Journal of Animal Environment

(E-ISSN 2717-1396, ISSN 2717-1388)

Original Research Paper

Artificial Intelligence in Indian Courts: Constitutional Safeguards and Judicial Accountability under e-Courts Phase III with Reference to Sustainable Development

Vismaya Bansal[1*], Dr. Anchal Mittal Aggarwal[2]

[1]Research Scholar, Faculty of Law, Shree Guru Gobind Singh Tricentenary University, Gurugram

[2]Associate Professor, Faculty of Law, Shree Guru Gobind Singh Tricentenary University, Gurugram

***Corresponding Author:** Vismaya Bansal, Research Scholar, Faculty of Law, Shree Guru Gobind Singh Tricentenary University, Gurugram

ABSTRACT

The digital transformation of the Indian judiciary has gone beyond just using computers for court records. Now, it's moving towards a completely technologically equipped system that can handle services like electronic filing, online court sessions, digital evidence, automatic speech writing, language translation, legal research, and managing court operations with the help of data analysis. The e-Courts Mission Mode Project, especially Phase III, shows a major step forward in this change. The government has clearly thought about including new technologies, like Artificial Intelligence (AI) and blockchain, in this phase. This article looks at the legal and constitutional issues that come up when using Artificial Intelligence in the Indian court system, especially how it connects to the e-Courts Project. It says AI should not be seen as a replacement for judges thinking and expertise, but rather as a tool that is controlled and used under human supervision in the legal decision-making process. The article looks at the key principles from the constitution, like equality, dignity, privacy, fairness, transparency, like, open court processes, to ensure that everyone gets timely justice, by technology in the courts. The article argues that there is a big gap in the rules because there isn't a complete set of laws that specifically apply to AI in courts. The article suggests an AI governance model that can be used in Indian courts which focuses on having humans oversee the AI, protecting data, ensuring cybersecurity, making sure processes are fair, being open and clear, and holding institutions responsible with reference to Sustainable Development Goals. The article concludes that e-Courts Phase III can only be implemented in its true essence only if the technology works well but doesn't take over from the judicial independence.

Keywords: Artificial Intelligence, e-Courts, e-Courts Phase III, Judicial Technology, Right to Privacy, Open Justice, Digital Justice, Sustainable Development, Electronic Evidence.

***Corresponding Author:**

Received: 25th July, 2026 | Revised: 26th August, 2026 | Accepted: 18th September, 2026 | Available Online: 24th September, 2026

(DOI): 10.70102/AEJ.2026.18.7s.93

I. INTRODUCTION

The rule of law in a constitutional democracy depends heavily on the temporal efficiency and systemic accessibility of its judicial forums. When justice is delayed by procedural friction, bureaucratic obstacles, or institutional backlogs, fundamental rights risk becoming transactional privileges rather than constitutional guarantees. For decades, traditional judiciaries worldwide have grappled with massive scale challenges. In India, for instance, judicial backlogs exceeded 50 million cases by the end of year 2025, creating severe structural stress on litigants and state machinery alike.[1] To address this challenge, the intersection of law and technology has evolved beyond a mere logistical support mechanism into a foundational pillar of modern court architecture. This evolution is represented by the e-Courts Mission Mode Project. This is a pan-India initiative, which is working under the realms and guidance of the e-Committee of the Supreme Court of India, has structurally altered the administration of justice.[2]

The implementation of the said project has transitioned through phases and is currently in its phase III of implementation, which majorly focusses on proactive and intelligent judicial automation, alongwith the integration of Artificial Intelligence, Natural Language Processing, and Predictive Analytics directly into court procedures.

This development should be examined not only as technological modernization but also in the context of constitutional commitments to equality, access to justice, privacy, procedural fairness, transparency and judicial accountability. It also has a direct relationship with the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), particularly SDG 16, concerning peace, justice and strong institutions, including access to justice and accountable institutions. SDG 9, concerning innovation and infrastructure, and SDG 10, concerning reduced inequalities, are also relevant.
AI-assisted translation and digital services may reduce geographical and linguistic barriers, while electronic filing and intelligent case-management tools may improve efficiency. However, algorithmic bias, inaccurate outputs, lack of explainability, privacy and cybersecurity risks, and the digital divide may undermine justice if safeguards are absent. The introduction should therefore establish that AI under e-Courts project can contribute to India's SDGs only when technological innovation remains subject to constitutional safeguards and meaningful human oversight.

