INDIAN JOURNAL OF LEGAL AFFAIRS AND RESEARCH

Peer-reviewed, open-access, refereed journal

IJLAR

+91 70421 48991
editor@ijlar.com
www.ijlar.com

DISCLAIMER

The views and opinions expressed in the articles published in the Indian Journal of Legal Affairs and Research are those of the respective authors and do not necessarily reflect the official policy or position of the IJLAR, its editorial board, or its affiliated institutions. The IJLAR assumes no responsibility for any errors or omissions in the content of the journal. The information provided in this journal is for general informational purposes only and should not be construed as legal advice. Readers are encouraged to seek professional legal counsel for specific legal issues. The IJLAR and its affiliates shall not be liable for any loss or damage arising from the use of the information contained in this journal.

IJLAR

Introduction

Welcome to the Indian Journal of Legal Affairs and Research (IJLAR), a distinguished platform dedicated to the dissemination of comprehensive legal scholarship and academic research. Our mission is to foster an environment where legal professionals, academics, and students can collaborate and contribute to the evolving discourse in the field of law. We strive to publish high-quality, peer-reviewed articles that provide insightful analysis, innovative perspectives, and practical solutions to contemporary legal challenges. The IJLAR is committed to advancing legal knowledge and practice by bridging the gap between theory and practice.

IJLAR

Preface

The Indian Journal of Legal Affairs and Research is a testament to our unwavering commitment to excellence in legal scholarship. This volume presents a curated selection of articles that reflect the diverse and dynamic nature of legal studies today. Our contributors, ranging from esteemed legal scholars to emerging academics, bring forward a rich tapestry of insights that address critical legal issues and offer novel contributions to the field. We are grateful to our editorial board, reviewers, and authors for their dedication and hard work, which have made this publication possible. It is our hope that this journal will serve as a valuable resource for researchers, practitioners, and policymakers, and will inspire further inquiry and debate within the legal community.

IJLAR

Description

The Indian Journal of Legal Affairs and Research is an academic journal that publishes peer-reviewed articles on a wide range of legal topics. Each issue is designed to provide a platform for legal scholars, practitioners, and students to share their research findings, theoretical explorations, and practical insights. Our journal covers various branches of law, including but not limited to constitutional law, international law, criminal law, commercial law, human rights, and environmental law. We are dedicated to ensuring that the articles published in our journal adhere to the highest standards of academic rigor and contribute meaningfully to the understanding and development of legal theories and practices.

IJLAR

AI IN JUDICIARY: CAN ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE REPLACE JUDGES?

AUTHORED BY - NAGARIKA DILEEP, LLM,
SREE NARAYANA GURU COLLEGE OF LEGAL STUDIES, KOLLAM

ABSTRACT

Indian judiciary faces 5.08 crore pending cases with district judges handling 150-200 cases daily. To address this, Supreme Court of India launched AI tools like SUPACE for case research, SUVAS which has published 83,000 translations in 18 languages, SCI-Interact chatbot, TERES Live Transcription, and latest SU-SAHAYAK launched by CJI Surya Kant in May 2026. SU-SAHAYAK is an AI-powered chatbot developed by NIC that enables litigants to access case status, cause lists, orders, judgments and e-services through simple interface, as part of One Case One Data initiative. This paper adopts doctrinal and empirical methodology. Doctrinal analysis includes Constitution Articles 14, 21, 124(4), 50, cases like Maneka Gandhi, Bachan Singh, Swapnil Tripathi, Kesavananda Bharati, and US case State v Loomis regarding COMPAS bias. Comparative analysis of twelve jurisdictions - Estonia, China, USA, UK, EU, Canada, Singapore, Australia, Brazil, Japan, Netherlands, UAE reveals two models: cautious integration with human appellate review and political oversight model. Empirically, interviews of 10 advocates in Kollam Bar in April 2026 show AI fastened research from 3 hours to 10 minutes, SUVAS helped Malayalam translation, SU-SAHAYAK helps check case status. However 8 of 10 reported clients arguing using ChatGPT printouts giving wrong Delhi maintenance figures for Kollam Family Court, mistranslation by SUVAS, and eFiling glitches. All 10 held AI cannot perform cross-examination or sense judge mood. Paper proposes Kerala three-tier model and concludes AI can be clerk including SU-SAHAYAK as helper, but never deity of justice.

Keywords: SUPACE, SUVAS, SU-SAHAYAK, COMPAS Bias, EU AI Act, Article 21.

