UTILIZATION OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE IN THE JUDICIARY

Karel NEDBÁLEK

doc. JUDr., Ing., PhD., MBA, Lawyer,
Law firm "Mgr. Karel Nedbálek a otec",
Slušovice, Czech Republic
ORCID ID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1010-2460

Abstract. In recent years, there has been significant progress in the field of artificial intelligence (AI), which is beginning to have a considerable impact on the judiciary and thereby on judges' decisions. The complexity of AI systems often means that it is difficult to understand how an algorithm reached a certain decision, which can be problematic in the legal system context where decisions must be fair, comprehensible, and reviewable.

The capabilities of generative artificial intelligence can fundamentally streamline the law and bring substantial economic savings. Judges strive to take an objective stance in judicial decision-making, but their subjective perspective can also play a role. AI can eliminate this aspect of decision-making. The current system does not yet allow judges to work effectively with AI and streamline judicial proceedings because there are no defined and mandatory form-based lawsuits.

For now, AI cannot completely replace the critical thinking and creativity of humans; the final word must belong to a human who bears responsibility. The use of artificial intelligence in the judiciary represents a significant step toward modernizing the legal system. AI offers many opportunities to improve the efficiency of access to justice and predictive analysis of legal disputesThe capabilities of generative AI can fundamentally streamline and bring great economic savings in law. Judges try to take an objective stance in judicial decision-making, but their subjective view can also play a role, which AI can eliminate this aspect of decision-making.

The current system does not yet allow judges to work effectively with AI and make court proceedings more efficient, as there are no mandatory form-based claims. AI cannot yet completely replace critical thinking and creativity of humans, humans must have the last word and bear responsibility. The use of artificial intelligence in the judiciary represents a significant step towards the modernisation of the legal system. AI offers many opportunities to improve efficiency, access to justice, and predictive analysis of legal disputes.

Keywords: *Artificial Intelligence (AI), judiciary, judge decision-making, economic savings, judicial efficiency, modernization of the legal system*

Introduction

Justice and its executive apparatus is a traditional, perhaps even conservative field, where the subjective view of matters is maximized. It is in the interest of the whole society to partly eliminate this type of perception, and artificial intelligence can help in this regard. Implementing changes in society is generally not easy, and it will be even more challenging in justice. This is a current and significant topic in general terms, but the article only opens the topic, providing a present-day view on the use of AI in the practice of judicial decisions.

In recent years, there have been significant advances in the field of artificial intelligence (AI),[1] which is beginning to have a significant impact on various spheres of human activity, including the judiciary. AI offers the potential to transform the legal system by streamlining processes, reducing costs, and increasing access to justice. This introductory text focuses on describing the basic ways in

---

[1]   **AI Artificial intelligence** is the ability of programs to simulate human qualities such as reasoning, learning, planning, or creativity. AI allows the technical system to respond to people's questions and the AI network available from the database, solve problems and achieve certain outputs and goals.

which AI is currently used in the judiciary and presents the key benefits and challenges associated with its deployment.

One of the main ways in which AI is used in the judiciary is through the automation of administrative and repetitive tasks. Judges often spend a significant part of their time carrying out routine activities such as searching for relevant legislation, analysing legal documents or preparing draft decisions.

AI can make these tasks faster and more efficient. For example, natural language processing (NLP) algorithms [2] can quickly analyze large volumes of text and identify key information, saving judges hours of manual work.

Another major area of AI application is predictive analysis, search, and search of court decisions, which seek to predict the outcome of litigation based on the analysis of historical data. Machine learning algorithms can analyze large databases of past decisions and identify patterns that can help predict what the likely outcome of similar cases will be in the future. This tool is valuable not only for lawyers and their clients when deciding on strategy, but also for judges, who can gain a better understanding of the likely impact of their decisions.

Artificial intelligence is influencing the law more and more often, legislation is starting to change, laws need to be amended or recodified , both at the national and international level. AI can also play a key role in improving access to justice, especially for those on lower incomes who cannot afford a lawyer. AI-powered virtual legal assistants can provide basic legal advice, assist with filling out forms, and offer information on legal procedures. This can significantly reduce the barriers that prevent people from accessing legal aid and increase the efficiency of the entire legal system.

