

## International Journal of Criminal, Common and Statutory Law



E-ISSN: 2789-9500  
P-ISSN: 2789-9497  
IJCCSL 2025; 5(2): 06-11  
© 2025 IJCCSL  
[www.criminallawjournal.org](http://www.criminallawjournal.org)  
Received: 09-05-2025  
Accepted: 13-06-2025

**Nitesh Kumar**  
Assistant Professor and H.O.D.,  
School of Law, Vijaybhoomi  
University, Greater Mumbai  
Karjat, Maharashtra, India

### Evaluating the role of artificial intelligence in legal governance: A PSR approach to sustainable development and judicial efficiency

**Nitesh Kumar**

**DOI:** <https://www.doi.org/10.22271/27899497.2025.v5.i2a.141>

#### **Abstract**

Through automation of judicial processes, judicial efficiency improvement, and access to justice, artificial intelligence (AI) is revolutionizing legal administration across the globe. Artificial intelligence (AI) provides novel technology capable of helping the judiciary address increased case burden, citizens' desire for more transparency, and the complexity of issues in contemporary life. In the process, alongside, there are also arising issues of algorithmic bias, transparency, accountability, and safeguarding of basic rights of AI. According to the Pressure-State-Response (PSR) approach, the research investigates how these external pressures have reshaped the institutions' practices and engineered new policy responses through artificial intelligence (AI) in the making of legal rules. The Sustainable Development Goal 16 is about keeping institutions of high integrity and ensuring peace and justice, which this paper also reflects on the role of AI. By combining existing literature, case studies, and policy analysis, this research concludes that AI has the capacity to enhance judicial efficiency and access to justice. However, it emphasizes conducting the integration of AI with extreme caution to prevent compromising judicial judgment and procedural fairness. The research concludes by suggesting the means by which legal systems can embrace the practice of governance that is able to ensure AI is used responsibly, understandably, and human-centered. Should we be guiding this complicated technological transition towards sustainability and equity, the PSR model is ready now to assist us.

**Keywords:** Artificial Intelligence in legal governance, judicial efficiency, Sustainable Development Goal 16 (SDG 16), ethics of AI in law, Pressure-State-Response (PSR) framework

#### **1. Introduction**

Globally, judicial systems are currently facing an unprecedented level of technological transformation. Artificial intelligence (AI) is a legal revolution. Implementation of Artificial Intelligence (AI) technology, such as sophisticated machine learning algorithms, Natural Language Processing (NLP), and big data analytics, is evolving at a fast pace in the judiciary. Judicial competence, access to justice, and the success of even more sustainable development objectives are all among those that would be enabled by the same. At the same time, judicial application of AI gives rise to such profound concerns about openness, accountability, human rights, and the extremely basic ideas of law. Employment of Artificial Intelligence (AI) by public administrations is raising fresh ethical and regulatory challenges to case management, legal research, ODR, and prediction analysis. Most of the concerns are issues with algorithmic bias, data privacy, potential harm to procedural fairness, and limitation of judicial discretion.

Developed first by the OECD to study environmental management, the Pressure-State-Response (PSR) framework is a satisfactory framework to study such institutional transitions. Growing caseloads, pressures from the people for transparency, and technological changes are just a few of the external pressures that compel legal institutions to implement recent technology. The governance activities and policy responses adapt accordingly, and the model can be employed to explain how the changes take place.

This research evaluates the evolving role of AI in court management based on the PSR model. This study also connects to SDG 16, building peace, justice, and effective institutions, as described by the United Nations. The deployment of AI can significantly contribute to this worldwide aspiration by reducing backlogs in courts, improving judicial accountability, and increasing access to justice.

This research will analyze the advantages and disadvantages of long-term legal regulation of AI through a literature review and citing international best practices.

**Corresponding Author:**  
**Nitesh Kumar**  
Assistant Professor and H.O.D.,  
School of Law, Vijaybhoomi  
University, Greater Mumbai  
Karjat, Maharashtra, India

Suggested recommendations that can be used to create AI-driven legal systems that are ethical, transparent, and accountable will be made accessible to lawmakers, legal experts, and AI professionals.

