

AUTOMATION IN JUDICIAL ADMINISTRATION: EVALUATING THE ROLE OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE

Ahmed Raza^{*1}, Shahzad Khalid², Abida Yasin³, Shahid Maqsood Kasuri⁴, Dr. Bakht Munir⁵

^{*1}LLM Scholar Postgraduate School of Legal Studies, University of the Punjab, Lahore, Pakistan.

²LLM (International Law) University of the West of England, United Kingdom Principal Superior College of Law
Superior University Lahore

³Visiting Faculty Punjab University Law College

⁴LL.M Scholar University of Lahore (UOL)

⁵University of the Punjab, Lahore

^{*1}ahmedraza.sajjad@gmail.com, ²Rana.shahzad@superior.edu.pk, ³abida_yasin5@yahoo.com,
⁴smksr25@gmail.com, ⁵bakht.law@pu.edu.pk

Corresponding Author: *

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.15180181>

Received: 10 June, 2023

Revised: 10 July, 2023

Accepted: 26 July, 2023

Published: 31 July, 2023

ABSTRACT

This article examines the role of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in judicial administration, exploring its potential benefits and challenges. AI can streamline court procedures, enhancing efficiency in routine legal tasks, but its use in complex adjudication raises ethical and procedural concerns. For efficient AI implementation, identifying AI technologies that have already demonstrated effectiveness in legal processes is essential. Ensuring AI's compatibility with judicial safeguards, particularly Human Rights, is crucial for maintaining fairness and due process. In this regard, structuring legal data is essential to enhance AI's usability, requiring standardized document formatting, metadata integration, and machine-readable organization. Moreover, training judges to ensure informed decision-making and accurate interpretation of AI-generated outputs, along with continuous evaluation of AI systems, is necessary to maintain their reliability. Observing the risks involved, this article explores these considerations and makes key legal recommendations for drawing maximum benefit from AI technology and integrating it into judicial functioning.

Keywords: Artificial Intelligence, Judicial Administration, Information Technology, Court Proceedings.

INTRODUCTION

The integration of AI into various aspects of daily life is advancing rapidly, with machines increasingly performing tasks once carried out exclusively by humans. Technologies that were once considered innovative, such as spell checkers and search engines, have now become commonplace, while sophisticated AI applications, including facial recognition at airports and real-time navigation updates, continue to evolve. Additionally, voice-assistants on mobile

devices and tablets respond to spoken queries with increasing accuracy. In the legal domain, discussions surrounding "robot justice" have gained prominence, with claims that AI can predict court rulings with high precision, potentially altering the role of human judges. While speculative discourse on future technological advancements is prevalent, it is crucial to assess the current capabilities and limitations of AI in judicial administration.

This article critically examines the potential benefits and risks associated with AI in judicial proceedings based on existing knowledge. Key considerations include whether AI should be incorporated into court proceedings, the extent to which it can assist judges, and the necessary conditions for its effective and responsible integration. Not all legal matters require complex, case-specific adjudication; many routine cases can be efficiently managed through automated processes. As a result, the role of AI in judicial decision-making varies depending on the nature of the case. Identifying AI systems that have already demonstrated success in judicial processes is essential for informed implementation.

Furthermore, the adoption of AI in judicial settings must align with established legal standards, particularly the safeguards enshrined in Article 6 of the European Convention on Human Rights, which guarantees the right to a fair trial and due process. The potential risks AI poses to these procedural guarantees necessitate a careful evaluation of its implementation. In response to these concerns, the Council of Europe has introduced ethical guidelines to regulate AI use in judicial administration, ensuring that its deployment upholds fundamental legal principles. Additionally, the structuring of legal information remains a critical issue, as optimizing legal data for AI compatibility is essential for its reliable and effective application in judicial decision-making. This article explores these considerations, providing a comprehensive analysis of AI's evolving role in modern legal systems.

