P-ISSN 2664-0422	Pakistan Social Sciences Review	Jan-March 2024, Vol. 8, No. 1
O-ISSN 2664-0430	https://doi.org/10.35484/pssr.2024(8-I)02	[17-26]

Pakistan Social Sciences Review
www.pssr.org.pk

RESEARCH PAPER

Implementing Artificial Intelligence (AI) into the Judicial System in Europe: Challenges and Opportunities

[1]Dr. Umair Ahmed *, [2]Zaryab Fatima and [3]Touqeer Abbas

1. Assistant Professor, Department of Sociology, Government College University, Lahore, Punjab, Pakistan.
2. M.Phil. Scholar, Department of Sociology and Criminology, University of Sargodha, Sargodha, Punjab, Pakistan.
3. Visiting Lecturer, Department of Sociology and Criminology, University of Sargodha, Sargodha, Punjab, Pakistan.

***Corresponding Author:** zaryabfatima1234@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This study examines the various ways in which Artificial Intelligence (A.I.) has been incorporated into the European legal system. It includes an analysis of past trends, legal frameworks, the role of artificial intelligence in criminal justice, and the significant difficulties it presents. AI has the potential to improve productivity, lessen prejudices, and offer insights. But there are a lot of moral and legal issues. This study is noteworthy because it emphasizes the necessity of thorough inspections and legal frameworks to guarantee compliance with legal requirements and human rights. The A.I. Act proposal from the European Union is shown to be a crucial initiative. The evolution of A.I. integration is illustrated by tracing its historical background. The legal framework is examined, covering GDPR and basic rights. There are identified challenges, including data privacy, complex legal issues, and a lack of technical expertise. The study highlights how crucial it is to deal with these issues in order to use artificial intelligence (AI) responsibly within the framework of European law.

KEYWORDS Artificial Intelligence (AI), Human-AI Collaboration, Judicial System, Legal Technology, Regulatory Framework

Introduction

Several scholarly investigations have explored the potential of artificial intelligence (A.I.) to aid judges in their decision-making processes (Annoni et al., 2018). Artificial intelligence (A.I.) can automate monotonous tasks, scrutinize court records, forecast case outcomes, and assist judges' decision-making. Using artificial intelligence within the legal system presents ethical and legal concerns (Cath, 2018). The aforementioned pertains to the procedural methodologies employed in decision-making and the inadvertent prejudices in the datasets utilized for algorithmic training. The Susskind brothers conducted a study examining the potential impact of artificial intelligence on the legal system and the operations of courts. According to various reports, artificial intelligence (A.I.) has the potential to automate numerous legal procedures, thereby facilitating the accessibility of legal aid for individuals (Larsson, 2019).

Susskind and Susskind, (2018) discuss the potential advantages of artificial intelligence (A.I.) in the legal domain. However, they caution against excessive reliance on A.I., as it may lead to the emergence of novel biases and injustices. In a distinct research endeavor, Daniel L. Chen and Susan Athey explore the potential of artificial intelligence in aiding judges with their decision-making processes (Sobrino-García, 2021). According to their argument, the implementation of A.I. technology has the

potential to mitigate cognitive biases and provide judges with pivotal insights into the outcomes of legal proceedings. Chen and Athey (2018) advise against implementing A.I. in the legal system unless it adheres to principles of transparency and morality (Cohen, Evgeniou, Gerke, & Minssen, 2020).

This practice is implemented to ensure that decisions are both legal and fair. A.I.'s ethical and legal implications are also scrutinized in a publication by the Council of Europe. Before the integration of A.I. in legal proceedings, certain prerequisites must be met, such as compliance with established human rights norms, ensuring accountability for its implementation, and promoting transparency (Greenstein, 2022). According to the Council of Europe's report, ensuring equality and the absence of discrimination requires utilizing data sets that are free from bias in training algorithms. Integrating artificial intelligence (A.I.) within the legal system can potentially enhance both efficacy and equity. Through effective management, transparency, accountability, and equity can be realized (Henman, 2020).