Artificial Intelligence has emerged as one of the most consequential technological developments affecting Indian Judicial system. Its application extends from document classification and legal research to speech recognition, machine translation, document summarisation and case management. However, the more significant research issue for India is no longer whether AI will enter the justice system, but rather it is under what constitutional, and institutional conditions AI may legitimately be used within it.

The Indian Judiciary is consistently building up a progression towards the adoption of AI based technologies in the system. The advent of the Artificial Intelligence cannot be examined in isolation from the implementation of the e-Courts project. AI constitutes one of the technological layers through which the objectives of e-Courts Phase III ought to be realized.

The Hon'ble Apex Court's jurisprudence already establishes that technological transformation must operate within constitutional boundaries. In *Justice K.S. Puttaswamy (Retd.) v. Union of India*[3], the nine-judge Bench of the Apex Court has observed that right to privacy as a constitutionally protected right and emphasized legality, legitimate state purpose and proportionality where State action intrudes upon privacy.[4] In *Anuradha Bhasin v. Union of India*[5], the Court recognised the constitutional protection attaching to freedoms exercised through the Internet and insisted that restrictions affecting such rights satisfy constitutional standards including proportionality.

II.OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

i. To examine the emerging role of Artificial Intelligence within the Indian judicial system under the realm

[1] Harmandeep Kaur, Advanced Judicial Technology, e-Courts, and Artificial Intelligence: Reimagining the Architecture of Justice Delivery, 11(6) International Journal Rsch. & Innovation in Applied Sci. 2542, 2542–48 (2026), doi:10.51584/IJRIAS.2026.11060196.
[2] e-Committee, Supreme Court of India, https://ecommitteesci.gov.in (last visited Aug. 20, 2026).
[3] *Justice K.S. Puttaswamy (Retd.) v. Union of India*, (2017) 10 SCC 1, AIR 2017 SC 4161.
[4] Justice K.S. Puttaswamy (Retd.) v. Union of India, (2017) 10 SCC 1, AIR 2017 SC 4161, https://indiankanoon.org/doc/91938676/ (last visited Aug. 20, 2026).
[5] *Anuradha Bhasin v. Union of India*, (2020) 3 SCC 637, AIR 2020 SC 1308.

of the phase III of the e-Courts Mission Mode Project and identify the areas in which AI may legitimately assist in the delivery of justice.

ii. To examine the constitutional implications of AI-enabled judicial processes with reference to Articles 14, 19 and 21 of the Constitution of India.

iii. To examine the lessons India can draw from the international experiences in regulating AI to ensure fairness in its legal system.

iv. To propose institutional and regulatory safeguards for integrating AI under Phase III of the e-Courts project.

III.RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This research adopts a doctrinal and analytical methodology. The primary sources include the Constitution of India, legislation, judicial decisions, government notifications, e-Courts policy documents and the directives issued by Apex and High Court. Further the secondary sources include academic literature, policy documents, institutional reports and commentary relating to AI, legal technology and digital justice.

IV.THE EVOLUTION OF e-COURTS PROJECT

The e-Courts Mission Mode Project was initiated in the year 2005 and has completed its two phases and is currently in its third phase. This mission in both qualitative and quantitative terms has been through so many ups and downs. Looking at the present-day scenario there has been an Installation of hardware and software to carry out functions digitally in approximately 13000 courts.[6] Automation of day-to-day work flow is already done like cause list, daily proceeding, uploading of orders and judgement is done by court staff. Use of computer has become absolutely necessary. The unified Case Information System all over the country has made Indian judiciary more transparent. All the courts update the data on National Judicial Data Grid regularly which is a comprehensive database to maintain the summary statistics of all cases across all levels.

The e-Courts Project represents a progressive transformation of India's judicial infrastructure.

The first phase concentrated upon basic computerisation and ICT infrastructure. The second phase substantially expanded citizen-centric digital services and electronic court administration. Phase III moves towards a more integrated and intelligent judicial ecosystem and inclusion of the Artificial Intelligence technology in order to aid the judicial delivery mechanisms.

