individuals' ability to understand, challenge, or appeal decisions made by such systems. Proposals like creating a National Register of Algorithmic Systems or incorporating contestability into the design of AI systems aim to address these issues, but the implementation of these solutions remains complex and challenging.[21]

Another concern is that automation may compromise individual due process rights. This issue arises because automated systems can limit a person's ability to influence or

---

[20] Stanley Greenstein, 'Preserving the Rule of Law in the Era of Artificial Intelligence (AI)' (2022) 30 Artificial Intelligence and Law 291 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10506-021-09294-4>.

[21] ibid.

challenge decisions that affect them. For instance, in the case of Australia's robo-debt scheme, debt notices were sent to welfare recipients without providing a clear explanation of how income variations over the year impacted welfare entitlements. This lack of transparency prevented individuals from effectively reviewing or correcting the information used against them, thereby denying them due process rights and equal treatment under the law. Another challenge is the complexity and opacity of machine learning algorithms used in automated decision-making. These systems can be so intricate that their operations are understandable only to those with high technical expertise. This complexity can lead to a lack of transparency, making it difficult for affected individuals to comprehend how decisions about them are made. Such opacity undermines the principle of accountability, as it becomes challenging for citizens and oversight bodies to hold the government accountable for decisions influenced by automated systems. Moreover, this issue is exacerbated when proprietary algorithms, like those used in the COMPAS risk assessment tool, are not disclosed, preventing any external scrutiny of the decision-making criteria.[22]

The predictability and consistency of the law are also at risk due to automation. Automated systems, especially those that rely on machine learning, can produce inconsistent outcomes because their decision-making processes evolve over time based on new data inputs. This means that two individuals in similar situations might receive different decisions at different times, violating the legal principle that similar cases should be treated alike. Additionally, the reliance on historical data to train these systems can perpetuate existing biases and inequalities, further undermining the equality before the law. The burden of proof and evidence thresholds can be unfairly altered by automated systems. In automated decision-making, such as the robo-debt case, the responsibility to prove or disprove a debt was effectively shifted from the government to the individuals. This reversal of the burden of proof not only contravenes legal norms but also places an undue and often insurmountable burden on individuals, particularly those from disadvantaged backgrounds who may lack the resources to challenge automated decisions effectively.[23]

---

[22] Monika Zalnieriute, Lyria Bennett Moses and George Williams, 'The Rule of Law and Automation of Government Decision-Making' (2019) 82 The Modern Law Review 425 <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/1468-2230.12412> accessed 21 May 2024.
[23] ibid.

## 3. <u>CASE STUDIES</u>

The SyRI and Loomis cases are significant in regulating AI-based judicial decision-making systems in the EU by highlighting the critical balance between technological advancements and fundamental human rights. The SyRI case underscored the necessity for transparency, adequate safeguards, and the proportionality of data-driven tools to protect privacy rights under Article 8 of the European Convention on Human Rights, leading to the prohibition of insufficiently transparent systems. The Loomis case, although in the U.S., resonates within the EU context by emphasizing the need for judicial discretion, transparency, and the caution against over-reliance on proprietary AI tools, ensuring that sentencing remains individualized and just. Together, these cases illustrate the imperative for robust regulatory frameworks that ensure AI tools in the judiciary are transparent, fair, and respect fundamental rights, guiding EU policymakers in the ethical integration of AI in justice systems.

### a. the SyRI Case

**Facts:**

The SyRI (System Risk Indication) system was implemented by the Dutch government to detect welfare fraud through extensive data analysis and profiling. This system involved the use of personal data from various governmental agencies, which was then analysed to identify potential fraudsters. The primary objective was to combat social benefits fraud by flagging individuals who appeared to be at risk of committing such fraud based on predefined risk models. However, the system faced criticism for its lack of transparency, inadequate safeguards for protecting personal data, and potential violations of individuals' privacy rights.[24]

A coalition of NGOs, led by the Dutch Section of the International Commission of Jurists (NJCM), filed a lawsuit against the Dutch government, arguing that SyRI infringed on the right to privacy as protected by Article 8 of the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR). The case was brought before the District Court of The Hague.[25]

---

[24] https://uitspraken.rechtspraak.nl/details?id=ECLI:NL:RBDHA:2020:1878
[25] ibid.

**Issues:**

1. Whether the SyRI system's use of extensive data analysis to detect welfare fraud constituted a violation of Article 8 of the ECHR, which guarantees the right to respect for private and family life, home, and correspondence.

2. Whether the lack of transparency and insufficient safeguards in the implementation of SyRI made it an unjustifiable interference with individuals' privacy rights.

3. Whether the Dutch government had struck the appropriate balance between the public interest in combating welfare fraud and the privacy rights of individuals.

**Rule:**

- Article 8 of the ECHR stipulates that any interference by a public authority with the exercise of the right to respect for private and family life must be justified, necessary, and proportionate. The interference must pursue a legitimate aim, be in accordance with the law, and be necessary in a democratic society.

**Application:**

The District Court of The Hague applied Article 8 of the ECHR to assess whether the SyRI system's interference with individuals' privacy rights was justified. The court found that the system's implementation lacked transparency and did not provide sufficient safeguards to protect personal data. Specifically, the court noted that the SyRI system's risk models and the criteria used to flag individuals were not disclosed, making it impossible for individuals to understand how their data was being used or to challenge incorrect or biased assessments.[26]

Furthermore, the court determined that the Dutch government had not provided adequate justification for the necessity and proportionality of the SyRI system. The benefits of detecting welfare fraud did not outweigh the significant intrusion into individuals' private lives, especially given the insufficient safeguards and lack of transparency. The court concluded that the system did not strike the right balance between the public interest and the protection of privacy rights.[27]

---

[26] Anne Meuwese, 'Regulating Algorithmic Decision-Making One Case at the Time: A Note on the Dutch "SyRI" Judgment' (2020) 1 European Review of Digital Administration & Law 209.
[27] ibid.

**Conclusion:**

The District Court of The Hague ruled that the SyRI system, in its current form, violated Article 8 of the ECHR due to its lack of transparency and insufficient safeguards for protecting personal data. The court emphasised that while combating welfare fraud is a legitimate aim, it must be pursued in a manner that respects individuals' privacy rights and ensures adequate protection of personal data. As a result, the court prohibited the further use of the SyRI system until such time as appropriate safeguards and transparency measures could be implemented.

The SyRI case profoundly influences the regulation of AI-based judicial decision-making by setting a precedent for stringent safeguards and transparency requirements in the deployment of such technologies. The District Court of The Hague's ruling emphasised that any AI system used by the government must comply with fundamental human rights, particularly the right to privacy as enshrined in Article 8 of the European Convention on Human Rights. This decision underlines the necessity for AI systems to be transparent, meaning that the algorithms and decision-making processes must be accessible and understandable to the public and affected individuals. Moreover, the case highlighted the need for proportionality and adequacy of safeguards to prevent undue interference with privacy. By prohibiting the use of SyRI until these criteria were met, the court established a legal benchmark that AI systems in the judiciary must not only serve legitimate public interests but also protect individual rights through rigorous oversight and accountability measures. Consequently, the SyRI case serves as a crucial reference point for policymakers and regulators in designing AI frameworks that balance innovation with the ethical imperatives of justice and human rights.

**b.  The Loomis Case**

**Facts:**

Eric L. Loomis was convicted of eluding an officer and operating a vehicle without the owner's consent in Wisconsin. During his sentencing, the court utilised a COMPAS (Correctional Offender Management Profiling for Alternative Sanctions) risk assessment tool to evaluate Loomis's likelihood of recidivism. The COMPAS report

indicated that Loomis was at high risk of recidivism, which influenced the court's sentencing decision. Loomis challenged the use of COMPAS on the grounds that it violated his due process rights because the tool's proprietary nature prevented him from understanding and challenging its methodology. Additionally, Loomis argued that the COMPAS risk assessment improperly took gender into account and that the tool's lack of transparency and potential biases made it unreliable and unfair.[28]

**Issues:**

**1.** Whether the use of the COMPAS risk assessment at sentencing violated Loomis's due process rights because of the tool's proprietary nature, which prevented him from assessing its scientific validity.

2. Whether the use of gender as a factor in the COMPAS risk assessment violated Loomis's right to an individualised sentence and equal protection under the law.

3. Whether the overall transparency and potential biases in the COMPAS tool rendered its use at sentencing unjust and in violation of due process rights.

**Rule:**

**-** The due process clause of the Fourteenth Amendment guarantees individuals the right to be sentenced based on accurate information and requires transparency in the factors influencing sentencing decisions.

- Sentencing decisions should be individualised, considering the unique circumstances and characteristics of the defendant without reliance on potentially biased or opaque tools.

**Application:**

The Wisconsin Supreme Court analysed whether the use of the COMPAS tool met the due process requirements. It acknowledged that while the COMPAS risk assessment provided useful information for sentencing, its proprietary nature posed challenges. Because COMPAS did not disclose how it weighed various factors to produce risk scores, defendants could not effectively challenge its accuracy or methodology.

---

[28] State of Wisconsin v Eric L Loomis, Supreme Court of Wisconsin, Case No 2015AP157-CR, Opinion filed July 13, 2016.

However, the court noted that defendants could review and dispute the factual inputs into the COMPAS assessment.[29]

The court also examined the issue of gender being used in the risk assessment. It found that while gender was considered, this was intended to improve the tool's accuracy rather than to discriminate. The court concluded that using gender in a way that enhances predictive validity does not inherently violate due process, provided it does not result in discriminatory treatment.[30]

Regarding transparency and potential biases, the court recognised concerns raised by studies indicating that tools like COMPAS might disproportionately classify minority offenders as high-risk. To address these issues, the court-imposed limitations on the use of COMPAS: it should not be the sole determinant of sentencing decisions and must be used alongside other factors. Furthermore, the court required that any presentence investigation report (PSI) containing a COMPAS risk assessment must include specific cautions about the tool's limitations and the potential for biases.[31]

**Conclusion:**

The Wisconsin Supreme Court concluded that the use of COMPAS in Loomis's sentencing did not violate his due process rights, provided certain limitations and cautions were observed. The court ruled that COMPAS could be used as a part of the sentencing decision but should not be the determinative factor. The court mandated that any PSI containing a COMPAS risk assessment must inform the sentencing court about the tool's proprietary nature, the lack of a Wisconsin-specific validation study, the potential for racial biases, and the necessity for continuous monitoring and adjustment of the tool.