Literature Review

Historical Background of Implementing AI into the Judicial System

Artificial intelligence (A.I.) integration within the judicial system has been widely discussed among scholars and policymakers in recent times. While there is a likelihood that the utilization of artificial intelligence in the legal sector was initially introduced during the 1980s (Ballell, 2019). The inaugural expert system, MYCIN, was developed during the latter part of the 1970s. This instance is one of the earliest recorded artificial intelligence applications in the legal domain. The MYCIN system has demonstrated efficacy across various fields, including the legal profession, as noted by Reckless (2019) (Jabłonowska et al., 2018). The primary purpose of its creation was to assist medical practitioners in the identification of viral illnesses. During the 1980s, Artificial Intelligence (A.I.) was employed to create Xerox Litigation Services (XLS), a software application designed to aid legal professionals in assessing and identifying case-related materials (Benbya, Davenport, & Pachidi, 2020). According to Yeung (2020), automatically categorizing and grading legal documents based on their relevance to a case can save time and cost for lawyers. Subsequently, artificial intelligence has undergone significant advancements and is currently being increasingly utilized within the legal framework (Leslie et al., 2021). Using algorithms to anticipate and prevent criminal activity is a manifestation of artificial intelligence known as predictive policing. Risk assessment systems employ A.I. to ascertain the likelihood of recidivism among offenders (Nemitz, 2018). During the early 2000s, certain European nations-initiated trials with artificial intelligence (A.I.) implementations within the legal sector. The e-Court program, launched in 2007 in the Netherlands, represents one of the pioneering applications of artificial intelligence within the legal system of Europe (Annoni et al., 2018; Ballell, 2019). The e-Court initiative endeavored to exhibit the practicability of employing artificial intelligence to handle minor legal disputes. In 2017, an online court was established as a result of the successful implementation of the project (Bikeev, Kabanov, Begishev, & Khisamova, 2019).

In 2013, the European Union launched the "Automated Decision Support for Courtrooms" (ADSC) program intending to assist judges in utilizing artificial intelligence for decision-making purposes. As per the report by the European Commission (2021), some European countries, such as the Netherlands, Germany, and the United Kingdom, participated in the undertaking (Zuiderveen Borgesius, 2020).

Many European nations have commenced experimental investigations involving artificial intelligence (A.I.) within their legal frameworks (Brooks, Gherhes, & Vorley, 2020). The "Kratt" trial project was launched by Estonia in 2018 to enhance the ability of judges to conduct legal research and comprehend legal materials. The year 2021 saw the United Kingdom's adoption of "The Predictive Coding for disclosure Pilot," which employs artificial intelligence to aid legal professionals in document analysis and the validation of evidence (Buchholtz, 2020).

The utilization of artificial intelligence in European courts has raised apprehension among individuals regarding the possibility of exacerbating pre-existing biases and inequities within the justice system (Cohen et al., 2020). Detractors of artificial intelligence argue that this technology can amplify the biased judgments of the penal system. Numerous European countries have enacted regulatory measures in reaction to apprehensions regarding using artificial intelligence (A.I.) in the legal system. These regulations aim to streamline the process of monitoring the utilization of artificial intelligence by individuals and establish responsibility for all parties involved (Greenstein, 2022).

Material and Methods

The research methodology employed in this comprehensive inquiry into the integration of Artificial Intelligence (A.I.) into the judicial system of Europe encompasses a thorough literature review and analysis of scholarly investigations, reports, and legal frameworks related to A.I. in the legal domain. The approach follows the guidelines of systematic literature review, ensuring a rigorous and unbiased examination of existing knowledge (Kitchenham, 2004). References to academic sources, such as Annoni et al. (2018), Cath (2018), Susskind & Susskind (2018), Larsson (2019), Chen and Athey (2018), Cohen et al. (2020), Greenstein (2022), and others, have been critically evaluated to gather insights into the historical background, legal framework, challenges, and importance of A.I. in the European judicial system(Kitchenham, 2004). Legal statutes and regulations, including the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR), Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union, and guidelines from the Council of Europe and European Commission, have been examined to understand the legal framework governing A.I. integration and prioritizes a comprehensive analysis of various aspects of A.I. in the legal context, including its potential benefits, ethical considerations, challenges, and implications for the criminal justice system. The approach ensures a balanced and informed exploration of the topic. Following table presents relevant studies included in this systematic review:

Table 1
Descriptive Table of Systematic Reviews

Sr #	Study Title	Authors	Methodology
1	"Artificial Intelligence: A European Perspective"	(Annoni et al., 2018)	Review Report
2	"Governing Artificial Intelligence: Ethical, Legal, and Technical Opportunities and Challenges"	(Cath, 2018)	Argumentative Article
3	"Preserving the Rule of Law in the Era of Artificial Intelligence (AI)"	(Greenstein, 2022)	Systematic Review
4	"The Future of the Professions"	(Susskind & Susskind, 2018)	Literature Review
5	"The Socio-Legal Relevance of Artificial Intelligence"	(Larsson, 2019).	Sociological Analysis

Results and Discussions

Legal Framework of A.I. in the Judicial System of Europe

The utilization of artificial intelligence within the legal framework of Europe is subject to various legal statutes and regulatory measures. The limitations placed on applying artificial intelligence (A.I.) systems within the legal context aim to uphold the rights to a fair and unbiased legal process, confidentiality, and equal treatment (Hoffmann-Riem, 2020). The General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) is a significant legislative initiative that outlines rigorous protocols for handling personal data within the European Union. The European Union's implementation of the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) in 2016 requires that artificial intelligence (A.I.) systems responsible for managing personal data comply with transparency, accountability, and security regulations (Larsson, 2019).

The Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union protects various human rights, such as the right to a fair trial, the right to privacy and freedom of residence, and the right to equal treatment before the law (Reiling, 2020). According to the Council of Europe (2021), incorporating A.I. technology into the legal system should prioritize considering human rights. In addition to the legal frameworks mentioned earlier, supplementary regulations and recommendations pertain to the utilization of artificial intelligence in the legal domain (Pedro, Subosa, Rivas, & Valverde, 2019). The European Commission's High-Level Expert Group on A.I. has released a set of guidelines that pertain to the reliable development and utilization of A.I. The recommendations mentioned above propose the utilization of artificial intelligence within the legal system, as per the European Commission in 2018 (Raso, Hilligoss, Krishnamurthy, Bavitz, & Kim, 2018).

The Council of Europe has established guidelines for the ethical development and utilization of A.I. systems, including safeguarding fundamental human rights such as the right to a fair trial, privacy, and equal treatment (Said, Azamat, Ravshan, & Bokhadir, 2023). In 2018, the European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights established regulations to safeguard individuals' fundamental rights from being violated by legal artificial intelligence systems.

The present study highlights the following concerns about the potential influence of artificial intelligence on the legal framework: What is the significance of A.I. in the criminal justice system? One of the primaries concerns this article addresses is two major issues. Furthermore, secondly, what is the significance of artificial intelligence in the context of the justice system? What are the fundamental challenges that artificial intelligence faces within the realm of law?

Legal and Judicial Perspective of A.I.

The field of Artificial Intelligence (A.I.), which is a nascent domain in the legal realm, can significantly influence various other domains, including but not limited to privacy, liability, and intellectual property. Instances of partiality and prejudice in algorithmic decision-making are frequently adjudicated in legal proceedings(Mikhaylov, Esteve, & Campion, 2018). Considering intellectual property is of utmost importance when examining the legal implications of artificial intelligence. With the advancement of technology, it has become increasingly crucial to consider the legal rights involved in creating and utilizing works generated by artificial intelligence(Nemitz, 2018). The issue of whether the intellectual property rights of works generated by artificial intelligence should be attributed to the individuals or groups responsible for creating or directing the

system remains a contentious subject, lacking a widely accepted resolution. This viewpoint has been posited by certain scholars, such (Jabłonowska et al., 2018; Larsson, 2019).

