ShodhAI: Journal of Artificial Intelligence
January-June 2026 3(1)
https://shodhai.org

Original Article

DEMOCRATIZING LEGAL AID: HARNESSING AI FOR AFFORDABLE JUSTICE

Diwakar Dhakal [1*]
[1] BA LLB Student at Kathmandu School of Law, Nepal

ABSTRACT

Access to justice remains an enduring challenge for marginalized communities due to high legal fees, limited resources, and geographical constraints. While legal aid has long been the sole recourse for bridging this gap, its overstretched capacity is insufficient to meet rising demand. This article examines the transformative potential of artificial intelligence (AI) in democratizing legal aid by analyzing its ethical, practical, and regulatory challenges. AI applications—including chatbots, predictive analytics, and automated legal documentation—are evaluated through case studies of platforms such as DoNotPay, Ailira, COMPAS, ROSS Intelligence, Luminance, and LawGeex to demonstrate how AI can improve the affordability, efficiency, and accessibility of legal services. Despite its promise, AI raises critical concerns regarding algorithmic bias and data privacy that threatens to undermine fairness and inclusivity. This research situates these issues within global regulatory frameworks, encompassing the EU AI Act, OECD AI Principles, GDPR, and HIPAA, underscoring the necessity for robust standards of accountability and transparency. The article concludes by proposing a specialized policy framework—focusing on regular audits, independent oversight, and equitable funding—to ensure ethical AI deployment. Ultimately, the future of AI in legal services lies in balancing innovation with ethical safeguards to ensure justice is realized as a right, not a privilege.

Keywords: Artificial Intelligence (AI), Legal Aid, Access to Justice, AI Ethic, Legal Technology, Marginalized Communities

INTRODUCTION

Access to justice policy remains a formidable challenge for marginalized communities, who confront substantial obstacles when seeking resolution for their legal problems. High legal costs, limited financial resources, and geographical constraints exacerbate the insurmountable gaps in legal access, often making legal aid the sole recourse for obtaining justice MacDowell (2015). However, with legal aid services struggling to meet existing demand and limited in scope, there is an urgent need to improve their availability and affordability Feijóo et al. (2020). The legal industry, like many sectors, is now integrating artificial intelligence (AI) to enhance its services Dhakal (2024). Through applications like chatbots, predictive analytics, and automated document generation, AI can make legal services more convenient and cost-effective. Instant assistance, rapid case analysis, and streamlined operations are merely a few of the benefits AI offers an overworked legal aid sector Perlman (2023). More importantly, AI can empower the communities that require it the most, helping to balance the scales and provide users with a fighting chance. Crucially, by reducing expenses, AI can make legal services more affordable for everyone. At the same time, its use must be regulated by critical ethical and practical considerations, such as algorithmic bias and data privacy concerns Sonday (2023). Therefore, a sensible fusion of ethics and

*Corresponding Author:
Email address: Diwakar Dhakal (diwakardhakal10@gmail.com)

Received: 10 November 2025; **Accepted:** 25 December 2025; **Published** 02 February 2026
DOI: 10.29121/ShodhAI.v3.i1.2026.50
Page Number: 1-8
Journal Title: ShodhAI: Journal of Artificial Intelligence
Journal Abbreviation: ShodhAI J. Artif. Intell.
Online ISSN: 3048-9245, **Print ISSN:** 3108-1940
Publisher: Granthaalayah Publications and Printers, India
Conflict of Interests: The authors declare that they have no competing interests.
Funding: This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.
Authors' Contributions: Each author made an equal contribution to the conception and design of the study. All authors have reviewed and approved the final version of the manuscript for publication.
Transparency: The authors affirm that this manuscript presents an honest, accurate, and transparent account of the study. All essential aspects have been included, and any deviations from the original study plan have been clearly explained. The writing process strictly adhered to established ethical standards.

technology is essential, as the judicious administration of such tools will determine whether justice is realized as a right or merely a privilege Isaac and Johnson (2025).

