

News

Supreme Court warns of 'alarming' trend of attorneys drafting petitions using AI



After learning that some attorneys were using AI tools to create petitions with erroneous citations and nonexistent judgments, the Court expressed alarm.

On Tuesday, the Supreme Court of India expressed worry about the increasing use of artificial intelligence (AI) in court petition writing after discovering instances in which attorneys had referenced quotes and rulings that were either erroneous or nonexistent.

A panel consisting of Justices Joymalya Bagchi, BV Nagarathna, and Chief Justice of

India (CJI) Surya Kant stated that the Court was becoming more aware of pleas that seemed to have been produced using artificial intelligence (AI) techniques without adequate verification.

During the hearing, CJI Kant said, "We have been told alarmingly that some lawyers have started using AI for drafting."

Justice Nagarathna recalled a case in which the court had been presented with a false ruling.

"There was a Mercy v. Mankind case, but it doesn't exist," she stated.

CJI Kant further stated that comparable problems had arisen in a case before Justice Dipankar Datta, when it was discovered that the statute in question was a fabrication.

Justice Dipankar Datta was involved as well. According to CJI Kant, all of the precedents mentioned were nonexistent.

Justice Nagarathna also noted that the excerpts presented to the court were occasionally inaccurate, even in cases when actual judgments were cited.

She said, "Then some are citing actual Supreme Court cases, but those quoted portions do not even exist in the judgment."

The Court's remarks are part of a larger judicial concern about the way artificial intelligence was starting to influence legal practice.

The Supreme Court and other courts encountered pleas and even orders last year that made reference to case laws that were not available in official documents.

As a result, courts frequently reminded people of the importance of accuracy and appropriate verification.

Judges have been emphasizing that although technology might be useful for case management and research, lawyers and judges still have the last say.

Every citation and legal reference must be verified against approved sources before being included into the record, according to court rulings.

Lawread