

**Course Name – Artificial Intelligence, Law and Justice**  
**Professor Name – Dr. Krishna Ravi Srinivas**  
**Department Name – Center of Excellence in Artificial Intelligence and Law**  
**Institute Name – NALSAR University of Law**  
**Week – 06**  
**Lecture – 30**



# Artificial Intelligence, Law and Justice

Session 30

## AI and Law and Justice in select jurisdictions

Dr. Krishna Ravi Srinivas  
Adjunct Professor of Law &  
Director, Center of Excellence in Artificial Intelligence and Law  
NALSAR University of Law



Artificial Intelligence Law and Justice Course: This is Session 30, AI and Law and Justice in Select Jurisdictions.



# Recap AI and Competition Law

- In the last session we discussed AI's impact on Competition Law in the context of power of the platform and digital economy. We highlighted some key issues and the challenge in balancing competition with inter alia, consumers rights.



As usual, we will do a recap of the previous session. In the last session, we had a quick

look at AI and competition law, where we discussed AI's impact on competition law in the context of the power of the platform and the digital economy. We also identified why the power of the platforms is becoming a major issue for competition law, particularly in light of the increasing role they are playing as surveillance mechanisms, as well as other factors. And then we also looked into some of the key issues and the challenges in balancing competition with consumers' rights, so we made an important point there that competition law, like any other branch of law, is facing huge challenges when it has to deal with AI, not just on account of AI's impact on them but also because AI is being totally deployed in different sectors, and wherever AI is going to be deployed, competition issues will arise on account of various factors. Now, in the previous sessions, we had discussed artificial intelligence, law, and justice. We had discussed AI and how it's being deployed in different branches of law. And we also discussed some examples from India, particularly in the context of law and justice.

**NPTEL** **International Experience in Using AI in Justice** **NALSAR**

- **China's AI Integration in Judicial System**
  - Three stages of transformation since 1990
  - 1996-2003: Digitization of files and website links
  - 2004-2013: Internet-based court hearings and live broadcasts
  - 2014 onwards: Introduction of 'smart courts' and online platforms
  - Creation of Internet Courts for online dispute resolution
  - Use of AI for facial recognition, machine learning, and block chain
- **United States' AI Initiatives in Justice**
  - AI helps judges make fair and unbiased decisions
  - PSA system for preventive measures and bail decisions
  - PSA Pretrial Public Safety Assessment (**PSA**)
  - COMPAS system for assessing risk of reoffending



In this session, we will go a little further and have a quick look at the international experience or experiences in other countries. As I begin this session, let me mention some caveats. First caveat: given the wide variety of literature available, and the wide variety of facts available on this topic, i.e., the application of AI in law and justice in various countries, it is very difficult to condense that and then discuss it in one or two sessions. In fact, one has to really do a quick course on it, maybe about 12 hours or 18 hours, even to come to grips with understanding what is being done because so much is happening. It is also very difficult to track who is doing what and which country is doing what.

Interestingly, AI in law and justice is being increasingly adopted even in countries that are otherwise lagging behind in AI in other sectors. Particularly in Africa, Latin America, and Asia. So, when many countries use AI in law and justice because of the simple fact

that some of the applications in law and justice are very crucial to meet the challenges in law and justice and are more oriented towards meeting some specific needs or being used in some specific systems like the criminal justice system, we cannot extrapolate from that and then say that by and large AI in law and justice in that country is well developed. So that is something we need to take into account. Then the major issue here is that there are common law countries, non-common law countries, and then there are countries that have constitutional democracy; then there are countries that have different forms of rule, governance mechanisms, and different forms of government, including parliamentary democracy.

Some of the countries have very complex legal systems; some countries have legal systems that have been in place for more than hundreds of years as they have their own heritage, while some countries are quicker to adopt AI in law and justice, and some are not. So, there are many factors at play when it comes to the application of AI in law and justice. So even to understand or to get a bird's-eye view or a picker's overview itself is very difficult. One reason is that many things are happening concurrently. Governments are installing new systems; judicial systems are becoming overlapped, changing, being overhauled, or new ones are coming into place.

Bar associations are developing their own guidelines, and other stakeholders, including big law firms, are also creating their own innovations and practices. Then there is an increasing body of law literature from scholars and others on the application of AI in law and practice, both in theory and practice. A lot of work is also being done by UN agencies, including UNESCO, particularly in the application of AI and law in the context of the rule of law. So, UNESCO is doing a lot of capacity-building work in it, even for countries in Africa where AI is otherwise not fully developed in all sectors. So, in this session, we will have a bird's-eye view of what is happening in AI and law and justice in some selected countries.