OBJECTIVES AND METHODOLOGY

This paper examines the capacity of AI to democratize legal aid by analyzing its potential to overcome the socio-economic barriers that limit access to justice for marginalized populations. This study is guided by the following objectives:

- To evaluate the potential of specific AI applications—including chatbots, predictive analytics, and automated documentation—to democratize legal aid by increasing its affordability and accessibility.
- To analyze the critical ethical and practical challenges inherent in deploying these technologies, with particular emphasis on algorithmic bias, data privacy, and systemic implementation barriers.
- To formulate a normative framework of policy recommendations designed to govern the ethical use of AI in legal aid, ensuring fairness, accountability, and transparency.

To achieve these objectives, this research employs a doctrinal legal methodology. The core of this approach is a systematic literature review and qualitative analysis of scholarly articles, existing case studies, and emerging regulatory frameworks. Unlike broader surveys of legal technology, this study provides a unique contribution by synthesizing high-level regulatory analysis (such as the EU AI Act) with granular, empirical data from front-line organizations like Legal Aid of North Carolina and the Legal Aid Society of Middle Tennessee.

Data and scholarly literature were retrieved via the Australian National University (ANU) Library SuperSearch, alongside specialized academic databases including Google Scholar, SSRN, and ResearchGate. To ensure objectivity, the search strategy utilized targeted Boolean parameters (e.g., "AI AND Access to Justice") to identify peer-reviewed research and high-impact "grey literature" from reputable online repositories.

CONCEPTUALIZATION

The application of AI in legal aid offers significant potential to enhance justice for underserved populations. The implementation of chatbots, predictive analytics, and robotic process automation can address key gaps in delivering personalized legal services Simshaw (2022). First, AI-powered chatbots with natural language processing (NLP) can give rapid and cost-effective legal guidance, increasing accessibility for low-income people. Second, predictive analytics can assist predicting legal outcomes, allowing for better resource allocation and case management. Third, robotic process automation can substantially reduce the time and expense of preparing legal documents, lowering costs for both providers and clients Chakraborty et al. (2023).

Conceptually, these AI applications function as catalysts for democratizing justice. By automating administrative processes and expediting legal procedures, AI lowers the economic and logistical barriers that have historically excluded marginalized groups. This enhancement of legal services-–from initial aid to dispute resolution-–makes the justice system more accessible. When legal support is no longer an unattainable service, low-income individuals are empowered to defend their rights more effectively, thereby fostering a more democratic and equitable legal landscape Lee et al. (2024). However, the promise of harnessing this technology is contingent upon the careful navigation of significant ethical challenges. AI algorithms risk inheriting and amplifying historical biases stored in legal data, which could lead to discriminatory outcomes that perpetuate systemic inequality Alvarez et al. (2024). Furthermore, the use of sensitive client information raises critical concerns regarding data privacy and security. Ultimately, the deployment of AI in legal aid cannot be considered ethical without rigorous frameworks to ensure fairness, transparency, and accountability in its application Chien and Kim (2024).

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The integration of AI into the justice system must be guided by a theoretical framework that reconciles technological efficiency with foundational legal principles. While AI offers the potential to make justice more accessible and equitable, it is essential that its application upholds the core tenets of fairness and due process. This article, therefore, conceptualizes AI not as an autonomous replacement for human judgment, but as an assistive tool designed to augment the capabilities of legal practitioners. The theoretical underpinning of this research is that AI's efficiency can be ethically harnessed to reduce the cost of legal aid, thereby promoting equity and the rule of law. By lowering the financial barriers to legal representation for poor and marginalized communities, AI can reinforce fundamental principles such as judicial impartiality and equality before the law.

This framework is operationalized through several layers of legal and ethical governance. Existing data protection regimes, such as the GDPR in Europe and HIPAA in the US, establish strict parameters for the management of sensitive information handled by AI systems European Parliament. (2023). Building on this, evolving AI governance models set standards for accountability, transparency, and fairness. A central challenge within this framework is the problem of algorithmic bias. Because AI systems are products of the data on which they are trained, they risk perpetuating or even amplifying historical inequities if that data is biased,

leading to unjust outcomes Camilleri (2024) To counter this, AI applications must be designed to prevent harm to vulnerable groups, which necessitates regular auditing of datasets and the implementation of bias-mitigation techniques. Sustaining public confidence in the legal system depends on the perceived fairness of AI-assisted decisions Dankwa-Mullan (2024). Consequently, robust accountability mechanisms are essential to address instances where biased AI systems produce inequitable results Libai et al. (2020).