## 2. Review of Literature

Artificial Intelligence is profoundly revolutionizing legal governance systems globally by boosting judicial efficiency, eliminating procedural delays, and supporting sustainable development through new technology solutions <sup>[1, 2]</sup>. The incorporation of AI in legal systems marks a paradigm change from traditional judicial processes to data-driven, automated mechanisms that can analyze huge volumes of legal material with extraordinary speed and precision <sup>[3]</sup>. This transition is particularly obvious in nations like India, where AI-powered solutions such as SUPACE and E-Courts are changing case administration and courtroom recording <sup>[3]</sup>. The adoption of AI technology in legal governance is driven by the pressing need to overcome structural inefficiencies that have plagued court systems globally, including large case backlogs and resource limits that prohibit timely justice delivery <sup>[4]</sup>.

The Pressure-State-Response (PSR) paradigm provides a thorough analytical foundation for understanding how external pressures drive the current state of AI adoption in legal systems and the subsequent policy actions required for its implementation <sup>[5]</sup>. This framework is especially relevant in the setting of legal governance because it enables systematic assessments of the barriers facing judicial systems (pressures), the current technological advances being deployed (state), and the regulatory responses needed to safeguard ethical and effective AI implementation (responses). The PSR approach aligns with sustainable development concepts by emphasizing the need for balanced solutions that address urgent judicial efficiency problems while maintaining long-term viability and moral principles in legal governance <sup>[6]</sup>.

### 2.1 Critical challenges driving AI integration in legal systems

The key pressure driving AI deployment in legal governance arises from serious court inefficiencies that undermine the core tenet of prompt justice delivery. India's judiciary exhibits this difficulty with over 3 crore pending cases, causing a crisis of access to justice that disproportionately impacts poor groups. These massive congestions are not unique to India; judicial systems worldwide have difficulty with similar challenges that include delays in procedure caused by extended examination of evidence processes, financial limitations manifested through severe shortages of judges and staff members, and difficulties with accessibility created by complex judicial processes and language requirements <sup>[3, 4]</sup>. The dilemma is further compounded by the conventional reliance on manual systems for case management, legal research, and documentation, which are inherently time-consuming and prone to human mistakes.

The social and economic repercussions of these judicial inefficiencies reach far beyond the courtroom, creating structural hurdles to sustainable development and social justice <sup>[6]</sup>. Delayed justice delivery reinforces inequality by denying prompt resolution to conflicts, notably hurting underprivileged groups who lack resources to navigate extended legal proceedings. The economic consequence of inefficient judicial systems emerges in greater expenses for litigants, reduced corporate confidence due to unclear legal

results, and the overall erosion of rule of law that is required for sustainable economic development. These demands make a compelling case for technological intervention, as traditional approaches to judicial reform have proven unable to manage the scope and complexity of contemporary legal concerns.

### 2.2 Current applications of AI in legal governance systems

The current status of AI deployment in legal governance displays a broad array of technology solutions aiming to address specific judicial inefficiencies <sup>[1, 3]</sup>. Predictive analytics is one of the most promising applications, enabling courts to foresee case outcomes, estimate processing times, and optimize resource allocation based on past data patterns. These systems enable judicial administrators to make educated judgments about case scheduling, priority setting, and resource deployment, thereby minimizing delays and enhancing overall system efficiency. AI-assisted evidence reviews solutions have shown substantial impact by automating the analysis of digital documents, lowering evidence processing time by 30-50% compared to traditional manual techniques.

Automated legal investigation tools powered by Natural Language Processing (NLP) are transforming how legal practitioners access and interpret case law, laws, and legal precedents. These technologies can scan enormous databases of legal documents, identify important precedents, and provide extensive research help that would usually require days or weeks of manual labor. The incorporation of AI in case management systems has enabled real-time tracking of case progress, automatic deadline monitoring, and intelligent scheduling that maximizes court resources and reduces administrative burden <sup>[3]</sup>. Language translation capabilities built into AI systems are tackling accessibility concerns by delivering real-time translation of court papers and procedures into local languages, making justice more accessible to varied communities.

India's e-Courts Project Phase III provides a complete example of systematic AI integration in judicial processes. This program comprises numerous AI applications like automated case scheduling, intelligent document management, real-time language translation, and predictive analytics for case outcome forecasts. The project has shown demonstrable improvements in judicial efficiency, with the closure rate of first-instance civil cases improving from around 1.25% in 2017 to an estimated resolution of millions of cases out of over 10 million by 2020 <sup>[4]</sup>. Similar programs in other jurisdictions have yielded equivalent outcomes, with courts reporting considerable reductions in case processing times and improved resource efficiency through AI-powered optimization <sup>[1, 2]</sup>.