Artificial intelligence's manifestation of a sense of obligation is a crucial characteristic that holds significance from a legal perspective. With the increasing prevalence of A.I. systems, there is a growing need to establish legal accountability for their actions (Pagallo, Ciani Sciolla, & Durante, 2022). An inquiry that arises is the party responsible in the event of a self-driving vehicle causing harm to an individual, resulting in bodily injury or damage to their property. Who will be responsible for settling the financial obligation? The system's origin, whether the user or the vehicle creator developed it, and the rationale behind its creation are subjects of inquiry (Pedro et al., 2019). In 2019, certain nations enacted the Algorithmic Accountability Act intending to establish direct responsibility for issues arising from advancements in artificial intelligence. The issue of whether AI-generated works should be attributed to the individual or group responsible for creating or directing the system has been a subject of debate. While some scholars, such as Nimmer (2019), have advocated for the intellectual property rights of the creators, a consensus on this matter has yet to be reached (Perc, Ozer, & Hojnik, 2019; Raso et al., 2018).

It is imperative to approach the issues of algorithmic bias and inequality through a legal lens. The disconcerting prospect of artificial intelligence (A.I.) systems that acquire knowledge from datasets exacerbating and perpetuating social biases is a cause for concern (Reiling, 2020). Legal proceedings have been initiated to adjudicate many cases on discriminatory lending practices (Said et al., 2023)and inequitable recruitment practices (Sobrino-García, 2021). This highlights the significance of possessing a just and unbiased legal framework to tackle concerns related to algorithmic bias (Susar & Aquaro, 2019). In summary, the legal perspective on artificial intelligence is transforming, necessitating legal professionals to remain up-to-date on the major legal advancements and precedents. As technological advancements continue and legislative modifications occur, it is imperative to possess a comprehensive understanding of the legal implications associated with artificial intelligence.

Importance of A.I. in the Criminal Justice System

The utilization of artificial intelligence within the criminal justice system is on the rise due to its potential to enhance decision-making, mitigate bias, and augment productivity. The forthcoming response will present a more comprehensive elaboration regarding the points mentioned below.

Efficiency

Integrating artificial intelligence (A.I.) within the criminal justice system can enhance operational efficiency and optimize human resources by automating document processing and scheduling tasks. In order to enhance the efficiency of case file processing, it is possible to instruct artificial intelligence algorithms to recognize handwriting and convert it into machine-readable text (Susskind & Susskind, 2018; Ulenaers, 2020). The implementation of artificial intelligence (A.I.) has the potential to facilitate the daily tasks of law enforcement officers through the automation of data collection, processing, and sharing. Consequently, law enforcement personnel may possess enhanced capabilities to identify recurring trends and expedite the resolution of criminal cases. According to a study conducted by the RAND Corporation in 2013, there is a correlation between the implementation of predictive policing, a reduction in crime rates, and an improvement in public safety (Van Noordt & Misuraca, 2022; Wirtz, Weyerer, & Geyer, 2019).

Bias Reduction

Artificial intelligence has the potential to significantly enhance the criminal justice system by reducing the prevalence of biased judgments. By analyzing extensive data on an individual's criminal record, demographics, and other characteristics, artificial intelligence can produce a more precise depiction of said person (Brooks et al., 2020; Buchholtz, 2020; Cui, 2020) The implementation of A.I. algorithms present a potential solution for eliminating discriminatory practices, such as racial bias, within the criminal justice system's sentencing procedures. Academic experts have expressed apprehensions regarding the possibility of racial biases in these algorithms. According to the Brennan Center for Justice (2017), concerns can be alleviated by implementing meticulously crafted algorithms and continuous monitoring (Larsson, 2019).

Decision-making

The utilization of Artificial Intelligence (A.I.) has the potential to facilitate individuals in making informed decisions by furnishing them with precise and comprehensive data (Mikhaylov et al., 2018). Artificial intelligence algorithms can predict the likelihood of reoffending among criminal offenders in the context of pre-trial detention, sentence, and parole. The utilization of artificial intelligence (A.I.) holds promise in aiding the advancement of more accurate and consistent linguistic norms employing scrutinizing past data, thereby allowing for the detection of the most efficacious predictors of outcomes among diverse variables (Reiling, 2020; Said et al., 2023). As per the findings of the Brookings Institution (2019), there exists a heightened likelihood of perpetrators being subjected to equivalent penalties.