1. The Concept of AI: An Analytical View

Artificial Intelligence (AI) is all about making machines think and act like humans. John McCarthy, who is considered the father of the term "Artificial Intelligence," devised this definition in 1956 (McCarthy et al., 1955). For AI to mimic human cognition effectively, it must encompass faculties such as abstract thought, logical reasoning, pattern identification, problem-solving, gleaning meaning from unstructured data, applying prior learning to novel challenges, adapting to unfamiliar circumstances, and autonomous growth absent explicit instruction. AI relies heavily on colossal datasets, commonly called "big data," to function competently. Luc Julia, a pioneer of Siri, illustrated

this by noting it takes approximately 100,000 images of cats for a machine to identify the species with

95% accuracy (Julia, 2019). With time, the accessibility of immense data has substantially fueled interest in AI. Various forms of AI now exist, such as speech and image recognition. This discussion focuses primarily on machine learning and natural language processing. Despite being a nascent field of research, deep learning – in which AI systems develop through self-directed learning – has the potential to change the course of the future.

2. The Interaction of Information Technology with Judicial Processes

Delivering justice in specific cases is only one function of the judiciary; courts serve a broader role in shaping the norms of society. At its core, judicial work revolves around processing information. Parties present information to the court, which undergoes procedural changes before a final ruling—also a form of information—is issued. However, not all aspects of this process require complex legal analysis. Many judicial decisions, such as default judgments and rulings on inadmissibility, are produced through routine procedures. Some cases require a straightforward evaluation without formal hearing, while others are settled outside of court. (Reiling, 2009) The Netherlands Judiciary deals with approximately 1.3 million cases annually. Only a small portion of cases involve complex legal disputes. It is essential to acknowledge that the procedures—and consequently, the role of information technology—vary depending on the type of case.

In the administrative and civil context, including by local court, still by small claims, the administration of case processing floats largely on the two critical factors: (a) the complexity of information (b) predictability of the outcome. Many routine cases have predictable outcomes. A significant number of routine cases have outcomes that are easy to anticipate. In these instances, court decisions are often generated through an automated process using the provided data. The issued judgment serves as an official enforcement document. Courts increasingly receive digital case filings, allowing information to be submitted electronically, which eliminates the need for manual data entry. Moreover, in cases where the

outcome is highly predictable, artificial intelligence (AI) can be used to automate certain aspects—or even the majority—of case processing, as the final decision is largely predetermined.

A similar pattern can be observed in family and employment law cases, where many cases follow standard legal procedures. The judges in these cases take on a civil-law notary-like role, examining the agreements that the parties submit to make sure they fulfill legal requirements. This may include divorce settlements, arrangements for parental authority, or the termination of employment contracts. In these cases, judicial decisions are often generated automatically to confirm legal compliance. Digital case filing and process automation remain crucial elements in these proceedings. Smart filing systems also enable parties to file their cases in an organized manner within the court.

3. The Application of Information Technology in Courts

In cases that are not entirely routine, settlements are often reached before a formal judgment is needed. Specialized software is available to assess both parties' perspectives and propose an optimal resolution based on their input. If an agreement is not reached, only then does the case proceed to a formal court judgment. In the Netherlands, routine matters in the criminal justice system are at least handled by the Public Prosecution Service, with only those in need of a formal ruling being taken to the court. The complexity of these cases varies from simple affairs to very complex legal matters. In complex cases that require a judge or judicial panel to render a ruling to determine the matter, information technology is a vital player. Knowledge management systems make sure those resources are easy to access, and digital case files allow mountains of information to be organized and reviewed efficiently. Being a type of information technology, the use of artificial intelligence may vary according to the nature of the case. Its function may differ, adjusting to the demands of the legal process.