The Loomis case significantly influences the regulation of AI-based judicial decision-making in the EU by underscoring the critical need for transparency, fairness, and

---

[29] Iñigo De Miguel Beriain, 'Does the Use of Risk Assessments in Sentences Respect the Right to Due Process? A Critical Analysis of the Wisconsin v. Loomis Ruling' (2018) 17 Law, Probability and Risk 45 <https://doi.org/10.1093/lpr/mgy001> accessed 11 June 2024.

[30] Freeman K, 'Algorithmic Injustice: How the Wisconsin Supreme Court Failed to Protect Due Process Rights in State v. Loomis' (Carolina Law Scholarship Repository) <https://scholarship.law.unc.edu/ncjolt/vol18/iss5/3/> accessed 11 June 2024

[31] Iñigo De Miguel Beriain, 'Does the Use of Risk Assessments in Sentences Respect the Right to Due Process? A Critical Analysis of the Wisconsin v. Loomis Ruling' (2018) 17 Law, Probability and Risk 45 <https://doi.org/10.1093/lpr/mgy001> accessed 11 June 2024.

judicial discretion in the use of AI tools. The Wisconsin Supreme Court's ruling on the use of the COMPAS risk assessment tool highlighted the potential risks associated with opaque, proprietary algorithms that defendants cannot adequately challenge or understand. The court's requirement that COMPAS not be the sole determinant in sentencing decisions, along with the mandated warnings about the tool's limitations and potential biases, illustrates the importance of ensuring AI systems are supplementary aids rather than determinative factors. This case provides a framework for EU policymakers by emphasizing that AI tools must be used transparently and accountably, ensuring defendants' rights to a fair trial and due process. It reinforces the notion that while AI can enhance judicial decision-making, it must be implemented within a robust legal framework that prioritizes individual rights and maintains judicial oversight to prevent discriminatory outcomes and uphold justice.

## 4. REGULATING AI BASED JUDICIAL DECISION-MAKING SYSTEMS

The integration of Artificial Intelligence (AI) into judicial decision-making systems has sparked significant debate regarding its potential benefits and inherent risks. AI promises enhanced efficiency, consistency, and accuracy in legal proceedings, yet it also introduces challenges related to transparency, bias, accountability, and the right to a fair trial. Several high-profile cases, such as the SyRI case in the Netherlands and the Loomis case in the United States, have underscored these challenges. These cases highlight the necessity for robust regulatory frameworks to ensure that AI systems are used ethically and effectively within the judiciary. The application of Article 22 of the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR), the AI Act by the European Commission, and the standards set by the Venice Commission and the European Commission for the Efficiency of Justice (CEPEJ) provide a foundational basis for developing these frameworks.

Regulating AI in judicial decision-making involves aligning technology with fundamental legal principles and human rights. Article 22 GDPR emphasises the right not to be subject to decisions based solely on automated processing without meaningful human intervention, while the AI Act seeks to establish stringent requirements for high-risk AI systems, including those used in the judiciary. The Venice Commission and CEPEJ provide guidelines to ensure that AI applications uphold the rule of law, transparency, accountability, and non-discrimination, and the protections guaranteed under Article 6 of the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR), which ensures the right to a fair trial. By examining these regulatory instruments and notable case studies, this chapter aims to propose comprehensive strategies for the effective and ethical integration of AI in judicial systems, ensuring that the deployment of AI respects legal norms and enhances the quality of justice.

### a. The AI Act

The regulation of artificial intelligence (AI) within the judicial decision-making process is a complex and evolving issue, intricately connected to the broader framework of AI governance. The European Union (EU) AI Act represents the first comprehensive attempt to legally regulate AI technologies, addressing the multifaceted challenges posed by these dynamic innovations. The Act aims to enhance economic growth, foster innovation, and ensure AI systems align with EU values and fundamental rights.

The AI Act classifies AI systems by their risk levels, distinguishing between unacceptable risk, high-risk, limited-risk, and minimal-risk AI. High-risk AI systems, which include those used in critical areas such as law enforcement and judicial decision-making, are subject to stringent regulatory requirements. These systems must undergo conformity assessments to ensure they meet safety, security, and fundamental rights standards. Despite these measures, the Act does not explicitly visualise the integration of automated decision-making within national administrations, including judicial systems, although these aspects are inherently linked to AI deployment.[41]

One of the primary features of the AI Act is its risk-based approach. AI systems that pose an unacceptable risk, such as those that manipulate behavior or exploit vulnerabilities, are outright banned. High-risk AI systems, including those in judicial contexts, must comply with strict obligations, including transparency, robustness, and accuracy requirements. These systems are expected to demonstrate compliance through documentation, testing, and ongoing monitoring. Limited-risk AI systems are subject to fewer obligations, primarily focusing on transparency, while minimal-risk AI systems face no additional legal requirements beyond existing legislation.[42]

However, the AI Act's approach has notable gaps. For instance, while it establishes a framework for high-risk AI, it does not provide detailed guidance on specific applications within the judicial system. The Act's definition of AI, focusing on machine learning and data-driven decision-making, might not fully capture the complexity and diversity of AI technologies used in judicial contexts. Additionally, the Act primarily addresses the technological aspects of AI without sufficiently considering the broader constitutional and legal principles that govern judicial decision-making.[43]

The rule of law is a fundamental principle underlying the regulation of AI in judicial decision-making. The AI Act seeks to uphold this principle by ensuring AI systems are transparent, accountable, and respect fundamental rights. However, the rapid evolution of AI technologies poses significant challenges to maintaining transparency and

---

[41] Hannah Ruschemeier, 'AI as a Challenge for Legal Regulation – the Scope of Application of the Artificial Intelligence Act Proposal' (2023) 23 ERA Forum 361 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12027-022-00725-6> accessed 11 June 2024.

[42] ibid.

[43] Anna-Sara Lind, 'Legislating AI: A Matter of High-Risk Administration?' in Markku Suksi (ed), The Rule of Law and Automated Decision-Making: Exploring Fundamentals of Algorithmic Governance (Springer International Publishing 2023) <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-30142-1_8> accessed 11 June 2024.

accountability. For instance, the inherent unpredictability of self-learning algorithms can obscure the decision-making process, making it difficult for individuals to understand and contest AI-driven decisions.[44]

Moreover, the AI Act's reliance on the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) for data protection issues highlights the need for a more integrated approach to regulating AI in judicial contexts. Article 22 of the GDPR, which limits decisions based solely on automated processing, underscores the importance of human oversight in automated decision-making processes. Yet, the application of this principle within the judicial system remains ambiguous, necessitating clearer guidelines to ensure the rights of individuals are adequately protected.[45]

In conclusion, the AI Act represents a significant step towards regulating AI technologies, including their application in judicial decision-making. Its risk-based approach and emphasis on transparency and accountability align with the fundamental principles of the rule of law. However, the Act's current scope and definitions may not fully address the unique challenges posed by AI in judicial contexts. Future reforms should consider the specific needs of judicial decision-making, incorporating comprehensive guidelines that ensure AI systems are used responsibly and ethically, with robust mechanisms for oversight and accountability. This will be crucial to maintaining public trust and safeguarding the integrity of the judicial process in an era of increasing AI integration.

The European Union (EU) AI Act represents a pioneering effort to legally regulate AI technologies, addressing their complex and evolving implications, particularly within the judicial decision-making process. The Act's classification of AI systems by risk levels and the stringent requirements imposed on high-risk AI systems, such as those used in law enforcement and judicial contexts, highlight its commitment to ensuring safety, security, and adherence to fundamental rights. These high-risk systems are mandated to undergo rigorous conformity assessments, emphasising transparency, robustness, and accuracy, thereby reinforcing the principles of accountability and trust in AI applications. Despite these comprehensive measures, the AI Act exhibits notable

---

[44] ibid.

[45] European Commission, Proposal for a Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council Laying Down Harmonised Rules on Artificial Intelligence (Artificial Intelligence Act) and Amending Certain Union Legislative Acts, COM(2021) 206 final.

gaps, especially in its lack of detailed guidance specific to judicial applications. The definition of AI within the Act, primarily focused on machine learning and data-driven decision-making, may not fully encompass the diverse AI technologies employed in judicial systems.[46] Furthermore, while the Act aims to uphold the rule of law by ensuring transparency and accountability, the inherent unpredictability of self-learning algorithms poses significant challenges to maintaining these principles, potentially obscuring the decision-making process and complicating individual recourse against AI-driven decisions. The reliance on the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) for data protection issues underscores the need for a more integrated regulatory approach, as Article 22 of the GDPR highlights the necessity of human oversight in automated decisions, a principle that requires clearer application within judicial systems. In summary, while the AI Act marks a significant regulatory advancement, its current framework may not entirely address the unique challenges posed by AI in judicial decision-making.[47] Future reforms should focus on creating comprehensive guidelines tailored to judicial contexts, ensuring responsible and ethical AI usage, and establishing robust oversight mechanisms to safeguard public trust and the integrity of the judicial process.

## b. **GDPR**

The intersection of the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) and the regulation of AI in judicial decision-making highlights the intricate balance between technological innovation and the protection of fundamental rights. The GDPR, which governs the processing of personal data within the European Union, has significant implications for AI systems, especially those utilized in judicial contexts. This section delves into the relevant articles of the GDPR, with a particular emphasis on Article 22, and discusses their importance in the regulation of AI systems used in judicial decision-making.

Article 22 of the GDPR is a cornerstone in the regulation of automated decision-making, including AI-driven judicial processes. It grants individuals the right not to be

---

[46] Hannah Ruschemeier, 'AI as a Challenge for Legal Regulation – the Scope of Application of the Artificial Intelligence Act Proposal' (2023) 23 ERA Forum 361 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12027-022-00725-6> accessed 11 June 2024.

[47] Anna-Sara Lind, 'Legislating AI: A Matter of High-Risk Administration?' in Markku Suksi (ed), *The Rule of Law and Automated Decision-Making: Exploring Fundamentals of Algorithmic Governance* (Springer International Publishing 2023) <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-30142-1_8> accessed 11 June 2024.

subject to decisions based solely on automated processing, including profiling, which produces legal effects concerning them or significantly affects them. This article is pivotal as it places clear limitations on the extent to which AI can be used autonomously in making judicial decisions without human intervention.[48] The core of Article 22 is to ensure that automated decisions do not undermine the principles of fairness, transparency, and accountability, which are fundamental to judicial processes.

