



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 or copied in any form by any means without prior written permission of Editor-in-chief of White Black Legal – The Law Journal. The Editorial Team of White Black Legal holds the copyright to all articles contributed to this publication. The views expressed in this publication are purely personal opinions of the authors and do not reflect the views of the Editorial Team of White Black Legal. Though all efforts are made to ensure the accuracy and correctness of the information published, White Black Legal shall not be responsible for any errors caused due to oversight or otherwise.

WHITE BLACK
LEGAL

EDITORIAL **TEAM**

Raju Narayana Swamy (IAS) Indian Administrative Service **officer**



a professional
Procurement from the World Bank.

Dr. Raju Narayana Swamy popularly known as Kerala's Anti-Corruption Crusader is the All India Topper of the 1991 batch of the IAS and is currently posted as Principal Secretary to the Government of Kerala. He has earned many accolades as he hit against the political-bureaucrat corruption nexus in India. Dr Swamy holds a B.Tech in Computer Science and Engineering from the IIT Madras and a Ph. D. in Cyber Law from Gujarat National Law University. He also has an LLM (Pro) (with specialization in IPR) as well as three PG Diplomas from the National Law University, Delhi- one in Urban Environmental Management and Law, another in Environmental Law and Policy and a third one in Tourism and Environmental Law. He also holds a post-graduate diploma in IPR from the National Law School, Bengaluru and diploma in Public

Dr. R. K. Upadhyay

Dr. R. K. Upadhyay is Registrar, University of Kota (Raj.), Dr Upadhyay obtained LLB , LLM degrees from Banaras Hindu University & Phd from university of Kota.He has succesfully completed UGC sponsored M.R.P for the work in the ares of the various prisoners reforms in the state of the Rajasthan.



Senior Editor

Dr. Neha Mishra



Dr. Neha Mishra is Associate Professor & Associate Dean (Scholarships) in Jindal Global Law School, OP Jindal Global University. She was awarded both her PhD degree and Associate Professor & Associate Dean M.A.; LL.B. (University of Delhi); LL.M.; Ph.D. (NLSIU, Bangalore) LLM from National Law School of India University, Bengaluru; she did her LL.B. from Faculty of Law, Delhi University as well as M.A. and B.A. from Hindu College and DCAC from DU respectively. Neha has been a Visiting Fellow, School of Social Work, Michigan State University, 2016 and invited speaker Panelist at Global Conference, Whitney R. Harris World Law Institute, Washington University in St.Louis, 2015.

Ms. Sumiti Ahuja

Ms. Sumiti Ahuja, Assistant Professor, Faculty of Law, University of Delhi,

Ms. Sumiti Ahuja completed her LL.M. from the Indian Law Institute with specialization in Criminal Law and Corporate Law, and has over nine years of teaching experience. She has done her LL.B. from the Faculty of Law, University of Delhi. She is currently pursuing Ph.D. in the area of Forensics and Law. Prior to joining the teaching profession, she has worked as Research Assistant for projects funded by different agencies of Govt. of India. She has developed various audio-video teaching modules under UGC e-PG Pathshala programme in the area of Criminology, under the aegis of an MHRD Project. Her areas of interest are Criminal Law, Law of Evidence, Interpretation of Statutes, and Clinical Legal Education.



Dr. Navtika Singh Nautiyal

Dr. Navtika Singh Nautiyal presently working as an Assistant Professor in School of law, Forensic Justice and Policy studies at National Forensic Sciences University, Gandhinagar, Gujarat. She has 9 years of Teaching and Research Experience. She has completed her Philosophy of Doctorate in 'Intercountry adoption laws from Uttranchal University, Dehradun' and LLM from Indian Law Institute, New Delhi.



Dr. Rinu Saraswat

Associate Professor at School of Law, Apex University, Jaipur, M.A, LL.M, Ph.D,

Dr. Rinu have 5 yrs of teaching experience in renowned institutions like Jagannath University and Apex University. Participated in more than 20 national and international seminars and conferences and 5 workshops and training programmes.