4. The Significance of AI in the Judicial System

Artificial intelligence can serve multiple purposes in the judicial system, addressing various needs. There is no shortage of claims about its potential benefits

for courts. Some argue that AI could enhance fairness, and, unlike human judges, it does not experience fatigue or rely on physical factors like glucose levels to function. (Kahneman, 2011) However, such statements remain largely speculative. The focus here is on AI applications that have already demonstrated their effectiveness. This discussion centers on "proven technology"—systems that have shown practical value in legal settings. But can robots truly replace human judges? That question still does not have a clear answer (Van den Herik, n.d.).

A. Organizing Information

Passing text files and documents can be super helpful for managing a high caseload or multi-issue matters with lots of related information. One of the classic examples from the US is "e-discovery," an automated process that analyses court-related electronic data to acquire relevant information before the first court moves. Based on the data up to October 2022, this machine learning technology drives the system to determine the best way of extracting critical information from huge datasets. The judge reviews and approves the specific search terms and coding strategies the parties agree on. In both the US and Britain, for instance, courts formally recognize this type of document analysis. This method is far more accurate and successful when compared to the traditional manual analysis process of data.

B. Providing Legal Consultation

Artificial intelligence that can provide legal counsel could prove immensely beneficial to people who are seeking legal advice but have no idea where to start. Similarly, the ability to search for relevant information and even suggest solutions is an aspect that legal practitioners can take advantage of. The user still has the final say on whether to follow the suggestion, however. This consultative role may help people handle legal issues on their own and thus prevent those disputes from escalating and having to go to court. AI is also capable of generating legal documents such as summons, in addition to petitions, which may help expedite the judicial review and enhance efficiency for the judiciary as well.

One example of AI as an advising entity in practice is the "Civil Resolution Tribunal" (CRT) in British Columbia, Canada. (British Columbia Civil

Resolution Tribunal, 2019) Its powers expanded over the years, and by April 2019, it included claims for personal injuries caused in traffic accidents. It was designed to address disputes related to strata and subsidized housing. The "Solution Explorer" is a CRT tool that provides interactive directed advice, legal knowledge, natural language mediation, and legal preparation assistance. This is not a fully autonomous AI system, but a trained advanced system that is updated quarterly by humans depending on whether up until analysis of data + user feedback.

The "District Court of East Brabant" in the Netherlands is also conducting a similar exercise of exploring AI technology in traffic infringement matters with "Tilburg University, Eindhoven University of Technology, and The Jheronimus Academy of Data Science (JADS)" (Van der Put, 2019, pp. 50-60). We aim at producing a tool to facilitate judges' processing of and decisions regarding these kinds of cases. For research, it has been decided that the data of the 'Arnhem Leeuwarden' (Court of Appeal) and the data from the courts of Zeeland-West Brabant and East Brabant will be added to the dataset. This is now in the experimental phase of the project until we have results in 2020.

C. Predicting Legal Decisions

The use of "AI" to predict the results from the court decisions has received a great deal of interest especially within American and English legal systems. This concept is often referred to as "predictive justice," though the term is debatable, since AI-generated outcomes do not offer exact predictions or even real justice. It might even be more precise to describe one of these AI-enabled evaluations as "legal forecasting," since it offers probability rather than final determinations, the way weather forecasts do. Considerations such as how complex the matter is will directly affect how unpredictable court rulings are and, thus, the extent to which AI can be used as a tool for lowering legal ambiguity.

In the US, there are numerous commercial AI-powered judicial forecasting systems available, but their proprietary techniques remain unknown. However, several non-profit projects offer valuable insights into how AI-based legal forecasting works.

Yet

another example is the machine learning system developed by researchers from the USA able to guess with 70.2% accuracy the majority SCOTUS decision and with 71.9% accuracy the votes of the individual justices (Katz et al., 2017). An AI model orients its prediction with case information, judges' political views and voting trends.