In some jurisdictions, automated decision-making is already being experimented, where AI algorithms help judges decide on minor cases. An example may be determining the amount of the deposit or deciding in the case of traffic offences. While this practice has the benefits of making faster and less biased decisions, it also raises a number of ethical questions about fairness and accountability.

Despite the benefits associated with the use of AI in the judiciary, there are a number of challenges and ethical issues that need to be addressed. One of the main concerns is the transparency and explainability of algorithms. The complexity of AI systems often means that it is difficult to understand how an algorithm arrived at a certain decision, which can be problematic in the context of a legal system where it is important that decisions are understandable and reviewable.

Another major challenge is ensuring fairness and the absence of bias and bias on the part of judges in AI systems. Machine learning algorithms depend on the data they are trained on, and if that data is biased or contains historical biases, it can lead to unfair decisions. Therefore, it is crucial that data is carefully selected and regularly monitored. With the increasing use of AI in the judiciary, legal and regulatory issues also need to be addressed. Legislation must be updated to reflect new technologies and ensure adequate protection of individual rights. This includes, for example, the protection of personal data, liability for errors in AI systems, and mechanisms for reviewing decisions made by AI.

Juan Manuel Padilla Garcia[3], who is a Colombian judge, said his decision on the case coincided with how AI proposed it to help ChatGPT[4]. Garcia thus became apparently one of the first judges to admit that he used AI to make his decision. He wanted to point out its capabilities and possibilities of use.

---

[2]   **NLP,** Neuro-Linguistic Programming. NLP techniques are also used for the mental preparation of athletes (e.g. golfer Tiger Woods, tennis players Serena Williams and Andre Agassi, from team sports some clubs of the English Premier League, Manchester United and others). Worldwide, NLP ideas and techniques have also spread thanks to so-called business gurus (people with influential ideas or theories about business).

[3]   **Judge Juan Manuel Padilla Garcia,** the first in history, mentioned his use of AI in passing judgment on an autistic child and paying for his treatment by his insurance company. However, this sentence handed down on January 30, 2023, has sparked controversy among the judge's peers. They argued that hasty adaptation of unproven technology, however good, should not be used without thorough verification. The EU has set out guidelines to be followed before any AI tool is considered trustworthy.

[4]   **Chat GPT,** is a chatbot, otherwise a computer program with artificial intelligence, to create a conversational dialogue, answering people's questions based on a predefined scenario, possibly taking into account the context of the situation. A text model is created for the purpose of automated communication.

Generative models[5] can eventually come to biased, discriminatory or racist conclusions. This is also one of the reasons why many judges disagree with the use of generative AI in decision-making, even though generative AI capabilities can make the law significantly more efficient and bring great economic savings. In addition, large language models are notorious for trying to answer questions at all costs, so they also make things up, so-called hallucinating, and very credibly.

ChatGPT and other AI chatbots cannot only be used as search engines or a source of factual information, they are also fantastic generators of texts, ideas and inspiration, urges artificial intelligence and machine learning expert **Ondřej Bojar** from Charles University. We must always keep in mind that this is not a traditional search engine, but a language model that generates the next word based on probability, thus forming sentences that do not have to be logically and internally coexistent.[6]

Fair trial

The European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms[7] affirms that everyone has the right to a fair trial, and this must be a fundamental pillar of all legal systems of democratic states. Within the European Union, the so-called AI Act has been approved,[8] which is supposed to be the first ever international measure regulating artificial intelligence.

In addition to European regulations and basic constitutional laws, the Czech legal system contains a number of laws that protect humans from possible problems related to artificial intelligence. When using artificial intelligence, Czech judges must comply with the following legal principles and regulations. The approach of artificial intelligence to individual laws and regulations must be in line with their current wording in the spirit of amendments. These are all laws that are in the legal system of the Czech Republic.

The Constitution of the Czech Republic (Constitutional Act No. 1/1993 Coll.) ensures fundamental rights and freedoms that must be respected even when using artificial intelligence (AI). This includes the right to a fair trial and the protection of personal data.

The Charter of Fundamental Rights and Freedoms (No. 2/1993 Coll.) guarantees, among other things, the right to privacy protection and the protection of personal data, which is important when working with data used by AI.