Dr. Nitesh Saraswat

E.MBA, LL.M, Ph.D, PGDSAPM

Currently working as Assistant Professor at Law Centre II, Faculty of Law, University of Delhi. Dr. Nitesh have 14 years of Teaching, Administrative and research experience in Renowned Institutions like Amity University, Tata Institute of Social Sciences, Jai Narain Vyas University Jodhpur, Jagannath University and Nirma University.

More than 25 Publications in renowned National and International Journals and has authored a Text book on Cr.P.C and Juvenile Delinquency law.



Subhrajit Chanda

BBA. LL.B. (Hons.) (Amity University, Rajasthan); LL. M. (UPES, Dehradun) (Nottingham Trent University, UK); Ph.D. Candidate (G.D. Goenka University)

Subhrajit did his LL.M. in Sports Law, from Nottingham Trent University of United Kingdoms, with international scholarship provided by university; he has also completed another LL.M. in Energy Law from University of Petroleum and Energy Studies, India. He did his B.B.A.LL.B. (Hons.) focussing on International Trade Law.

ABOUT US

WHITE BLACK LEGAL is an open access, peer-reviewed and refereed journal providededicated to express views on topical legal issues, thereby generating a cross current of ideas on emerging matters. This platform shall also ignite the initiative and desire of young law students to contribute in the field of law. The erudite response of legal luminaries shall be solicited to enable readers to explore challenges that lie before law makers, lawyers and the society at large, in the event of the ever changing social, economic and technological scenario.

With this thought, we hereby present to you

AI AND THE FUTURE OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE: LEGAL AND ETHICAL CHALLENGES

AUTHORED BY - VIKAS

Pursuing PH.D

Singhania University, Pacheri Bari, Jhunjhunu Rajasthan

Abstract

The integration of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in the criminal justice system marks a significant transformation in how crime is detected, investigated, prosecuted, and adjudicated. From predictive policing and facial recognition to AI-based risk assessments in sentencing and parole decisions, the use of AI introduces both promising efficiencies and profound legal and ethical concerns. This paper examines the evolving role of AI in criminal justice, focusing on its potential to enhance public safety and streamline judicial processes, while also critically analysing the threats it poses to fundamental rights such as privacy, due process, and equality before the law. It highlights the regulatory gaps and ethical dilemmas inherent in delegating key decisions to opaque and sometimes biased algorithms. Through a comparative analysis and review of recent legal frameworks and court rulings, the paper offers a nuanced understanding of the challenges and opportunities that AI presents in criminal justice, urging a balance between innovation and constitutional safeguards.

Keywords

Artificial Intelligence, Criminal Justice, Predictive Policing, Legal Ethics, Algorithmic Bias, Due Process, Privacy, Sentencing, Risk Assessment

Literature Review

The intersection of artificial intelligence and criminal justice has become a burgeoning area of scholarly interest. A significant portion of existing literature evaluates both the utility and dangers of AI integration within law enforcement and judicial processes. Scholars like Andrew Guthrie Ferguson have discussed the implications of predictive policing technologies, arguing that such tools risk reinforcing systemic biases already embedded in criminal data, potentially

leading to a feedback loop of discrimination.¹ His work emphasizes the importance of transparency and judicial oversight in AI-driven policing.

Danielle Keats Citron and Frank Pasquale have raised ethical and legal concerns about algorithmic opacity, particularly in the use of risk assessment tools in sentencing and parole decisions.² They argue that the absence of transparency in AI decision-making undermines due process and judicial accountability, especially when defendants and their counsel cannot scrutinize or challenge the basis of algorithmic outcomes. Their work underscores the necessity for explainability in AI systems used by courts and correctional institutions.

