



INTERNATIONAL LAW
JOURNAL

**WHITE BLACK
LEGAL LAW
JOURNAL**
**ISSN: 2581-
8503**

Peer - Reviewed & Refereed Journal

The Law Journal strives to provide a platform for discussion of International as well as National Developments in the Field of Law.

WWW.WHITEBLACKLEGAL.CO.IN

DISCLAIMER

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored, transmitted, translated, or distributed in any form or by any means—whether electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, scanning, or otherwise—without the prior written permission of the Editor-in-Chief of *White Black Legal – The Law Journal*.

All copyrights in the articles published in this journal vest with *White Black Legal – The Law Journal*, unless otherwise expressly stated. Authors are solely responsible for the originality, authenticity, accuracy, and legality of the content submitted and published.

The views, opinions, interpretations, and conclusions expressed in the articles are exclusively those of the respective authors. They do not represent or reflect the views of the Editorial Board, Editors, Reviewers, Advisors, Publisher, or Management of *White Black Legal*.

While reasonable efforts are made to ensure academic quality and accuracy through editorial and peer-review processes, *White Black Legal* makes no representations or warranties, express or implied, regarding the completeness, accuracy, reliability, or suitability of the content published. The journal shall not be liable for any errors, omissions, inaccuracies, or consequences arising from the use, interpretation, or reliance upon the information contained in this publication.

The content published in this journal is intended solely for academic and informational purposes and shall not be construed as legal advice, professional advice, or legal opinion. *White Black Legal* expressly disclaims all liability for any loss, damage, claim, or legal consequence arising directly or indirectly from the use of any material published herein.

ABOUT WHITE BLACK LEGAL

White Black Legal – The Law Journal is an open-access, peer-reviewed, and refereed legal journal established to provide a scholarly platform for the examination and discussion of contemporary legal issues. The journal is dedicated to encouraging rigorous legal research, critical analysis, and informed academic discourse across diverse fields of law.

The journal invites contributions from law students, researchers, academicians, legal practitioners, and policy scholars. By facilitating engagement between emerging scholars and experienced legal professionals, *White Black Legal* seeks to bridge theoretical legal research with practical, institutional, and societal perspectives.

In a rapidly evolving social, economic, and technological environment, the journal endeavours to examine the changing role of law and its impact on governance, justice systems, and society. *White Black Legal* remains committed to academic integrity, ethical research practices, and the dissemination of accessible legal scholarship to a global readership.

AIM & SCOPE

The aim of *White Black Legal – The Law Journal* is to promote excellence in legal research and to provide a credible academic forum for the analysis, discussion, and advancement of contemporary legal issues. The journal encourages original, analytical, and well-researched contributions that add substantive value to legal scholarship.

The journal publishes scholarly works examining doctrinal, theoretical, empirical, and interdisciplinary perspectives of law. Submissions are welcomed from academicians, legal professionals, researchers, scholars, and students who demonstrate intellectual rigour, analytical clarity, and relevance to current legal and policy developments.

The scope of the journal includes, but is not limited to:

- Constitutional and Administrative Law
- Criminal Law and Criminal Justice
- Corporate, Commercial, and Business Laws
- Intellectual Property and Technology Law
- International Law and Human Rights
- Environmental and Sustainable Development Law
- Cyber Law, Artificial Intelligence, and Emerging Technologies
- Family Law, Labour Law, and Social Justice Studies

The journal accepts original research articles, case comments, legislative and policy analyses, book reviews, and interdisciplinary studies addressing legal issues at national and international levels. All submissions are subject to a rigorous double-blind peer-review process to ensure academic quality, originality, and relevance.

Through its publications, *White Black Legal – The Law Journal* seeks to foster critical legal thinking and contribute to the development of law as an instrument of justice, governance, and social progress, while expressly disclaiming responsibility for the application or misuse of published content.