To begin with, we can start in China. China is one of the leading and most innovative countries when it comes to AI and justice. For one reason, they started much earlier than many other countries did. Secondly, the Chinese legal system is so unique that it is almost driven by the state. So, in that sense, many things that other countries would struggle to come up with or do quickly, the Chinese have been able to do at a much faster pace because they have well-laid-out plans with systematic thinking and also with specific targets to be met. Thirdly, China has also brought in AI governance mechanisms as much as it develops AI systems, and the technology, so both of them are marching hand in hand in China, which is not the same as in other countries. This governance mechanism's availability and the broader framework in place, which also covers private players and private developers in law, and applications in law and justice in AI, enable everyone to be on the same page or that everyone will have to abide by the same rules. So, the Chinese started integrating the judicial system from 1990 onwards. From 1996 to

2003, they started the first phase of digitizing files and then website links. Then they started with internet-based court proceedings sharing and then live broadcasting.

That was as early as 2010 and 2013, much ahead of many other countries. Then, from 2014 onwards, they moved towards smart courts and online platforms. Smart courts are digital courts that operate based on digitalization and are fully automated. Then, they created specific internet courts for online dispute resolution. And China is one of the major countries, or perhaps the only country, in the world that uses AI for facial recognition, machine learning, and then blockchain.

What is unique in China is that it has been able to successfully integrate machine learning and blockchain with AI very effectively in the context of law and justice. So, all this means that in the Chinese judicial system, AI is well integrated and then China is also applying blockchain for various purposes. So when you integrate blockchain with AI, it gives a lot of advantages when you really want to deal with a lot of administrative functions or when you have to really deal with specific items that involve large data management, and then blockchain is a technology that is very secure, can help in records management, can help in the management of data, and can also be a technology that can be considered foolproof; it can be deployed, in one sense, in more than one way across sectors, so China is ahead in using AI when compared to many countries. But the downside here is that since everything is driven by the state or everything is decided by the state, the role of private players is present but limited to what state-led innovations are. And the United States of America, we all know, is the number one country in the world in AI.

So, in the United States of America, the advancement or deployment of AI varies across states in the sense that states have their own mechanisms and plans for the use of AI. But what is equally important is that although the United States has not yet fully come up with an AI governance framework. The previous Biden regime came up with a framework through various executive orders, and if all put together, that amounted to an AI governance framework taking into account all the federal agencies, what they would do, and then including the Federal Trade Commission. But the Trump administration is slowly but steadily reversing that, and it is bringing in its own AI governance mechanisms. *Prima facie*, this seems to prioritize innovation over governance.

Having said that, we should look into some specific examples from the USA, which we are going to discuss in a separate session on how the USA is using AI in law and justice. Specific examples where the deployment of AI can be done in a much more proactive and creative way. So, the USA is using pre-trial public safety assessments, or PSA, for preventive measures and bail decisions. And then we have heard about the COMPAS system, which is very controversial due to the risk of reoffending. So, in the United States, there are lots and lots of AI initiatives happening in justice and law, and there are

prominent, well-intended private players, the big law firms, as well as a huge number of tech law firms specializing in innovation in AI for law and technology. So, the American picture is much more complex and much broader in the sense that it is one of the pioneering countries in the world in this application.



**China**

- **First Phase (1996-2003)**
  - Started after the 1996 Conference
  - Completed digitization of court files and website links
- **Second Phase (2004-2013)**
  - Conducted court hearings using the Internet
  - First full hearing via videoconferencing in 2007
  - Live broadcast of court hearings to the public
- **Third Phase (2014-Present)**
  - Introduction of 'smart courts' initiative
  - Completion of online platforms for judicial processes
- **Technological Advancements**
- **AI in Legal Research**

Now China, as we said, started with the 1996 conference. They completed the digitization of the courts by 2003. Then the court hearings were held using the internet in 2004. The first hearing of video conferencing was held in 2007. The live broadcast also started around that time. The third phase, which is 2014 till now, has smart courts, and online platforms for judicial practices and has been completed. So, China is reaping the benefits of its investments and its AI technology by deploying them effectively in law and justice. And, more importantly, China is using AI extensively in legal research. Although I am not citing it here, there is a good amount of literature available from China on various aspects of the use of AI in law and justice, but most of that is confined to the Chinese language. But whatever we get to see due to translation and due to the experience of Chinese scholars writing about China also tells us that China is perhaps one of the three or four major countries in the world that have successfully used AI in law and justice across many sectors, including online dispute resolution.



