News

The Madras High Court approves AI-assisted record analysis in an arbitration case for the first time.

The Court emphasized that the AI tool will not express legal opinions, evaluate credibility, interpret purpose, or draw legal conclusions.

For the first time, the Madras High Court has approved the use of an AI-assisted system to support court proceedings, but it has made it clear that this would not interfere with judicial decision-making. [Chennai Metro Rail Corporation v. Gammon]

Justice N Anand Venkatesh authorized a controlled trial of an AI-based tool known as "Superlaw Courts" in a series of arbitration-related cases involving Gammon–OJSC Mosmetrostroy JV and Chennai Metro Rail Limited in a single order dated January 28,

2026.Superlaw Courts essentially serves as an incredibly well-organized and cautious record assistant: it prepares the files, produces a trustworthy finding aid, and provides pertinent excerpts upon request, all the while adhering strictly to the record and delegating all legal judgment to human decision-makers.

The judge and both sides' attorneys participated in the algorithm's public demonstration, which was documented by the court. A thorough note outlining the system's operation was distributed and documented.

The note states that the technology only serves as a record-bound assistance. It doesn't access outside sources, only works with documents filed in the specific case, and doesn't provide information that can't be linked to the record. Instead than filling in the blanks or speculating, the system is built to indicate when the desired content is missing from the papers.

The Court emphasized that the AI tool will not express legal opinions, evaluate credibility, interpret purpose, or draw legal conclusions. Its responsibilities are restricted to document organization, the creation of searchable and indexed records, and the rewording or summarization of pertinent passages upon request from the Court or counsel.

The approach creates a digital workstation similar to a sealed record room, according to Justice Venkatesh. It divides records into logically coherent snippets rather than using mechanical page splits, organizes relevant materials, eliminates duplication, and transforms scanned documents into searchable text. The Court noted that the goal of this procedure is to lessen the time and effort required to navigate extensive arbitral documents.

The Court ordered that a different link be made available to record and show all of the Court's and counsel's contacts with the algorithm in order to guarantee transparency. The degree to which the AI system was consulted during the proceedings might be confirmed by any reader of the order.

With AI help, a draft order documenting the facts, pleadings, evidence, and opposing submissions would be created and sent to both parties for confirmation. The Court stated that after this phase is finished, the judge will make the ultimate decision and reliance on AI will *"come to an end."*

Both parties' attorneys committed to using the system for a week and reporting back on its

efficacy. A comprehensive timetable for the completion of submissions and reply arguments has been set, and the proceedings are scheduled for final hearing on February 12, 2026.

Senior Advocate Sivanandaraj and Advocate PJ Rishikesh represented the petitioners.

Advocate Harishankar represented the respondent.