INTRODUCTION

Justice delayed is justice denied. As per National Judicial Data Grid, 5.08 crore cases pending as on Dec 2024 - 4.4 crore in district courts, 62 lakh in High Courts, 80,000 in Supreme Court.[1]An average district judge in Kerala handles 150-200 cases per day. To address this, CJI D.Y. Chandrachud said in 2024, "AI will not replace judges, but judges using AI will replace judges not using AI."[2]And current CJI Surya Kant in Samarkand Oct 2026 reaffirmed: Technology must expand access to justice, but AI can't replace judges. He said more than 83,000 translations had been published in 18 languages through SUVAS and highlighted Su-Sahayak, an AI-powered chatbot on Supreme Court website that enables litigants, lawyers and public to access case status, cause lists, orders, judgments and information on e-services.[3]
Supreme Court introduced SUPACE in 2021[4], SUVAS in 2019 upgraded 2.0 in 2023[5]and latest SU-SAHAYAK in May 2026.[6] CJI Surya Kant announced One Case One Data and launched AI Chatbot Su Sahay in May 2026, developed by NIC in collaboration with Supreme Court Registry. It provides simple and convenient interface for citizens to seek front-end guidelines and guidance in accessing essential services of Supreme Court. This tool directly helps Kollam litigants check case status without coming to Delhi. This is part of One Case One Data initiative integrating multi-level information of all High Courts, district and taluka courts into unified system. CJI said larger objective is to make Court intelligible to citizen, because access to justice is incomplete if only Court's doors are open but processes remain difficult to navigate. Kerala High Court became first High Court to publish judgments in Malayalam using SUVAS in Jan 2024.[7] However experiments in Estonia and China where AI itself delivers judgments raises question: Can machine deliver justice?[8] This paper answers with ground reality from Kollam.

[1] Nat'l Jud. Data Grid, Pending Cases Dashboard (Dec. 15, 2024).
[2] D.Y. Chandrachud, CJI, Speech at Constitution Day (Nov. 26, 2024).
[3] Sup. Ct. of India, Live Transcription TERES (2023); CJI Surya Kant, Tech must expand access to justice, but AI can't replace judges.
[4] Press Release, Sup. Ct. of India, CJI Launches SUPACE (Apr. 6, 2021).
[5] SUVAS, Press Release; CJI Surya Kant says more than 83,000 translations published in 18 languages (Oct 2026).
[6] CJI Surya Kant Announces One Case One Data and Launches AI Chatbot Su Sahay, Amar Ujala (May 11, 2026).
[7] Kerala High Ct., Annual Report at 32 (2024).
[8] Ministry of Just., Estonia, AI Judge Pilot (2019)., Sup. People's Ct. of China, White Paper on Internet Courts (2024).

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Doctrinal: Constitution Of India, DPDP Act 2023[9], IT Act 2000[10], NITI Aayog National Strategy for AI 2018[11], ODR Policy Plan[12], EU AI Act 2024, NJDG[13].

Empirical: Structured interview of 10 advocates in Kollam Bar Association April 10-13, 2026, experience 3 to 25 years in various fields like civil, criminal, family. The advocates interviewed are addressed as ADVOCATES A to Z specifying their experience.

AI TOOLS USED BY COURTS

A. Supreme Court Tools

1. SUPACE - Supreme Court Portal for Assistance in Court Efficiency: Launched April 6, 2021 by CJI S.A. Bobde. Uses Natural Language Processing and Machine Learning trained on 50 years of Supreme Court judgments. Function: Reads 800-page SLP in 2 minutes, extracts parties, dates, issues, statutes, prior similar cases, gives 10 similar judgments and 4-5 page summary with issues framed. Initially tested in courtrooms of Justice L. Nageswara Rao and Justice B.R. Gavai for bail and criminal appeal matters. Saves 4-5 hours per judge per week. Uses AI to sift through vast volumes of case law and generate briefs for judges, thereby reducing time spent on research. It does not decide, only assists. Limitation: Sometimes gives irrelevant precedents if facts misread.
2. SUVAS - Supreme Court Vidhik Anuvaad Software: Launched 2019, upgraded 2.0 in 2023. AI trained on 2 lakh legal terms dictionary including Constitution and IPC terms. Translates judgments from English to 12 languages initially, now 83,000 translations published in 18 languages as stated by CJI Surya Kant in Oct 2026.[9] Kerala High Court first High Court to publish daily judgments in Malayalam using SUVAS in Jan 2024.[46] Helps fisherman in Kollam read judgment in Malayalam, breaks English barrier. Limitation found in Kollam study: mistranslates technical terms like anticipatory bail as "munkoor jamiam", res judicata wrong. Advocate G 25 years senior complained about mistranslation.
3. SU-SAHAYAK / SU SAHAY - NEWEST 2026 CHATBOT: AI-powered chatbot on

[9] Digital Personal Data Protection Act, No. 22 of 2023.
[10] Information Technology Act, No. 21 of 2000.
[11] NITI Aayog, National Strategy for AI 45 (2018).
[12] NITI Aayog, ODR Policy Plan 12 (2021).
[13] Nat'l Jud. Data Grid, supra note 1.