## United States of America



- **AI in Judicial Sphere**
  - Popular in civil and criminal proceedings
  - Several initiatives implemented
- **AI Systems for Judicial Decisions**
  - PSA system for preventive measures and bail decisions
  - Pretrial Public Safety Assessment (PSA)
  - COMPAS system for assessing reoffending risk
- **Challenges and Bias**
- **AI-powered Chatbots**



We have discussed all the things that are happening in the USA. Then there are a lot of challenges and biases. Then there are AI-powered chatbots available.



## PSA an Example



- Judges are required to consider three risk factors along with others arrestee may fail to appear in court (FTA)  
arrestee may engage in new criminal activity (NCA)  
arrestee may engage in new violent criminal activity (NVCA)
- PSA as an algorithmic recommendation to judges  
classifying arrestees according to FTA and NCA/NVCA
- Risks derived from an application of a machine learning  
algorithm to training data set based on past  
observations  
<https://imai.fas.harvard.edu/talk/files/Taiwan20.pdf>



We will give an example now: PSA. See, when judges have to assess the risk of whether a person who is applying for bail will jump bail, will not return, will commit a new criminal activity, or will disappear somewhere, they need to factor in these risks while deciding. Now, this PSA takes these things into account and then categorizes them into three different categories. The probability of the arrestee failing to appear again in court is called FTA. The arrestee may engage in new criminal activity or have the tendency to

commit another crime that becomes NCA, or he may engage in new violent criminal activity that is NVCA. Now, NVCA is a much more severe than NCA.

So, what does PSA do? PSA is an algorithmic recommendation for judges classifying arrestees according to FTA and NCA/NVCA. Now, according to the PSA system, based on the algorithms, previous records, and other factors, it will specify the probability or recommend whether the person can be given bail or not. But the risks are derived from the application of machine learning algorithms on training data, which is again based on past observations. The idea is that the algorithm is trained on past data. There are pros and cons; the pros are that it makes things easier for the judge to decide, in the sense that it is able to provide an idea of FTA, NCA, and NVCA. The cons are that, as we have seen in many instances, there is a potential bias, there is a potential harm, and it could be misleading. But PSA can also be used by the judges, and then they can again decide whether they need additional data or if the data itself is sufficient; but then they can also decide that PSA findings are not binding on me; I will decide on my own, taking into account other factors.



**United Kingdom**

- **House of Lords Report on AI in Criminal Justice**
  - Published by Justice and Home Affairs Committee in November 2022
  - Highlights potential miscarriages of justice due to unregulated AI use
- **Harm Assessment Risk Tool (HART)**
  - Developed by Durham Police and University of Cambridge
  - Predicts likelihood of repeat offenses using 34 indicators
  - Excludes race to prevent racial disparities
  - Used to inform rehabilitation program selection
- **PredPol System by Kent Police**
  - Predicts future crime locations based on past data
- **Concerns and Recommendations by Officials**
- **Digital Case System (DCS)**

So, PSA is a tool that is used widely. In the United Kingdom, we have already cited this report. The House of Lords report on AI and criminal justice came out in 2022. It identified major risks and then potential factors that can go wrong when AI is deployed, particularly in criminal justice. So, this is a very cautious view which takes into account that, as we again cited, we said that it is pointed out that many countries and many state governments are rushing to acquire AI systems when there are a lot of uncertainties or unresolved issues in place. And then the HART, or the Harm Assessment Risk Tool (HART), which we reported earlier, was used by Durham Police and then by the University of Cambridge. Taking into account 34 indicators, it predicts the likelihood of

repeat offenses. This is something very similar to the PSA. But this does not include race as a criterion to prevent race from being included amounting to racial disparities. This is again used to inform rehabilitation for program selection. Then the PredPol predictive system is used by Kent Police. So, this again predicts the future crime locations based on past data. This is something like predictive policing in the sense that if you are in a metropolitan area or a big city, you map the city based on different zones and then correlate that with the crimes happening.