THE AI LAWYER'S DILEMMA: PROFESSIONAL ETHICS, JUDICIAL INTEGRITY, AND LIABILITY IN THE DIGITAL AGE

AUTHORED BY - DR. KAMINI RARIA

*Assistant Professor,
Government Law College, Ajmer, Rajasthan.*

ABSTRACT

*Artificial intelligence has swiftly transitioned from a speculative notion to a commonplace instrument in legal practice, offering unmatched efficiency in research, drafting, compliance, and litigation assistance. The rapid incorporation of AI presents significant ethical dilemmas that current professional frameworks in India are ill-equipped to tackle. This study examines how AI-induced errors—hallucinations, faked citations, and misinterpretations—undermine the essential duties mandated for advocates by the Bar Council of India Rules. The paper demonstrates, through cases such as *Mata v. Avianca* and *Buckeye Trust v. PCIT*, how uncritical dependence on untested AI may mislead courts and compromise judicial thinking. It additionally examines the escalating threat to client confidentiality posed by the rising trend of legal professionals uploading sensitive information to AI systems that lack sufficient privacy safeguards and may preserve data indefinitely. The discourse thereafter transitions to the emerging issue of liability, examining initiatives like the EU's Product Liability Directive to ascertain if accountability may extend beyond attorneys to developers and other participants in the AI supply chain. Subsequently, the study contends that, regardless of technological advancements, the paramount responsibility for oversight, precision, and ethical adherence resides with legal practitioners. Ultimately, it underscores the necessity for more explicit regulatory frameworks, enhanced training in AI literacy, and stricter transparency mandates to ensure that AI upholds, rather than undermines, the foundational ideals of the legal profession.*

Keywords: *Artificial Intelligence, Legal Ethics, AI Hallucinations, Client Confidentiality, Professional Liability*

1. INTRODUCTION: ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE AND THE TRANSFORMATION OF LEGAL PRACTICE

Over the course of three years, AI has transitioned from a speculative notion in science fiction literature to an integral component of our daily existence. The infiltration of AI across all sectors and professions is profound, and the legal domain is no exception. What occurs when the AI employed in legal discourse makes an error? Who bears responsibility for the errors of a computer, and in what contexts do professional ethical standards apply in these situations?

AI aids in several duties, such as document examination, legal research, document summarization, deposition inquiries, and ensuring adherence to contract policies.¹ Delegating technical and administrative tasks to AI alleviates the workload of lawyers, enabling them to concentrate on the substance and outcomes of cases.

Significant power entails an augmented ethical obligation. In contrast to conventional robots or tools, which are wholly governed by human operators, numerous AI systems operate autonomously and make judgments based on algorithms that develop over time. This autonomy presents issues for the implementation of established legal concepts, which generally depend on human purpose, control, and predictability.²

Due to its autonomy, AI cannot only function as a neutral aide or a passive instrument. Biased outcomes, hallucinations, or errors might yield harmful consequences, including misleading courts and jeopardizing client confidentiality. Artificial intelligence is not human and hence cannot be openly queried regarding its reasoning; thus, meticulous verification and supervision are vital.

This study aims to elucidate the issues and provide insights about the current position of legal professionals in a domain increasingly characterized by artificial intelligence.

¹ Marjorie Richter, *See what legal professionals say about the role of AI and law*, Thomson Reuters Law Blog (Aug. 18, 2025), <https://legal.thomsonreuters.com/blog/how-ai-is-transforming-the-legal-profession/>.

² Shreya Goyal, *AI And Legal Liability: Who Is Responsible When Machines Go Wrong?*, 8 Indian J.L. & Legal Rsch.,(2025).

2. UNDERSTANDING GENERATIVE AI AND ITS GROWING ROLE IN LEGAL SERVICES

Artificial Intelligence is described as the discipline focused on instructing computers to learn, think, observe, infer, communicate, and make judgments akin to human capabilities. Generative artificial intelligence (GAI) encompasses a collection of algorithms and models that may generate novel content, such as text, images, videos, and problem-solving methodologies, exhibiting human-like creativity and flexibility. Notable instances of these generative AIs include ChatGPT, Claude, Gemini, Perplexity, DALL·E, among others. The history of Generative AI extends to the 1950s, originating with the emergence of rule-based systems, despite appearing to be modern advancements. A rule-based system functions via a series of steps. It initially acquires input, such as numerical data, information, or symptoms. It subsequently correlates this input with a set of "if-then" rules integrated within its knowledge base. Upon identifying a matching rule, the system executes it and carries out the corresponding action. When multiple rules are concurrently relevant, the system employs strategies to ascertain the order of execution, generally favoring the most specific or highest-priority rule. Finally, the system generates an output, which might be a decision, recommendation, or response; for instance, the General Problem Solver (GPS), created in the 1950s by Herbert A. Simon and Allen Newell, was supposed to emulate human problem-solving by decomposing issues into smaller sub-problems. MYCIN is an expert system created in the 1970s for diagnosing bacterial illnesses and suggesting antibiotics.³ This rapidly developed into contemporary generative AI, a groundbreaking technology capable of autonomously generating new material by leveraging input data. The theoretical framework of generative AI consists of