### 2.3 Policy Frameworks and Implementation Strategies

The response dimension of the PSR framework comprises the policy initiatives, regulatory frameworks, and implementation techniques established to manage AI integration in legal systems. The European Union's Artificial Intelligence Act is a landmark regulatory reaction that characterizes judicial AI systems as "high-risk," requiring severe control, transparency measures, and human supervision to ensure ethical implementation <sup>[6]</sup>. This risk-based approach recognizes the potential for AI systems to profoundly impact individual rights and social results, necessitating robust protections including comprehensive risk management systems, high-quality data governance standards, and rigorous documentation requirements.

India's Digital Justice Strategy illustrates a comprehensive policy approach that mixes innovation with ethical issues. The approach contains precise principles for AI implementation that demonstrate accountability, openness, and human supervision in all AI-assisted judicial operations. The policy structure tackles important issues, including confidential information protection through advanced encryption and decentralized storage facilities, algorithmic bias mitigation through broad datasets for instruction and periodic auditing procedures, and capacity building through extensive training programs for judges, lawyers, and court personnel [3, 4]. These policy responses understand that effective AI integration involves not only technological advancements but also administrative adaptation and development of human capacity.

The regulatory frameworks evolving globally emphasize the need to keep human judgment and monitoring in AI-assisted judicial processes [2, 6]. This approach assures that while AI can boost efficiency and give analytical help, ultimate decision-making authority remains vested in human judges who can examine contextual variables, ethical implications, and particular characteristics that may not be captured by computational analysis [7]. International collaboration and harmonization activities are creating standardized approaches to AI governance in legal systems, including cross-border obstacles relating to data sharing, matters of jurisdiction, and reciprocal acceptance of AI-assisted legal processes.

## 2.4 Sustainable Development and Ethical Considerations

The integration of AI in legal governance directly helps sustainable development objectives, particularly SDG 16 (Peace, Justice, and Strong Institutions), by encouraging more efficient, accessible, and equitable justice delivery systems. AI technologies minimize the environmental impact of judicial operations through automation of procedures, reduction in the use of paper, and minimization of transportation costs through online proceedings and digital storage of records. The democratization of legal information through AI-powered solutions promotes access to justice for underprivileged people, supporting inclusive development objectives and eliminating systemic inequities [3, 4]. However, the use of AI in legal governance also poses substantial ethical concerns that must be addressed through comprehensive regulatory responses. Algorithmic bias offers a key challenge, since AI systems trained on past legal data may perpetuate or magnify existing discriminatory trends in judicial decision-making [6, 4]. Data privacy and security considerations are crucial, given the sensitive nature of legal information and the possibility for illegal access or misuse of personal data handled by AI systems. The digital gap and differing levels of technical awareness among legal professionals and the public provide additional hurdles for equitable AI applications.

## 3. Materials and Methods

This study utilizes a qualitative research design anchored in conceptual, doctrinal, and policy analysis to analyze the developing role of artificial intelligence (AI) in legal governance. The research is mostly descriptive and analytical in character, focusing on secondary data sources. The Pressure-State-Response (PSR) framework, initially created for environmental policy evaluation, serves as the basic analytical model. The PSR model is modified to the legal environment to examine how technological, institutional, and societal influences are impacting the adoption of AI, what institutional changes are resulting (state), and how

policymakers and institutions are responding.

Secondary data were acquired from a wide range of reliable sources, including peer-reviewed academic articles, official reports, government publications, legal databases, and policy documents. Major databases consulted include JSTOR, Hein Online, Scopus, Google Scholar, and SSRN. Reports and guidance from entities such as the OECD, United Nations, European Commission, Council of Europe, and national judicial councils were also evaluated. In addition, case studies of AI applications in legal systems (such as smart courts in China and robot judges in Estonia) were investigated to highlight real-world ramifications and outcomes.

A thematic content analysis method was applied to categorize findings into major categories generated from the PSR framework. These areas include external factors driving AI adoption, the current status of AI application in legal systems, and institutional and regulatory responses. Within these categories, the data was evaluated to find patterns, reoccurring difficulties, challenges, and emerging best practices. Specific attention was paid to examining the alignment of AI-driven legal reforms with the objectives of Sustainable Development Goal 16 (SDG 16), which advocates peace, justice, and strong institutions.