A similar AI approach has been used for the prediction of decisions from the "European Court of Human Rights" (ECHR). This technique uses machine learning and natural language processing to examine prior decisions to gauge whether the court is likely to rule against the European Convention on Human Rights. Researchers found that the way the facts in evidence were presented was a key determinant in predicting the outcome with a 79% accuracy rate, according to records from HUDOC, the official database of the court. Although these tools do not replace the judgment of a judge, they do provide useful information and highlight trends in case law that could be useful to courts making decisions (Prakken, 2018).

AI is also employed in criminal justice to assess the risk of recidivism. Judges in some jurisdictions in the USA use the "COMPAS," which can be stated as "Correctional Offender Management Profiling for Alternative Sanctions," system to assess recidivism risk. It relies on information from criminal history and an extensive questionnaire that asks the defendants whether they think stealing is justifiable under extreme circumstances. Supporters argue that AI-based reviews reduce unnecessary detention by introducing a degree of objectivity (Institute for Crime and Justice Policy Research, 2019). Studies show that COMPAS provides higher risk scores for African American offenders compared to Caucasian offenders, indicating systemic biases. Even though it was intended to reduce incarceration, its broad application has at times also resulted in greater detainment. Another significant advancement in judicial AI comes from Ravel, a US-based legal analytics company that founded AI-driven tools for investigating court decisions, judicial patterns, and even the decision-making patterns of judges (Angwin, 2016). Although precise accuracy metrics have not been revealed, these products were first made accessible through subscriptions. Ravel was eventually purchased by LexisNexis, a top supplier of

legal investigation services, which included its AI-powered features in its larger range of legal analytical products.

5. Major concerns regarding the use of AI in Judicial Administration

There remains much disagreement about AI's place in the judiciary as it develops. Numerous ethical principles have been published, with more than 25 texts defining fundamental ideas for the application of AI. The European Union, the Council of Europe, as well as the "Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers" (IEEE) have all made significant contributions. The "Council of Europe's Commission for the Efficiency of Justice" (CEPEJ) has also taken up this topic. The ethical standards for integrating AI into the systems of Law were developed via CEPEJ's

Working Party on Quality (GTQUAL) and formally endorsed in December 2018. (European Commission for the Efficiency of Justice [CEPEJ], 2019) They outline five basic rules:

A. Respect for Fundamental Rights

AI systems in the legal domain must be designed and implemented in strict compliance with fundamental rights, ensuring transparency, privacy protection, and procedural fairness. As these technologies influence legal decision-making, they must align with the principles of equal dignity and the right to a fair trial, preventing bias, undue data intrusion, and opaque reasoning. Establishing robust legal safeguards, including accountability mechanisms and oversight frameworks, is essential to uphold public trust and ensure that AI enhances, rather than undermines, the legitimacy of judicial and administrative processes.

B. Equal Consideration

The design of AI systems must prioritize fairness by actively mitigating biases that could result in unjust treatment or comparison of individuals or groups. AI-driven decision-making tools, particularly in sensitive areas such as criminal justice, healthcare, and hiring, must be developed with safeguards to prevent algorithmic discrimination. The case of COMPAS, a risk assessment tool used in the U.S. criminal justice system, underscores the dangers of

biased

data and algorithmic structures, which can reinforce systemic disparities and produce skewed outcomes. Such biases arise when training data reflect historical inequalities or when algorithmic frameworks amplify pre-existing prejudices. To ensure fairness, AI systems must be subject to rigorous auditing, transparency measures, and continuous oversight to detect and correct discriminatory patterns. Legal and regulatory frameworks should mandate ethical AI development that upholds principles of equal treatment, ensuring that automated decisions do not perpetuate existing social injustices but instead contribute to fair and impartial outcomes.