The Civil Code (Act No. 89/2012 Coll.) is the main legal regulation that regulates private-law relationships in the Czech Republic. When judges use artificial intelligence (AI), certain parts of it may be relevant, in particular as regards the protection of individual rights and the transparency of the judicial process. Here are the key aspects that may be important:

Consumer Protection Act (Act No. 634/1992 Coll.) When using artificial intelligence in the context of consumer protection, judges must ensure compliance with all relevant legal regulations and principles that ensure consumer rights, transparency of processes and protection of personal data.

Copyright Act (Act No. 121/2000 Coll.) When using artificial intelligence (AI) in the context of copyright, it is important to comply with the following provisions and principles:

The Criminal Code (Act No. 40/2009 Coll.) is the main legal regulation in the field of criminal law in the Czech Republic. When using artificial intelligence (AI), judges and lawyers must comply with the provisions of this code and ensure that the use of AI does not result in a violation of the law.

Code of Civil Procedure (Act No. 99/1963 Coll.) Court proceedings must be conducted fairly, impartially and in accordance with the law. The use of AI must not interfere with the right of participants to a fair trial. When taking evidence using AI, it is necessary to ensure that evidence is

---

5   **Generative Model**, a model created using user-modified generative design computational algorithms to explore the shape or function of a design. A common use of generative models is shape optimization using computational methods for shape creation, scenario prediction, and optimization.

6   Pavla HUBÁLKOVÁ, **Bojar: ChatGPT works as an aggregator of the internet impression.** www.ukforum.cz, 2024, [online] [cit. 2024-5-25], available on the internet.

7   **The Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms**, abbreviated as the European Convention on Human Rights, is a human rights convention negotiated within the Council of Europe and the basis of regional international human rights protection in Europe. It was signed in Rome on 4 November 1950 and entered into force on 3 September 1953. In 1992, Czechoslovakia was the first state in Central and Eastern Europe to become a party to the Convention (ratified on 18 March 1992 and published under No. 209/1992 Coll.).

8   **AI Act**. (EU Artificial Intelligence Regulation), the European Parliament has definitively adopted the ways of using artificial intelligence and regulating the use of AI. The regulation, which has been approved by the EU member states, will enter into practice gradually. The ban on the riskiest apps will apply in 6 months, most rules will apply within 24 months, and the rules for creators and users of high-risk AI systems will be fully enforced in 3 years.

obtained and used in accordance with the law. AI can be used to analyse evidence, but its adequacy and relevance must be ensured.

Code of Criminal Procedure (Act No. 141/1961 Coll.) The use of AI in criminal proceedings must not jeopardize the presumption of innocence of the accused. AI can be used to analyze data and evidence, but the decision must always be made by a judge. The trial must be fair and impartial. The evidence must then be obtained and used in accordance with the law. Ensuring due process is crucial.

Administrative Procedure Code (Act No. 500/2004 Coll.) Administrative authorities, including courts, must proceed in accordance with the law. AI can be used to analyze data and support decision-making, but the legality of the procedure must be ensured.

Personal Data Processing Act (No. 110/2019 Coll.) It implements the GDPR into the Czech legal system from the European Regulation and specifies some national regulations.

Act on Courts and Judges (No. 6/2002 Coll.) It regulates the organisation and activities of courts and the status of judges. It also contains the principles that judges must follow in the exercise of their duties, including the use of technology.

Judges must abide by codes of ethics and internal rules of the judiciary, which may contain specific provisions regarding the use of modern technologies, including AI. The principle of fair trial must be adhered to, which means that any decision influenced by AI must be transparent and the judge must be able to explain how the AI was used and how it affected the decision. Judges must ensure that the use of AI is proportionate and does not compromise their independence. The use of AI in the judiciary is still a relatively new and evolving area and may therefore be subject to further legislation and specific guidance in the future. It is important that judges use AI to ensure that the rights and freedoms of individuals and the transparency and accountability of their decision-making are preserved.

The judge's views on the decision

Judges try to take an objective position in their judicial decision-making, but their subjective view can also play a role. Objectivity and subjectivity in the decision-making of judges are key aspects that affect the quality and fairness of their decisions. Understanding the differences between the two approaches and their impact on the judicial process is essential to ensuring fairness and trust in the legal system.