The application of Article 22 is particularly relevant in scenarios where AI systems are used to assist judicial authorities in researching, interpreting facts, and applying the law. For instance, AI systems employed in predicting legal outcomes or suggesting sentencing can have profound legal effects on individuals. As articulated in the AI Act proposal, high-risk AI systems, including those used in judicial decision-making, must comply with stringent requirements to mitigate risks associated with bias, errors, and lack of transparency[49]. Article 22 complements these requirements by ensuring that such systems are used with adequate human oversight, thus preserving the integrity of judicial decisions.[50]

Moreover, the GDPR encompasses several other articles that collectively bolster the regulation of AI in judicial contexts. Article 5 outlines the principles of data processing, including lawfulness, fairness, and transparency, which are crucial in ensuring that AI systems operate within ethical boundaries. Articles 13 and 14 mandate that individuals be informed about the processing of their data, including the involvement of AI systems in making decisions. This transparency is essential for maintaining trust in AI-assisted judicial processes and ensuring that individuals are aware of how their data is being used.[51]

---

[48] Georgios I Zekos, 'Digital Politics, GDPR, and AI' in Georgios I Zekos (ed), *Political, Economic and Legal Effects of Artificial Intelligence: Governance, Digital Economy and Society* (Springer International Publishing 2022) <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-94736-1_11> accessed 13 June 2024.

[49] Sebastian Felix Schwemer, Letizia Tomada and Tommaso Pasini, 'Legal AI Systems in the EU's Proposed Artificial Intelligence Act' (21 June 2021) <https://papers.ssrn.com/abstract=3871099> accessed 11 June 2024.

[50] Hannah Ruschemeier, 'AI as a Challenge for Legal Regulation – the Scope of Application of the Artificial Intelligence Act Proposal' (2023) 23 ERA Forum 361 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12027-022-00725-6> accessed 11 June 2024.

[51] Maja Brkan, 'Do Algorithms Rule the World? Algorithmic Decision-Making and Data Protection in the Framework of the GDPR and Beyond' (2019) 27 International Journal of Law and Information Technology 91 <https://doi.org/10.1093/ijlit/eay017> accessed 13 June 2024.

Article 35 of the GDPR requires the conduct of Data Protection Impact Assessments (DPIAs) for processing operations that are likely to result in high risks to the rights and freedoms of individuals. Given the high stakes involved in judicial decision-making, conducting DPIAs for AI systems used in this domain is imperative. These assessments help identify and mitigate potential risks, ensuring that AI applications do not compromise the fairness and impartiality of judicial outcomes.[52]

Despite these comprehensive provisions, certain gaps remain in the regulatory framework. The GDPR does not explicitly address all the nuances of AI-driven judicial decision-making. For instance, while Article 22 provides a robust safeguard against fully automated decisions, it does not delineate the specific criteria for human oversight required in judicial contexts. This ambiguity can lead to variations in how oversight is implemented, potentially affecting the consistency and reliability of AI-assisted decisions.[53] Furthermore, the AI Act proposal underscores the need for harmonized rules across the EU to manage the risks associated with AI in judicial processes. It emphasizes the importance of human-centric AI and the need for legal frameworks that evolve with technological advancements.[54] However, the AI Act must work in tandem with the GDPR to ensure a holistic regulatory approach that addresses both data protection and the ethical deployment of AI in judicial systems.

Moreover, the GDPR's broader regulatory framework, including Articles 12 to 23, supports a system of data governance that extends beyond individual rights to encompass corporate responsibilities. For instance, Article 35 mandates data protection impact assessments (DPIAs) for processing operations that are likely to result in high risks to the rights and freedoms of natural persons, including the use of AI in judicial decisions. This ensures that potential risks are assessed and mitigated before such systems are deployed. The application of the GDPR to AI in judicial decision-making

---

[52] Georgios I Zekos, 'Digital Politics, GDPR, and AI' in Georgios I Zekos (ed), *Political, Economic and Legal Effects of Artificial Intelligence: Governance, Digital Economy and Society* (Springer International Publishing 2022) <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-94736-1_11> accessed 13 June 2024.

[53] Maja Brkan, 'Do Algorithms Rule the World? Algorithmic Decision-Making and Data Protection in the Framework of the GDPR and Beyond' (2019) 27 International Journal of Law and Information Technology 91 <https://doi.org/10.1093/ijlit/eay017> accessed 13 June 2024.

[54] Sebastian Felix Schwemer, Letizia Tomada and Tommaso Pasini, 'Legal AI Systems in the EU's Proposed Artificial Intelligence Act' (21 June 2021) <https://papers.ssrn.com/abstract=3871099> accessed 11 June 2024.

is also significant in the context of secondary use, disclosure, and retention of personal data for constructing AI training sets. The GDPR's influence extends to how AI systems are trained and operated, emphasizing the importance of data quality, relevance, and protection against discriminatory outcomes. Recital 71 explicitly requires the implementation of technical and organizational measures to prevent discriminatory effects based on sensitive attributes such as race, ethnicity, political opinions, or health status.[55]

The intersection of the GDPR and AI regulation in judicial decision-making underscores the intricate balance between technological innovation and the protection of fundamental rights. Article 22 of the GDPR is critical, as it restricts decisions based solely on automated processing without human intervention, thereby safeguarding fairness, transparency, and accountability in judicial processes. This provision is particularly vital when AI systems assist in interpreting facts or predicting legal outcomes, given their significant impact on individuals' lives. The AI Act's stringent requirements for high-risk systems, such as those used in judicial contexts, aim to mitigate risks like bias and errors, complementing the protections offered by Article 22.[56]

However, the GDPR does not fully address all the complexities of AI-driven judicial decision-making. The lack of specific criteria for human oversight in Article 22 can lead to inconsistencies in implementation, potentially undermining the reliability of AI-assisted decisions. The AI Act and GDPR must be harmonized to provide a comprehensive regulatory framework that addresses both data protection and ethical AI deployment. Despite these gaps, the GDPR's strong emphasis on data protection and transparency, supported by requirements for DPIAs and data processing principles, helps maintain public trust in AI systems.[57]

---

[55] Maja Brkan, 'Do Algorithms Rule the World? Algorithmic Decision-Making and Data Protection in the Framework of the GDPR and Beyond' (2019) 27 International Journal of Law and Information Technology 91 <https://doi.org/10.1093/ijlit/eay017> accessed 13 June 2024.

[56] Georgios I Zekos, 'Digital Politics, GDPR, and AI' in Georgios I Zekos (ed), *Political, Economic and Legal Effects of Artificial Intelligence: Governance, Digital Economy and Society* (Springer International Publishing 2022) <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-94736-1_11> accessed 13 June 2024.

[57] Hannah Ruschemeier, 'AI as a Challenge for Legal Regulation – the Scope of Application of the Artificial Intelligence Act Proposal' (2023) 23 ERA Forum 361 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12027-022-00725-6> accessed 11 June 2024.

In conclusion, while the GDPR provides essential safeguards, effectively regulating AI in judicial contexts requires an integrated approach with the AI Act. This integration is crucial to addressing existing gaps and ensuring that AI systems enhance, rather than undermine, the fairness and integrity of judicial processes. Only through a cohesive regulatory framework can the potential of AI be harnessed responsibly in judicial decision-making.

### c. ECHR

The integration of artificial intelligence (AI) in judicial decision-making has sparked considerable debate regarding its implications for fundamental rights enshrined in the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR). Central to this discussion is Article 6, which guarantees the right to a fair trial. This subchapter explores the role of Article 6 and other pertinent articles in regulating AI's involvement in judicial processes, highlighting the benefits, challenges, and gaps in current regulatory frameworks.

Article 6 ECHR embodies the right to a fair trial, which is a cornerstone of democratic societies governed by the rule of law. This article stipulates that every individual is entitled to a fair and public hearing within a reasonable time by an independent and impartial tribunal established by law. The integration of AI into judicial decision-making processes must align with these principles to ensure justice is served. AI systems can assist judges by predicting and preparing judicial decisions, thereby potentially enhancing efficiency and consistency in judicial outcomes. However, concerns arise regarding the transparency, explainability, and fairness of AI systems. The opacity of AI algorithms, often referred to as the "black box" problem, poses significant challenges to ensuring that AI-assisted decisions are comprehensible and justifiable.[58]

The independence and impartiality of the judiciary, as required by Article 6, could be compromised by the use of AI in judicial decision-making. Independence is evaluated based on how judges are appointed, the duration of their terms, and the protections against external pressures. AI systems, if not carefully regulated, could introduce biases

---

[58] Nídia Andrade Moreira, 'The Compatibility of AI in Criminal System with the ECHR and ECtHR Jurisprudence' in Goreti Marreiros and others (eds) (Springer International Publishing 2022).

and external influences that undermine judicial independence. [59] Impartiality, the absence of prejudice or bias, is equally critical. While AI has the potential to reduce human bias, it can also perpetuate existing biases present in the data used to train these systems.[60]

The principle of explainability is crucial in the context of AI in judicial decision-making. Explainability refers to the ability to understand and interpret how AI systems arrive at their decisions. Transparency is necessary to maintain public trust in the judicial system and to ensure that judicial decisions are subject to scrutiny and appeal .[61] Current AI systems often lack the capability to provide reasoned justifications for their decisions, which is a fundamental requirement under Article 6. This shortfall undermines the parties' ability to understand and contest decisions, thereby impacting the fairness of the trial process.[62]

Article 14 ECHR, which prohibits discrimination, is another critical consideration in the deployment of AI in judicial contexts. AI systems can inadvertently perpetuate or exacerbate biases, leading to discriminatory outcomes. The use of AI in risk assessments and sentencing, for instance, has shown tendencies to disproportionately affect certain demographic groups. [63] Ensuring that AI systems are designed and implemented in a manner that prevents discrimination is essential for upholding the principles of equality and fairness under the ECHR.

Article 7 ECHR embodies the principle of legality, which requires that no one shall be held guilty of any criminal offence on account of any act or omission which did not constitute a criminal offence under national or international law at the time when it was committed. This article underscores the importance of legal certainty and predictability.