1. Machine learning: a subset of Artificial Intelligence (AI) that enables systems to autonomously learn and enhance their performance via experience, without explicit programming. It is an ongoing process wherein a software or system acquires knowledge and enhances its performance through experience. It generates an astute forecast of an outcome based on the dataset.⁴
2. Natural language processing (NLP) is a multidisciplinary domain dedicated to facilitating machines' comprehension, interpretation, and generation of human language in a manner that is both significant and contextually pertinent. It integrates principles from linguistics,

³ Jeff Johnston, *The History of AI: From Rules-based Algorithms to Generative Models*, Lantern (July 17, 2024), <https://lanternstudios.com/insights/blog/the-history-of-ai-from-rules-based-algorithms-to-generative-models/>.

⁴ Alam Azmir, *What is Machine Learning?*, 2023, ResearchGate, <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.8231581>.

computer science, artificial intelligence, and cognitive psychology to connect human communication with machine comprehension.⁵

3. Image processing, and computer vision.⁶

2.1 The Expanding Use of Generative AI Across the Legal Profession

The extensive features of these models, particularly large language models such as ChatGPT, render them highly appealing to legal professionals. These models can process vast quantities of information in a much reduced timeframe, rendering regular yet labor-intensive tasks such as contract drafting, fundamental legal research, and document review considerably more scalable and cost-efficient. Although the technology has not yet advanced to a point where lawyers can be supplanted.⁷ Utilizing machine learning and natural language processing, the AI's logic and output closely resemble those of a person.

Various forms of "legal" AI have arisen within a brief period. Prominent GenAI items now utilized in the legal business encompass Microsoft Copilot, Lexis+ AI, Thomson Reuters Cocounsel, and Harvey.⁸ These have been specifically designed to serve as aides to attorneys. They assist in mitigating inherent human flaws that many attorneys may have when attempting to comprehend extensive volumes of information. Some technologies employ NLP to analyze court dockets, forecast decision outcomes, find advantageous jurisdictions for filing lawsuits, and suggest potentially successful motions and arguments tailored to certain judges.⁹

AI is currently being deployed to do the following work

1. Legal research: by rapidly scanning the Internet for legal concepts, case law, and doctrines, AI alleviates the manual workload encountered by most legal professionals.
2. Contract drafting and review: utilizing AI, a well-structured prompt can yield a contract in just seconds. It can also evaluate and identify clauses in the contract that are ambiguous, superfluous, or erroneous.
3. Litigation support: AI can replicate human reasoning and engage in strategic thinking,

⁵ Rayhan, A., Kinzler, R., & Rayhan, R. (2023). NATURAL LANGUAGE PROCESSING: TRANSFORMING HOW MACHINES UNDERSTAND HUMAN LANGUAGE. *ResearchGate*. <https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.34900.99200>

⁶ Zhihan Lv, Generative artificial intelligence in the metaverse era, *Cognitive Robotics*, Volume 3, 2023, Pages 208-217, ISSN 2667-2413, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cogr.2023.06.001>.

⁷ Steve Lohr, A.I. Is Doing Legal Work. But It Won't Replace Lawyers, Yet., *NEW YORK TIMES*, March 19, 2017, available at <https://www.nytimes.com/2017/03/19/technology/lawyers-artificial-intelligence.html>

⁸ Alex Heshmaty, *The State of AI and Legal*, *Legal Management* (Oct. 11, 2024), <https://www.alanet.org/legal-management/2024/october/features/the-state-of-ai-and-legal>.

⁹ Anirudh Gotety, *REGULATING THE ETHICS OF THE UNKNOWN: ANALYSING REGULATORY REGIMES FOR AI-BASED LEGAL TECHNOLOGY AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ITS REGULATION IN INDIA*, 14 *NUJS L. Rev.* 3 (2021).

enabling it to forecast case outcomes and judgment patterns, thereby assisting an advocate in formulating their case.