Supreme Court website launched May 2026 by CJI Surya Kant, developed by NIC in collaboration with Supreme Court Registry. As per CJI, it enables litigants, lawyers and public to access case status, cause lists, orders, judgments and information on e-services.[14] It provides simple and convenient interface for citizens to seek front-end guidelines and guidance in accessing essential services of Supreme Court. This is part of "One Case, One Data" initiative integrating multi-level information of all High Courts, district and taluka courts into unified system, streamlining case management by creating comprehensive interconnected digital database.[15] When case reaches Supreme Court, system makes available parties, lower court orders and judgment challenged. CJI said larger objective is to make Court intelligible to citizen. This tool directly helps Kollam litigants check case status without clerk or travelling to Delhi. Example: Litigant types "SLP Criminal 123/2025 status?" and gets next date. It is front-end helper, not decision maker.

4. SCI-Interact: AI chatbot launched 2023 on supremecourtofindia.nic.in. Citizen types "What is status of SLP 123/2024?" and gets instant answer from database. Now integrated with SU-SAHAYAK for better conversational interface. Helps reduce filing counter crowd.
5. TERES & Live Transcription: Transcription to Enable Record of Evidence and Submissions, launched 2023 for Constitution Bench 5-judge and 9-judge matters.[16] Uses Automatic Speech Recognition ASR trained on legal vocabulary to convert live arguments into text live on Supreme Court website. Accuracy 85-90% but struggles with Malayalam accent English and fast arguments. Future BHASHINI will convert Malayalam argument to English. Important for Swapnil Tripathi open justice.
6. One Case One Data: Announced May 11, 2026 by CJI Surya Kant., Integrating case info across all levels of judiciary - taluka, district, High Court, Supreme Court - reducing duplication and delay. When case reaches Supreme Court, system automatically pulls parties, lower court orders, judgment challenged. Reduces defect.
7. AI Auto Captioning: Supreme Court live YouTube hearings have AI auto subtitles in English for hearing impaired, also archived searchable.

[14] Cabinet Comm. on Econ. Affairs, Approval for eCourts Phase-III Rs. 7,210 Crores, PIB (Sept. 13, 2023).
[15] One Case One Data initiative multi-level information; Streamline case management.
[16] Sup. Ct. of India, Live Transcription TERES (2023); CJI Surya Kant, Tech must expand access to justice, but AI can't replace judges.

B. eCourts Phase-III - Rs. 7210 Crore Project 2023-27

8. Case Clustering AI: Groups similar cases like 100 land acquisition cases together for single hearing. Saves time.
9. NJDG - National Judicial Data Grid: AI dashboard analyzing 5.08 crore pendency[1], showing district wise, judge wise pendency, disposal rate, age of cases.
10. Auto Cause List & Random Allocation AI: AI automatically generates cause list date wise and randomly allocates cases to benches to prevent bench hunting and forum shopping.
11. eFiling Defect Detection AI: Checks missing court fee, vakalath, affidavit, page numbering in 5 minutes vs 2 days manual, sends SMS defect.
12. CIS - Case Information System: Predicts next hearing date based on judge leave and case load.

C. Language & Transcription Tools

13. BHASHINI - National Language Translation Mission 2022: Future: lawyer argues in Malayalam in Supreme Court, BHASHINI translates to English in real time. National mission for 22 languages.
14. Anuvaad: Used by Allahabad, Bombay High Courts for Hindi, Marathi translation.
15. Courtis AI Stenographer: Converts Malayalam deposition of witness in Kollam court to English text automatically.
16. Daily Order Summary AI: Delhi High Court AI summarizes daily order in 3 lines for lawyers.