---

[59] Jasper Ulenaers, 'The Impact of Artificial Intelligence on the Right to a Fair Trial: Towards a Robot Judge?' (2020) 11 Asian Journal of Law and Economics <https://www.degruyter.com/document/doi/10.1515/ajle-2020-0008/html?lang%3Den=> accessed 15 June 2024.
[60] Nídia Andrade Moreira, 'The Compatibility of AI in Criminal System with the ECHR and ECtHR Jurisprudence' in Goreti Marreiros and others (eds) (Springer International Publishing 2022).
[61] ibid.
[62] Jasper Ulenaers, 'The Impact of Artificial Intelligence on the Right to a Fair Trial: Towards a Robot Judge?' (2020) 11 Asian Journal of Law and Economics <https://www.degruyter.com/document/doi/10.1515/ajle-2020-0008/html?lang%3Den=> accessed 15 June 2024.
[63] Nídia Andrade Moreira, 'The Compatibility of AI in Criminal System with the ECHR and ECtHR Jurisprudence' in Goreti Marreiros and others (eds) (Springer International Publishing 2022).

AI systems can contribute to legal predictability by providing consistent interpretations of the law based on large datasets of past judicial decisions. However, this predictive capability must be balanced against the need for human judges to exercise discretion and consider the unique circumstances of each case.[64]

The primary gaps and challenges in regulating AI in judicial decision-making include ensuring the explainability and transparency of AI systems, safeguarding judicial independence and impartiality, and preventing discrimination. There is also a need for a robust legal framework that clearly delineates the roles and responsibilities of AI systems in the judiciary. The European Commission for the Efficiency of Justice (CEPEJ) and other bodies have emphasized the importance of ethical guidelines and regulatory standards to address these challenges.[65]

The integration of AI in judicial decision-making, while promising efficiency and consistency, poses significant challenges regarding fundamental rights under the ECHR. Article 6, which ensures the right to a fair trial, is particularly impacted by AI's "black box" nature, raising concerns about transparency, explainability, and fairness. The use of AI must align with judicial independence and impartiality, yet biases in AI systems could undermine these principles. Although AI can reduce human bias, it often perpetuates biases from training data, threatening impartiality. Explainability is crucial, as current AI systems often fail to provide reasoned justifications for decisions, undermining the fairness of the trial process and public trust. Article 14's prohibition of discrimination is also at risk, as AI can inadvertently produce biased outcomes, disproportionately affecting certain demographic groups. Article 7's principle of legality underscores the need for AI to provide legal certainty while allowing judicial discretion. The gaps in current regulations, such as the lack of clear human oversight criteria, necessitate robust legal frameworks and ethical guidelines. Bodies like the European Commission for the Efficiency of Justice emphasise the importance of such standards. Ultimately, integrating AI in judicial systems requires balancing technological benefits with stringent protections for fairness and human rights.

---

[64] Jasper Ulenaers, 'The Impact of Artificial Intelligence on the Right to a Fair Trial: Towards a Robot Judge?' (2020) 11 Asian Journal of Law and Economics <https://www.degruyter.com/document/doi/10.1515/ajle-2020-0008/html?lang%3Den=> accessed 15 June 2024.

[65] ibid.

### d. **European Ethical Charter on the Use of AI in Judicial Systems**

The European Ethical Charter on the Use of Artificial Intelligence in Judicial Systems and their Environment, adopted by the European Commission for the Efficiency of Justice (CEPEJ) in December 2018, aims to provide guidelines for the ethical and responsible deployment of AI in judicial processes. This subchapter critically examines the Charter's principles, assessing their implications for regulating AI-based judicial decision-making and identifying potential gaps and challenges in its implementation.

**Principle of Respect for Fundamental Rights**

The first principle underscores the necessity of ensuring that AI tools and services are compatible with fundamental rights as guaranteed by the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR) and the Convention for the Protection of Personal Data. This principle mandates that AI systems must not undermine the right of access to a judge and the right to a fair trial, emphasising equality of arms and respect for the adversarial process.[66]

In practice, this means that AI tools should be designed and implemented in a way that respects these rights from the outset. The concept of "ethical-by-design" or "human-rights-by-design" approaches is advocated, ensuring that prohibitions against direct or indirect violations of fundamental values are integrated into the AI's development and learning phases.[67] This proactive approach aims to embed ethical considerations into the technology, rather than addressing issues post hoc.

**Principle of Non-Discrimination**

The second principle focuses on preventing the development or intensification of discrimination through AI tools. Given the potential of AI systems to reveal and amplify existing biases, there is a strong emphasis on careful development and deployment,

---

[66] European Commission for the Efficiency of Justice (CEPEJ), "European Ethical Charter on the Use of Artificial Intelligence in Judicial Systems and their Environment," 2018, p.8.
[67] ibid.

particularly when sensitive data is involved. This principle calls for multidisciplinary analyses and corrective measures to mitigate risks of discrimination.[68]

By ensuring non-discrimination, the Charter seeks to address one of the primary concerns associated with AI in judicial decision-making: the potential for biased outcomes. This principle aligns with Article 14 ECHR, which prohibits discrimination and emphasizes the need for AI tools to be fair and impartial.

**Principle of Quality and Security**

The third principle pertains to the quality and security of AI systems used in judicial decision-making. It advocates for the use of certified sources and secure technological environments, with a multidisciplinary approach to model development.[69] This ensures that AI tools are reliable, and the data they process is accurate and secure.

Ensuring the integrity of AI systems is crucial for maintaining public trust in judicial processes. The requirement for traceability and the use of certified data sources aims to prevent unauthorized alterations and ensure that AI decisions are based on valid information. This principle supports the overarching goals of transparency and accountability in AI use.

**Principle of Transparency, Impartiality, and Fairness**

Transparency, impartiality, and fairness are central to the fourth principle. The Charter calls for making data processing methods accessible and understandable, and authorizing external audits to ensure impartiality and fairness.[70] This principle directly addresses concerns about the "black box" nature of AI algorithms, which can obscure the decision-making process.

By promoting transparency, the Charter aims to make AI decisions explainable and justifiable, which is essential for maintaining the fairness of judicial processes. External

---

[68] European Commission for the Efficiency of Justice (CEPEJ), "European Ethical Charter on the Use of Artificial Intelligence in Judicial Systems and their Environment," 2018, p.9.
[69] European Commission for the Efficiency of Justice (CEPEJ), "European Ethical Charter on the Use of Artificial Intelligence in Judicial Systems and their Environment," 2018, p10.
[70] European Commission for the Efficiency of Justice (CEPEJ), "European Ethical Charter on the Use of Artificial Intelligence in Judicial Systems and their Environment," 2018, p11.

audits provide an additional layer of scrutiny, ensuring that AI tools operate without bias and in the best interest of justice.

**Principle of User Control**

The fifth principle emphasizes user control, ensuring that AI tools do not adopt a prescriptive approach but rather support informed decision-making by users. Legal professionals must retain the ability to review and override AI decisions, maintaining autonomy in judicial processes.[71] Users should be clearly informed about the AI's role in their cases and have the right to opt for human judgment.

This principle is crucial for safeguarding the role of human judges and ensuring that AI serves as an assistive tool rather than a replacement. It aligns with the broader goal of enhancing judicial efficiency while preserving the fundamental human elements of legal decision-making.

**Gaps and Challenges**

While the Charter provides a robust framework for the ethical use of AI in judicial systems, several gaps and challenges remain. One significant gap is the lack of enforceability of these ethical guidelines. While they offer valuable principles, their implementation depends largely on the commitment of individual jurisdictions and stakeholders.

Another challenge is the ongoing need for advancements in explainable AI (XAI). Despite the emphasis on transparency, current AI technologies still struggle to provide clear and understandable explanations for their decisions. This limitation can undermine the trust and accountability essential for fair trials.[72]

Additionally, there is a need for continuous monitoring and evaluation of AI systems to ensure they remain aligned with ethical standards and do not evolve in ways that introduce new biases or ethical concerns. The Charter's call for regular reviews and

---

[71] European Commission for the Efficiency of Justice (CEPEJ), "European Ethical Charter on the Use of Artificial Intelligence in Judicial Systems and their Environment," 2018, p12.
[72] Nídia Andrade Moreira, 'The Compatibility of AI in Criminal System with the ECHR and ECtHR Jurisprudence' in Goreti Marreiros and others (eds) (Springer International Publishing 2022).

updates is a step in the right direction but requires a concerted effort from all stakeholders involved.

The European Ethical Charter on the Use of Artificial Intelligence in Judicial Systems establishes essential principles aimed at ensuring the ethical deployment of AI in judicial processes, addressing critical aspects such as fundamental rights, non-discrimination, quality, security, transparency, impartiality, fairness, and user control. The principle of respect for fundamental rights mandates that AI systems must be designed to uphold access to justice and fair trials, embedding ethical considerations from the outset. Non-discrimination focuses on preventing biases, aligning with Article 14 ECHR to ensure AI systems do not perpetuate or exacerbate discriminatory outcomes. The principles of quality and security emphasize the use of certified, secure technologies to maintain data integrity and public trust.

Transparency and explainability are central to the Charter, addressing the "black box" nature of AI and promoting external audits to ensure fairness and impartiality. User control ensures that AI tools support, rather than replace, human judicial decision-making, preserving the autonomy of legal professionals. Despite these robust guidelines, the lack of enforceability poses a significant challenge, as the implementation relies on the commitment of individual jurisdictions. Additionally, advancements in explainable AI (XAI) are necessary to meet transparency requirements fully.

Continuous monitoring and evaluation of AI systems are crucial to prevent new biases and ethical concerns from emerging. While the Charter provides a comprehensive framework, its effectiveness depends on rigorous implementation and ongoing oversight to protect fundamental rights and maintain judicial integrity. Thus, the Charter represents a significant step forward, but its impact will ultimately be determined by the dedication of stakeholders to uphold these ethical standards in practice.

## 5. LEGAL ANALYSIS OF THE LEGAL REGIME REGULATING JUDICIAL AI SYSTEMS.

The deployment of AI in judicial decision-making presents a profound challenge: Can the current legal frameworks and regulations adequately safeguard fundamental principles such as transparency, trust, fairness, and impartiality, as highlighted in Chapter Two of this thesis? To explore this question, we will analyse key case studies and examine how existing legislation addresses these issues, focusing on transparency, bias, accountability, and the rule of law.