4. Compliance: AI may analyze legislation and regulatory frameworks to identify potential loopholes and discrepancies.

A LexisNexis report indicates that over 25% of lawyers consistently utilize GenAI products, in contrast to slightly over 10% from the previous year. Nevertheless, nearly 40% of surveyed legal professionals indicated they had no intention of adopting GenAI.¹⁰ This data illustrates a profession in transition, characterized by a dichotomy between individuals who regard AI as a beneficial enhancement to the legal sector and those who perceive the potential for misuse of this technology within the domain. Resolving the ethical and legal uncertainties associated with AI is crucial for closing this gap. In what manner do these principles manifest differently in practice? What responsibilities do attorneys have while utilizing AI, and crucially, who is liable in the event of AI malfunction?

3. PROFESSIONAL ETHICS IN THE AGE OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE

The Bar Council of India is the governing organization that establishes the standards of conduct for its members. The Standards of Professional Conduct and Etiquette constitute Chapter II of the Bar Council of India Rules.¹¹ The Bar Council of India (BCI), established under Section 4 of the Advocates Act, is authorized by Section 49 to set standards for professional behavior and etiquette for advocates.¹² These regulations, however, have not adapted to the advancing legal practice in the nation. The BCI Rules were conceived with regard to a setting in which a lawyer only practices in a courtroom.¹³ Furthermore, it envisions a realm in which technology is excluded from the courts. These regulations do not address matters such as technological proficiency, AI supervision, or client consent in AI-supported legal services.¹⁴ This silence creates opportunities for lapses and violations of the professional standards a lawyer is

¹⁰ Laura Halls, *Exploring the growing appetite for legal AI* | LexisNexis Blogs, LexisNexis | Legal and Professional Solutions and Products (Mar. 27, 2024), <https://www.lexisnexis.co.uk/blog/future-of-law/explore-the-growing-appetite-for-legal-ai#:~:text=The%20report%20shows%20adoption%20rates,trend%20looks%20likely%20to%20continue.>

¹¹ Neeraj Sharma, *Ethical Lawyering: A Way to Uphold the Nobility of the Legal Profession*, 4 Int'l J.L. Mgmt. & Humans. 488, (2021), <https://doi.org/10.1000/IJLMH.111359>.

¹² 3 Bar Council of India Rules, Part VI, Chapter II, "Standards of Professional Conduct and Etiquette," available at: <http://www.barcouncilofindia.org>

¹³ Gotety, *supra* note 11

¹⁴ Sreddha Gopakumar Krishna, *Ethical And Professional Responsibility In AI- Enhanced Legal Practice: Need For A New Code Of Conduct*, 7 Indian J.L. & Legal Rsch., (2025).

obligated to maintain.

4. SAFEGUARDING JUDICIAL INTEGRITY: AI HALLUCINATIONS AND THE RISK OF MISLEADING THE COURTS

Artificial Intelligence hallucinations denote occurrences in which AI systems produce outputs that are factually inaccurate, deceptive, or manufactured, frequently exhibiting a convincing semblance of reality.¹⁵ It has been known to

- a) Accurately reference the appropriate legal concept while citing fictitious examples, employing ostensibly accurate citation methods.
- b) Construct legal doctrines and principles that either do not exist or are inapplicable to a specific country.
- c) Misinterpret or inaccurately summarize case law
- d) Arrive at false legal conclusions or apply repealed or obsolete laws

Utilizing it as a rapid remedy may result in catastrophic outcomes. In *Mata v. Avianca*¹⁶, the plaintiffs' attorney utilized ChatGPT to identify situations that were ultimately erroneous. The court filing revealed the cases were fraudulent, resulting in sanctions against the attorney. This highlights that AI systems such as ChatGPT are not legal databases and can thus produce inaccuracies. The lawyer has an ethical obligation to defend and represent the client courageously and with integrity, irrespective of personal beliefs. Rule 15 of the BCI regulations.¹⁷

In an identical case of *Buckeye Trust v. PCIT*¹⁸ The Bengaluru bench of the Income Tax Appellate Tribunal (ITAT) issued an order citing three Supreme Court rulings and one Madras High Court rule, all of which were fabricated by AI and do not exist. The decree was promptly rescinded within a week, alleging "unintentional errors. This case underscores a more profound concern. To date, attorneys have utilized AI to augment legal research, indicating that ethical

¹⁵ Debajyoti Chakravarty, *AI Hallucinations in the Legal Field: Present Experiences, Future Considerations*, OBSERVER RESEARCH FOUNDATION (Aug. 12, 2025), <https://www.orfonline.org/expert-speak/ai-hallucinations-in-the-legal-field-present-experiences-future-considerations>.