Other researchers such as Brandon Garrett have analyzed empirical data on the application of AI in various stages of the criminal justice system. His findings suggest that while AI can aid in consistency and efficiency, it often does so at the cost of fairness and individualized justice. Garrett supports a hybrid model where AI augments rather than replaces human discretion.

In the Indian context, literature remains nascent, with few publications critically examining the use of AI in policing and judicial administration. However, emerging legal scholarship has begun to explore the constitutional implications of AI-based surveillance and data collection. These debates are particularly relevant in light of the Supreme Court of India's evolving jurisprudence on the right to privacy and the procedural guarantees enshrined in Article 21 of the Constitution.

Thus, the literature reflects a growing consensus on the need for a cautious, rights-based approach to integrating AI into the criminal justice framework, while also identifying significant gaps in current legal protections and regulatory mechanisms.

Research Methodology

This research adopts a qualitative and doctrinal approach, supported by comparative legal analysis. The study primarily relies on secondary sources, including judicial decisions, academic commentaries, journal articles, statutory frameworks, and policy papers concerning

¹ Andrew G Ferguson, *The Rise of Big Data Policing: Surveillance, Race, and the Future of Law Enforcement* (NYU Press 2017).

² Danielle K Citron and Frank A Pasquale, 'The Scored Society: Due Process for Automated Predictions' (2014) 89 Wash L Rev 1.

the use of artificial intelligence in criminal justice systems in India, the United States, and select European jurisdictions.

1. Doctrinal Legal Research

The doctrinal method is employed to examine the existing laws, constitutional principles, and judicial precedents that govern the integration of AI into criminal justice processes. This includes the analysis of Indian constitutional provisions (notably Articles 14, 19, and 21), international human rights instruments, and decisions by courts that touch upon AI, privacy, due process, and equality.

2. Comparative Legal Analysis

To provide a holistic understanding of the subject, the paper compares developments in India with those in the United States and the European Union. This includes analysis of tools like COMPAS (Correctional Offender Management Profiling for Alternative Sanctions) in the US and the GDPR's impact on AI regulation in Europe. Such comparative analysis helps to identify best practices and potential pitfalls.

3. Analytical Method

The study adopts an analytical approach to assess how the use of AI affects key tenets of criminal justice, such as fairness, accountability, and transparency. This involves critically examining the benefits of AI (like efficiency and accuracy) against its drawbacks (such as algorithmic bias and opacity).

4. Interdisciplinary Insights

Given the technical nature of AI, the research also draws on interdisciplinary sources, including computer science literature, reports by AI ethics organizations, and sociological studies on crime prediction and policing. These insights help contextualize the legal implications in practical scenarios.

Hypothesis

The integration of Artificial Intelligence into the criminal justice system, while promising increased efficiency and consistency, poses significant threats to fundamental legal principles such as due process, privacy, and equality. It is hypothesized that without comprehensive legal regulation and oversight, the deployment of AI in areas such as predictive policing, risk assessment, and surveillance may lead to systemic violations of constitutional rights and ethical norms.

Furthermore, the hypothesis asserts that the opacity and potential bias inherent in many AI algorithms may disproportionately affect marginalized communities, thereby exacerbating existing inequalities within the criminal justice system. Hence, legal frameworks must be adapted to ensure that the use of AI aligns with democratic values, judicial accountability, and human rights protections.

Introduction

The integration of Artificial Intelligence (AI) into the criminal justice system represents a profound shift in how societies approach law enforcement, adjudication, and correctional administration. From facial recognition used in crowd surveillance to algorithmic models predicting recidivism, AI tools are increasingly influencing decisions that affect the liberty and rights of individuals. While such innovations promise greater efficiency and objectivity, they also introduce novel risks—legal, ethical, and procedural—that challenge traditional notions of justice.