Suppose you notice that some violent crimes are recurring in a specific area over a period of time with wide regularity, such as three or four murders or two or three riots every week in that specific locality, along with certain other violent eruptions. Then, mapping this trend over a period of time will give the police an idea of the potential locations where crime could happen more or where they need to deploy more force to ensure that law and order is not disturbed. So, the crime locations, or the prime locations for crime, or what are called hotspots for crime, can be identified by the police based on the previous data and also by mapping where exactly the criminals are and where they reside, as well as the potential for the crime to be committed by them. So, the Kent police are using something like the PredPol scheme. Then there are also various concerns about the recommendation by officials. The UK is also using a digital case system. Again, we need to take into account that there are states and counties which make their own decisions, so there is no federal system that decides everything for everybody. Rather, you would find that there are a lot of things which the federal system takes into account, comes up with guidelines, practical issues, notes, and other things, but that is not the deciding factor in everything.



**European Union**

- **Ethical Charter on AI in Judicial Systems**
  - Adopted by CEPEJ on December 3, 2018
  - Five basic principles: respect for fundamental rights, non-discrimination, quality and safety, transparency, impartiality and reliability, under user control
- **Ethics Guidelines for Trustworthy AI**
  - Approved by the European Commission in 2019
  - Three components: lawful, ethical, robust
  - Main ethical principles: respect for human autonomy, prevention of harm, fairness, explicability
- **Digital Europe Strategy Programme**
  - EU financial consolidation for 2021–2027
  - Objective: stimulate digital transformation
- **Artificial Intelligence Act**
- **France's AI in Justice**



The European Union, which we have seen, adopted an ethical charter on AI and judicial

systems in 2018. So, it gives five basic principles: respect for fundamental rights, non-discrimination, quality and safety, transparency, impartiality, and reliability, under user control. So, this charter is being implemented in many countries of the European Union that have adopted it or agreed to use it. Then the trustworthy AI guidelines were given by European Commission in 2019 with lawful, ethical and robust. Again, the ethical principles are there. Then the Digital Europe strategy itself mentioned simulated digital transformation, and there is an Artificial Intelligence Act, and France has an AI in Justice program. So, the European Union, as we know, is very vast; there are about 27 countries with different legal systems adopting different practices, so it is very difficult even to map what is happening in the European Union, whereas the broader picture of what the binding or suggested ones can be understood from this.



**Russia : Areas of Use of AI in Justice**

- **Automated Court Composition**
  - Formed considering workload and specialization of judges
  - Excludes influence by interested parties
  - AI can determine case categories and distribute cases
- **Digital Writs of Execution**
  - Traditional writs of execution may be revised
  - AI can determine the need for issuance and process requests
  - Automated sending to Federal Bailiff Service or bank
- **Research and Assessment of Evidence**
  - AI can assist in analytics without direct conclusions
  - AI can evaluate evidence and form conclusions
  - Risks of judge's dependency on AI conclusions



Russia is a country where the use of AI in justice has been very extensive. The automated court composition was done much earlier, formed concerning workload and specialized judges, and it excludes influence by interested parties. AI can determine case categories and distribute cases. So, the allotment of different cases to different benches or different judges, or even to allocate different benches for different types of cases, can be done through this automated system. Then the traditional judicial system may be revised because Russia is moving towards digital writs of execution. AI can decide in the preliminary stage itself, whether there is a need to go for this or even to accept it, and then what the process requirements that need to be met are. And then there is also a facility for the automated sending of federal bailiff service or bank. So, the writ's execution, when it is fully automated, can involve the federal bailiff service in cases of approved bails, and then other matters can be addressed. And more importantly, they are also using research and assessment evidence for support. So, analytics is being done. It's

used to evaluate conclusions and the risks of AI judges' dependency on AI, which is also evident there.



## Language of Proceedings

- **Language of Proceedings**
  - Legal proceedings conducted in the state language
  - Participants can use their native language or a chosen language with an interpreter
- **AI Prospects in Legal Proceedings**
  - Multilingual document submission and speech during court hearings
  - Speech recognition programs and translation into text
  - Emotional and psychological speech recognition
  - Speech polygraphs to assess integrity and detect perjury
  - Intellectual processing of speech and documents
  - Reduces translation time and legal costs
  - Example: Biorg system in Russia for recognizing documents and objects in different languages



And in Russia, the language of the legal proceedings is conducted in the state language. Participants can use their native language or choose a language for an interpreter: AI prospects and legal proceedings, multilingual document submission, and speech during court hearings. This can happen in India if 'Bosni' is fully implemented in law and justice, where parallel translation can occur, with the judge speaking in one language, the person sitting or the person in the witness box speaking in another language, and translation happening simultaneously. Then they go into speech polygraphs to assess integrity in detecting perjury. Then speech and documents could be processed. Translation times and legal costs could be reduced. For example, the Biorg system in Russia recognizes documents and objects in different languages and then tries to make the best reading of them.