¹⁶ *Mata v. Avianca, Inc.*, U.S.D.S.D. OF N.Y., June 22, 2023, 2022cv01461, (U.S.), <https://law.justia.com/cases/federal/district-courts/new-york/nysdce/1:2022cv01461/575368/54/>.

¹⁷ Bar Council of India Rules, Part VI, Chapter II, Section II, Rule 15, Standards of Professional Conduct and Etiquette (as amended), available at <https://www.barcouncilofindia.org/info/rules-on-an-advocates-duty-towards-the-client>

¹⁸ ITA No.1051/Bang/2024 Buckeye Trust, Bangalore

obligations and repercussions for any violations rest with the attorneys. However, in this instance, AI was employed in judicial reasoning by a certified tribunal, which was required to consider the reasoning and submissions from both parties, thereby obscuring the extent to which AI may have influenced the reasoning process. This additionally complicates the process of contestation or appeal. This indicates that the ethical use of AI is the responsibility of all stakeholders in the judicial process.

4.1 Towards Responsible AI Use: Policy Recommendations and Best Practices

Mitigating the hazards of AI hallucinations necessitates a multifaceted strategy that integrates policy frameworks, technical protections, professional accountability, and judicial oversight. The Responsible AI – Approach Document, Part 1 (2021) by India's NITI Aayog establishes rules for artificial intelligence in India, highlighting safety, accountability, transparency, and reliability. Continuous error testing of the AI, together with documentation and external audits, is necessary.

AI system developers must prioritize data quality above data quantity. This is accomplished by educating the AI with contemporary, varied, and accurately sourced material. It should be obligatory to incorporate a transparent design feature from the outset, which will reveal sources, model architecture, and performance metrics. Users must be able to trace the origins of the material supplied by AI, necessitating verified citations for all information. Contracts with AI service providers must incorporate clauses mandating transparency concerning the training data and algorithms of the AI system.¹⁹

Moreover, courts must adapt and implement updated norms and regulations to integrate AI. The utilization of AI in a legal action must be explicitly stated, including its location and methodology. Bar councils may promulgate enforceable directives to guarantee human scrutiny of AI-generated legal materials. To equip attorneys for cross-verification and error reporting, law firms and judicial institutions could establish internal governance norms that prioritize AI literacy.

A robust framework of ethical standards, technical openness, and human oversight is essential to fully leverage AI's legal advantages without compromising integrity. AI can serve as a tool to advance justice rather than distort it, provided that developers, courts, regulators, and practitioners collaborate with diligence.

¹⁹ Kiara Fink, *AI Hallucinations In Legal Practice: Risks, Real Cases, And Solutions*, Mondaq - Law Articles and Insights (Nov. 7, 2024), <https://www.mondaq.com/new-technology/1540712/ai-hallucinations-in-legal-practice-risks-real-cases-and-solutions>.

5. PRESERVING CLIENT TRUST: CONFIDENTIALITY, DATA PROTECTION, AND PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE

“OpenAI CEO Sam Altman has cautioned that although users frequently disclose intimate details of their lives to ChatGPT, their interactions lack privacy safeguards and may be subject to disclosure in legal proceedings or other judicial contexts.” This single phrase from a Hindu article sufficiently highlights one of the most significant ethical dilemmas in the integration of AI into the legal domain.

Artificial intelligence operates on a reciprocal exchange of information. Legal professionals require AI to analyze policies or design contracts, necessitating the upload of substantial volumes of potentially sensitive data.

The attorney-client privilege aims to promote open and thorough communication, allowing clients to obtain legal advice without fear that their disclosures may be used against them. Clause 7 of the "Rules on an Advocate's Duty Towards the Client," as published by the Bar Council of India, explicitly states that the professional shall not, directly or indirectly, reveal communications made by the client to him or vice versa. Moreover, section 134 of the Bharatiya Sakshya Adhiniyam preserves attorney-client privilege, prohibiting lawyers and clients from revealing sensitive information shared during legal representation, save in instances of active criminal activity or fraud.²⁰

Upon the upload of sensitive material, attorneys relinquish effective control over its storage location, retention duration, and access permissions. Given that AI is educated on provided data, there exists a significant likelihood that it utilizes this data for subsequent outputs, resulting in potential breaches. A lawyer's obligation to maintain confidentiality is active; utilizing an AI tool and uploading data without examining its privacy regulations constitutes negligence.