Objectivity means impartiality and impartiality of the judge in assessing the case. The judge is guided by the following principles. An objective judge bases his or her decision on facts and evidence presented during the trial. Evidence must be evaluated according to its relevance and reliability. In making decisions, judges are guided by the applicable law and case law. The interpretation of laws and the application of legal principles must be as consistent and transparent as possible. Judges must remain impartial and avoid any conflict of interest. This includes not succumbing to external influences such as political pressures, personal sympathies or antipathies.

Subjectivity in a judge's decision-making refers to his or her personal experiences, values, beliefs, and intuitions, which can influence his or her interpretation of facts and legal norms. A judge can be influenced by his or her life experiences, education, values, and beliefs. These factors can affect his view of justice and morality. Judges often have to make decisions based on their intuition and judgment, especially in cases where the legal rules are not clear or where there is no case law. A judge may show empathy towards the parties to the proceedings, which may influence his or her decision-making. Empathy can be beneficial in assessing the human aspects of a case, but it must be balanced with impartiality.

Balance between objectivity and subjectivity

Ensuring fairness in judicial decision-making requires careful balancing of objective and subjective aspects. Judges must be able to critically evaluate evidence and be aware of their personal biases. Objective analysis of evidence is the basis of a fair decision. Regular education and training of judges in the legal, ethics and psychological aspects of decision-making can help to minimise the influence of subjective factors. Court decisions should be transparent and judges should be accountable for their decisions. The statement of reasons for the decision must be clear and logical in order to be able to examine whether the decision was taken objectively. In some cases, collective decision-making by several judges can reduce the influence of individual subjective views and ensure a more balanced approach.

Artificial intelligence has the potential to play a significant role in the analysis and evaluation of court decisions. It can be used to evaluate both objective and subjective aspects of judicial decision-making. Below is an overview of how AI can help evaluate these two approaches.

1. Objective view

AI can analyze large databases of past decisions, identify similar cases, and evaluate whether a judge's decision conforms to established case law. Automated search and triage of evidence, using natural language processing (NLP) algorithms, AI can sort and evaluate evidence to determine whether it has been correctly interpreted and applied. AI can check whether the decision complies with applicable legislation and case law. AI can identify any errors or deviations from standard legal procedures.

2. Subjective view

Using sentiment analysis, the AI can evaluate the language used in court decisions and identify emotional charge that may indicate subjective influences. AI can detect signs of potential bias or bias in decision texts by analyzing the words and phrases used. AI can analyze the decision-making patterns of individual judges and identify deviations or anomalies that could indicate subjective influences. AI can compare decisions of different judges in the same or similar cases and see if their decisions are consistent.

3. Integration of objective and subjective evaluations

Combining these approaches can help to create a more comprehensive picture of judicial decision-making. AI can assess the consistency of a judge's decision with his or her own previous decisions and those of other judges in the same jurisdictions. Based on historical data, AI can create predictive models that estimate the likelihood of different decisions and identify the factors that have the greatest impact on them.

Many judges are exposed to psychological pressures, time constraints, personal and family problems. Judges are only human and can be prone to prejudice and stereotypes. It is important for judges to be aware of their possible prejudices and to actively try to eliminate them. Judges may face pressures from the public, politicians or the media. Maintaining objectivity in such an environment can be challenging. Judges may encounter ethical dilemmas where it is necessary to choose between the strict application of the law and a broader view of justice and morality. Objectivity and subjectivity are an inseparable part of judicial decision-making. While objectivity is a fundamental principle that ensures impartiality and fairness, subjective aspects can bring a human dimension and an intuitive understanding of complex cases. A balanced approach that minimizes the negative effects of subjectivity and maximizes objectivity is key to maintaining trust in a fair and efficient legal system.

Introduction of form-based lawsuits

The current system does not yet allow judges to work effectively with AI and make court proceedings more efficient. So far, there are only some mandatory form-based actions, namely electronic payment orders, European payment orders, applications for debt relief and applications for the Commercial Register, but these are not lawsuits. We must use a mandatory system of form-based actions, thereby simplifying and speeding up court proceedings, especially in the area of petty disputes, i.e. disputes over smaller amounts. Form-based claims are standardized claims that allow plaintiffs to file a claim more easily and quickly without the need for in-depth legal knowledge. This approach aims to make the work of courts more efficient and to increase the accessibility of judicial protection to the wider public.

The mandatory introduction of form-based lawsuits is part of a broader effort to modernize and streamline the Czech judiciary. This concept was inspired by practice in other European countries, where standardised forms for filing claims have led to faster court proceedings and a reduction in the administrative burden on courts.