KEY AI TECHNOLOGIES IN LEGAL AID

The application of AI to legal aid delivery has the potential to reshape the legal industry by offering substantial benefits to poor and marginalized communities Dhakal (2024). Key technologies–including interactive AI chatbots, predictive analytics for data analysis, and the automation of legal paperwork–represent a new model for providing low-cost, efficient, and accessible legal services Laptev and Feyzrakhmanova (2024). This section examines several case studies that illustrate how AI is being deployed to enhance legal assistance for underserved populations and support overburdened judicial institutions.

AI CHATBOTS

AI-powered chatbots have emerged as a prominent tool in delivering legal aid, exemplified by the “DoNotPay” platform, often described as the pioneering “Robot Lawyer." Founded by Joshua Browder, a London-based investor, the service was initially created to help individuals contest parking fees but has since expanded to provide basic legal advice on matters such as contract law, landlord-tenant disputes, and consumer rights Fernando et al. (2023). Utilizing natural language processing (NLP), the chatbot interprets a user's query to provide procedural guidance, such as assisting a tenant facing an unjust eviction by helping to generate supporting documentation. The primary significance of DoNotPay lies in its service to underprivileged populations, with reports indicating that approximately 99% of its users cannot afford a human lawyer Sonday (2023). The empirical impact of such tools is substantiated by early performance data; in its first 21 months, DoNotPay successfully appealed 160,000 parking tickets with a 64% success rate, representing millions in saved fees for individuals who might otherwise lack legal recourse Gibbs (2016).

Further illustrating this trend is Ailira (Artificially Intelligent Legal Information Resource Assistant), an Australian chatbot designed for tax law, estate planning, and business law, which is particularly notable for its capacity to draft legal documents like wills and contracts based on user inputs Isaac and Johnson (2025). Like DoNotPay, Ailira also leverages NLP, confirming that AI can serve as a viable and affordable option for obtaining guidance in specialized legal domains Chien and Kim (2024). This capacity to scale is further evidenced by Legal Aid of North Carolina’s ‘LIA’ assistant, which recorded over 95,000 views on its help platform in just five months, with 20,000 views specifically focused on family and housing law information to rural populations Sonday (2024). These observations suggest that GPT-powered chatbots can be developed up to ten times faster than previous intent-based systems, allowing for a rapid expansion of legal help interfaces Sonday (2023).

PREDICTIVE ANALYTICS

AI's predictive capabilities are being leveraged by legal aid organizations to increase case success rates and expedite legal work, as exemplified by HUMANITAS, a non-profit housing dispute organization. By analyzing historical case data, the nature of disputes, the parties involved, and judicial trends, HUMANITAS can calculate the likelihood of winning a case. This allows the organization to concentrate its resources on cases with a high probability of success and inform clients of their prospects ahead of time Chien and Kim (2024). The urgency for such predictive intervention is underscored by the reality that approximately 92% of the civil legal needs of low-income individuals currently remain inadequately addressed Sonday (2023). For tenants facing eviction, this data-driven insight is pivotal; it enables legal aid organizations, which often operate with a dearth of resources, to offer more effective recommendations and ultimately serve more clients by optimizing the allocation of their time Ford (2023). These predictive applications also extend to the criminal justice system, where public defenders employ such tools to inform strategies for plea bargains and court cases. The Correctional Offender Management Profiling for Alternative Sanction (COMPAS) system, for instance, evaluates a defendant's risk of recidivism. However, while COMPAS illustrates how AI can facilitate data-based judgements for legal practitioners, it has also faced significant accusations of algorithmic bias. This highlights a critical caveat: under proper supervision, predictive analytics can provide ethical and favorable support for low-income defendants and public attorneys, but its implementation requires rigorous oversight Garrett and Rudin (2023).