C. Data Security

AI systems that process court data and judicial decisions must be constructed on immutable, verified sources to ensure the integrity, accuracy, and reliability of legal outcomes. Given the critical role of these systems in shaping legal analysis, predictions, and even case outcomes, their foundation must be built on secure, tamper-proof technology that prevents data corruption, unauthorized access, or manipulation. Naivete in their design or deployment is not an option, as any compromise in data authenticity or algorithmic integrity could have far-reaching consequences on the fairness and legitimacy of legal proceedings. These models should be built on a robust technological framework that integrates knowledge from multiple domains, including law, ethics, and cybersecurity, to enhance their resilience against both data degradation and access vulnerabilities. Additionally, regular audits, transparency mechanisms, and interdisciplinary collaboration are essential to maintaining the credibility of AI-driven legal tools, ensuring that they function as reliable and unbiased instruments in the pursuit of justice.

C. Transparency

AI-induced legal processes must be transparent and open to external scrutiny. In European states, transparency has become a minimum legal obligation. AI users are also required to quickly disclose and explain key information, such as decision-making standards, data sources, and underlying assumptions, for the sake of accountability. This allows the public and legal specialists to scrutinize AI-based verdicts

and challenge them if necessary. Courts should still be empowered to conduct judicial reviews of decisions produced by AI. These moral guidelines—especially transparency—have been paramount in shaping Dutch legal precedent that mirrors broader efforts to effectively integrate AI within the justice system.

6. The Complexities in the Use of AI: An Illustration

AI must be treated as a tool to help, rather than as a decision-maker, to halt independent actions from AI. Users must understand exactly how the AI works and have full ownership of how they make the decision. Users should be free to diverge from AI-generated suggestions without superfluous constraints.

This discussion was the focal point of the Loomis case before the Wisconsin Supreme Court, which highlighted two key concerns: (1) Whether a defendant's right to a fair trial is violated by utilizing a proprietary risk assessment tool, such as COMPAS, whose formula is a trade secret, as it prevents them from assessing the tool's scientific reliability and precision. (2) Whether it is unfair to use gender as well as race in recidivism risk evaluations.

Despite rejecting Loomis' arguments, the Wisconsin Supreme Court decided that judges had to clarify how they utilize COMPAS data when determining sentences. The U.S. Supreme Court was later asked to consider the issue, but it chose not to. The "Council of State" of the Netherlands has suggested stricter interpretations of principles of good governance, particularly the principles of rational decision-making and appropriate diligence, in the context of digitalization. Courts must explicitly state which algorithms were used and whether data were sourced from other administrative bodies. This approach enhances transparency and strengthens citizens' ability to challenge automated decisions (Council of State, 2018). In cases of automated decision-making, a human review process is recommended during appeals.

The risks of over-reliance on IT systems are evident in a case from the United Kingdom (Contini & Lanzara, 2017). A relatively simple software tool was used in financial maintenance proceedings to determine the financial capacity of spouses. Due to

an unnoticed error, incorrect calculations affected 3,638 cases that occurred between April 2011 to January 2012, as well as April 2014 to December 2015, respectively. The software mistakenly added debts instead of subtracting them, inflating the reported financial capacity. While errors in pending cases were corrected, over 2,200 cases had already resulted in incorrect rulings, many of which were likely enforced.

7. The Integration of Artificial Intelligence into the Judicial System: Key Legal Recommendations

A. Establishment of Clear Guidelines:

It is essential to develop and implement ethical guidelines that govern the use of AI in judicial administration, ensuring that AI systems operate within well-defined legal and ethical boundaries. These guidelines should be based on internationally recognized legal principles, such as those outlined in Article 6 of the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR), which safeguards the right to a fair trial and due process. The guidelines must also specify how AI should be integrated into court procedures while preventing bias, protecting privacy, and ensuring transparency in automated legal decision-making. Furthermore, they should define accountability structures, clarifying the responsibilities of judges, legal professionals, and AI developers in maintaining AI integrity and fairness within judicial systems (Doshi-Velez et al., 2017).