The SyRI (System Risk Indication) case, implemented by the Dutch government, aimed to detect welfare fraud through extensive data analysis and profiling. The case raised significant concerns about privacy, transparency, and the adequacy of safeguards against data misuse. In the SyRI case, the District Court of The Hague found that the system violated Article 8 of the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR), which guarantees the right to respect for private and family life. The court emphasised that any interference with these rights must be justified, necessary, and proportionate, with adequate safeguards to prevent misuse. The SyRI system's lack of transparency was a central issue, as the criteria and risk models used to flag individuals were not disclosed, preventing individuals from understanding or challenging the assessments. This opacity directly undermined public trust and accountability, violating principles of transparency.[73]

Trust in judicial and administrative systems is built on the ability of individuals to understand and scrutinise decisions affecting them. The SyRI case demonstrated that without transparency, trust is eroded, leading to public resistance and legal challenges. Although the case did not explicitly address bias, the lack of transparency in the algorithm's operation could perpetuate existing biases within the data used, leading to discriminatory outcomes. The SyRI case underscores the necessity of transparent and explainable AI systems to uphold privacy rights and maintain public trust. The ruling mandates the implementation of clear, adequate safeguards and transparency measures,

---

[73] Anne Meuwese, 'Regulating Algorithmic Decision-Making One Case at the Time: A Note on the Dutch "SyRI" Judgment' (2020) 1 European Review of Digital Administration & Law 209.

illustrating those current regulations, when properly enforced, can address some of the critical issues posed by AI.

The Loomis case involved the use of the COMPAS (Correctional Offender Management Profiling for Alternative Sanctions) risk assessment tool in sentencing decisions. The case highlighted concerns about due process, transparency, and potential biases within AI-driven judicial tools. The Wisconsin Supreme Court ruled that the use of COMPAS did not violate due process, provided specific limitations and cautions were observed. The court required that COMPAS should not be the sole determinant of sentencing decisions and that judges must be informed about the tool's limitations and potential biases.[74]

The proprietary nature of COMPAS presented significant transparency issues, as defendants and their counsel could not access the algorithm's methodology, making it challenging to contest the risk scores. This lack of transparency undermined the fairness and accountability of the judicial process. Trust in judicial decisions hinges on the perceived fairness and openness of the process. The opaque nature of COMPAS risk assessments raised questions about the legitimacy of AI-influenced decisions, potentially undermining public confidence.[75] Studies revealed that COMPAS exhibited racial biases, disproportionately classifying minority offenders as high-risk. This bias highlights the critical need for continuous evaluation and adjustment of AI systems to prevent discriminatory outcomes.[76]

The Loomis case illustrates the complexities and risks associated with AI in judicial decision-making. While the ruling permitted the use of COMPAS, it stressed the importance of judicial oversight and the need for transparency and bias mitigation. This

---

[74] Freeman K, 'Algorithmic Injustice: How the Wisconsin Supreme Court Failed to Protect Due Process Rights in State v. Loomis' (Carolina Law Scholarship Repository) <https://scholarship.law.unc.edu/ncjolt/vol18/iss5/3/> accessed 11 June 2024
[75] uclalaw, 'Injustice Ex Machina: Predictive Algorithms in Criminal Sentencing' (*UCLA Law Review,* 19 February 2019) <https://www.uclalawreview.org/injustice-ex-machina-predictive-algorithms-in-criminal-sentencing/> accessed 28 January 2024.
[76] Julia Angwin Mattu Jeff Larson,Lauren Kirchner,Surya, 'Machine Bias' (*ProPublica*) <https://www.propublica.org/article/machine-bias-risk-assessments-in-criminal-sentencing> accessed 28 January 2024.

case demonstrates that existing legal frameworks can address these issues but require rigorous implementation and continuous oversight.[77]

Both the SyRI and Loomis cases highlight the fundamental need for transparency in AI systems. Lack of transparency not only undermines public trust but also poses significant challenges to accountability and fairness.[78] Current regulations, such as Article 8 of the ECHR and due process requirements, mandate transparency and public scrutiny, emphasising that AI systems must be explainable and their decision-making processes understandable.

The potential for AI systems to perpetuate and even exacerbate existing biases is a significant concern.[79] The SyRI and Loomis cases show that while legal frameworks recognise the issue, more robust safeguards and continuous monitoring are essential to ensure fairness and prevent discrimination. AI systems can obscure the chain of responsibility, complicating the attribution of accountability. Both case studies stress the need for human oversight and the importance of judicial discretion in AI-assisted decisions, reinforcing the principle that ultimate accountability must remain with human judges.[80]

The integration of AI must align with the rule of law, ensuring that judicial processes are transparent, fair, and subject to scrutiny. The cases discussed emphasise the importance of legal frameworks that uphold these principles, demonstrating that while AI offers significant benefits, its deployment must be carefully regulated to protect fundamental rights. The analysis of the SyRI and Loomis cases reveals that while current legal frameworks can address some of the challenges posed by AI in judicial decision-making, they require robust enforcement and continuous oversight to be effective.

---

[77] Iñigo De Miguel Beriain, 'Does the Use of Risk Assessments in Sentences Respect the Right to Due Process? A Critical Analysis of the Wisconsin v. Loomis Ruling' (2018) 17 Law, Probability and Risk 45 <https://doi.org/10.1093/lpr/mgy001> accessed 11 June 2024.

[78] Ashley Deeks, 'The Judicial Demand for Explainable Artificial Intelligence' (2019) 119 Columbia Law Review 1829 <https://www.jstor.org/stable/26810851> accessed 25 April 2024.

[79] Julia Angwin Mattu Jeff Larson,Lauren Kirchner,Surya, 'Machine Bias' (*ProPublica*) <https://www.propublica.org/article/machine-bias-risk-assessments-in-criminal-sentencing> accessed 28 January 2024.

[80] Finale Doshi-Velez and others, 'Accountability of AI Under the Law: The Role of Explanation' (2017) abs/1711.01134 CoRR <http://arxiv.org/abs/1711.01134>.

The European Union (EU) AI Act represents a pioneering effort to legally regulate AI technologies, addressing their complex and evolving implications, particularly within judicial decision-making processes. The Act classifies AI systems by their risk levels, distinguishing between unacceptable risk, high-risk, limited-risk, and minimal-risk AI. High-risk AI systems, which include those used in critical areas such as law enforcement and judicial decision-making, are subject to stringent regulatory requirements. These systems must undergo conformity assessments to ensure they meet safety, security, and fundamental rights standards. Despite these measures, the Act does not explicitly visualise the integration of automated decision-making within national administrations, including judicial systems, although these aspects are inherently linked to AI deployment.[81]

One of the primary features of the AI Act is its risk-based approach. AI systems that pose an unacceptable risk, such as those that manipulate behavior or exploit vulnerabilities, are outright banned. High-risk AI systems, including those in judicial contexts, must comply with strict obligations, including transparency, robustness, and accuracy requirements. These systems are expected to demonstrate compliance through documentation, testing, and ongoing monitoring. Limited-risk AI systems are subject to fewer obligations, primarily focusing on transparency, while minimal-risk AI systems face no additional legal requirements beyond existing legislation.[82]

However, the AI Act's approach has notable gaps. For instance, while it establishes a framework for high-risk AI, it does not provide detailed guidance on specific applications within the judicial system. The Act's definition of AI, focusing on machine learning and data-driven decision-making, might not fully capture the complexity and diversity of AI technologies used in judicial contexts. Additionally, the Act primarily

---

[81] Sebastian Felix Schwemer, Letizia Tomada and Tommaso Pasini, 'Legal AI Systems in the EU's Proposed Artificial Intelligence Act' (21 June 2021) <https://papers.ssrn.com/abstract=3871099> accessed 11 June 2024.

[82] Anna-Sara Lind, 'Legislating AI: A Matter of High-Risk Administration?' in Markku Suksi (ed), *The Rule of Law and Automated Decision-Making: Exploring Fundamentals of Algorithmic Governance* (Springer International Publishing 2023) <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-30142-1_8> accessed 11 June 2024.

addresses the technological aspects of AI without sufficiently considering the broader constitutional and legal principles that govern judicial decision-making.[83]

The rule of law is a fundamental principle underlying the regulation of AI in judicial decision-making. The AI Act seeks to uphold this principle by ensuring AI systems are transparent, accountable, and respect fundamental rights. However, the rapid evolution of AI technologies poses significant challenges to maintaining transparency and accountability. For instance, the inherent unpredictability of self-learning algorithms can obscure the decision-making process, making it difficult for individuals to understand and contest AI-driven decisions.[84]

Moreover, the AI Act's reliance on the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) for data protection issues highlights the need for a more integrated approach to regulating AI in judicial contexts. Article 22 of the GDPR, which limits decisions based solely on automated processing, underscores the importance of human oversight in automated decision-making processes. Yet, the application of this principle within the judicial system remains ambiguous, necessitating clearer guidelines to ensure the rights of individuals are adequately protected.[85]

The General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) plays a crucial role in regulating AI systems used in judicial decision-making, emphasizing the protection of personal data and ensuring transparency. Article 22 of the GDPR grants individuals the right not to be subject to decisions based solely on automated processing, including profiling, which produces legal effects concerning them or significantly affects them. This article is pivotal as it places clear limitations on the extent to which AI can be used autonomously in making judicial decisions without human intervention. The core of Article 22 is to ensure that automated decisions do not undermine the principles of

---

[83] Hannah Ruschemeier, 'AI as a Challenge for Legal Regulation – the Scope of Application of the Artificial Intelligence Act Proposal' (2023) 23 ERA Forum 361 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12027-022-00725-6> accessed 11 June 2024.

[84] Stanley Greenstein, 'Preserving the Rule of Law in the Era of Artificial Intelligence (AI)' (2022) 30 Artificial Intelligence and Law 291 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10506-021-09294-4>.