## Digital Protocol



- **Development of Electronic Justice**
  - Paper protocol written by hand or using technical means
  - Audio protocol kept in digital format
- **Audio Recording in Russian Arbitration Process**
  - Main means of recording court hearing information
  - Ensures openness of court proceedings
  - Material medium attached to protocol
- **Protocol as an Additional Recording Means**
  - Records completed procedural actions
- **Advancements in Telecommunication Technologies**
  - Enable exclusive electronic recording of court hearings
- **Printing Audio Protocol on Paper**



And then Russia has developed a digital protocol; the paper protocol, created by hand using technical means, is being converted to a digital protocol, which could again be an audio protocol. So, they are using more audio recordings of the arbitration process, again, a material medium attached to the protocol, so the protocol has an additional reading means also available there, so records complete procedural actions. Then, advancements in telecommunication technology enabled extensive electronic recording of court hearings. So here, what they are doing is something similar to what is happening in India in the sense that everything is being recorded, and they are also trying to move towards what they call electronic justice. So, the audio protocol can be printed on paper. So, this is a combination of digitization and audio so that a lot of things that are recorded are also translated into a digitized mechanism and are also getting converted into orders.



## Formation of the Court Composition & Determination of the Category of Cases



- **Automated Formation of Court Composition**
  - Ensures impartiality by excluding influence from interested parties
  - Utilizes an automated information system
- **Role of AI in Judicial Processes**
  - Automates court composition formation
  - Determines case categories and distributes cases among judicial panels
  - Considers judges' specialization
- **Handling Borderline Specialization Disputes**
  - AI can quickly limit claims filed in court
  - Examples include tax authority decisions in corporate disputes



How does the AI system take care of the court's composition and determination of cases? First of all, it ensures impartiality by excluding influence from interested parties. So, it uses an autonomous information system. So, it automates court composition formats, determines the case categories first, and then distributes cases to various judicial panels. And then it considers judges' specialization; for example, if a judge specializes in space law and may be a specialist in labour law, they may also be in gender law, but the cases that are to be decided on that day may require a judge who specializes in another branch of law, or it may need a bench that requires at least one judge who is an expert in space law, so the system identifies the judges' specialization and then allocates the work accordingly. And then, in the case of borderline specialization disputes and tax authority decisions in corporate disputes, AI can quickly limit claims filed in court. So, this is something like, without going into elaborate procedures or arguments, AI systems can quickly decide on certain things. For example, claims. If the claims are less than this, the AI system can quickly dispose of them and then decide the matter immediately. Similarly, in corporate disputes, the tax authority's decisions can also be made by AI when the limit is set that way.



## Digital Writs of Execution



- **Revision of Traditional Executive Documents**
  - Traditional writs of execution may be revised soon
- **Optimization of Russian Arbitration Courts**
  - Issuance of writs of execution at claimant's request
  - Changes due to unclaimed or returned writs
  - Irrelevance of writs in cases like debtor bankruptcy
- **AI Integration in Court Information Portals**
  - Automatic determination of need for writ issuance
  - Processing requests from claimants
  - Sending writs for execution to relevant authorities



Then it's also moving towards digital writs of execution. Issue writs at the claimant's request and then charge fees due to unclaimed or returned writs. Irrelevance of writs in the case of a debtor's bankruptcy: If the person is bankrupt, the writ becomes irrelevant. So, in Russia, what is happening is that AI is being integrated into court information portals so that whether the writ should be issued or not, it is nothing but an order. It is decided upfront. And then as a client, I have an order issued by the court, and I am asking the registry or any other institution of the court to issue a writ or an order based on the order issued by the judge. Such requests can be handled by AI in a much more effective way, reducing the risk of execution. For example, if a property is to be attached, if someone's PF is to be attached, if someone's property has to be released from the mortgage, or if someone's property, which has already been attached by one authority, is revoked by the court. All those things will be sent in the name of a writ by the court to different institutions and government departments.