A federal judge has mandated that OpenAI, Inc.²¹ preserve any future ChatGPT conversations, including those users attempt to delete, in relation to an ongoing copyright infringement

²⁰ Bharatiya Sakshya Adhiniyam, No. 46 of 2023, § 134 (India).

²¹ In Re: OpenAI, Inc. Copyright Infringement Litigation, 1:25-md-03143, (S.D.N.Y.)

litigation initiated by multiple news organizations.²² This case illustrates that any data uploaded to AI, whether personal or professional, can be retained indefinitely and utilized in litigations unrelated to specific parties.

India's legislation regarding evidence and crime has been revised to encompass all types of electronic evidence, and although it is not currently in progress, AI-generated recordings are anticipated to be admissible as evidence in the majority of courts within a few years.

An advocate must do every effort to maintain confidentiality; yet, it is also the obligation of the state to implement new laws and systems to safeguard privacy from the outset. The Tamil Nadu e-Governance Agency (TNeGA) instituted the DEEP-MAX Scorecard to assess AI technologies prior to their public deployment. This rating guarantees that AI systems conform to ethical standards by evaluating diversity, equity, and safeguards against misuse. The scorecard encompasses multiple dimensions, such as data integrity, algorithmic equity, and effect evaluation.²³

5.1 The Duty of Competence: Balancing Technological Innovation with Professional Diligence

The ethical conflict between utilizing AI for enhanced efficiency and maintaining customer anonymity will persist for years. We must not overlook a lawyer's obligation to be proficient and diligent while adapting to societal transformations. The obligation of competence extends beyond mere knowledge of procedural and substantive laws; it encompasses a comprehensive understanding of the entire legal system and the instruments that influence it. As AI advances, legal professionals must integrate technology into their daily practices rather than evade it, beginning with a thorough understanding of AI legislation.

The obligation of competence, although not explicitly stated in the BCI regulations, is inherently suggested within the established duty to the client. Rule 1.1 of the American Bar Association (ABA) regulations²⁴, Principle 3, and Rule 3.2 of the Solicitors Regulation Authority (SRA) Code of Conduct (2023),²⁵ as well as Rule 5(2)(c) of the Legal Profession

²² Kyle Moen, *Think your AI Chats are Private? The Court Might Disagree.* | Segal Duffek Moen | Minneapolis, MN, Segal Duffek Moen (June 19, 2025), <https://sdmlawyers.com/think-your-ai-chats-are-private-the-court-might-disagree/>.

²³ Ispp, *AI Ethics in Public Policy: Case Studies & Challenges* | ISPP, Indian School of Public Policy - (July 10, 2024), <https://www.ispp.org.in/ethics-of-ai-in-public-policy-in-the-indian-context/>.

²⁴ Model Rules of Prof'l Conduct r. 1.1 (Am. Bar Ass'n),

²⁵ SRA Code of Conduct for Solicitors, RELs, and RFLs (2023), Principle 3 and Rule 3.2

(Professional Conduct) regulations in Singapore, clearly state this information.²⁶ The Lamp of Industry represents diligence. An advocate must dedicate themselves entirely to their client's case. He ought to engage with literature, be informed about pertinent legal developments, and structure his thoughts for more compelling arguments.²⁷ Attorneys must be informed about technology advancements that can improve their practice and must effectively oversee the utilization of AI tools by their personnel, ensuring the precision of AI-generated outputs.²⁸ Legal professionals must be trained to utilize AI efficiently and responsibly to fulfill their responsibilities.

AI training should be incorporated into university curricula as a mandatory component, focusing on skills such as selecting the appropriate AI for specific tasks, prompt engineering, and upholding ethical norms in AI interactions. Subsequently, obligatory training for attorneys in legal firms should be implemented. on acquiring proficiency in AI. They must be instructed on formulating appropriate questions and assessing the relevance, quality, and accuracy of the responses (and then refining the queries as necessary), as well as synthesizing the total data into a coherent, actionable overview.²⁹

Numerous legal firms worldwide have established summer programs to instruct their personnel on the appropriate utilization of AI. Summer associates acquire proficiency in utilizing the firm's research and conversational tools for work such as legal writing, document production and summarization, drafting, proofreading, and additional activities. This advancement indicates a dedication to innovative technologies, facilitating the acquisition of essential competencies for emerging lawyers. The training provided must be experiential and interpersonal; it should illustrate tools within context and ultimately foster a community centered on AI methodologies.