[85] Georgios I Zekos, 'Digital Politics, GDPR, and AI' in Georgios I Zekos (ed), *Political, Economic and Legal Effects of Artificial Intelligence: Governance, Digital Economy and Society* (Springer International Publishing 2022) <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-94736-1_11> accessed 13 June 2024.

fairness, transparency, and accountability, which are fundamental to judicial processes.[86]

The application of Article 22 is particularly relevant in scenarios where AI systems assist judicial authorities in researching, interpreting facts, and applying the law. For instance, AI systems employed in predicting legal outcomes or suggesting sentencing can have profound legal effects on individuals. As articulated in the AI Act proposal, high-risk AI systems, including those used in judicial decision-making, must comply with stringent requirements to mitigate risks associated with bias, errors, and lack of transparency. Article 22 complements these requirements by ensuring that such systems are used with adequate human oversight, thus preserving the integrity of judicial decisions.[87]

Moreover, the GDPR encompasses several other articles that collectively bolster the regulation of AI in judicial contexts. Article 5 outlines the principles of data processing, including lawfulness, fairness, and transparency, which are crucial in ensuring that AI systems operate within ethical boundaries. Articles 13 and 14 mandate that individuals be informed about the processing of their data, including the involvement of AI systems in making decisions. This transparency is essential for maintaining trust in AI-assisted judicial processes and ensuring that individuals are aware of how their data is being used.[88]

Article 35 of the GDPR requires the conduct of Data Protection Impact Assessments (DPIAs) for processing operations that are likely to result in high risks to the rights and freedoms of individuals. Given the high stakes involved in judicial decision-making, conducting DPIAs for AI systems used in this domain is imperative. These assessments help identify and mitigate potential risks, ensuring that AI applications do not compromise the fairness and impartiality of judicial outcomes.[89]

---

[86] Maja Brkan, 'Do Algorithms Rule the World? Algorithmic Decision-Making and Data Protection in the Framework of the GDPR and Beyond' (2019) 27 International Journal of Law and Information Technology 91 <https://doi.org/10.1093/ijlit/eay017> accessed 13 June 2024.
[87] ibid.
[88] Maja Brkan, 'Do Algorithms Rule the World? Algorithmic Decision-Making and Data Protection in the Framework of the GDPR and Beyond' (2019) 27 International Journal of Law and Information Technology 91 <https://doi.org/10.1093/ijlit/eay017> accessed 13 June 2024.
[89] ibid.

Despite these comprehensive provisions, certain gaps remain in the regulatory framework. The GDPR does not explicitly address all the nuances of AI-driven judicial decision-making. For instance, while Article 22 provides a robust safeguard against fully automated decisions, it does not delineate the specific criteria for human oversight required in judicial contexts. This ambiguity can lead to variations in how oversight is implemented, potentially affecting the consistency and reliability of AI-assisted decisions. Furthermore, the AI Act proposal underscores the need for harmonised rules across the EU to manage the risks associated with AI in judicial processes. It emphasises the importance of human-centric AI and the need for legal frameworks that evolve with technological advancements. However, the AI Act must work in tandem with the GDPR to ensure a holistic regulatory approach that addresses both data protection and the ethical deployment of AI in judicial systems.[90]

In conclusion, while the GDPR provides essential safeguards, effectively regulating AI in judicial contexts requires an integrated approach with the AI Act. This integration is crucial to addressing existing gaps and ensuring that AI systems enhance rather than undermine the fairness and integrity of judicial processes. By harmonizing the AI Act and the GDPR, the EU can establish a comprehensive regulatory framework that balances technological innovation with the protection of fundamental rights, maintaining public trust and upholding the core principles of justice and the rule of law. The integration of AI into judicial decision-making holds significant promise for enhancing efficiency, consistency, and fairness within legal systems. However, it also presents substantial challenges that must be carefully navigated to ensure that AI technologies are used responsibly and ethically. Transparency, accountability, and the prevention of bias are crucial for maintaining public trust and the integrity of the judicial process. Ongoing efforts to develop ethical guidelines and regulatory frameworks, such as the GDPR and the AI Act, will be essential in addressing these challenges and harnessing the benefits of AI in the judiciary. By thoughtfully integrating AI into judicial decision-making, we can leverage its capabilities while upholding the core values of justice, fairness, and the rule of law.

---

[90] Anna-Sara Lind, 'Legislating AI: A Matter of High-Risk Administration?' in Markku Suksi (ed), *The Rule of Law and Automated Decision-Making: Exploring Fundamentals of Algorithmic Governance* (Springer International Publishing 2023) <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-30142-1_8> accessed 11 June 2024.

## 6.  <u>POSSIBILITIES FOR AI IN JUDICIAL DECISION MAKING</u>

### a.  <u>Practical Applications of AI in Judicial Assistance</u>

Artificial intelligence has increasingly become an integral component in various sectors, including the judiciary. The potential of AI to assist human judges is multifaceted, encompassing administrative support, predictive analytics, and even decision-drafting capabilities. This chapter explores the practical ways AI can be harnessed to support human judges in courts, ensuring efficiency while maintaining the integrity and nuances of human judicial decision-making.

**Enhancing Judicial Efficiency**

One of the primary ways AI can assist judges is through the automation of administrative tasks. AI systems can handle the labor-intensive process of searching through vast amounts of legal documents and case precedents to find relevant information. This capability significantly reduces the effort and time judges spend on these preliminary tasks, allowing them to focus more on substantive legal issues and deliberation. Advanced AI tools, such as those described by Reichman,[91] can process and analyse large datasets to identify patterns and relevant legal precedents, thus providing judges with comprehensive background information that might be missed during manual searches.[92]

Furthermore, AI can aid in case management by tracking the progress of cases, sending automated reminders about deadlines, and even performing preliminary analyses of case materials. This not only streamlines the workflow but also ensures that judges are kept up to date with the procedural aspects of their cases, thereby reducing the likelihood of administrative errors.[93]

---

[91] Reichman A, Sagy Y, Balaban S (2020) From a panacea to a Panopticon: the use and misuse of technology in the regulation of judges. Hastings Law J 71:589–636
[92] Dovilė Barysė and Roee Sarel, 'Algorithms in the Court: Does It Matter Which Part of the Judicial Decision-Making Is Automated?' (2024) 32 Artificial Intelligence and Law 117 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10506-022-09343-6> accessed 19 June 2024.
[93] ibid.

**Predictive Analytics and Decision Support**

AI's predictive analytics capabilities can play a crucial role in judicial decision-making. By analysing past case outcomes and identifying patterns, AI can assist judges in making more informed decisions. For instance, AI systems can provide probabilistic assessments of case outcomes based on historical data, which can help judges gauge the potential implications of their rulings.[94] This predictive power is particularly useful in complex cases where human capacity to detect patterns is limited.

AI's ability to generate draft judgments based on legal data inputs is another practical application. These AI-generated drafts can serve as a preliminary framework that judges can then review, edit, and finalise. This approach not only saves time but also ensures that all relevant legal precedents and arguments are considered. As Sourdin notes, such systems enable judges to maintain oversight and apply human discretion where necessary, thereby combining the efficiency of AI with the nuanced understanding of a human judge.[95]

**Addressing Bias and Ensuring Fairness**

One significant advantage of AI in judicial contexts is its potential to reduce human biases. Judges, like all humans, are susceptible to cognitive biases that can affect their decisions. AI systems, trained on diverse datasets, can offer a more objective analysis of cases, potentially leading to fairer outcomes.[96] For example, AI can help in identifying biases in sentencing by providing standardised recommendations based on objective criteria rather than subjective judgment.[97]

---

[94] John Morison and Adam Harkens, 'Re-Engineering Justice? Robot Judges, Computerised Courts and (Semi) Automated Legal Decision-Making' (2019) 39 Legal Studies 618 <https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/legal-studies/article/reengineering-justice-robot-judges-computerised-courts-and-semi-automated-legal-decisionmaking/E153E0FB25BB155B971AA38284EC7929> accessed 19 June 2024.

[95] Tania Sourdin, 'Judge v Robot?: Artificial Intelligence and Judicial Decision-Making' (2020) 41 UNIVERSITY OF NEW SOUTH WALES LAW JOURNAL 1114 <https://search.informit.org/doi/10.3316/informit.040979608613368> accessed 19 June 2024.

[96] John Morison and Adam Harkens, 'Re-Engineering Justice? Robot Judges, Computerised Courts and (Semi) Automated Legal Decision-Making' (2019) 39 Legal Studies 618 <https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/legal-studies/article/reengineering-justice-robot-judges-computerised-courts-and-semi-automated-legal-decisionmaking/E153E0FB25BB155B971AA38284EC7929> accessed 19 June 2024.

[97] Tania Sourdin, 'Judge v Robot?: Artificial Intelligence and Judicial Decision-Making' (2020) 41 UNIVERSITY OF NEW SOUTH WALES LAW JOURNAL 1114 <https://search.informit.org/doi/10.3316/informit.040979608613368> accessed 19 June 2024.

However, the implementation of AI also raises concerns about the transparency and accountability of judicial decisions. The opacity of AI algorithms can make it difficult to understand how certain decisions are made, posing a challenge to the principles of transparency and accountability in the judiciary. To mitigate these concerns, it is essential to ensure that AI systems used in judicial contexts are designed to be interpretable and that their decision-making processes can be audited.[98]

**Integration with Human Oversight**

Despite the advancements in AI, the human element in judicial decision-making remains indispensable. AI systems can support but not entirely replace human judges. Judges provide a level of empathy, ethical reasoning, and discretion that AI currently cannot replicate. The integration of AI should thus be seen as a means to enhance judicial capabilities rather than a replacement of human judgment.[99]

The concept of "co-bots" or collaborative robots illustrates this integration well. These AI systems work alongside judges, providing them with data-driven insights and administrative support while leaving the ultimate decision-making to the human judge. This collaboration ensures that the judicial process benefits from the efficiency and objectivity of AI while retaining the human qualities essential to justice[100]

The practical applications of AI in assisting human judges are vast and varied. From improving administrative efficiency to providing predictive analytics and reducing biases, AI offers numerous benefits that can enhance the judicial process. However, it is crucial to integrate these technologies thoughtfully, ensuring that they complement human judgment rather than undermine it. By doing so, the judiciary can leverage AI's capabilities while maintaining the core values of fairness, transparency, and accountability.

---

[98] Christoph K Winter, 'The Challenges of Artificial Judicial Decision-Making for Liberal Democracy' in Piotr Bystranowski, Bartosz Janik and Maciej Próchnicki (eds), Judicial Decision-Making: Integrating Empirical and Theoretical Perspectives (Springer International Publishing 2022) <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-11744-2_9> accessed 19 June 2024.
[99] Tania Sourdin, 'Judge v Robot?: Artificial Intelligence and Judicial Decision-Making' (2020) 41 UNIVERSITY OF NEW SOUTH WALES LAW JOURNAL 1114 <https://search.informit.org/doi/10.3316/informit.040979608613368> accessed 19 June 2024.
[100] ibid.

