

# Review of: "AI in Court: Facing Today's Legal Challenges"

Alexandra Bizoi<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> West University of Timisoara

**Potential competing interests:** No potential competing interests to declare.

The paper examines the complex interplay between artificial intelligence (AI) and legal frameworks, articulating the potential and pitfalls of integrating AI into legal systems. It explores various facets, including the legal challenges posed by AI, the adaptation of laws to new technology, company strategies for navigating AI-related legal hurdles, and the development of clear regulatory landscapes.

The abstract hints at the motivation behind the discussion of AI in courtrooms—its growing influence and the subsequent changes this brings to the legal system. However, it does not explicitly state the purpose of the paper or study, such as whether it aims to analyze, critique, or propose solutions regarding the use of AI in legal settings. The abstract vaguely suggests a problem statement by mentioning "both advantages and challenges" and "big ethical and legal questions," but does not clearly define a specific problem or research question it intends to address. There is no mention of the methodology. For research papers, this would include the approach used to analyze the impact of AI on courtrooms. This abstract does not specify whether the discussion focuses on case studies, a review of literature, or empirical research. The abstract does not provide specific results or findings. It generalizes the impact of AI ("changing how cases are handled and decided") but lacks detailed outcomes or data gathered through the study. While it implies a conclusion—that AI is already impacting courtrooms and is not just a future concern—it does not offer a detailed analysis or a summarization of the implications of these impacts. The abstract suggests the issue's significance by emphasizing AI's current and tangible effects on court decisions. However, it stops short of detailing the broader implications for the legal system, society, or future research.

1. Section 1 provides an overview of the challenges and responses. It could be strengthened by including specific examples of legal cases or guidelines that have shaped AI development and deployment in legal settings. Additionally, discussing the effectiveness of current best practices and whether they sufficiently address the identified challenges would offer deeper insights into the evolving legal landscape surrounding AI in courtrooms.
2. Section 2 could incorporate more detailed examples of specific lawsuits and their outcomes, providing more precise insights into how the legal system navigates these challenges. Additionally, a deeper analysis of the differences in regulatory approaches across jurisdictions could offer a more global perspective. Finally, the section would benefit from discussing potential future legal challenges as AI technology evolves, preparing readers for the complexities.
3. Section 3 outlines the need to fit old laws into new technologies and the importance of legal frameworks for AI's ethical use. It could incorporate more detailed analyses of modifiable existing laws. Examples of proposed legislative changes or discussions on the feasibility of such adjustments in different legal systems would offer more practical insights.

Additionally, exploring the global diversity in legal responses to AI's challenges could provide a more comprehensive understanding of the international legal landscape. Lastly, a more in-depth examination of the ethical considerations behind AI's legal challenges, beyond privacy and liability, could deepen the discussion on the societal impacts of AI.

4. Section 4 outlines general strategies for managing legal risks associated with AI. It could benefit from more concrete examples of how companies have successfully integrated compliance into their innovation processes. Specific case studies of tech giants and startups overcoming legal hurdles could offer practical insights into effective compliance strategies. Additionally, discussing potential pitfalls or challenges companies face in maintaining this balance would provide a more nuanced understanding of the complexities of navigating the legal landscape of AI.
5. Section 5 could provide more detailed examples of how new policies might specifically address the concerns mentioned. While it cites the importance of global cooperation and outlines regional approaches, a deeper analysis of the successes and limitations of these efforts could offer valuable insights into best practices and challenges in AI governance. Additionally, discussing potential barriers to international cooperation and strategies to overcome them could provide a more comprehensive view of the path toward harmonized AI regulations.
6. Section 6 uses past cases to illustrate legal precedents in AI. However, it could be enhanced by more explicitly linking these cases to specific legal principles or regulations that have emerged as a result. Additionally, discussing the broader societal implications of these cases could provide a more comprehensive view of the impact of AI on privacy, safety, and ethical considerations. Finally, offering more detailed strategies for companies to navigate these legal complexities could make the section more actionable for practitioners in the field.
7. Section 7 succinctly summarizes critical concerns. However, the section could benefit from providing specific examples or recommendations for future legal research areas, offering readers concrete directions for further exploration.
8. The conclusion succinctly encapsulates the core dilemma of integrating AI into the legal system: the balance between leveraging AI's potential benefits for efficiency and decision-making against the inherent challenges it brings, primarily regarding fairness, bias, transparency, and accountability. However, this section could suggest concrete steps or frameworks for mitigating these challenges, such as adopting international standards for AI ethics in the legal sector or implementing oversight mechanisms to monitor AI's impact on due process. Additionally, it could call for ongoing research and dialogue among legal professionals, technologists, and policymakers to ensure that the deployment of AI technologies aligns with the principles of justice and equity.

**While each section provides valuable insights into its respective focus area, the paper could benefit from more profound analysis and more concrete examples in some areas. Integrating case studies or specific regulatory proposals could enhance its practical relevance. Additionally, a more substantial thread of continuity linking the sections to illustrate the evolution of legal thought around AI and more explicit recommendations for future legal and policy initiatives could make the paper a more compelling and comprehensive resource for readers interested in the legal implications of AI technologies.**