AUTOMATED LEGAL DOCUMENTATION

The automation of legal documentation is another area where AI has profoundly transformed legal aid. Given heavy judicial backlogs, legal aid organizations are persistently short on time, and AI-powered technologies help free up lawyers by handling mundane documentation tasks Collenette et al. (2023). For instance, ROSS Intelligence acts as an AI-assisted research assistant, leveraging machine learning and natural language processing to rapidly search vast legal databases for precedents and case law to help drafting legal documents. This enables legal aid organizations to produce briefs or contracts significantly faster than a typical practitioner, with the provider claiming it can increase efficiency by up to 100 times, thereby reducing costs for clients Kruszynska

(2024). The practical applications verify these efficiency gains; the Legal Aid Society of Middle Tennessee utilized generative AI to automate expungement petitions, allowing a single-day clinic to process 324 charges for 98 individuals—a volume that would be unfeasible through manual documentation Sonday (2024).

Similarly, Luminance assists low-income legal aid providers by using machine learning algorithms to quickly review legal contracts and documents. This technology can accurately and swiftly evaluate important provisions, identify inconsistencies, or legal compliance issues, contributing to shorter timeframes for settling housing disputes or obtaining immigration documents and allowing organizations to serve more clients without compromising standards. Lastly, LawGeex employs AI to assist legal aid clients by efficiently reviewing and approving incoming contracts. By comparing a contract's content against an organization's legal policies, the system highlights potential problems and offers suggestions for improvement, eliminating the need for extensive manual redlining and providing clients with quick and proper legal guidance Chien and Kim (2024). Furthermore, the 24th Judicial District Court in Louisiana has implemented AI chatbots across criminal and civil workflows to help litigants navigate the justice system and access case-specific information, illustrating that AI can effectively extend limited judicial resources Sonday (2023).

CHALLENGES AND ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS

Despite the transformative potential of AI, its integration into legal aid is accompanied by significant practical and ethical challenges. Addressing these concerns is essential to ensure that AI genuinely democratizes justice rather than perpetuating existing inequalities. This section will examine three critical issues: algorithmic bias, data privacy and security, and the barriers to implementation.

ALGORITHMIC BIAS

Among the most significant ethical challenges is algorithmic bias. AI systems, especially in the legal domain, are trained on vast datasets of historical information. If these datasets reflect and increase ongoing social prejudices related to race or gender, the resulting algorithms will inevitably perpetuate those same injustices MacDowell (2015). For instance, an AI tool trained on data from a justice system that excessively imprison members of a particular race may replicate and automate that discriminatory pattern. This risk is especially damaging because the affected groups are often those who already face systemic barriers to an adequate legal defense. Furthermore, a biased system can wrongly forecast unfavorable legal outcomes, thereby reinforcing the very inequities that AI is intended to alleviate Javed and Li (2024). This problem is particularly acute in the criminal justice system, where biased risk assessment algorithms can lead to discriminatory recommendations for bail or sentencing. To address this, robust safeguards and oversight are imperative. Data scientists and legal experts must collaborate to ensure training datasets are representative and fair, while regular audits of AI systems are crucial to identify and correct biases Edenberg and Wood (2023). Transparency in algorithmic decision-making is also essential for accountability. Without such protections, AI risks exacerbating existing legal disparities rather than fulfilling its promise of equitable access to justice Dhakal (2024).

DATA PRIVACY

Beyond algorithmic bias, the use of AI in the legal field raises profound concerns regarding data privacy and security. Legal proceedings inherently involve privileged and highly sensitive information, including personal, financial, and medical data. Consequently, AI systems processing this information must adhere to stringent data protection protocols to prevent unauthorized access, disclosure, or modification Laptev and Feyzrakhmanova (2024). Simultaneously, the enormous datasets required for AI to function effectively can pose an inherent threat to individual privacy. Existing data protection regulations, such as the EU's GDPR, the US's HIPAA, and comparable national laws like Ukraine's Personal Data Protection Law of 2020, provide a framework to mitigate these risks. These laws mandate that organizations restrict access to classified information and utilize encryption, but compliance is often costly and complex Securiti Research Team. (2024), and violations can lead to severe penalties, including criminal charges for both executives and employees. The reliance on cloud platforms for processing and storing this data introduces another layer of complexity. Despite their efficiency and affordability, cloud servers present significant risks, as many legal jurisdictions prohibit third-party access to sensitive data. Moreover, the challenge of virtual jurisdiction and data sovereignty further complicates the issue, underscoring that AI is not a cost-free solution. This technological arrangement naturally leads clients to question the security of their confidential information when it is stored on third-party computers or transmitted across borders Simshaw (2022).