### b. __Explainable AI (xAI) in Judicial Decision Making__

The integration of artificial intelligence (AI) into the judicial system has introduced numerous advantages, such as increased efficiency and the ability to manage large volumes of data. However, a significant challenge has been the "black box" nature of many AI systems, where the internal workings and decision-making processes of the algorithms are not transparent. This lack of transparency can lead to issues of accountability and trust, particularly in judicial contexts where understanding the rationale behind decisions is crucial. Explainable AI (xAI) offers a solution by providing mechanisms to make AI decision-making processes transparent and understandable.[101]

Explainable AI refers to methodologies and tools that make the outcomes of AI systems comprehensible to human users. In the judicial system, this is particularly important as it allows judges, lawyers, and other stakeholders to understand how AI reaches its conclusions. The primary goal of xAI is to ensure that AI systems can provide explanations for their decisions, thereby enhancing transparency and accountability. Chaudhary emphasises that xAI is vital in judicial settings because it empowers judges to make informed decisions based on algorithmic outcomes, addressing the concerns about the opacity of traditional AI models.[102]

One of the significant advantages of xAI in judicial decision-making is its ability to provide clear, reasoned explanations for the outcomes of AI systems. This transparency is critical in maintaining the legitimacy of the judicial process. Judges and lawyers must be able to scrutinise and understand AI decisions to ensure they align with legal principles and do not perpetuate biases. Górski and Ramakrishna highlight that xAI can help demystify the decision-making processes of AI, making it easier to detect and correct any biases or errors that might otherwise go unnoticed.[103]

---

[101] Shaun Lim, 'Judicial Decision-Making and Explainable Artificial Intelligence: A Reckoning from First Principles Law and Technology' (2021) 33 Singapore Academy of Law Journal 280 <https://heinonline.org/HOL/P?h=hein.journals/saclj33&i=1131> accessed 19 June 2024.

[102] G Chaudhary, 'Explainable Artificial Intelligence (XAI): Reflections on Judicial System' (2024) 10 Kutafin Law Review 872 <https://kulawr.msal.ru/jour/article/view/230> accessed 19 June 2024.

[103] Łukasz Górski and Shashishekar Ramakrishna, 'Explainable Artificial Intelligence, Lawyer's Perspective' (Association for Computing Machinery 2021) <https://dl.acm.org/doi/10.1145/3462757.3466145> accessed 19 June 2024.

The implementation of xAI in the judicial system also facilitates compliance with legal standards and ethical requirements. For instance, the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) in the European Union mandates the right to explanation, meaning individuals have the right to know how decisions affecting them are made by automated systems. This regulatory requirement underscores the necessity for transparency and accountability in AI systems used within the judiciary. By adopting xAI, courts can ensure that AI-driven decisions are not only accurate but also legally and ethically sound.[104]

Furthermore, xAI can enhance the collaborative decision-making process between humans and machines. In judicial contexts, AI systems can assist by providing data-driven insights and preliminary analyses, while human judges retain the final decision-making authority. This collaboration ensures that AI supports judicial functions without replacing the nuanced judgment and ethical considerations that human judges bring to the table. By making AI processes transparent, xAI enables judges to understand and trust the insights provided by AI, leading to better-informed decisions.[105]

Explainable AI also plays a crucial role in fostering public trust in the judicial system. As AI becomes more prevalent in legal contexts, it is essential for the public to have confidence in the fairness and transparency of AI-driven decisions. When AI systems can explain their reasoning, it helps demystify the technology for the public, making it easier for individuals to accept and trust the use of AI in judicial processes. This transparency is particularly important in maintaining the integrity and credibility of the legal system in the eyes of the public.[106]

Despite its benefits, the implementation of xAI is not without challenges. Developing AI systems that are both accurate and explainable can be technically complex and resource intensive. There is often a trade-off between the complexity of AI models and their interpretability. More complex models, such as deep learning algorithms, tend to be less transparent but more accurate, while simpler models are easier to explain but

---

[104] G Chaudhary, 'Explainable Artificial Intelligence (XAI): Reflections on Judicial System' (2024) 10 Kutafin Law Review 872 <https://kulawr.msal.ru/jour/article/view/230> accessed 19 June 2024.

[105] Ashley Deeks, 'The Judicial Demand for Explainable Artificial Intelligence' (2019) 119 Columbia Law Review 1829 <https://www.jstor.org/stable/26810851> accessed 25 April 2024.

[106] G Chaudhary, 'Explainable Artificial Intelligence (XAI): Reflections on Judicial System' (2024) 10 Kutafin Law Review 872 <https://kulawr.msal.ru/jour/article/view/230> accessed 19 June 2024.

may sacrifice accuracy. Balancing these factors is crucial to the successful integration of xAI in judicial decision-making.[107]

In conclusion, explainable AI offers a promising approach to integrating AI into the judicial system in a way that enhances transparency, accountability, and public trust. By providing clear and understandable explanations for AI decisions, xAI ensures that AI systems support rather than undermine the judicial process. As the legal sector continues to adopt AI technologies, the development and implementation of xAI will be essential in ensuring that these technologies are used responsibly and ethically, maintaining the integrity of judicial decision-making.[108]

---

[107] Ashley Deeks, 'The Judicial Demand for Explainable Artificial Intelligence' (2019) 119 Columbia Law Review 1829 <https://www.jstor.org/stable/26810851> accessed 25 April 2024.
[108] Łukasz Górski and Shashishekar Ramakrishna, 'Explainable Artificial Intelligence, Lawyer's Perspective' (Association for Computing Machinery 2021) <https://dl.acm.org/doi/10.1145/3462757.3466145> accessed 19 June 2024.

## 7. <u>**CONCLUSION**</u>

The integration of artificial intelligence (AI) into judicial decision-making is a transformative development that holds the promise of enhancing efficiency, consistency, and fairness within legal systems. However, it also raises profound legal, ethical, and social challenges that must be addressed to ensure that the deployment of AI in the judiciary upholds the fundamental principles of justice and the rule of law. This thesis has explored the multifaceted implications of using AI in judicial contexts, focusing on transparency, accountability, bias, and the rule of law.

AI technologies have the potential to significantly enhance judicial efficiency by automating routine administrative tasks, providing predictive analytics, and supporting judges in decision-making processes. These technologies can reduce the time judges spend on searching for legal precedents and analyzing large datasets, thereby allowing them to focus on more substantive legal issues. AI's ability to generate draft judgments and offer probabilistic assessments based on historical data can aid judges in making more informed decisions. However, while AI can support judicial functions, it cannot replace the nuanced judgment and ethical considerations that human judges bring to the table.

One of the most critical issues in integrating AI into judicial decision-making is ensuring transparency. The "black box" nature of many AI systems poses significant challenges to transparency and accountability. Explainable AI (xAI) offers a solution by making AI decision-making processes transparent and understandable. xAI ensures that AI systems can provide clear and reasoned explanations for their decisions, thereby enhancing public trust and compliance with legal standards and ethical requirements. This transparency is crucial for maintaining the legitimacy of the judicial process and ensuring that AI-driven decisions are aligned with legal principles and do not perpetuate biases.

Bias in AI systems is another significant concern, particularly in judicial contexts where fairness and equality before the law are paramount. AI systems trained on diverse datasets can offer more objective analyses of cases, potentially reducing human biases. However, the risk of AI systems perpetuating existing societal prejudices remains. Instances like the COMPAS algorithm, which exhibited racial bias, highlight the critical importance of implementing robust safeguards and continuous scrutiny to mitigate the

risk of bias in AI-driven judicial processes. Addressing these biases is an ongoing process that requires careful monitoring and adjustment of AI systems to ensure fair and equitable outcomes.

Accountability in AI-driven judicial decision-making is a complex issue. The use of AI can obscure the chain of responsibility, making it challenging to determine who is ultimately accountable for decisions. Ensuring transparency in AI decision-making processes and maintaining human oversight are essential to preserving accountability and preventing a loss of confidence in the legal system. Judges must retain the ability to review and override AI decisions, ensuring that the judicial process remains under human control and that AI serves as an assistive tool rather than a replacement.

The integration of AI into the judiciary must also align with fundamental legal principles, particularly those enshrined in the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR). Article 6 of the ECHR, which guarantees the right to a fair trial, underscores the need for judicial processes to be transparent, impartial, and subject to scrutiny and appeal. The use of AI in judicial decision-making must ensure that these principles are upheld, with AI systems providing clear and justifiable explanations for their decisions. Similarly, Article 14 of the ECHR, which prohibits discrimination, requires that AI systems are designed and implemented in a manner that prevents discriminatory outcomes.

Regulating AI in judicial decision-making involves aligning technology with fundamental legal principles and human rights. The General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) and the proposed AI Act by the European Commission provide a foundational basis for developing robust regulatory frameworks. Article 22 of the GDPR, which limits decisions based solely on automated processing, underscores the importance of human oversight in automated decision-making processes. The AI Act's risk-based approach and emphasis on transparency, accountability, and non-discrimination align with the fundamental principles of the rule of law.

In summary, while the GDPR provides essential safeguards, effective regulation of AI in judicial contexts necessitates a cohesive approach incorporating the AI Act. This integration is vital to address current gaps and ensure that AI systems enhance rather than compromise the fairness and integrity of judicial processes. By harmonising the AI Act with the GDPR, the EU can establish a robust regulatory framework that

balances technological advancement with the protection of fundamental rights, thereby maintaining public trust and upholding the core principles of justice and the rule of law. The integration of AI into judicial decision-making offers significant potential for improving efficiency, consistency, and fairness within legal systems. However, it also introduces considerable challenges that must be carefully managed to ensure responsible and ethical use of AI technologies. Transparency, accountability, and the prevention of bias are essential to maintaining public trust and the integrity of the judicial process. Ongoing efforts to develop ethical guidelines and regulatory frameworks, such as the GDPR and the AI Act, will be crucial in addressing these challenges and maximizing the benefits of AI in the judiciary. By thoughtfully integrating AI into judicial decision-making, we can harness its capabilities while preserving the core values of justice, fairness, and the rule of law.