Phase III of the e-Courts project seeks to move towards establishing more digital and paperless courts, digitised legacy records, universal e-Filing and e-Payments, setting up of more e-Sewa Kendras and focussing on integrated judicial information systems and AI-enabled applications including technologies such as blockchain and predictive analysis.

The major objectives behind the implementation of the e-Courts project are speedier justice, better accessibility and transparency in the judicial processes and implementation of this project and infusion of technology shall ensure that these objectives are achieved. The Vision document that has been released for the phase three of the project delineates these very objectives and thus is a progressive document.

The Draft Vision document for delineating the aim and objectives for phase three of the project was being released by the Hon’ble Justice Sh. DY Chandrachud, which is another affirmative step to bring in the forefront the advantages of the information and technology-based e-services under the said project.[7] The draft vision document adopts an affirmative approach to address the challenges and shortcomings of the previous two phases of the project.

Since we are working on using Artificial Intelligence in the third phase of the e-Courts project, it's important to understand what AI really does. Artificial Intelligence, or AI, is a branch of science and technology that deals with creating smart machines, especially computer systems that can think and learn. In its simplest form, artificial intelligence brings together computer science and large sets of data to help solve problems. However, digitisation should not be mistaken for AI governance. A digitised court merely changes the

[6] Press Information Bureau, Government of India, https://www.pib.gov.in/PressRelease (last visited Aug. 17, 2026)

[7] Department of Justice, Government of India, *Brief on e-Courts Project—Phase I and Phase II* (Sept. 30, 2015), https://doj.gov.in/sites/default/files/Brief-on-e-Courts-Project-(Phase-I-%26-Phase-II)-30.09.2015.pdf(last visited May 14, 2023).

format in which information is stored and transmitted. An AI-enabled court introduces systems capable of processing, classifying, predicting, translating, summarising or otherwise generating outputs from that information.

The e-Courts Project plays an important role in helping reach Sustainable Development Goal 16, which focuses on promoting peace, justice, and strong institutions, as well as making sure everyone has fair access to justice. By offering services like online case filing, sending court notices electronically, conducting virtual court sessions, allowing access to case updates and court decisions, and providing digital access to judicial information, e-Courts project can lower the challenges litigants face related to location, court processes, and costs. Digital judicial services are especially helpful for people who might find it hard to go to court or get access to court documents. Therefore, the e-Courts project may be seen not just as a technological upgrade but as a tool to make justice more accessible, inclusive, transparent, and efficient, which helps achieve the larger goals of SDG 16.

V.AI APPLICATIONS WITHIN THE FRAMEWORK OF e-COURTS PROJECT

In this section of the study, we shall be delineating the Artificial intelligence tools and services that are currently in practice in the Indian judicial delivery systems.

Firstly, it is pertinent to state that the Supreme Court's AI initiatives have included legal research assistance at the core and hence the advent and implementation of SUPACE i.e., Supreme Court Portal for Assistance in Court Efficiency was developed as an AI-based legal research assistance tool, while SUVAS was developed for judicial translation.[8]

SUPACE is an AI-assisted legal research and judicial assistance initiative developed for the Supreme Court. Its basic purpose is to assist judges and their research teams in dealing with large volumes of legal material. Its functions include searching and organising legal material, assisting in identification of relevant authorities, analysing large quantities of case material, assisting with case-law research, extracting relevant information from documents and supporting judges and research teams in preparing for hearings. It is to be noted that SUPACE is an assistance mechanism rather than an adjudicatory mechanism.

Secondly, we talk about yet another significant tool that is SUVAS which is an AI-based machine-assisted translation system that has been specifically designed for legal and judicial documents. SUVAS assists in translating judgments, orders, judicial documents and court records. SUVAS is not confined to the Supreme Court. It has been made available to the High Courts.

Thirdly we enlist the AI tool namely LegRAA i.e., the Legal Research Analysis Assistant which was developed by the Artificial Intelligence Division of NIC and the Centre of Excellence (e-Courts), NIC Pune. It has been designed to assist judicial officers with legal research, document analysis, identification and organisation of relevant legal material and judicial research. LegRAA has been developed under the Supreme Court for judicial officers, but at present it is applicable in only certain pilot deployments and not applicable universally across every court in India.