PRACTICAL CHALLENGES

In addition to these ethical considerations, the implementation of AI in legal aid faces significant practical barriers, especially for organizations with limited resources. The primary obstacle is a lack of infrastructure, as legal aid providers serving low-income or rural communities may not have reliable access to the internet, cloud storage, or high-performance computing (HPC) required to deploy these technologies Chouhan (2019). This digital divide risks aggravating the very justice gap that AI is intended to close. Second, a lack of funding presents a significant hurdle, as the high costs of AI software development, maintenance, and data security

are often prohibitive for non-profits and smaller legal aid firms, as are the costs associated with professional training. A third practical challenge is the common resistance to AI within the legal profession Khawaja and Bélisle-Pipon (2023). Many legal practitioners are reluctant to adopt AI tools, often due to concerns about job insecurity or an over-dependence on technology. This skepticism can lead to intense scrutiny of AI applications for accuracy and dependability, potentially resulting in the underutilization of otherwise useful systems. Addressing these practical issues requires a multi-faceted approach. Governments and legal institutions should provide financial support to bridge the infrastructural gap for underserved communities and offer grants to help legal aid organizations adopt AI. Furthermore, educational forums on the advantages and ethical use of AI are essential to help legal practitioners understand and embrace these tools as a necessary evolution in the pursuit of justice Hacker (2021).

NEED FOR REGULATION

Effective regulation is imperative to govern the integration of AI into legal aid and mitigate the inherent risks of bias, privacy violations, and data misuse. Without explicit legislation, AI holds the potential to exacerbate systemic inequities and harm marginalized populations. Specifically, biased algorithms can produce discriminatory outcomes for clients, while inadequate data protection can expose sensitive information, leading to severe adverse consequences Belenguer (2022). Regulatory frameworks are therefore vital for providing clear guidelines on the ethical development and deployment of AI tools by legal professionals. By mandating transparency and accountability, such legislation would build public trust in AI-driven legal services and ensure their responsible application. Ultimately, a collaborative approach among legal experts, AI developers, and policymakers is required to guide technological innovation in a manner that reinforces, rather than erodes, fundamental human rights Lohr et al. (2019).

GLOBAL STANDARDS

The most significant international AI targeting regulations, known as the "European Union's AI Act", offer a chance to apply AI governance. The AI Act, which the EU passed in 2021, intends to regulate the growth and application of AI technology based on risk. There are four threat levels for AI programs: small, hard, controlled and prohibited. The greatest risk is that AI programs implemented in fields like healthcare, law enforcement, and justice operations will result in more severe regulatory agreements. More stringent guidelines will be established to safeguard individual's rights in this area by guaranteeing that AI is transparent, accountable, and equitable Comunale (2024). Moreover, this Act will empower ministers of ethics and investment to apply its provisions appropriately based on the threats that exist today. The entity will be extremely accountable, agreements will be more transparent, and more rigorous audits can be processed. Global and regulatory principles for technological aid in law may safeguard the legislative measures adherence to legal protection and fair prevention despite distant AI applications, since the usage of AI will be restricted. The EU AI Act and the "OECD AI Principles" established global AI boundaries to direct the most recent responsible AI development Alvarez et al. (2024). Furthermore, law will guarantee that all AI technologies are stable, transparent, accountable, and effective and encourage broad development. Reserves can safeguard the advancement of those technologies by agreements under which legal advice and justice can be delivered without deviations Arcila (2024).