One of the central tensions in the use of AI lies in its potential to undermine foundational principles of criminal jurisprudence such as presumption of innocence, the right to a fair trial, and judicial impartiality. For instance, AI-powered risk assessment tools used during sentencing or parole decisions often rely on historical data, which may embed racial or socio-economic biases, thereby perpetuating existing structural inequalities.³ Predictive policing, another controversial use case, has been criticized for disproportionately targeting communities already over-policed, leading to a self-fulfilling prophecy of criminal suspicion.⁴

In the Indian context, the debate around AI in criminal justice is still emerging. However, recent initiatives such as facial recognition deployments by police forces and the digitization of court processes have sparked concern about data privacy, algorithmic transparency, and due process.⁵ The lack of a dedicated legal framework to govern the use of AI in criminal justice exacerbates these concerns, making it imperative to study the issue from both legal and ethical standpoints.

³ Danielle K Citron and Frank A Pasquale, 'The Scored Society: Due Process for Automated Predictions' (2014) 89 Wash L Rev 1.

⁴ Andrew G Ferguson, *The Rise of Big Data Policing: Surveillance, Race, and the Future of Law Enforcement* (NYU Press 2017).

⁵ Ujwala P, 'Artificial Intelligence in India's Criminal Justice System: Challenges and Opportunities' (2022) 8(2) *NALSAR Law Review* 65.

This paper aims to critically examine the current and potential applications of AI in the criminal justice system, with a particular focus on the legal and ethical challenges they pose. It explores whether existing legal frameworks are adequate to address these challenges and what reforms are necessary to ensure that technological advancement does not come at the cost of justice and human rights.

1. Predictive Policing and the Risk of Bias

Predictive policing involves the use of AI algorithms to forecast criminal activity based on historical data, location-based trends, and behavioural analysis. These tools are employed to allocate police resources more efficiently and prevent crimes before they occur. However, critics argue that predictive algorithms often reinforce existing racial and socio-economic biases present in historical crime data.⁶ For example, if a particular locality has been over-policed in the past due to racial profiling, the algorithm may disproportionately flag that area as high-risk, leading to a vicious cycle of surveillance and criminalisation.

In the United States, tools like PredPol have been used to map "high crime zones," but their reliability and neutrality have been widely questioned.⁷ In India, facial recognition and surveillance technology are being trialled in various states, often without public scrutiny or legal safeguards. The absence of transparency in these tools, coupled with a lack of independent audits, raises serious questions about procedural fairness and constitutional validity under Article 14 and Article 21 of the Indian Constitution.

A key concern is the "black box" nature of many AI systems, where the internal logic of the algorithm is not easily interpretable even by its creators. This lack of explainability makes it difficult for individuals to challenge decisions made about them, thereby undermining the right to a fair hearing and the principle of audi alteram partem.

2. AI in Judicial Decision-Making and Sentencing

The use of AI in judicial decision-making, particularly in sentencing and bail decisions, is gaining traction globally. AI tools such as COMPAS (Correctional Offender Management Profiling for Alternative Sanctions) have been deployed in courts to predict the likelihood of

⁶ Sarah Brayne, 'Big Data Surveillance: The Case of Policing' (2017) 82(5) *American Sociological Review* 977.

⁷ Rashida Richardson, Jason M Schultz and Kate Crawford, 'Dirty Data, Bad Predictions: How Civil Rights Violations Impact Police Data, Predictive Policing Systems, and Justice' (2019) 94 *NYU L Rev Online* 15.

recidivism, thereby influencing whether a defendant receives a custodial sentence, parole, or pretrial release.⁸ While these systems are presented as objective, studies have shown that they can reflect and even magnify societal biases embedded in the data on which they are trained.

In a landmark investigation by *ProPublica*, the COMPAS system was found to disproportionately label Black defendants as high risk compared to white defendants, even when the latter had comparable or worse criminal records. This raises serious concerns about equal treatment under the law and challenges the legitimacy of automated sentencing tools.