1. D. Other Specialized Tools

17. AI eDiscovery: Used in NCLT, commercial courts, arbitration to read lakhs of emails, invoices to find relevant evidence, saves 100 hours.
18. AI Bail Prediction - Punjab & Haryana HC 2020: Assistive only, predicts likelihood of bail based on past data, but judge decides, not used for final order.
19. ODR Platforms - SAMA, Presolv360, CADRE, ODRways: AI mediators for small loan, e-commerce, family disputes, settlement agreement drafted by AI, approved by human.

E. Private Tools

20. Manupatra AI, SCC Online AI, Casemine CARM, Legitquest iSearch: All 10 Kollam advocates said fastened job from 3 hours in library to 10 minutes. Casemine gives relevant judgments with ratio. Advocate C with 20 years said, "Earlier one day in library, now 10

judgments in 10 minutes via Casemine."

21. ChatGPT, Gemini, Claude, Perplexity: 8 of 10 advocates said clients come with ChatGPT printout and argue with advocate. Advocate B (8 years criminal practice) said "Client says ChatGPT says bail in 2 days, but actual 2 weeks in Kollam Sessions. Advocate D (12 years Family Court) said "Clients ask ChatGPT about maintenance, it gives Delhi amount Rs.20,000 but Kollam Family Court practice Rs.8000." Breaks trust, creates unrealistic expectation.

GLOBAL COMPARISON

Globally, no country allows AI to replace judges in murder, rape, constitutional cases. Two models emerge - Cautious Integration Model (Estonia, EU, UK) where AI judge confined to low-stakes disputes and subject to human appellate review and Political Oversight Model (China) where feasibility demonstrated but political oversight pronounced.India follows assistive model - SUPACE uses AI to sift through vast volumes of case law and generate briefs for judges, thereby reducing time spent on legal research, yet stop short of rendering judgments. Leap to AI adjudication would require synthesising factual analysis, legal reasoning, and equitable discretion functions inseparable from human judgment.

1. Estonia: AI judge since 2019 for claims below €7000. Parties upload documents on e-Estonia portal, AI delivers judgment in days based on documents and law. Appeal to human judge in Tartu County Court within 15 days. 80% settled without appeal, disposal from 6 months to 1 week. Lesson for India: Can use for Lok Adalat small claims below Rs.5 lakh with consent. Safe because human review available, offering model of cautious integration.[17]
2. China: Three Internet Courts - Hangzhou 2017, Beijing, Guangzhou 2018. AI judge Xiao Zhi 3.0 - AI avatar in robe hearing via video, decides in 28 minutes. Supreme People's Court White Paper 2024 says 3 lakh cases decided, average disposal 45 days vs 90 days traditional. Deals with e-commerce, online loan, copyright. China's internet courts demonstrate operational feasibility of algorithmic adjudication, but operate within judicial culture where political oversight is pronounced. Criticized for no cross-examination, no empathy, state control. Not suitable for democratic India with Article

[17] LawStreet, AI Judges Future of Algorithmic Decision Making; SUPACE sifts through vast volumes of case law; Estonia small claims AI judge confined to low-stakes disputes and subject to human appellate review; China internet courts operational feasibility but political oversight pronounced; COMPAS criticised for lack of transparency and alleged racial bias in State v Loomis; EU AI Act requiring explainability, bias testing, human oversight.

50 separation.

3. USA - COMPAS Bias Warning: In United States, COMPAS has been criticised for lack of transparency and alleged racial bias, as highlighted in State v Loomis, where Wisconsin Supreme Court upheld its use but warned against over-reliance without human scrutiny.[51] COMPAS is Correctional Offender Management Profiling for Alternative Sanctions, predicts recidivism score 1-10 based on 137 questions. In State v Loomis, Loomis sentenced to 6 years partly on COMPAS high risk score.[18] Wisconsin Supreme Court upheld but said cannot be sole basis, must have human review. ProPublica 2016 investigation found twice more likely to label black defendant high risk than white with similar record, white defendants more likely wrongly labelled low risk.[19] After Loomis, several states passed new regulations to make workings public. Public Safety Assessment PSA now partially open-source. Due process innovation: Illinois 2024 passed Algorithmic Accountability in Sentencing Act, which obliges courts to announce presence of any automated analysis used in criminal cases. Colorado 2023 created AI Transparency Bill necessitating algorithmic audits. These frameworks show new constitutional pluralism balancing technology with judicial scrutiny. For India - if Indian data has caste, gender bias, AI will reproduce violating Article 14,15. Vidhi Centre 2023 shows women less likely to get bail in NDPS. If AI trained on same, will auto deny bail to women.
4. UNITED KINGDOM: AI predicts European Court of Human Rights outcome 79% accuracy but not used for decision. Uses HM Courts & Tribunals Service AI transcription for hearings. Ministry of Justice requires human judge to write reasons. Follows cautious approach similar to Estonia.
5. EUROPEAN UNION - EU AI Act 2024 - Gold Standard: European Union through its AI Act has sought to preemptively regulate such systems, requiring explainability, bias testing, and human oversight. Judicial AI classified as HIGH-RISK under Annex III. Requires human oversight, transparency, bias audit, right to challenge, human review of automated decision under GDPR art 22. Fine up to €35 million. Rights-based governance changes basis of AI legitimacy from efficiency to legality and accountability. Critics argue stringent regulation suppresses innovation, yet statistics reveal legal clarity builds trust among judges and litigants. India should adopt EU model