This strategy allowed for a rigorous appraisal of both the opportunities and hazards involved with the incorporation of AI in legal governance. While the study does not include primary empirical data collection (such as interviews or surveys), the comprehensive use of secondary legal and policy literature ensures a sound foundation for theoretical insights and normative recommendations. The interdisciplinary character of the problem, mixing law, technology, ethics, and development studies, requires a broad-based approach to data sourcing and analysis.

## 4. Objectives

1. To evaluate the current uses of artificial intelligence (AI) in legal administration and legal proceedings.
2. To analyze how the adoption of AI supports judicial efficiency, access to justice, and transparency according to Sustainable Development Goal 16 (SDG 16).
3. To apply the Pressure-State-Response (PSR) framework to examine systemic change in legal governance from AI integration.
4. To determine significant ethical, legal, and social issues about using AI in legal systems.
5. To recommend policy responses and governance mechanisms that promote ethical, transparent, and human-centric AI adoption in legal governance.

## 5. Research Questions

1. What are the main applications of AI in legal governance, and how are these technologies reshaping judicial and administrative functions?
2. In what ways does AI enhance or challenge judicial efficiency, access to justice, and transparency, particularly in relation to SDG 16?
3. How can the Pressure-State-Response (PSR) model help in understanding the systemic changes induced by AI in legal governance?
4. What ethical, legal, and social concerns arise from AI adoption in legal systems, and how can these be effectively addressed through governance frameworks?

## 6. Discussion

The Pressure-State-Response (PSR) framework allows for structured analysis of the implications of increasing practice



of incorporating Artificial Intelligence (AI) in legal administration globally. Several drivers are pushing the application of AI technologies into law systems globally, transforming institutional function and governance structures. Sustainable Development Goal 16 (SDG 16) requires peace, justice, and effective institutions; these will have a direct impact on their achievement.

Artificial intelligence instruments attempt to mitigate increasing pressures on contemporary legal institutions. The increasing court case backlog is one of the most critical issues. For instance, based on the National Judicial Data Grid, over fifty million cases are pending in courts of India up to the year 2025. When justice is delayed, the judiciary loses the faith of the people, and the principle of speedy justice is violated. Both the EU and US courts are faced with the issue of delays in civil and criminal cases. The public is now expecting the judicial system to become transparent and efficient due to such backlogs. The public has grown accustomed to instant feedback from all other sorts of digital services, and now they expect the courts to do the same. In addition, the intricacies of contemporary legal issues are growing at a fast rate, especially in intellectual property, data privacy, digital commerce, and cross-border crime. Electronic communications, online posts, and e-commerce are some examples of the kind of evidence that contemporary legal systems will be flooded with.

Meanwhile, improvements in AI technology have provided the most effective tools for their solution. Machine learning, big data processing, and natural language processing (NLP) were beyond lawyers' means a decade ago. Today, artificial intelligence platforms can undertake an amazingly broad range of routine legal tasks, from processing huge legal databases to discovering appropriate precedents and predicting the destiny of court cases. With these funds, the judiciary and other courts of justice will be able to cope with the different demands they face.

These demands and developments are causing a sea change in the current "state" of legal regulation. Many judicial and administrative stages around the globe are embracing AI technologies. Two significant areas where it can be used are case management and triage. For instance, Estonia's Ministry of Justice piloted an AI-driven "robot judge" system to decide up to €7,000 worth of cases on its own. Similarly, China's "smart court" master plan uses artificial intelligence (AI) to various degrees in handling evidence, scheduling cases, and even issuing judicial orders. Cases would be less burdensome on waiting with such AI-based solutions.

Artificial intelligence is also transforming decision-making and legal research. Legal research platforms like Blue J Legal, Westlaw Edge, and LexisNexis utilize sophisticated natural language processing algorithms in order to give quicker and better results. They enable judges and attorneys to query relevant case law, monitor litigation trends, and predict cases. Commercial contracts can also be aided by artificial intelligence-driven contract review tools that aid in identifying potential legal issues. Legal arguments are enhanced and strengthened using these tools.

Artificial intelligence has also proved to be highly effective in the field of Online Dispute Resolution (ODR). To help parties resolve consumer complaints outside courts, the EU ODR portal uses AI workflows. Private portals like Modria offer artificial intelligence-based negotiating capabilities for private resolution of disputes in property and family law. For poor and pro se litigants, these facilities increase access to justice

significantly by minimizing the expense and intricacy of legal determination.