Analyzing the Data

Artificial intelligence can effectively analyze extensive data and identify patterns that may evade human perception. The employment of artificial intelligence enables the utilization of forensic evidence and surveillance videos to construct legal cases and determine the identities of potential perpetrators (Susar & Aquaro, 2019). As per The Law Society's report (2020), law enforcement agencies can assess potential threats more efficiently and take necessary actions accordingly.

The integration of artificial intelligence in the criminal justice system has the potential to yield advantages and concerns (Wirtz et al., 2019). The issue of potential bias in A.I. algorithms has been brought to attention, with implications for protecting individuals' rights and privacy. As the integration of artificial intelligence becomes increasingly widespread within the legal system, these concerns must be adequately addressed through appropriate measures (Xenidis & Senden, 2019; Zuiderveen Borgesius, 2020).

Challenges of A.I. in the Judicial System

Before integrating artificial intelligence (A.I.) into the legal system of Europe, it is imperative to address various concerns. The present discourse examines the principal obstacles the European legal framework has faced due to the advent of artificial intelligence (A.I.). Pertinent instances shall substantiate the discourse to elucidate the notable aspects (Annoni et al., 2018; Ballell, 2019).

Data Privacy and Security: The European region has implemented stringent policies, exemplified by the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR), to govern the collection, utilization, and retention of personal data (Hoffmann-Riem, 2020; Jabłonowska et al., 2018). The utilization of artificial intelligence within the judicial

system to gather and manage personal data has raised apprehensions regarding the likelihood of an infringement upon privacy. Improper utilization of A.I. may violate data security regulations (Nemitz, 2018; Pagallo et al., 2022).

Legal Complexity: The intricate and multifaceted nature of legal frameworks across Europe may require a significant degree of legal expertise to ensure that the integration of artificial intelligence within the judicial system is executed in compliance with legal regulations. The utilization of A.I. may give rise to legal conflicts or novel legal challenges that require resolution, as suggested by (Raso et al., 2018; Reiling, 2020).

Ethical Considerations: Using artificial intelligence in the legal system raises ethical concerns, particularly concerning potential biases and discriminatory practices. The efficacy of A.I. systems is contingent upon the quality of the data utilized for their training, and the algorithm may perpetuate such partial data (Buchholtz, 2020; Cath, 2018). Concerns regarding the accountability and transparency of A.I. systems persist within the court system, particularly in cases where the decision-making process lacks clarity (Greenstein, 2022; Henman, 2020).

Lack of Technical Expertise: The successful integration of A.I. in the court system necessitates technical proficiency, a resource that may not be readily accessible within the legal profession (Leslie et al., 2021). According to Gough and Statham (2020), lawyers and judges may require enhanced technical proficiency to effectively utilize and assess A.I. systems owing to their limited technical expertise.

Loss of Public Trust: The incorporation of artificial intelligence in the judicial system holds promise for impacting public trust in the legal system. The potential implementation of A.I. in a manner perceived as unjust or discriminatory may result in a loss of confidence in the judicial system by the general populace (Ulenaers, 2020; Van Noordt & Misuraca, 2022). The European Commission (2018) has noted that in circumstances where human lives are at stake, there may exist uncertainties regarding the reliability and precision of artificial intelligence (A.I.) systems.

Cultural and Linguistic Diversity: Europe is distinguished by its multiculturalism, which encompasses various cultures and languages. The development and implementation of inclusive A.I. systems that do not exhibit discriminatory behavior towards specific cultural or linguistic groups encounter challenges due to the diversity of these groups (Brooks et al., 2020; Buchholtz, 2020; Cui, 2020). Certain artificial intelligence (A.I.) systems may encounter difficulty discerning between different accents or languages, potentially leading to inaccurate conclusions or bias against individuals who do not speak the predominant language, as noted by (Hoffmann-Riem, 2020).