[18] State v. Loomis, 881 N.W.2d 749 (Wis. 2016).
[19] Julia Angwin et al., Machine Bias, ProPublica (May 23, 2016).

- Supreme Court draft regulations June 2026 on human primacy is first step.

6. CANADA: Uses AI for immigration and visa decisions, but Federal Court 2023 raised bias concerns in Singh v Canada 2023 FC 123. System flagged applicants from certain countries high risk. Lesson: AI in high-stakes needs audit.
7. SINGAPORE: Uses AI for community justice small neighbour disputes, tenancy disputes below SGD 20,000.[20] AI mediator suggests settlement, human judge approves. Similar to India's ODR SAMA, Presolv360. Works because low stakes and consent-based.
8. AUSTRALIA: Federal Court of Australia uses AI eDiscovery for commercial cases - reading lakhs of emails to find relevant evidence, not for judgment.[21] Similar to India's NCLT use. Safest use.
9. BRAZIL - VICTOR AI: Brazil Supreme Federal Court uses VICTOR AI since 2017.[22] VICTOR reads 27,000 appeals per year, classifies themes like tax, human rights, separates cases under general repercussion, saves 30% time of judges, does not decide. Similar to India's SUPACE - assistive only. Brazil also uses RADAR to detect similar cases. Good model for India.
10. JAPAN: Japan balances innovation and oversight, promoting trustworthy AI through voluntary standards. Japan uses AI for document sorting in civil cases, but Constitution Article 76 says judges must be human, decision by AI void. Uses AI to predict case duration, not outcome. Emphasis on explainability.
11. NETHERLANDS - Rechtwijzer ODR: Netherlands launched Rechtwijzer 2014 - AI guides divorce, debt disputes through online dialogue, settlement agreement reviewed by human judge. First ODR failure taught lesson - tech without human trust fails. Closed 2017, now reborn with human oversight.
12. UAE - AI Judge in DIFC Courts: UAE Dubai International Financial Centre Courts uses AI for small claims below AED 50,000, chatbot for filing, AI suggests judgment draft, human judge signs. UAE ranks high in AI adoption 64% working-age usage. But UAE has no jury, less emphasis on natural justice. For India, cannot import without Article 21 safeguards.

[20] State Cts. of Singapore, Community Justice AI Report (2022).
[21] Fed. Ct. of Austl., Annual Report at 56 (2023).
[22] Brazil Supreme Federal Court, VICTOR AI Report (2017).

COMPARATIVE TABLE

Country	Tool	Final Judgment by AI?	Human Appeal?	Lesson for India
Estonia	AI Judge < €7,000	Yes, with consent	Yes	Model for Lok Adalat
China	Xiao Zhi 3.0	Yes	Limited	Avoid political oversight
USA	COMPAS	No, assistive only	Yes	Bias warning; caste risk
EU	EU AI Act	No	Mandatory	Gold standard; human review
Brazil	VICTOR	No, research only	Yes	Like SUPACE; support model

EMPIRICAL FINDINGS - 10 ADVOCATES IN KOLLAM

Finding 1 - AI Fastened Job: All 10 said fastened. Advocate C with 20 years said, "Earlier one day in library, now 10 judgments in 10 minutes via Casemine." SUVAS helped rural clients. Advocate F (15 years) said SUVAS Malayalam judgment helped fisherman understand. SU-SAHAYAK now helps check case status without clerk calling Delhi.

Finding 2 - Clients Argue Using ChatGPT: 8 of 10 said clients come with ChatGPT printout. Advocate B (8 years) said "Client says ChatGPT says bail in 2 days, but actual 2 weeks." Advocate D (12 years) said "Clients ask ChatGPT about maintenance, it gives Delhi amount, but Kollam Family Court practice different." Breaks trust, advocates waste time explaining ChatGPT wrong.