Further the fourth AI tool is the ASR-SHRUTI i.e., Automatic Speech Recognition (ASR) technology which converts spoken judicial dictation into machine-readable text and can potentially reduce the time and administrative resources which may be required for manual transcription. Its application facilitates the preparation of interim orders, procedural directions and judgments.

Moving further the fifth tool is PANINI, which is a language-translation component of Digital Courts 2.1. Its significance arises from the multilingual nature of the Indian judicial system and the constitutional and practical importance of making justice accessible across linguistic communities. AI-assisted translation can potentially facilitate the preparation and dissemination of judicial material in different Indian languages and reduce the time involved in conventional translation processes.

VI.CONSTITUTIONAL PRINCIPLES AND ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE

The connection between the bias that comes from using artificial intelligence technology and the basic rules in a country's constitution is one of the hardest problems in managing AI. Algorithmic bias happens when AI systems use old data that shows unfair treatment or unfairness in society, and then they repeat or amplify those unfair things in their processes and decisions. In the context of the Indian

[8]Department of Justice, Government of India, https://doj.gov.in (last visited Aug. 20, 2026).

judiciary, where decisions directly impact fundamental rights and freedoms, such bias poses serious constitutional concerns.[9]

Article 14 of the Indian Constitution guarantees equality before law and equal protection of laws. This principle, derived from Anglo-American law but has been implemented in accordance with the Indian conditions, requires that similarly situated individuals be treated similarly and prohibits arbitrary discrimination. The Supreme Court's interpretation of Article 14 has evolved to encompass both formal equality i.e., similar treatment and substantive equality i.e., recognition of structural disadvantages requiring differential treatment.

The artificial intelligence systems can adversely affect the equality where training data contains historical, social or institutional biases. For example, if a case-management system prioritises matters based upon historical disposal patterns without accounting for structural differences, apparently neutral intelligence applications may repeat the existing inequalities.

Therefore, judicial AI should regularly be tested for existing bias, representative-data assessment, periodic algorithmic audits, disparate-impact assessment and independent review.

The principle essentially is that the AI should not become a system through which historical judicial inequalities are technologically repeated and reproduced.

The deployment of AI systems in judicial processes creates potential violations of Article 14 in several ways. First, if AI systems are trained on historical legal data that reflects past discriminatory practices, they may perpetuate these patterns of discrimination. For example, if historical sentencing data shows disparate treatment based on caste, religion, or economic status, an AI system trained on this data might recommend similar disparate treatment in future cases.[10]

Second, biased algorithms can lead to new kinds of unfair treatment that might not be obvious at first. AI systems could pick up on factors that are linked to protected traits, which might result in unfair treatment without being obvious. For example, an AI system could use information like someone's home address or their schooling history, which often relates to their social group or income level, leading to unfair results even if it doesn't directly look at forbidden factors.

One big problem is that many AI systems are hard to understand, which makes it tough to spot and fight against unfair or biased results. If people don't know how an AI system came up with a recommendation that impacts their legal rights, they might not be able to properly argue against unfair decisions, which can weaken the real impact of equality guarantees.

Article 21 ensures that everyone has the right to life and personal freedom, and it also means they must be treated fairly during any legal process. The Supreme Court has interpreted Article 21 in a broad way, saying that if someone's life or freedom is taken away, it must be done through fair, just, and reasonable processes. This means you have the right to know what the charges are against you, the right to have a lawyer help you, and the right to get a decision that explains the reasons behind it.

Using AI in court decisions brings up many issues related to fair treatment under the law. Many AI algorithms work in a way that's hard to understand, so people might not know why certain decisions were made that affect their rights. This lack of transparency goes against the need for clear processes and the right to understand why a decision was made against someone.

Furthermore, if judges rely heavily on AI recommendations without independent analysis, there is a risk that the human judgment traditionally required in legal proceedings may be compromised. While AI can provide valuable analytical support, the constitutional requirement of fair procedures may demand that human judges maintain meaningful oversight and independent decision-making authority.

The nine-judge Bench in *Justice K.S. Puttaswamy (Retd.) v. Union of India*, (2017) 10 SCC 1, recognised privacy as a constitutionally protected right and explained that an invasion of privacy must satisfy legality, legitimate state purpose and proportionality.