B. Structuring and Streamlining Data:

Legal information must be systematically structured and enriched to maximize its compatibility with AI applications. This process involves digitizing and formatting legal documents to ensure machine readability, including integrating structured text, metadata, unique identification codes, and document categorization systems. Proper data structuring enhances AI's ability to analyze vast amounts of legal material, facilitating accurate case predictions, precedent retrieval, and automated legal reasoning. Additionally, efforts should be made to standardize legal data formats across jurisdictions, ensuring AI systems can process information efficiently without inconsistencies. By structuring legal texts methodically, AI applications can better

support judges, lawyers, and policymakers in making well-informed legal decisions (Hildebrandt, 2018).

C. The Need for Judicial Training

Judges and legal professionals must be equipped with the necessary knowledge and training to understand AI technologies, their functionalities, and their limitations. A comprehensive training program should be introduced to familiarize legal practitioners with AI-assisted tools, such as predictive analytics, legal research automation, and risk assessment models. This knowledge is crucial for ensuring that AI-generated outputs are critically assessed and applied correctly within the legal context, rather than being relied upon blindly. Additionally, training programs should highlight potential biases in AI models and emphasize the importance of human oversight in AI-assisted decision-making. Judicial institutions should collaborate with AI developers, legal scholars, and technology experts to create tailored educational initiatives that empower legal professionals to use AI effectively while safeguarding fundamental legal principles (Lum & Isaac, 2016).

D. Continuous Evaluation of AI systems

A structured framework for the continuous evaluation and monitoring of AI systems in the judiciary must be established to ensure their ongoing efficiency, accuracy, and compliance with legal standards. This evaluation process should involve periodic audits, performance assessments, and impact studies to determine whether AI tools are meeting the intended judicial objectives. If discrepancies, biases, or inefficiencies are identified, necessary modifications should be made to improve AI reliability and fairness. Additionally, mechanisms should be in place to collect user feedback from judges, lawyers, and litigants to refine AI applications based on practical insights. The judiciary should also remain adaptable to technological advancements, updating AI models and legal frameworks as needed to address emerging challenges.

E. Monitoring Compliance

Implementing robust compliance monitoring mechanisms is crucial to ensuring that AI applications within the legal system adhere to ethical

and legal standards. This includes establishing clear governance structures that define decision-making authority over AI usage, as well as integrating external audits and regulatory oversight to enhance transparency and accountability. Compliance frameworks should include enforceable policies that dictate the permissible scope of AI interventions in legal decision-making, ensuring that automated tools do not override human judicial discretion. Furthermore, independent oversight bodies should be tasked with reviewing AI applications in the judiciary, identifying potential risks, and recommending corrective actions when necessary. By maintaining strict compliance monitoring, judicial institutions can build public trust in AI-driven legal processes while mitigating risks associated with automation (Pentland, 2019).

Conclusion

AI can serve multiple functions in legal proceedings, benefiting courts, judges, litigants, and individuals seeking justice. The most reliably successful application of AI in law is organizing large volumes of information, thereby enhancing judicial efficiency. However, AI's advisory and predictive roles remain contentious. In practice, judges may rely on AI-generated insights as long as they provide clear reasoning for their decisions. To make AI truly effective in the legal system, certain conditions must be met—these will be explored in the following section.

What benefits can artificial intelligence bring to the justice system, and what conditions must be met for its effective use? This article examines the current knowledge regarding AI in judicial settings. Since not all court cases require intricate, tailor-made solutions, the demand for information technology varies across different case types. AI, being a form of information technology, can therefore be applied in multiple ways, depending on the nature of the case. Some AI applications have already demonstrated their effectiveness in practical scenarios. However, there is currently no evidence to suggest that robots will take over the role of judges.

According to Article 6 of the European Convention on Human Rights, judicial procedures must adhere to proper standards. Significant progress is still required before AI can fully comply with these legal

requirements. Legal information needs to be more systematically structured and enriched with contextual meaning. At present, explaining how AI arrives at a particular outcome remains a challenge. However, AI is already assisting individuals, litigants, and judges in organizing legal information. As legal databases expand, AI can further support decision-making by providing recommendations and insights. Judges must develop a sound understanding of AI to utilize it effectively, while courts should work towards digitalizing their legal resources and integrating proper legal interpretation to enhance AI compatibility. Additionally, courts must regularly evaluate their AI systems to ensure efficiency and make necessary adjustments. Given that court institutions operate much like structured production organizations, adapting to this technological shift presents a significant challenge.