There already exist several examples of AI in administrative law. Machine learning algorithms are applied by tax officials in Finland to identify fraud cases and check compliance. The United Kingdom HMRC applies AI to some of the automated audit functions within taxation. The tools ease bureaucracy and make it simpler to deliver public administration services.

There has been a strong policy reaction against increased uses of AI in judicial administration. The use of artificial intelligence in law is a longstanding issue in the development of moral rules and laws by international institutions, state agencies, and tribunals. Use of AI systems for the protection of basic human rights and dignity has been underscored by the Council of Europe's Ad Hoc Committee on Artificial Intelligence (CAHAI). Judicial standards for the ethical application of AI have been issued by the Canadian Judicial Council, regulation of AI for the legal community having been recommended by the American Bar Association and the UK Law Society. Transparency, accountability, nondiscrimination, and explainability are included in these guidelines.

Aside from this, regulatory innovation is also progressing at a very quick pace. The European Commission's Artificial Intelligence Act draft would create a proportionate-to-risk legislative regime where significant responsibilities are imposed on AI systems used to support judicial decision-making. Legal AI systems are already subject to stringent limitations on processing personal data under current data protection law, i.e., the EU's General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR). Respectful AI development that is democratic and respectful of human rights is also encouraged in the 2019 OECD AI Principles.

Most governments are also investing in judging education and developing their capacity in a bid to ensure that AI is human led. Lawyers are being educated to be artificial intelligence literate in a bid to make them competent enough to assess AI technologies critically and shun excessive dependence on automated solutions. Lawyers, practitioners, and technologists are gathering in interdisciplinary workshops to try to share ideas about how best to use AI and how to do so responsibly.

The use of AI for Sustainable Development Goal 16 is envisioned in an unusual way. First, case management and triage systems based on AI improve court performance by minimizing judicial backlog. Second, chatbots for the delivery of law information and artificial intelligence-based web dispute resolution sites make it possible for vulnerable populations of individuals to resolve disputes at a lower cost. Third, AI technologies facilitate transparency since they enable citizens to better comprehend judicial processes and improve legal data availability. Finally, AI use in legal analytics makes it easier for governments to detect systemic issues in the provision of legal services, eventually resulting in evidence-based policymaking.

Aside from all those benefits, there are a number of extremely sobering legal and ethical concerns that accompany AI use in law enforcement. The foremost among them is algorithmic bias. AI deployed in the fields of family law, sentencing, and bail has the potential to inject biased thought and action unintentionally into these areas through antecedent court history. The second is that most AI systems are uninterpretable or untransparent, and that increases the stakes. Public and plaintiff due process and procedural justice can become asymmetrical if AI conclusions are not made explicit.

Another pertinent concern involved here is the privacy of data. Legislation based on AI addresses extremely sensitive personal data. The chances of unauthorized disclosure or tampering with the data are inherent in the nature of ineffective data governance policies. Secondly, AI has the potential to negate human agency in the administration of justice. Judicial discretion, compassion, and situational thinking are all essential components of dispassionate justice administration; however, they are weakened by unfettered trust in AI techniques.

In addressing such threats, regulatory frameworks must design an ethical AI system based on human values that must be human-oriented. Humans must be supported by AI systems and not replaced. Decisions on legal issues must be left in the hands of judges. Legal regulation using AI models must be transparent to be audited and explained to make them explainable. AI operation and adherence to ethical norms necessitate the exercise of responsibility frameworks, such as regulatory control and independent audit.

No less important is the role of citizen participation. Citizens will trust legal systems relying on AI more if they are themselves co-designers of these laws. Utilizing AI rule-making tools founded upon human rights and adhering to the rule of law involves, ultimately, interdisciplinary collaboration between technology specialists, legal scholars, politicians, and civil society players.

## 7. Conclusion

Globally, artificial intelligence (AI) is reshaping traditional legal systems that were once a theoretical frontier in legal regulation. In this research, the use of AI technologies in the courts, legal research, alternative dispute resolution, and administrative law is examined using the Pressure-State-Response (PSR) model. Evolutionary pressures such as the court backlog, increasing public demands for transparency, and expanding complexity of legal conflicts have been the stimulus for adoption. Consequently, the "state" of institutions is evolving at a fast pace, with AI transforming the internal dynamics of legal institutions and the way they interact with people.