Notable case studies, such as the SyRI case in the Netherlands and the Loomis case in the United States, highlight the complexities and challenges associated with integrating AI into judicial decision-making. These cases underscore the necessity for stringent regulatory frameworks to ensure that AI systems are used ethically and effectively within the judiciary. The SyRI case, for example, emphasized the need for transparency and adequate protections for privacy, while the Loomis case highlighted the importance of judicial discretion and the need for judges to critically assess AI-generated data.

The European Ethical Charter on the Use of Artificial Intelligence in Judicial Systems provides comprehensive guidelines for the ethical deployment of AI in judicial processes. The Charter emphasizes principles such as respect for fundamental rights, non-discrimination, quality and security, transparency, impartiality, fairness, and user control. These principles address many of the key concerns associated with AI in the judiciary, but their effectiveness depends on rigorous implementation and ongoing oversight to address emerging challenges.

In conclusion, the integration of AI into judicial decision-making holds significant promise for enhancing the efficiency, consistency, and fairness of legal systems. However, it also presents substantial challenges that must be carefully navigated to ensure that AI technologies are used responsibly and ethically. Transparency, accountability, and the prevention of bias are crucial for maintaining public trust and the integrity of the judicial process. Ongoing efforts to develop ethical guidelines and

regulatory frameworks, such as the GDPR and the AI Act, will be essential in addressing these challenges and harnessing the benefits of AI in the judiciary. By thoughtfully integrating AI into judicial decision-making, we can leverage its capabilities while upholding the core values of justice, fairness, and the rule of law.

## 8. <u>BIBLIOGRAPHY</u>

1. Barysė D and Sarel R, 'Algorithms in the Court: Does It Matter Which Part of the Judicial Decision-Making Is Automated?' (2024) 32 Artificial Intelligence and Law 117

2. Bell BW, 'Replacing Bureaucrats with Automated Sorcerers?' (2021) 150 Daedalus 89

3. Beriain IDM, 'Does the Use of Risk Assessments in Sentences Respect the Right to Due Process? A Critical Analysis of the Wisconsin v. Loomis Ruling' (2018) 17 Law, Probability and Risk 45

4. Binns R, 'Algorithmic Accountability and Public Reason' (2018) 31 Philosophy & Technology 543

5. Brkan M, 'Do Algorithms Rule the World? Algorithmic Decision-Making and Data Protection in the Framework of the GDPR and Beyond' (2019) 27 International Journal of Law and Information Technology 91

6. Buchholtz G, 'Artificial Intelligence and Legal Tech: Challenges to the Rule of Law' in Thomas Wischmeyer and Timo Rademacher (eds), *Regulating Artificial Intelligence* (Springer International Publishing 2020) <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-32361-5_8>

7. Carter A, 'The Moral Dimension of AI-Assisted Decision-Making: Some Practical Perspectives from the Front Lines' (2022) 151 Daedalus 299

8. Cataleta MS, 'Humane Artificial Intelligence: The Fragility of Human Rights Facing AI' (East-West Center 2020) <https://www.jstor.org/stable/resrep25514> accessed 27 November 2023

9. Chaudhary G, 'Explainable Artificial Intelligence (xAI): Reflections on Judicial System' (2024) 10 Kutafin Law Review 872

10. Coglianese C and Lehr D, 'Transparency and Algorithmic Governance' (2019) 71 Administrative Law Review 1

11. Crootof R, '"Cyborg Justice" and the Risk of Technological–Legal Lock-In' (2019) 119 Columbia Law Review 233

12. Deeks A, 'The Judicial Demand for Explainable Artificial Intelligence' (2019) 119 Columbia Law Review 1829

13. Doshi-Velez F and others, 'Accountability of AI Under the Law: The Role of Explanation' (2017) abs/1711.01134 CoRR <http://arxiv.org/abs/1711.01134>

14. Freeman K, 'Algorithmic Injustice: How the Wisconsin Supreme Court Failed to Protect Due Process Rights in State v. Loomis' (Carolina Law Scholarship Repository)<https://scholarship.law.unc.edu/ncjolt/vol18/iss5/3/> accessed 11 June 2024

15. Górski Ł and Ramakrishna S, 'Explainable Artificial Intelligence, Lawyer's Perspective' (Association for Computing Machinery 2021) <https://dl.acm.org/doi/10.1145/3462757.3466145> accessed 19 June 2024

16. Greenstein S, 'Preserving the Rule of Law in the Era of Artificial Intelligence (AI)' (2022) 30 Artificial Intelligence and Law 291

17. ——, 'Preserving the Rule of Law in the Era of Artificial Intelligence (AI)' (2022) 30 Artificial Intelligence and Law 291

18. Isley R, 'Algorithmic Bias and Its Implications: How to Maintain Ethics through AI Governance' [2022] N.Y.U. American Public Policy Review <https://nyuappr.pubpub.org/pub/61cuny79/release/2> accessed 16 May 2024

19. Junkai Zhang and Yuxuan Han, 'Algorithms Have Built Racial Bias in Legal System-Accept or Not?', *Proceedings of the 2021 International Conference on Social Development and Media Communication (SDMC 2021)* (Atlantis Press 2022) <https://doi.org/10.2991/assehr.k.220105.224>

20. Katyal SK, 'Democracy & Distrust in an Era of Artificial Intelligence' (2022) 151 Daedalus 322

21. Lim S, 'Judicial Decision-Making and Explainable Artificial Intelligence: A Reckoning from First Principles Law and Technology' (2021) 33 Singapore Academy of Law Journal 280

22. Lind A-S, 'Legislating AI: A Matter of High-Risk Administration?' in Markku Suksi (ed), *The Rule of Law and Automated Decision-Making: Exploring Fundamentals of Algorithmic Governance* (Springer International Publishing 2023) <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-30142-1_8> accessed 11 June 2024

23. Margetts H, 'Rethinking AI for Good Governance' (2022) 151 Daedalus 360

24. Mattu JA Jeff Larson,Lauren Kirchner,Surya, 'Machine Bias' (*ProPublica*) <https://www.propublica.org/article/machine-bias-risk-assessments-in-criminal-sentencing> accessed 28 January 2024

25. Meuwese A, 'Regulating Algorithmic Decision-Making One Case at the Time: A Note on the Dutch "SyRI" Judgment' (2020) 1 European Review of Digital Administration & Law 209

26. Moreira NA, 'The Compatibility of AI in Criminal System with the ECHR and ECtHR Jurisprudence' in Goreti Marreiros and others (eds) (Springer International Publishing 2022)

27. Morison J and Harkens A, 'Re-Engineering Justice? Robot Judges, Computerised Courts and (Semi) Automated Legal Decision-Making' (2019) 39 Legal Studies 618

28. Naarttijärvi M, 'Situating the Rule of Law in the Context of Automated Decision-Making' in Markku Suksi (ed), *The Rule of Law and Automated Decision-Making: Exploring Fundamentals of Algorithmic Governance* (Springer International Publishing 2023) <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-30142-1_2>

29. Nemitz P, 'Constitutional Democracy and Technology in the Age of Artificial Intelligence' (2018) 376 Philosophical Transactions: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences 1

30. Niiler E, 'Can AI Be a Fair Judge in Court? Estonia Thinks So' *Wired* <https://www.wired.com/story/can-ai-be-fair-judge-court-estonia-thinks-so/> accessed 18 April 2024

31. Nowotko PM, 'AI in Judicial Application of Law and the Right to a Court' (2021) 192 Procedia Computer Science 2220

32. Rasmusen E, 'Judicial Legitimacy as a Repeated Game' (1994) 10 Journal of Law, Economics, & Organization 63

33. Rossi F, 'Building Trust in Artificial Intelligence' (2018) 72 Journal of International Affairs 127

34. Ruschemeier H, 'AI as a Challenge for Legal Regulation – the Scope of Application of the Artificial Intelligence Act Proposal' (2023) 23 ERA Forum 361

35. Schwemer SF, Tomada L and Pasini T, 'Legal AI Systems in the EU's Proposed Artificial Intelligence Act' (21 June 2021) <https://papers.ssrn.com/abstract=3871099> accessed 11 June 2024

36. Sourdin T, 'Judge v Robot?: Artificial Intelligence and Judicial Decision-Making' (2020) 41 UNIVERSITY OF NEW SOUTH WALES LAW JOURNAL 1114

37. uclalaw, 'Injustice Ex Machina: Predictive Algorithms in Criminal Sentencing' (*UCLA Law Review*, 19 February 2019) <https://www.uclalawreview.org/injustice-ex-machina-predictive-algorithms-in-criminal-sentencing/> accessed 28 January 2024

38. Ulenaers J, 'The Impact of Artificial Intelligence on the Right to a Fair Trial: Towards a Robot Judge?' (2020) 11 Asian Journal of Law and Economics <https://www.degruyter.com/document/doi/10.1515/ajle-2020-0008/html?lang%3Den=> accessed 15 June 2024

39. Van Den Bosch E and others, 'Human-Machine Decision-Making and Trust' (Strategic Studies Institute, US Army War College 2017) <https://www.jstor.org/stable/resrep12117.14> accessed 25 April 2024

40. Winter CK, 'The Challenges of Artificial Judicial Decision-Making for Liberal Democracy' in Piotr Bystranowski, Bartosz Janik and Maciej Próchnicki (eds), *Judicial Decision-Making: Integrating Empirical and*

*Theoretical Perspectives* (Springer International Publishing 2022) <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-11744-2_9> accessed 19 June 2024

41. ──, 'The Challenges of Artificial Judicial Decision-Making for Liberal Democracy' in Piotr Bystranowski, Bartosz Janik and Maciej Próchnicki (eds), *Judicial Decision-Making: Integrating Empirical and Theoretical Perspectives* (Springer International Publishing 2022) <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-11744-2_9> accessed 28 June 2024

42. Wykstra S, 'Philosopher1s Corner: What Is "Fair"? Algorithms in Criminal Justice' (2018) 34 Issues in Science and Technology 21

43. Zalnieriute M, Moses LB and Williams G, 'The Rule of Law and Automation of Government Decision-Making' (2019) 82 The Modern Law Review 425

44. Završnik A, 'Criminal Justice, Artificial Intelligence Systems, and Human Rights' (2020) 20 ERA Forum 567

45. Zekos GI, 'Digital Politics, GDPR, and AI' in Georgios I Zekos (ed), *Political, Economic and Legal Effects of Artificial Intelligence: Governance, Digital Economy and Society* (Springer International Publishing 2022) <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-94736-1_11> accessed 13 June 2024