6. WHO BEARS THE BURDEN? DETERMINING LIABILITY FOR AI-INDUCED ERRORS IN LEGAL SERVICES

A pertinent concern regarding the intersection of AI and the legal domain is the determination of culpability when an AI errs. Although an advocate's primary professional responsibilities of

²⁶ Legal Profession (Professional Conduct) Rules 2015, Rule 5(2)(c), Sing. Subsidiary Legislation No. S 706/2015

²⁷ Ruchit Yadav, *PROFESSIONAL CONDUCT AND LAMPS IN ADVOCACY* - *Jus Corpus*, Jus Corpus (Aug. 16, 2023), <https://www.juscorpus.com/professional-conduct-and-lamps-in-advocacy/>.

²⁸ Terzidou, K. Generative AI systems in legal practice offering quality legal services while upholding legal ethics. *International Journal of Law in Context* **2025**, pp. 1–22.

²⁹ John Villasenor, *How AI will revolutionize the practice of law* | *Brookings*, Brookings (Mar. 20, 2023), <https://www.brookings.edu/articles/how-ai-will-revolutionize-the-practice-of-law/>.

ensuring compliance, confidentiality, and competency are crucial, recent advancements in this field have attributed accountability to other participants in the AI supply chain.

The European Union's New Product Liability Directive (PLD) encompasses software and AI systems, regardless of whether they are integrated into hardware or distributed autonomously. Consequently, it attributes accountability to manufacturers, third-party software developers, and intermediaries when their flawed AI software inflicts injury. Although ultimate blame may ultimately reside with the attorney based on the circumstances, this advancement indicates that as AI becomes increasingly regulated and integrated into our systems, there is an escalating likelihood of liability being directly assigned to it.

Even today, when sanctioned legal AI makes errors, a case for attributing responsibility to the AI developer may emerge. There may have been a flaw in the system, insufficient training of the AI by the developer, or the absence of essential protections. In these instances, the aggrieved party must demonstrate the specific technological mechanism that malfunctioned, establish that the developer had a contractual duty of care, and prove that this negligence resulted in reputational, financial, or procedural damage. The claimant must demonstrate that the danger was foreseeable and preventable, and that no tampering by the claimant contributed to the error. Nonetheless, notwithstanding these safeguards, the ultimate culpability, in this author's view, will and ought to rest with the legal professional. Machines are incapable of undergoing trial or compensating for damages. They lack moral agency, thus it would be unproductive for victims to seek recompense from a non-human entity in cases such as wrongful arrests or severe accidents. At a certain point, humans are accountable for the actions and rationale of the AI system. Granting personality to AI might potentially absolve firms of responsibility, thereby promoting a disavowal of authority over the "autonomous" computer.³⁰

7. CONCLUSION: BUILDING AN ETHICAL AND ACCOUNTABLE AI FRAMEWORK FOR THE LEGAL PROFESSION

The author believes that the ascent of AI introduces numerous alterations accompanied by new opportunities and advancements. Rather than openly opposing this transformation, we inside the legal profession must lead its implementation. Indeed, ethical dilemmas emerge, and some

³⁰ Erica Stanford, *Who is responsible when AI acts autonomously & things go wrong?*, GLI (May 15, 2025), <https://www.globallegalinsights.com/practice-areas/ai-machine-learning-and-big-data-laws-and-regulations/autonomous-ai-who-is-responsible-when-ai-acts-autonomously-and-things-go-wrong/>.

issues lack definitive solutions; nonetheless, these obstacles have to be perceived as opportunities to fortify the profession rather than as threats. Furthermore, the resolutions to contemporary issues are within reach. Through effective coordination among attorneys, policymakers, regulators, and developers, we may inhabit a world where AI operates at its optimal potential for our benefit. We must establish strong frameworks for transparency, accountability, and AI monitoring to prevent innovation from resulting in injustice. Consequently, the legal industry may not only adapt to the evolving terrain but also take the initiative in shaping it. We may mold AI appropriately by safeguarding the moral and ethical principles of law.