REFERENCES:

- Aletras, N., Tsarapatsanis, D., Preotiuc-Pietro, D., & Lampos, V. (2016). Predicting judicial decisions of the European Court of Human Rights: A natural language processing perspective. *PeerJ Computer Science*, 2, e93. <https://doi.org/10.7717/peerj-cs.93>
- Angwin, J. (2016, May 23). Machine bias. *ProPublica*. <https://www.propublica.org/article/machine-bias>
- British Columbia Civil Resolution Tribunal. (2019). *The Civil Resolution Tribunal*. <https://civilresolutionbc.ca>
- Contini, F., & Lanzara, G. F. (2017). The elusive mediation between law and technology. In P. Branco, N. Hosen, M. Leone, & R. Mohr (Eds.), *Tools of meaning: Representation, objects, and agency in the technologies of law and religion* (pp. 4-9). I Saggi di Lexia, Aracne.
- Council of State. (2018, September 6). *Advice of September 6, 2018*. *Staatscourant* (Official Gazette), 2018-50999.
- Doshi-Velez, F., et al. (2017, November). Accountability of AI under the law. *arXiv:1711.01134 [cs.AI]*. Retrieved December 7, 2019, from <https://arxiv.org/abs/1711.01134>
- European Commission for the Efficiency of Justice (CEPEJ). (2019). *European ethical charter on the use of artificial intelligence in judicial systems and their environment*. Council of Europe.
- Hildebrandt, M. (2018, March 29). *Position on artificial intelligence and the law*. Position paper for hearing/round table discussion on Artificial Intelligence in the Administration of Justice at the Second Chamber of Parliament of the Netherlands. *Kamerstukken (Chamber Documents) II*, 2018Z05199.
- Institute for Crime and Justice Policy Research. (2019). *World Prison Brief*. Retrieved December 6, 2019, from <https://www.prisonstudies.org>
- Julia, L. (2019). *L'intelligence artificielle n'existe pas* [AI does not exist] (1st ed.). Paris, France.
- Kahneman, D. (2011). *Thinking, fast and slow*. Penguin.
- Katz, D. M., Bommarito, M. J., & Blackman, J. (2017). A general approach for predicting the behavior of the Supreme Court of the United States. SSRN. <https://ssrn.com/abstract=2463244>
- Lum, K., & Isaac, W. (2016, October). To predict and serve? *Significance*. Retrieved December 7, 2019, from <https://www.significancemagazine.com>
- McCarthy, J., Minsky, M. L., Rochester, N., & Shannon, C. E. (1955). A proposal for the Dartmouth summer research project on artificial intelligence (31 August 1955). In J. Kaplan (Ed.), *Artificial intelligence: What everyone needs to know*. Oxford University Press.
- Pentland, A. (2019, December 6). A perspective on legal algorithms. *MIT Computational Law Report*, 4-6.
- Prakken, H. (2018). Komt de robotrechter eraan? (Is the robot judge arriving?). *Nederlands Juristenblad*, 2018(04), 207.
- Reiling, A. D. (2009). *Technology for justice: How information technology can support judicial reform* (Doctoral dissertation, VU Amsterdam). Leiden University Press.

- Van den Herik, H. J. (n.d.). *Kunnen computers rechtspreken?* (Can computers be judges?) (Inaugural lecture, Leiden). *Gouda Quint*.
- Van der Put, M. (2019). Kan artificiële intelligentie de rechtspraak betoveren? (Can AI bewitch the courts?). *Rechtstreeks*, 2019(02), 50-60.

