



Robotic Judges: A Future to Desire or Not?

Abraham Tamir*

Department of Law, Ben Gurion University of the Negev, Israel

Abstract

The use of artificial intelligence (AI) in the legal system has led to the emergence of the concept of robot judges, which has generated a great deal of debate and discussion. This article examines the potential advantages and disadvantages of using robot judges in the legal system. The article first explores the potential benefits of robot judges, including their ability to provide impartial and consistent judgments, work at a faster pace, and remove the potential for human error. The article then examines the drawbacks of using robot judges, including the potential for programming bias, the risk of depersonalizing the judicial process, and the loss of human empathy and intuition. The article concludes that while robot judges offer certain benefits, their use must be carefully considered in light of their potential drawbacks and the ethical considerations surrounding the delegation of such an important role to machines.

Keywords: Legal system; Increased efficiency; Artificial intelligence; Potential benefits; Appointed authority; Human thinking

Introduction

The needs of humanity dictate the path of technology. This has been the trend since we first learned to control fire. Law, on the other hand, treads carefully along this path. Every judicial system prefers careful movement. Aside from this, one important fact about law is that it is conservative.

Many of the legal functions that people currently perform may be performed by robots, according to some who believe the development of robotic lawyers could result in a decrease in the number of actual lawyers.

While there are some challenges associated with the rise of artificial intelligence in legal practice, there are also numerous potential benefits like speedy dispensation of justice and increased efficiency in the legal system.

Robotic lawyers seem to be advancing without end. Robots are becoming capable of handling high-volume or high-stakes legal duties as technology advances [1]. There are a lot of possible issues that need to be resolved, but there could also be significant advantages for both corporations and people as a result.

The centre focus of this essay is based on the relationship between artificial intelligence and the legal system. This article investigates the possibility of artificial intelligence eventually replacing judges [2]. It also assesses whether it is really possible that AI-driven adjudication would do away with human preconceptions and result in more moral decisions?

Discussion

What are Robotic Judges?

In order to fully appreciate the idea of Robotic Judges it is pertinent to discuss who a judge is first of all and the roles of a judge.

A judge is a public figure chosen to render judgments in legal proceedings. He is a judge who presides over court proceedings as an elected or appointed authority. They must work to correctly evaluate the law's significance, importance, and repercussions while being unbiased. Judges are people who understand that doing justice entails more than only applying the law; they also need to have empathy and sympathy for the parties involved in the dispute.

The judge in deciding matters must determine whether there is sufficient evidence when a case is first brought before the court to

support a reasonable suspicion that a crime has been committed and that the individual in question is the one who committed it [3].

A judge's job is a difficult one. It can include activism, complex interactions with people, dispute resolution, case management, public and specific education activities, social commentary, and adjudicatory functions performed with other judges or, in some jurisdictions, with lay people (juries).

The extent to which judges engage in each activity varies by jurisdiction and judge. Judges can vary in how "responsive" they are.

On the other hand, the term "robot" is derived from the Czech word "robota," which means "forced labour or work." Today, the term "robot" refers to any man-made machine that can perform work or other tasks automatically or under remote human control. Some robots work according to pre-programmed instructions, while others require continuous commands from a human. A robotic judge therefore is a device that is specifically designed to judge cases based on artificial intelligence [4].

In Legal practice Robotic judges are the judicial artificial intelligence decision-making system that makes predictions by learning the past judge's experience. Robotic judges are computer programs that function as judges in legal or other administrative hearings or trials.

These types of programs are also known as artificially intelligent judges.

The United Kingdom seems to be making significant advancement in this area, the reason being that a robot-judge algorithm was created; the more interesting part of this Project was when researchers showed the algorithm some cases under the jurisdiction of the European Court of Human Rights. The algorithm's decisions matched 79% of the Court's decisions. The algorithm is still being worked on to make it more functional [5].

*Corresponding author: Abraham Tamir, Department of Law, Ben Gurion University of the Negev, Israel, Tel: +05106433506, E-mail: syildirim@law.berkeley.edu

Received: 03-Mar-2023, Manuscript No. JCLS-23-91698; **Editor assigned:** 06-Mar-2023, PreQC No. JCLS-23-91698; **Reviewed:** 20-Mar-2023, QC No. JCLS-23-91698; **Revised:** 24-Mar-2023, Manuscript No. JCLS-23-91698; **Published:** 31-Mar-2023, DOI: 10.4172/2169-0170.1000384

Citation: Tamir A (2023) Robotic Judges: A Future to Desire or Not? J Civil Legal Sci 12: 384.

Copyright: © 2023 Tamir A. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

To summarize, AI judges' inability to use discretion is a significant limitation of this technology. While AI may improve judicial efficiency, it is critical to recognize that human judges have a unique ability to use discretion and make subjective decisions based on the facts of a case. As a result, it is critical that any use of AI in the legal system be done with caution and consideration of the technology's potential limitations and biases.

Among the various approaches that could be taken to have robots think like humans, introducing machine consciousness appears to be the most far-fetched. However, it may be the closest concept to the human-like intelligence that AI developers hope to achieve in the future [6].