Simplicity of form-based lawsuits is necessary, they must be modified so that they are easy to use even for people without legal education. The electronic filing of a form-based claim allows for faster and more efficient processing of cases. The use of form-based claims can reduce the costs associated with filing claims and legal representation. This is particularly important for individuals and small businesses that may have limited financial resources.

In the Czech Republic, the introduction of some form-based actions has been regulated by an amendment to the relevant legislation. This legislation sets out specific conditions and procedures for the use of form-based lawsuits in practice. The relevant forms that have been processed so far are available on the website of the Ministry of Justice and on the portals of the individual courts.

Form-based lawsuits standardise and simplify the process of filing claims, leading to faster decision-making by courts. Standardised forms can reduce the administrative burden for courts, allowing them to use their resources more efficiently. The introduction of mandatory form-based actions for all claims in the Czech Republic would represent a significant step towards modernizing and streamlining the judicial system. This instrument has the potential to increase access to justice, reduce costs and speed up court proceedings.

Artificial intelligence, if it has up-to-date sources in its database, in this case collections of laws, EU regulations or case law, is able to develop materials using. in a very short time. Generative AI can handle the time, which would take several hours, literally in a few minutes.

Aspects of a judge's decision-making

When making decisions, a judge should use various aspects to ensure a fair, objective and lawful decision. The judge must apply the relevant laws, regulations and other legal norms that apply to the case. This includes both national laws and, where appropriate, international law. Decisions of higher courts, especially the highest courts, can serve as precedents and the judge should take into account their interpretation and application of legal norms. The judge must carefully assess all evidence submitted by the parties, including witness statements, documents, expert opinions and other evidence. On the basis of the evidence, the judge must establish and assess the facts of the case. This includes determining what happened and what the relevant facts are. A judge must comply with procedural rules and rules that ensure a fair trial for both parties, including the right of defence and the right to a fair trial. A judge should strive to reach a fair decision that takes into account equality before the law and the basic principles of justice. A judge must respect and protect the constitutional rights and freedoms of individuals as enshrined in the Constitution and other fundamental legal documents. Even if legal and ethical norms are different, a judge should keep in mind basic moral and ethical principles, especially in cases where the law provides room for interpretation. These principles certainly include Kaufman's principles of modern law and the basic principles of modern legal thought, and last but not least, the principle of power and responsibility by E. F. Smidak.[9]

The judge may also take into account broader social and cultural contexts that may influence the interpretation of the law and its application to a particular case. A judge has a certain degree of discretion in decision-making that he or she can use to achieve a fair outcome, especially in cases where the law is unclear or provides several possibilities of interpretation. Together, these aspects form a comprehensive framework that helps judges reach a decision that is fair, lawful and in line with the spirit of law. These aspects should all be accessible in the AI database.

AI cannot yet completely replace critical thinking and human creativity. Sooner or later, the judiciary will come to this conclusion and start using AI intensively. However, the responsibility should still lie with the person, as expert Miroslav Sedláček from the Faculty of Law of Charles University said.[10]

Pointer	2015	2016	2017	2018
	District courts			
Criminal cases number	75 696	70 212	63 407	61 397
Number of days	163	166	166	167
	Regional courts			
Criminal cases number	962	1 196	1 178	1 351
Number of days	591	538	705	750

Figure 1: Number of cases of the Regional Court and District Court and length of proceedings[11]

The number of civil proceedings at district courts alone in 2014 reached the maximum length in the number of days of case resolution by courts, more than 1000 days for some cases. In 2022, the duration of the District Courts was roughly halved. These figures are also based on the annual

---

9   NEDBÁLEK Karel, ***Cardassian Law or Justice in the Czech Republic.*** Slušovice: Čibe a.s., advokátní kancelář Mgr. Karel Nedbálek a otec, 2023, p. 151, ISBN 978-80-908533-5-5.
10 Helena ZDRÁHALOVÁ, ***AI can help the judiciary, but the last word must be given to the person***. www.ukforum.cz, 2023, [online] [cit. 2024-5-24], available on the internet.
11 Czech Statistical Office

statistical report of the Ministry of Justice for 2022, published by Minister Pavel Blažek.[12] The above tables and the 2022 annual report show that although the length of court proceedings in district courts has decreased, 2022 shows an upward trajectory and in many cases reaches over 900 days in district and regional court decisions. Sometimes we can say with certainty that the courts behave in a non-systematic way.