FUTURE PROSPECTS

The new AI technology will remarkably impact the delivery of legal aid. Legal research assistants powered by AI appear to be on the rise. These AI systems are capable of processing large amounts of legal data and assisting lawyers in finding precedents and case law. In numerous cases, legal research will be less expensive and time-consuming, making it more available to those who can least afford it Feijóo et al. (2020). Moreover, intelligent contract analysis is becoming increasingly popular in commercial legal advising. Introduced at the start of the text, "intelligent contract analysis" employs AI to accurately research, develop, and study contracts while eliminating human error. These AI applications affect people's lives with regard to both money and time, as AI technology intends to make legal aid significantly affordable. This form of AI shall make legal aid delivery more affordable, allowing low-income individuals and small businesses to access services that were formerly only affordable to the very elite. Furthermore, enactment of AI will enable legal practitioners to spend additional time on challenging cases rather than regular documentation Forbes (2024). The adoption of such technology would lead to greater operational efficiency within any legal aid organization. AI, which is more democratic than previously observed, may do justice by creating the system faster, fairer, and more frugal. Nevertheless, AI should be regulated and monitored, as it has the potential to extend current prejudices or further expand the digital divide Perlman (2023). Lawmakers and legal practitioners must employ AI to ameliorate justice, rather than to exacerbate societal and economic inequity. AI provides new prospects for judicial systems, but ethical and social considerations must not be overlooked Dhakal (2024).

POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the preceding analysis, this article puts forward the following policy recommendations:

1) **AI Ethics for Legal Aid:** Government and legal institutions need to set up AI ethics for legal aid. Such guidelines will be focused on assuring AI responsibility, protecting data privacy, and eliminating algorithmic bias. To prevent

disproportionately harming marginalized groups, AI systems must be equitable and fair. Professionals and AI developers should also receive training on the legal use of ethical AI Laptev and Feyzrakhmanova (2024).

2) **Legal Aid Powered by AI:** Policymakers should make infrastructural investments to implement AI tools for fairness in impoverished populations. Adequate funding for legal aid groups to employ AI technologies for advancing justice is imperative. Such a policy will contribute to expanding internet access in low-income and rural areas. To benefit marginalized communities, the government should also finance research on AI-powered legal aid technologies Khawaja and Bélisle-Pipon (2023).
3) **Transparency and Accountability:** Legal aid decisions are made to make sure that clients and legal professionals grasp how AI technologies operate, including their data and algorithms; thus, it is necessary to provide an explanation. A client may file an appeal, for instance, if they are unhappy with the decision given by AI. To guarantee that AI developers and legal professionals do not employ unethical or prejudiced AI systems, accountability mechanisms are also required Lohr et al. (2019).
4) **Audits and Supervision:** To ascertain whether legal aid AI systems are functioning morally and legally, they should undergo regular audits. These audits will ensure fair AI judgements, safeguard data, and address algorithmic bias. Independent organizations are also required to supervise legal AI systems and sort out the complaints of clients and legal professionals Garrett and Rudin (2023).
5) **Regulations for Data Protection:** Legal Aid AI apparatus should adhere to rigorous personal data rules. Legal professionals and AI developers need to utilize encryption and other security precautions for their client's data. Governments must provide funding for the advancement of privacy-enhancing technologies (PET) like blockchain with respect to protecting legal data Belenguer et al. (2022).

CONCLUSION

This article has argued that artificial intelligence presents a transformative opportunity to democratize legal aid by lowering the financial and logistical barriers that have traditionally restricted access to justice. As evidenced by the success of initiatives in North Carolina, Tennessee, and Louisiana, AI technologies can empower marginalized communities by providing pathways to more equitable and timely legal assistance. However, this potential is contingent upon the careful navigation of significant ethical and practical challenges, including algorithmic bias, data privacy vulnerabilities, and implementation impediments. Realizing this promise necessitates a collaborative effort among policymakers, legal professionals, and technology developers to establish clear standards for transparency, fairness, and accountability. Specifically, the success of this transition depends on four essential pillars: the implementation of regular audits to ensure algorithmic fairness, the enforcement of robust data protection regulations, the provision of equitable funding to bridge the digital divide, and the maintenance of human supervision. Ultimately, the integration of AI into the justice system must be guided by an unwavering commitment to these tenets, harnessing technology responsibly to transform legal aid from a limited resource into a fundamental right and ensuring that justice is realized as a universal principle, not a private privilege.

