



# Regulations for the Use of Artificial Intelligence in Courts, 2026

On 3 June 2026, the Supreme Court issued draft regulations to govern the use of AI in courts



## Salient Features of the regulations:

- Supreme Court draft regulations support AI adoption in courts.
- AI use is subject to safeguards on accountability, transparency, privacy, and judicial independence.

### Core Principles

- AI is an assistive tool and cannot replace judges or judicial decision-making.
- Human judgment, judicial independence, and the rule of law remain paramount.
- AI must be transparent, explainable, auditable, fair, secure, and privacy-preserving.
- Courts are encouraged to adopt AI responsibly under an innovation-friendly approach.
- AI use should be encouraged where safe and responsible, rather than restricted due to potential risks.

### Accountability

- Responsibility for decisions remains with human users.
- AI outputs are advisory and non-binding.
- AI errors, hallucinations, or black-box systems do not absolve accountability.
- AI generated content must be verified before use unless specifically exempted.

### Permitted Uses of AI

- Legal research and precedent retrieval.
- Citation verification.
- Document summarization.
- Court transcription services.
- Translation of judgments and pleadings.
- Case management and scheduling.

- Identification of defects in filings.
- Chatbots and litigant assistance.
- Accessibility tools.
- Anonymization of judgments.
- Backlog monitoring and court analytics.
- Automated administrative document generation.

## Prohibited uses of AI

- Deciding cases or replacing judges.
- AI-only adjudication or sentencing.
- Risk-scoring of litigants, accused persons, or witnesses.
- Predicting future behaviour or legal outcomes.
- Surveillance of judges, lawyers, or litigants.
- Use of opaque or unexplained AI systems affecting rights or liberty.
- Use of AI-generated material as evidence without disclosure.
- Any use compromising judicial independence or deliberations.

## Mandatory Disclosure Requirements

- Lawyers must disclose AI assistance in pleadings, documents, or evidence.
- Courts may require disclosure of:
  - AI tool used.
  - Extent of AI assistance.
  - Verification measures undertaken.
- AI-generated or synthetic content must be specifically disclosed.
- Filers remain fully responsible for false, fabricated, or misleading AI-generated content.

## Governance Framework

- Apex Body at the Supreme Court level.
- AI Committees in the Supreme Court and all High Courts.
- Dedicated AI Secretariats.
- Technical, Judicial, Cybersecurity, Infrastructure, and Data Management Committees.
- Centre of Research and Excellence on AI (CoRE-AI).

## Verification and Oversight

- Mandatory technical, legal, and ethical assessments before deployment.
- Maintenance of an AI Register for approved tools, audits, and incidents.
- Periodic audits of AI systems.
- AI Incident Database for reporting errors, bias, failures, and security breaches.
- Emergency fallback mechanisms in case of AI system failures.

## AI Content Verification Authority

- Establishment of a dedicated authority for verifying GenAI-generated content.
- Development of standards, tools, and protocols for court-related AI content verification.

## Private Sector and Vendors

- Participation allowed only with court approval.
- Vendors must provide:
  - Transparency regarding models and training data.
  - Audit cooperation.
  - Data protection commitments.
  - Liability and indemnity assurances.
- Court data cannot be used for retraining without approval.
- Courts retain rights over AI tools developed using judicial data or public resources.

## Data Protection and Security

- Compliance with the Digital Personal Data Protection Act, 2023.
- Restriction on external transfer of sensitive judicial data without approval.
- Preference for data minimization and anonymization.
- Mandatory cybersecurity audits and access controls.

## Training and Capacity Building

- Mandatory AI training for judges, lawyers, and court staff.
- Training to cover:
  - AI capabilities and limitations.
  - Hallucinations and bias.
  - Ethical and legal obligations.
  - Data protection and cybersecurity.
  - Incident reporting procedures.

## Comparative Global Perspective

The following table situates India's approach within the international landscape.

Parameter	India (Draft Regulations for Use of AI in Courts, 2026)	European Union (EU AI Act, 2024)	UK Artificial Intelligence (Regulation) Bill 2025	Supreme Court of Singapore Guide on the Use of Generative AI Tools by Court Users (2024)	China (SPC Opinions on AI in Judicial Fields, 2022)
Status (2026)	Proposed	In Force	Proposed	In Force	In Force
Primary Scope	Use of AI across judicial, adjudicatory and administrative functions of courts	Regulation of AI systems, including high-risk applications in justice systems	Use of AI for legal and judicial support functions	Use of AI by judges, lawyers and court users in judicial proceedings	AI deployment across judicial administration and adjudication support
Permitted Uses of AI	Legal research, translation, Summarization, administrative functions, case management support	Research, document review, workflow management and support functions	Legal research, document drafting and administrative support	Drafting, summarisation, legal research and case preparation	AI-assisted filing, case management, legal retrieval and document generation
Human-in-the-Loop (HITL)	Mandatory human oversight over all AI outputs	Human control and accountability required for high-risk systems	Judges remain responsible for all AI assisted outputs	Judges and users must personally review AI generated content	Human judges retain final authority

Institutional Oversight	Permanent Apex Body and AI Content Verification Authority proposed	European AI Office and European AI Board	No dedicated AI regulator for courts	Registry-led oversight; judicial supervision	Supreme People's Court of China
Disclosure Requirements	Mandatory disclosure of AI generated filings; courts may seek details of AI tools used	Transparency obligations for high risk AI systems and GPAI models	AI assisted filings subject to professional conduct obligations	Disclosure required when AI materially influences submissions or upon court direction	AI generated content must be labelled
Data Protection Requirements	Strict restrictions on sharing judicial data with external AI systems; compliance with DPDP Act, 2023	Extensive data governance and risk management obligations	General data protection and confidentiality obligations apply	Confidential court information should not be entered into public GenAI systems	Judicial data subject to state controlled governance framework
Accountability & Liability	Grievance redressal mechanism for harms caused by prohibited AI use; liability provisions for vendors	Providers and deployers subject to regulatory penalties and compliance obligations	Lawyers remain professionally responsible for AI generated content	Hallucinations or AI errors do not excuse professional responsibility	Accountability retained by judicial authorities and system operators
Predictive Justice	High-stakes AI applications such as risk scoring subject to strict controls	Risk-scoring and certain predictive AI applications treated as high-risk	No endorsement of predictive judicial decision-making	Focus on reliability, verification and integrity of legal content	AI may support analysis but cannot independently determine judicial outcomes

The Supreme Court of India has invited stakeholders, legal professionals, technology experts and members of the **public to submit comments** on the draft regulations at email ID [office.regcc@sci.nic.in](mailto:office.regcc@sci.nic.in) by **June 20, 2026**, before the framework is finalised.