The updates to the statistics that have been found no longer contain summary statistics on the length of court proceedings, but divide the criminal and civil sections. The Ministry of Justice publishes data retrospectively in the yearbook. Let us note as a fact that any European statistics on the length of proceedings do not excuse the length of court proceedings in the Czech Republic. The potential opinion that the length of court proceedings is okay in the Czech Republic because there are longer proceedings in other countries is untenable from the point of view of arguments.

Court proceedings can also be unfair, slow, or corrupt. When a judge returns an unsolved case for the third time, there is a probability that he is not able to think from a different point of view and we can boldly talk about him being "mentally biased" and should be removed from the case for this kind of bias. The courts judge extremely slowly and poorly. The attainment of justice over the years is almost zero. If a judgment is not reached within a short period of time within a year, then the search for justice is difficult and often misses the point. The accused is sentenced to "waiting for justice", which is not a punishment according to the law, but it is the cruelest psychological punishment. The affected person is usually paralyzed because he is exposed to uncertainty and the inability of the machinery to decide, he often loses his job, social status, money or even his family, without it being clear whether he has committed the act or not.

Law de lege ferenda

In criminal cases, the first-instance courts would decide on cases up to 5 years in prison, instead of a panel with lay judges, a single judge would decide with the help of artificial intelligence, thus abolishing the institute of lay judges. The abolition of lay judges would shorten the length of proceedings.

In the judge's case, when an unsolved case returns for the third time, he is "mentally biased"

He should not continue to judge a judge of first instance to whom the court of appeal returns 50% or more of the cases per year.

Courts of first instance, with the help of AI, must decide the case no later than 6 months after the file has been handed over to court.

Conclusions

which usually rehash the facts known at the time of the start of the trial. The only difference is that witnesses lose their memory and judges stop reading it and do not properly prepare for the hearing. The accused and then the accused are absolutely not familiar with it, nor is it clear to him the deed of which he is accused. We are not talking about the intention of the defendant, whether conscious or unconscious, or negligent act, and when assessing these attributes, punishment should follow according to Act No. 40/2009 Coll., the Criminal Code.

What was previously clear becomes inaccurate and in many cases the testimonies begin to diverge and the evidence loses credibility. The court file becomes weeded with a lot of superfluous and ballast information and becomes difficult to decide.

The Ministry of Justice should create rules in which only the most talented judges with the ability to make decisions quickly, impartially and correctly would apply. This change will in no way require interference with the Constitution of the Czech Republic, but a minor amendment to Act No. 6/2002 Coll. on Courts and Judges will suffice.

<p align="center">"An important decision is a quick decision."</p>

By judging slowly, the law is taken into the hands of the police and prosecutors, who at their own discretion "sentence" the suspect to custody, or leave him paralyzed in legal uncertainty, which can last for several years, still without a proper trial. The suspect is thus morally and socially impossible, although after some time the prosecution is stopped for various reasons. The police and prosecutors thus have the opportunity to intervene in business and political relations, and they do so with various motivations. A quality judge who has the ability to make quick and high-quality decisions will

---

[12] **Annual Statistical Report 2022:** Ministry of Justice, justice.cz 2022, [online] [cit. 2024-5-28], available online.

not create room for either the prosecutor or the police to create a grey zone. It is worth considering that the judge should even judge in the first-instance court anonymously with the help of artificial intelligence, so the case will be given to any judge in the Czech Republic, and since he will not be burdened with either name or place, he can decide impartially and quickly with the help of AI.

"Justice must be attainable in time and quality."

It is completely unacceptable for the trials to last for years or decades. The judge does not suffer from this, but the person being judged goes through hell. This state of affairs generates injustice, which begins in the inability of the judicial machinery to make a decision.[13] The system thus loses public trust in this pillar of democracy.[14]

Although AI offers many opportunities, there are some limitations. AI systems are only as good as the data they are trained on. If this data is biased or contains biases, it can lead to unfair decisions. The complexity of AI algorithms can lead to issues with the transparency and explainability of decisions, which is critical in a legal context. The use of AI in the legal system raises a number of ethical questions, including liability for errors and privacy of personal data.