DECLARATION

The author utilized generative AI tools as a technical assistant to optimize the manuscript's flow and address similarity concerns through linguistic refinement. This process involved restructuring sentences and selecting alternative vocabulary to ensure clarity. The author affirms that all intellectual content, data interpretation, and original research ideas were generated solely by the human author, who maintains full accountability for the integrity and final revisions of the work.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

None.

REFERENCES

Alvarez, J. M., Colmenarejo, A. B., Elobaid, A., Fabbrizzi, S., Fahimi, M., Ferrara, A., Ghodsi, S., and Mougan, C. (2024). Policy Advice and Best Practices on Bias and Fairness in AI. Ethics and Information Technology, 26, 31. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10676-024-09746-w

Arcila, B. B. (2024). AI Liability in Europe: How does it Complement Risk Regulation and Deal with the Problem of Human Oversight? Computer Law & Security Review, 54, 106012. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0267364924000797

Belenguer, L. (2022). AI Bias: Exploring Discriminatory Algorithmic Decision-Making Models and the Application of Possible Machine-Centric Solutions Adapted from the Pharmaceutical Industry. AI and Ethics, 2, 771–787. https://doi.org/10.1007/s43681-022-00138-8

Camilleri, M. A. (2024). Artificial Intelligence Governance: Ethical considerations and Implications for Social Responsibility. Expert Systems, 41(7), e13406. https://doi.org/10.1111/exsy.13406

Chakraborty, C., Pal, S., Bhattacharya, M., Dash, S., and Lee, S.-S. (2023). Overview of Chatbots with Special Emphasis on Artificial Intelligence-Enabled ChatGPT in Medical Science. Frontiers in Artificial Intelligence, 6, 1237704. https://doi.org/10.3389/frai.2023.1237704

Chien, C. V. and Kim, M. (2024). Generative AI and Legal Aid: Results from a Field Study and 100 Use Cases to Bridge the Access to Justice Gap. SSRN. https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=4733061

Chouhan, K. S. (2019). Role of an AI in Legal aid and Access to Criminal Justice. International Journal of Legal Research, 6, 2. https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=3536194

Collenette, J., Atkinson, K., and Bench-Capon, T. (2023). Explainable AI Tools for Legal Reasoning about Cases: A Study on the European Court of Human Rights. Artificial Intelligence, 317, 103861.

Comunale, M. (2024). The Economic Impacts and the Regulation of AI: A Review of Academic Literature and Policy Actions. IMF Working Papers, 2024(065), 1. https://doi.org/10.5089/9798400268588.001

Dankwa-Mullan, I. (2024). Health Equity and Ethical Considerations in Using Artificial Intelligence in Public Health and Medicine. Preventing Chronic Disease, 21, E64. https://doi.org/10.5888/pcd21.240245

Dhakal, D. (2024). AI Revolutionizing Law: How Artificial Intelligence Is Transforming The Legal Industry. North South University Law Blog.

Dhakal, D. (2024). AI in law: Debates on Ethical Considerations. OnlineKhabar English. https://english.onlinekhabar.com/ai-in-law-ethical-concern.html

Edenberg, E. and Wood, A. (2023). Disambiguating Algorithmic Bias: From Neutrality to Justice. In Proceedings of the 2023 AAAI/ACM Conference on AI, Ethics, and Society, vol. 81, 691–704. https://doi.org/10.1145/3600211.3604695

European Parliament. (2023). EU AI Act: First Regulation on Artificial Intelligence.