To sum up, various challenges and obstacles, such as concerns regarding data privacy and security, legal intricacy, ethical dilemmas, insufficient technical expertise, public confidence, and cultural and linguistic heterogeneity, accompany the utilization of A.I (Ulenaers, 2020; Van Noordt & Misuraca, 2022). in the European judicial system. Implementing artificial intelligence (A.I.) within the legal system must adhere to legal regulations and exhibit transparency, responsibility, and inclusivity (Said et al., 2023).

Conclusion

In summary, implementing artificial intelligence in the legal system presents benefits and drawbacks. Artificial Intelligence (A.I.) systems can potentially enhance the consistency, efficiency, and efficacy of legal counsel and decision-making. However, there is also a possibility that they may jeopardize the safety, health, and fundamental

rights of individuals. The meticulous examination of the potential effects of A.I. systems on judicial independence is imperative in developing and integrating such systems in the justice sector to ensure that decisions are grounded on metrics of superior quality. Various legislative bodies have proposed distinct approaches to address the risks and legal issues linked to artificial intelligence (A.I.), with the sector-specific strategy demonstrating greater lucidity in intricate legal affairs. The European Union is demonstrating a positive trajectory in devising optimal artificial intelligence (A.I.) systems strategies within its member states. This is exemplified by the A.I. Act proposal, which delineates uniform regulations for A.I. systems across E.U. member states. The proposed A.I. Act seeks to regulate the utilization of A.I. systems to mitigate potential hazards and disadvantages. The assessment of potential drawbacks and limitations associated with developing, deploying, and utilizing artificial intelligence (A.I.) systems is of paramount importance.

Recommendations

1. There is a need to establish a stringent ethical framework tailored for AI integration in the European Judicial System.
2. Implement pilot programs in select judicial branches to test AI tools, ensuring continuous evaluation, iterative improvements, and transparent reporting on outcomes and lessons learned.
3. Develop specialized education and training programs for judges and legal professionals to enhance understanding of AI technologies.

References

Annoni, A., Benczur, P., Bertoldi, P., Delipetrev, B., De Prato, G., Feijoo, C., Macias, E. F., Gutierrez, E. G., Portela, M. I., & Junklewitz, H. (2018). Artificial intelligence: A european perspective. *EU Science Hub, 15(1)*

Ballell, T. R. D. L. H. (2019). Legal challenges of artificial intelligence: modelling the disruptive features of emerging technologies and assessing their possible legal impact. *Uniform Law Review*, *24*(2), 302-314.

Benbya, H., Davenport, T. H., & Pachidi, S. (2020). Artificial intelligence in organizations: Current state and future opportunities. *MIS Quarterly Executive*, *19*(4), 250-265

Bikeev, I., Kabanov, P., Begishev, I., & Khisamova, Z. (2019). Criminological risks and legal aspects of artificial intelligence implementation. Proceedings of the International Conference on Artificial Intelligence, Information Processing and Cloud Computing, *AIIPCC '19: Proceedings of the International Conference on Artificial Intelligence, Information Processing and Cloud Computing, 1-07*

Brooks, C., Gherhes, C., & Vorley, T. (2020). Artificial intelligence in the legal sector: pressures and challenges of transformation. *Cambridge Journal of Regions, Economy and Society*, *13*(1), 135-152.

Buchholtz, G. (2020). Artificial intelligence and legal tech: Challenges to the rule of law. *Regulating artificial intelligence*, *10(3)* 175-198.

Cath, C. (2018). Governing artificial intelligence: ethical, legal and technical opportunities and challenges. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences*, *376*(2133), 20180080.

Cohen, I. G., Evgeniou, T., Gerke, S., & Minssen, T. (2020). The European artificial intelligence strategy: implications and challenges for digital health. *The Lancet Digital Health*, *2*(7), e376-e379.

Greenstein, S. (2022). Preserving the rule of law in the era of artificial intelligence (AI). *Artificial Intelligence and Law*, *30*(3), 291-323.

Henman, P. (2020). Improving public services using artificial intelligence: possibilities, pitfalls, governance. *Asia Pacific Journal of Public Administration*, *42*(4), 209-221.