Artificial intelligence can make a significant contribution to the objective evaluation of judicial decisions and to the identification of subjective influences. By doing so, it can help to increase transparency, consistency and fairness in judicial decision-making. However, careful consideration of ethical, legal, and technical aspects is essential to fully exploit the potential of AI. AI should be seen as a tool to support judges, not as a substitute for human judgment and experience.

The development of AI technologies will continue and their influence on the judiciary will continue to deepen. It is likely that AI will become increasingly integrated into various aspects of the legal system, from crime prevention to rehabilitation and reintegration of convicts, to court rulings. It will also be important to follow international trends and share best practices between different jurisdictions.

The use of artificial intelligence in the judiciary represents a significant step towards modernising the legal system. AI offers many opportunities to improve efficiency, access to justice, and predictive analysis of legal disputes. However, it is essential that this process is accompanied by careful consideration of ethical and legal considerations to ensure that AI serves as a tool for achieving justice and not as a source of injustice. The legal community, technicians, and regulators must work together to create a framework that enables the safe and effective use of AI in the judiciary.

Artificial intelligence is a tool that can undoubtedly simplify and speed up the process of court decision-making, but the judge must be responsible for it. He must justify the decision correctly, even though AI helped him with its creation, referring to the fact that the text was generated by artificial intelligence. It would be worth considering whether the courts of first instance would also be obliged to publish decisions for comparison with the opinion of artificial intelligence on the case.

I do not expect that everyone will agree with the opinion piece; its aim is to provoke discussion. I believe that the current judicial system is quite hermetically sealed and incapable of assessing the qualitative and quantitative parameters of changes, nor of accepting external opinions. The members of the judicial group behave like a superior sect, and no one from the outside has the right to interfere with their system, and above all, no criticism of the conditions is allowed.

References

1. Pavla HUBÁLKOVÁ, Bojar: ChatGPT works as an aggregator of the internet impression. www.ukforum.cz, 2024, [online] [cit. 2024-5-25], available on the internet.
2. The Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, abbreviated as the European Convention on Human Rights, is a human rights convention negotiated within the Council of Europe and the basis of regional international human rights protection in Europe. It was signed in Rome on 4 November 1950 and entered into force on 3 September 1953. In 1992, Czechoslovakia was the first state in Central and Eastern Europe to become a party to the Convention (ratified on 18 March 1992 and published under No. 209/1992 Coll.).

---

[13] ČUBA, F., FRNKA, M., BLAHYNKA, P., ČUBA, R., **REFLECTIONS.** *March* 2019, pp. 24–29.

[14] NEDBÁLEK Karel, MALINOVÁ Naděžda, Rej Masek, Kolokvium rozmluva ABOUT ALL. Slušovice: Čibe a.s., advokátní kancelář Mgr. Karel Nedbálek a otec, 2021. ISBN 978-80-2709202-4, p. 207.

3. AI Act. (EU Artificial Intelligence Regulation), the European Parliament has definitively adopted the ways of using artificial intelligence and regulating the use of AI. The regulation, which has been approved by the EU member states, will enter into practice gradually. The ban on the riskiest apps will apply in 6 months, most rules will apply within 24 months, and the rules for creators and users of high-risk AI systems will be fully enforced in 3 years.
4. NEDBÁLEK Karel, Cardassian Law or Justice in the Czech Republic. Slušovice: Čibe a.s., advokátní kancelář Mgr. Karel Nedbálek a otec, 2023, p. 151, ISBN 978-80-908533-5-5.
5. Helena ZDRÁHALOVÁ, AI can help the judiciary, but the last word must be given to the person. www.ukforum.cz, 2023, [online] [cit. 2024-5-24], available on the internet.
6. Czech Statistical Office, Annual Statistical Report 2022: Ministry of Justice, justice.cz 2022, [online] [cit. 2024-5-28], available online.
7. ČUBA, F., FRNKA, M., BLAHYNKA, P., ČUBA, R., REFLECTIONS. March 2019, pp. 24–29.
8. NEDBÁLEK Karel, MALINOVÁ Naděžda, Rej Masek, Kolokvium rozmluva ABOUT ALL. Slušovice: Čibe a.s., advokátní kancelář Mgr. Karel Nedbálek a otec, 2021. ISBN 978-80-2709202-4, p. 207.