Feijóo, C., Kwon, Y., Bauer, J. M., Bohlin, E., Howell, B., Jain, R., Potgieter, P., Vu, K., Whalley, J., and Xia, J. (2020). Harnessing Artificial Intelligence (AI) to Increase Wellbeing for all: The Case for Modern Technology Diplomacy. Telecommunications Policy, 44(6), 101988. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.telpol.2020.101988

Fernando, Z. J., Kristanto, K., Anditya, A. W., Hartati, S. Y., and Baskara, A. (2023). Robot Lawyer in Indonesian Criminal justice system: Problems and challenges for Future Law Enforcement. Lex Scientia Law Review, 7(2), 489–528. https://doi.org/10.15294/lesrev.v7i2.69423

Forbes. (2024). AI Legal Services: How AI Is Providing Small Businesses with Affordable Legal Help.

Ford, J. (2023). Artificial Intelligence Models Aim to Forecast Eviction, Promote Renter Rights. Penn State University.

Garrett, B. L. and Rudin, C. (2023). Interpretable Algorithmic Forensics. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, 120, e2301842120. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2301842120

Gibbs, S. (2016). Chatbot Lawyer Overturns 160,000 Parking Tickets in London and New York. The Guardian.

Hacker, P. (2021). The European AI Liability Directives – Critique of a Half-Hearted Approach and Lessons for the Future. Computer Law & Security Review, 51, 105871. https://arxiv.org/abs/2211.13960

Isaac, O. and Johnson, N. (2025). The Use of Chatbots in Providing Free Legal Guidance: Benefits and Limitations. ResearchGate. 388179232_The_Use_of_Chatbots_in_Providing_Free_Legal_Guidance_Benefits_and_Limitations

Javed, K. and Li, J. (2024). Artificial Intelligence in Judicial Adjudication: Semantic Biasness Classification and Identification in Legal Judgement (SBCILJ). Heliyon, 10, e30184. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2405844024062157

Khawaja, Z. and Bélisle-Pipon, J.-C. (2023). Your Robot Therapist is not your Therapist: Understanding the Role of AI-Powered Mental Health Chatbots. Frontiers in Digital Health, 5, 1278186. https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/digital-health/articles/10.3389/fdgth.2023.1278186/full

Kruszynska, M. (2024). AI in the Legal Sector: How Can Legal Professionals Use AI & Automation? Spyrosoft.

Laptev, V. A. and Feyzrakhmanova, D. R. (2024). Application of Artificial Intelligence in Justice: Current Trends and Future Prospects. Human-Centric Intelligent Systems, 4, 394–405. https://doi.org/10.1007/s44230-024-00074-2

Lee, D., Arnold, M., Srivastava, A., Plastow, K., Strelan, P., Ploeckl, F., Lekkas, D., and Palmer, E. (2024). The Impact of Generative AI on Higher Education Learning and Teaching: A Study of Educators' Perspectives. Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence, 6, 100221. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2024.100221

Libai, B., Bart, Y., Gensler, S., Hofacker, C. F., Kaplan, A., Kötterheinrich, K., and Kroll, E. B. (2020). Brave new world? On AI and the Management of Customer Relationships. Journal of Interactive Marketing, 51, 44–56. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.intmar.2020.04.002

Lohr, J. D., Maxwell, W. J., and Watts, P. (2019). Legal Practitioners Approach to Regulating AI Risks. In K. Yeung & M. Lodge (Eds.), Algorithmic Regulation. Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780198838494.003.0010

MacDowell, E. L. (2015). Reimagining Access to Justice in the Poor People's Courts. Georgetown Journal on Poverty Law & Policy, 22, 3. https://scholars.law.unlv.edu/facpub/938

Perlman, A. (2023). The Implications of ChatGPT for Legal Services and Society. Harvard Law School Center on the Legal Profession.

Securiti Research Team. (2024). Data Privacy Laws and Regulations Around the World. Securiti.

Simshaw, D. (2022). Access to A.I. Justice: Avoiding an Inequitable Two-Tiered System of Legal Services. Yale Journal of Law & Technology, 24, 150.
Sonday, K. (2023). Forum: There's Potential for AI Chatbots to Increase Access to Justice. Thomson Reuters Institute, New York.
Sonday, K. (2024). AI for Legal Aid: How to Empower Clients in Need. Thomson Reuters Institute, New York.