AI and robotics exist to solve problems using cold logic and imprecise calculations. While this is sufficient for most businesses and smart cities, for the time being, robots can do more than just solve problems. Healthcare and CRM, two fields where AI and robotics have made steady inroads in recent years, have room for more "human" services. As a result, having characteristics such as empathy, logical reasoning, and qualitative analysis, which are all important when discussing human thinking, will make robots even more valuable resources than they are now [7].

Data diversity and inclusion in training

One of the main concerns about using AI judges is the possibility of bias and discrimination. A variety of factors can contribute to this, including the quality of the training data used to develop the AI system. If the training data is biased toward a specific group or demographic, the AI system's decision-making will most likely reflect this bias.

One possible solution is to collect training data from a variety of sources, such as public records, court transcripts, and expert opinions [8]. It is also critical to include a diverse range of stakeholders, including legal professionals, academics and members of the public, in the development and implementation of AI judges.

Accountability and human oversight

While AI judges have the potential to improve efficiency and consistency in the legal system, it is critical to maintain human oversight and accountability to ensure that AI judges make fair and just decisions. This could include requiring a human judge to review and approve an AI judge's decisions, or implementing a system of checks and balances to ensure that AI judges' decisions are transparent and open to challenge.

Another possible solution is to put in place a system of checks and balances in which AI judges' decisions are subject to review and appeal [9]. This would ensure that individuals have the right to challenge AI judges' decisions and that a mechanism is in place to correct any errors or biases that may arise.

Explainability and transparency

To maintain public trust and confidence in the legal system, it is critical that AI judges' decisions are transparent and explainable. This means that AI judges should be able to provide clear and concise explanations for their decisions that are easily understood by both legal professionals and the general public. Furthermore, it is critical to ensure that AI judges are open to challenge and appeal, and that individuals have the right to request a human judge to review their case if they believe an AI judge's decision was unfair or unjust.

One possible solution is to require AI judges to use natural language processing (NLP) or other techniques to provide clear and

concise explanations for their decisions [10]. This would allow legal professionals and the general public to understand the reasoning behind the decision and, if necessary, challenge it.

Another possible solution is to require AI judges to provide the same level of transparency and explainability as humans.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the idea of robot judges is a complicated and nuanced one that demands thorough evaluation of both its possible benefits and drawbacks. Artificial intelligence's potential to minimize bias and improve efficiency in the legal system is tempered by worries about accountability and the devaluation of human judgment.

Robot judges, according to their proponents, could aid in ensuring fair and consistent decisions by eliminating the possibility of human prejudice. The application of AI in the judicial system may also hasten the decision-making process, enabling the timely hearing and resolution of more cases.

Robot judges' detractors, on the other hand, are concerned that the technology is not yet developed enough to make complicated legal decisions and that the employment of AI in the judicial system may result in a lack of transparency and accountability. Furthermore, some fear that the removal of the subjective and emotional components of a trial may result in the dehumanization of the judicial system as a result of the deployment of robot judges.

Robot judges may or may not be a desirable future, depending on one's objectives and ideals. Although AI technology has a lot of potential to advance the legal system, it is essential to make sure that its usage is strictly regulated and supervised to guard against any harm. We won't be able to fully appreciate the advantages of AI in the legal system, while minimizing the risks.

Acknowledgement

None

Conflict of Interest

None

References

- Ramanathan P, Crutzen, J, Rosenfeld D (2001) Aerosols, climate, and the hydrological cycle. *Nature UK* 294:2119-24.
- Hassan A, Qadri MA, Saleem M (2021) The Muslim Family Law Ordinance 1961: Pioneer of Women Empowerment in Pakistan. *JRSP PAK* 58:1-8.
- Abdullah R, Monsoor T, Johari F (2015) Financial support for women under Islamic family law in Bangladesh and Malaysia. *Taylor and Francis UK* 21:363-383.
- Shahid TN (2013) Islam and women in the constitution of Bangladesh: The impact on family laws for Muslim women. *FLJS UK* 1-11.
- Shehabuddin E (2008) Reshaping the holy: Democracy, development, and Muslim women in Bangladesh. *CUP NY* 1-304.
- Hossain K (2003) In Search of Equality: Marriage Related Laws for Muslim Women in Bangladesh. *J Int Women's Stud MA* 5:1-38.
- Elias T (2015) Gaps and Challenges in the Enforcement Framework for Consumer Protection in Ethiopia. *Miz L Rev EA* 9:1-25.
- Levitus S, John I, Wang J, Thomas L, Keith W, et al. (2001) Anthropogenic Warming of Earth's Climate System. *USA* 292:267-270.
- Roger A, Jimmy A, Thomas N, Curtis H, Matsui T, et al. (2007) A new paradigm for assessing the role of agriculture in the climate system and in climate change. *Agric For Meteorol EU* 142:234-254
- Yoram J, Didier T, Olivier B (2002) A satellite view of aerosols in the climate system. *Nature UK* 419:215-223