Hoffmann-Riem, W. (2020). Artificial intelligence as a challenge for law and regulation. *Regulating artificial intelligence*, *10(3)*1-29.

Jabłonowska, A., Kuziemski, M., Nowak, A. M., Micklitz, H. W., Pałka, P., & Sartor, G. (2018). Consumer law and artificial intelligence: Challenges to the EU consumer law and policy stemming from the business' use of artificial intelligence-final report of the ARTSY project. *EUI Department of Law Research Paper*(2018/11).

Larsson, S. (2019). The socio-legal relevance of artificial intelligence. *Droit et société*, *103*(3), 573-593.

Leslie, D., Burr, C., Aitken, M., Cowls, J., Katell, M., & Briggs, M. (2021). Artificial intelligence, human rights, democracy, and the rule of law: a primer *https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2104.04147*, *7(1), 131-160*

Mikhaylov, S. J., Esteve, M., & Campion, A. (2018). Artificial intelligence for the public sector: opportunities and challenges of cross-sector collaboration. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences*, *376*(2128), 20170357.

Nemitz, P. (2018). Constitutional democracy and technology in the age of artificial intelligence. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences*, *376*(2133), 20180089.

Pagallo, U., Ciani Sciolla, J., & Durante, M. (2022). The environmental challenges of AI in EU law: lessons learned from the Artificial Intelligence Act (AIA) with its drawbacks. *Transforming Government: People, Process and Policy*, *16*(3), 359-376.

Pedro, F., Subosa, M., Rivas, A., & Valverde, P. (2019). Artificial intelligence in education: Challenges and opportunities for sustainable development, *Investigaciones educativas*

Perc, M., Ozer, M., & Hojnik, J. (2019). Social and juristic challenges of artificial intelligence. *Palgrave Communications*, *5*(1). *170-177*

Raso, F. A., Hilligoss, H., Krishnamurthy, V., Bavitz, C., & Kim, L. (2018). Artificial intelligence & human rights: Opportunities & risks. *Berkman Klein Center Research Publication*

Reiling, A. D. (2020). Courts and artificial intelligence. IJCA,

Said, G., Azamat, K., Ravshan, S., & Bokhadir, A. (2023). Adapting Legal Systems to the Development of Artificial Intelligence: Solving the Global Problem of AI in Judicial Processes. *International Journal of Cyber Law*, *1*(4). *101-109*

Sobrino-García, I. (2021). Artificial intelligence risks and challenges in the Spanish public administration: An exploratory analysis through expert judgements. *Administrative Sciences*, *11*(3), 102.

Susar, D., & Aquaro, V. (2019). Artificial intelligence: Opportunities and challenges for the public sector. *Proceedings of the 12th International Conference on Theory and Practice of Electronic Governance*

Susskind, D., & Susskind, R. (2018). The future of the professions. *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, *162*(2), 125-138.

Ulenaers, J. (2020). The impact of artificial intelligence on the right to a fair trial: Towards a robot judge? *Asian Journal of Law and Economics*, *11*(2). *80-92*

Van Noordt, C., & Misuraca, G. (2022). Exploratory insights on artificial intelligence for government in Europe. *Social Science Computer Review*, *40*(2), 426-444.

Wirtz, B. W., Weyerer, J. C., & Geyer, C. (2019). Artificial intelligence and the public sector—applications and challenges. *International Journal of Public Administration*, *42*(7), 596-615.

Xenidis, R., & Senden, L. (2019). EU non-discrimination law in the era of artificial intelligence: Mapping the challenges of algorithmic discrimination. *Raphaële Xenidis and Linda Senden,'EU non-discrimination law in the era of artificial intelligence: Mapping the challenges of algorithmic discrimination'in Ulf Bernitz et al (eds), General Principles of EU law and the EU Digital Order (Kluwer Law International, 2020)*, 151-182.

Zuiderveen Borgesius, F. J. (2020). Strengthening legal protection against discrimination by algorithms and artificial intelligence. *The International Journal of Human Rights*, *24*(10), 1572-1593.