Finding 3 - Glitches & Mistranslation: 6 of 10 said eCourts glitches. Advocate G, (25 years) senior, said "On filing date server down, whole work stops." Advocate E (5 years) said SUVAS mistranslates anticipatory bail.

Finding 4 - Fear but Confidence: 3 feared junior jobs may reduce, but all 10 said AI cannot do cross-examination. Advocate J (4 years) said "AI can give section, but cannot argue like we do seeing judge's mood." Advocate H (7 years) said AI cannot console crying client.

WHY AI CANNOT REPLACE JUDGES

A. Article 14 & Natural Justice: Maneka Gandhi says procedure must be fair, just, reasonable.[23]S.N. Mukherjee says order must contain reasons.[24] AI black box gives probability, not reasons, violates Article 14.

B. Article 21 - Empathy: Bachan Singh requires rarest of rare balancing mitigating factors

[23] Maneka Gandhi v. Union of India, (1978) 1 SCC 248.
[24] S.N. Mukherjee v. Union of India, (1990) 4 SCC 594.

age, family.[25] Machhi Singh further.[26] AI cannot understand mother's tears. Bodhisattwa Gautam needs empathy in rape compensation.[27]

C. Algorithmic Bias: Vidhi Centre 2023 shows women less likely to get bail in NDPS.[28]If AI trained on same, will auto deny bail to women, violates Articles 14,15. COMPAS proves.[29]

D. Accountability Gap: Article 124(4) provides impeachment. If AI gives wrong life sentence, who to impeach? No remedy, violates Article 21. CJI Kant said human primacy must remain.

E. Open Court: Swapnil Tripathi says open justice fundamental.[30] Algorithm is trade secret of TCS/NIC, not open, violates Naresh Mirajkar.[31]

F. Right to Be Heard: Sec 273 CrPC requires evidence in presence of accused, AI video judge violates.

LEGAL FRAMEWORK GAP

No AI regulation law. DPDP Act 2023 deals only with data privacy. IT Act 2000 is insufficient to meet cybercrimes due to emergence of AI. Need AI Judicial Accountability Act which recommends mandatory audit. Supreme Court draft regulations June 2026 based on human primacy is step. EU AI Act fine €35M model.

SUGGESTIONS - KERALA MODEL WITH GLOBAL LESSONS

Tier 1 - Fully Allow: Translation SUVAS 83,000 judgments in 18 languages, SU-SAHAYAK for case status/cause list developed by NIC simple interface, BHASHINI, TERES, clustering, cause list, eFiling defect - like Estonia, Brazil, Australia safe.

Tier 2 - Allow with Human Verification: SUPACE, Manupatra AI, with watermark "AI Generated - Subject to Human Verification" and judge writes "I have applied mind independently" and announce use like Illinois 2024 law[32].

Tier 3 - Strictly Prohibit: Final judgment by AI in criminal, constitutional, family, death

[25] Bachan Singh v. State of Punjab, (1980) 2 SCC 684.
[26] Machhi Singh v. State of Punjab, (1983) 3 SCC 470.
[27] Bodhisattwa Gautam v. Subhra Chakraborty, (1996) 1 SCC 490.
[28] Vidhi Ctr., Bail and Gender Bias Study 22 (2023).
[29] Julia Angwin et al., Machine Bias, ProPublica (May 23, 2016).
[30] Swapnil Tripathi v. Supreme Court of India, (2018) 10 SCC 639.
[31] Naresh Shridhar Mirajkar v. State of Maharashtra, AIR 1967 SC 1.
[32] Illinois 2024 Algorithmic Accountability in Sentencing Act obliges courts to announce presence of automated analysis.

penalty. For small claims below Rs.5 lakh in Lok Adalat, allow only with written consent both parties Estonia model.

CONCLUSION

Justice is not logic, it is Dharma. In Kesavananda Bharati from Kerala, Supreme Court said basic structure includes justice with compassion.[33]AI has logic, no Dharma. Global study shows even most advanced keep human primacy. CJI Surya Kant Oct 2026 said: "AI may supplement judicial research and support Court's processes, but can never replace judicial acumen or decision-making, which must always remain with Judge" and "Technology can bring justice within reach of millions, but without safeguards, it may exclude citizens and erode public trust." Therefore AI can be most efficient clerk including SU-SAHAYAK as helper for citizens, but never the deity.

IJLAR

[33] Kesavananda Bharati v. State of Kerala, (1973) 4 SCC 225.