SDG Target 16 aims for achieving "peace, justice, and strong institutions," and technology such as AI can assist in leading us toward it. AI-based case management systems reduce waiting times and increase the effectiveness of courts. Legal information robots and ODR platforms bring access to justice within the reach of all, particularly marginalized and disadvantaged sections of society. Enhanced transparency and the capacity to make informed, data-driven policy choices are two of the advantages to be gained from applying advanced legal analytics. Artificial intelligence (AI) has the potential to re-engineer legal systems to be more responsive, efficient, and inclusive, provided it is properly regulated.

However, there may be risks in using AI legal governance. The report has indicated some of the legal and ethical challenges, such as algorithmic bias, lack of transparency, threat to data privacy, and loss of human judgment in judicial decisions. Artificial Intelligence (AI) can be used to widen the existing inequalities, undermine confidence in the courts, and constitute a threat to procedural justice unless appropriate measures are in place.

The development of a responsible AI ecosystem of governance is at the heart of legal systems if they are to reap the maximum benefits of AI while reducing its risks. Human judgment has to be supplemented by AI systems and not

replaced by them. Human-centered norms have to regulate the development and deployment of AI. Judicial practice and regulatory systems have to institutionalize transparency, accountability, and oversight. There must be strict adherence to data protection and privacy rights. The basis for legal decision-making can always be human examination.

This equilibrium will be maintained through the ongoing cooperation of diverse parties. In the creation of AI guidelines that are responsive to core rights and democratic values, technologists, lawyers, judges, legislators, concerned communities, and civil society will need to work together. Endowing legal professionals with the capacity to employ AI technologies critically and ethically will also involve judicial education and AI literacy.

Finally, An AI holds enormous potential for making the courts more efficient and assisting in sustainable development. But in using AI, the moment has arrived to be careful, to be sincere, and to be firmly devoted to justice and the rule of law. To understand these trends and to develop well-thought-out, evidence-based responses, the PSR framework remains helpful. By continuing along this road, AI should be able to make it feasible to construct more enlightened and indeed more fair legal systems.

## 8. References

1. Agarwal S. Role of artificial intelligence in Indian judiciary. *I Pleaders J.* 2021;10(2):15.
2. Avin S. AI and international law governance: Challenges and opportunities. *CSER Work Pap Ser.* 2023;7:22.
3. Sharma P. Artificial intelligence in legal research: A critical appraisal. *Q J Soc Sci.* 2024;12(1):45.
4. Zuiderwijk A, Chen Y-C, Salem F. Implications of AI for public governance: A systematic literature review and research agenda. *Gov Inf Q.* 2021;38:101.
5. Press Information Bureau. India's AI initiatives in the justice delivery system. Delhi: PIB, 2025.
6. Saini RS. Sustainable justice delivery through technology: An Indian perspective. *SSRN Electron J.* 2018, p. 1.
7. Guihot M, Matthew A, Suzor N. Nudging robots: Innovative solutions to regulate artificial intelligence. *Vanderbilt J Ent. Technol Law.* 2017;20:385.
8. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). Core set of indicators for environmental performance reviews: A synthesis report by the group on the state of the environment. Paris: OECD, 1993.
9. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). Recommendation of the Council on Artificial Intelligence. Paris: OECD, 2019.
10. Council of Europe. Feasibility study on a legal framework on AI design, development, and application based on Council of Europe standards. Strasbourg: CAHAI, 2021.
11. European Commission. Proposal for a regulation laying down harmonized rules on artificial intelligence (Artificial Intelligence Act). COM/2021/206 final. Brussels: European Commission, 2021.
12. Canadian Judicial Council. Use of artificial intelligence in courts: Ethical guidelines for judges. Ottawa: Canadian Judicial Council, 2021.
13. United Nations. The Sustainable Development Goals Report 2024. New York: UN, 2024.
14. United Nations Sustainable Development Goals. Goal 16:

Peace, justice, and strong institutions.

<https://sdgs.un.org/goals/goal16>.

15. Council of Europe. CAHAI - Ad hoc committee on artificial intelligence  
<https://www.coe.int/en/web/artificial-intelligence/cahai>.
16. National Judicial Data Grid. Case statistics  
<https://njdg.ecourts.gov.in/njdgnew/index.php>.
17. European Commission. Artificial intelligence  
<https://digital-strategy.ec.europa.eu/en/policies/artificial-intelligence>.