In India, although AI has not yet been deployed for sentencing decisions, there is increasing interest in integrating such tools as part of judicial reforms to enhance efficiency. However, there are significant legal and ethical concerns. Sentencing in Indian criminal jurisprudence has a strong focus on individualized justice and the balancing of mitigating and aggravating factors, as laid out in cases like *Bachan Singh v State of Punjab*.⁹ Relying on a static algorithmic model to perform such a nuanced task may erode the discretion and human empathy that judicial reasoning demands.

Moreover, if a judge relies heavily on AI-generated recommendations, questions may arise regarding judicial independence and accountability. The delegation of judicial reasoning to opaque algorithms may compromise the fairness of the trial process and contradict the fundamental rights guaranteed under Articles 14 and 21 of the Indian Constitution.

3. AI Surveillance and the Right to Privacy

The proliferation of AI-driven surveillance technologies—such as facial recognition, gait analysis, and behavioural analytics—has led to widespread concerns regarding the erosion of privacy rights. These tools enable law enforcement agencies to monitor individuals in public and private spaces, often without judicial oversight or clear legal authority. While such systems are justified on grounds of national security and crime prevention, they carry the risk of mass surveillance and violation of individual liberties.

⁸ Julia Dressel and Hany Farid, 'The Accuracy, Fairness, and Limits of Predicting Recidivism' (2018) 4(1) *Science Advances* eaao5580.

In India, multiple police departments have deployed facial recognition systems during protests, large gatherings, and routine law enforcement without a comprehensive data protection law or regulatory framework governing their use.¹⁰ The Supreme Court in *Justice K.S. Puttaswamy (Retd.) v Union of India* recognised privacy as a fundamental right under Article 21 of the Constitution.¹¹ Yet, the deployment of AI surveillance without safeguards appears to contravene the principles of legality, necessity, and proportionality laid down in that landmark judgment.

Internationally, the European Union's General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) and the proposed AI Act provide stringent restrictions on biometric data processing and AI surveillance. These legal instruments offer valuable models for India and other jurisdictions to develop rights-respecting frameworks for AI governance in criminal justice.

Unchecked AI surveillance can have a chilling effect on free speech, assembly, and democratic participation. It is imperative that any deployment of such technologies be subjected to strict judicial review, transparency, and accountability mechanisms to prevent misuse and overreach.

Conclusion

The integration of Artificial Intelligence into the criminal justice system represents both a revolutionary advancement and a serious legal-ethical dilemma. While AI technologies offer promise in improving efficiency, consistency, and data-driven decision-making, they also pose significant threats to core constitutional values such as fairness, equality, due process, and privacy. The risk of algorithmic bias, opacity in decision-making, and the potential for mass surveillance challenge the very foundation of a just and democratic society.

The current legal infrastructure, particularly in jurisdictions like India, is ill-equipped to regulate the complex and rapidly evolving use of AI in policing, sentencing, and surveillance. Unlike the European Union's proactive legislative frameworks such as the GDPR and proposed AI Act, India still lacks comprehensive data protection laws and judicial safeguards specific to AI. As a result, AI is often deployed in legal grey zones, risking the infringement of fundamental rights.

¹⁰ Apar Gupta, 'The Legality of Facial Recognition in India' (2021) *Internet Freedom Foundation*

¹¹ *Justice K.S. Puttaswamy (Retd.) v Union of India* (2017) 10 SCC 1.

To ensure that the future of criminal justice is both technologically advanced and constitutionally sound, a multi-pronged approach is essential. This includes: enacting specific legislation regulating AI in criminal justice, mandating algorithmic transparency and auditability, ensuring judicial oversight, and incorporating human rights assessments in the design and deployment of AI systems.

Ultimately, the goal must not be to resist AI altogether but to channel its capabilities in ways that uphold human dignity, fairness, and justice. Legal systems must evolve alongside technology to safeguard against the blind trust in machines and ensure that human agency, ethics, and accountability remain central to criminal adjudication.