So, the AI systems integration ensures that the sending of writs for different relevant authorities could be done by AI itself. Normally, the practice in India and in many other countries is that the court or the judge issues a writ. Then that order is sent within the high court or the court itself to another section. They again take a printout and then that is sent to the relevant institution or to the relevant agency that has to execute it. Often what happens is that the person who got the order in his or her favour would first receive it and then try to expedite matters, or he or she would go to the agency first and show that this is the order in his or her favour and that they would be receiving it shortly, but they need to start the process on their own. But if AI is used, the time delay on this can be reduced, and then the communication transmission can be linked up through AI. So digital writs of execution are a better way of executing writs, particularly when courts issue writs in the hundreds in a week.



## Research and Assessment of Evidence, Establishment of Legally Significant Circumstances



- **Principle of Immediacy in Legal Proceedings**
  - Examination and assessment of evidence directly by the court
  - Question of AI violating this principle
- **Functionality of AI in Evidence Research**
  - Analytics without direct conclusions
  - Evaluation of evidence and forming conclusions
- **Risks of AI in Evidence Evaluation**
  - Judge's dependence on AI conclusions
  - Need for conditions preventing automatic AI decision approval
- **Principles of Equality and Adversarial Law**
- **Ensuring Compliance with Adversarial Principle**
- **Practical Issues and AI Integration**



Then we have seen research and assessment of legally significant circumstances, and the functionality of AI in evidence analytics without direct conclusions is also possible. AI can evaluate the evidence and come up with conclusions. Then the extent to which the judge will depend on this makes a huge difference. Here the risk is that judges depending on AI's conclusions may be more likely to rely on AI or may simply tend to believe AI. To prevent that, there is a need to re-condition the automatic AI decision approval by the judge. So, the principles of equality and adversarial law are being adopted there, ensuring compliance with the adversarial principles also mentioned, and there are a lot of practical issues in AI integration.



## Elsewhere



- AI is used in Africa in at least 10 countries in different degrees.
  - So is the case with South America
  - UNESCO is helping countries with its AI and Rule of Law Program
  - Columbia is the first country to adopt UNESCO's guidelines on use of AI in Judicial Decision Making
- <https://www.unesco.org/en/articles/justice-meets-innovation-colombias-groundbreaking-ai-guidelines-courts>



Elsewhere, AI is used in Africa in at least 10 countries to different degrees, and this is also the case in South America. UNESCO is helping countries with AI and rule of law programs. Colombia is the first country to adopt UNESCO's guidelines on the use of AI in judicial decision-making.



  
NPTEL

Next

  
NALSAR

- In the next session we will see more details on use of AI in Law and Justice in other parts of the world



So, we have just seen a quick bird's-eye overview of what is happening with AI in law and justice in specific countries. In countries like Canada, AI is also being extensively used. What is happening is that in some applications, such as facial recognition technology, there are specific guidelines that are issued or monitored by privacy watch organizations or watchdog organizations.

Some guidelines have been specified; a lot of legal people have also worked on the application of AI in law and justice in the case of Canada. So, Canada is one country where a lot of things are happening. Similarly, another country that has done enormously well in AI is Estonia. Estonia is also known as the digital republic for the simple reason that it has digitized its administration, including law and justice, extensively. So much so that Estonians are the most digitally served and digitally connected population in the world. Of course, their population is quite small. But then the delivery of services through digital systems, including AI, in Estonia is so astounding that it is seen as a model for other countries to emulate.

But our broad overview in this class does not tell us what exactly the countries have been dealing with in a larger context or what exactly the problems are, nor have we gone into some very specific examples of where AI use has gone in the wrong direction or where AI has been used massively in the right direction, for the simple reason that it is not just possible to give such examples in a course like this because the literature evidence is very

divided and very mixed. You do not come up with cases that analyse country-level experiences in greater detail. Rather, you get, at least in the context of some countries, some examples like COMPAS, some examples like the use of PSA, and some examples like CISORI in the Netherlands, but you do not get examples or case studies that extensively study how the use of AI deployment in law and justice in the UK has performed overall. But what we will do in the next class to compensate for this is that we will look at very specific examples of the use of AI in law and justice in the USA, particularly, and then see what exactly is happening in the USA in some counties and then in some other fields of development. Thank you.