AI systems trained upon judicial datasets should satisfy lawfulness, legitimate purpose, necessity, proportionality, security and accountability.

[9] V. Lo, H. Poosarla, A. Singhal, K. Li, H. Fu & P. Mui, *Unveiling Bias in ChatGPT-3.5: Analyzing Constitutional AI Principles for Politically Biased Responses*, J. Emerging Investigators (2024), https://doi.org/10.59720/24-047.

[10] A. G. & S. D., *Greening the Justice System: Assessing the Legality, Feasibility, and Potential of Artificial Intelligence in Advancing Environmental Sustainability Within the Indian Judiciary*, Frontiers in Pol. Sci. (2025), https://doi.org/10.3389/fpos.2025.1553705

In this context it shall be relevant to mention that the Digital Personal Data Protection Act, 2023 provides the contemporary statutory framework for processing digital personal data and establishes obligations for Data Fiduciaries and rights of Data Principals. Further the regulatory environment in the arena of protection of personal data and privacy has also developed further through the Digital Personal Data Protection Rules, 2025.

Therefore, it will not be wrong to decipher that any future judicial AI architecture must be designed with both constitutional privacy principles and applicable data-protection requirements in mind.

In *Swapnil Tripathi v. Supreme Court of India*, (2018) 10 SCC 639, the Supreme Court recognised the constitutional importance of live-streaming proceedings, while simultaneously recognising the need for safeguards relating to privacy, sensitive proceedings and the administration of justice, which reflects that the Hon'ble Apex court is welcoming of the new technology, but with due diligence and ensuring constitutional safeguards, are not compromised.

Moreover, it is to be noted that openness in lieu of transparency cannot mean unrestricted extraction and processing of personal information. AI systems processing publicly available court information must not automatically assume that every piece of public information is suitable for unrestricted profiling or secondary use.

In 2026, the Hon'ble Apex Court has dealt with a matter i.e., *Pooja Ramesh Singh v. Jammu and Kashmir Bank Ltd.*, 2026 INSC 668 involving reliance upon AI-generated, non-existent judgments. The Court took cognisance of the use of fabricated AI-generated judgments and indicated that the consequences raised questions concerning the integrity and accountability of the adjudicatory process.

VII. REGULATORY DEVELOPMENTS: INTERNATIONAL

In this section of the study, we shall delineate the regulatory systems in various international jurisdictions in respect of the adoption and use of artificial intelligence in the judicial delivery mechanisms.

i. European Union

The EU framework groups AI systems according to how much risk they pose, and AI systems used in court decisions are considered high-risk and must meet strict rules. The main parts of the EU approach involve requiring risk assessments, making sure information is open and clear, having people in charge to monitor things, and setting rules for accuracy and strength. The framework also needs checks to make sure AI systems are following rules and keeps watching them regularly, especially when they're used in risky situations.

For India, the EU's approach shows how to regulate in a forward-thinking way that protects basic rights while still letting new technologies develop. The risk-based classification system can be adjusted to fit India's situation, especially considering the special constitutional issues that come from the country's diverse social makeup.

ii. United States

The United States has extensive experience with algorithmic tools in criminal justice, providing both positive examples and cautionary tales for Indian policy makers. The use of risk assessment algorithms like COMPAS (Correctional Offender Management Profiling for Alternative Sanctions) in criminal sentencing has generated significant controversy and litigation.[11]

Studies have shown that some commonly used tools for assessing risk show racial bias, which has caused legal disputes and changes in policies in many states. The case of *State v. Loomis*[12] in Wisconsin shows how the state supreme court supported using algorithmic risk assessment in court decisions, but also made sure that its limits are clearly explained, highlighting both the possible advantages and legal issues that AI can bring to the justice system. The American experience shows how important it is to be open, check if AI systems are working properly, and keep watching them when they're used in legal situations. It also shows how challenges to the constitution can lead to changes in policies and better rules for managing AI. [13]

iii. China

China's use of AI in its "smart courts" system shows the biggest and most widespread application of artificial intelligence in legal processes around the world. Chinese courts are using artificial intelligence to help with filing cases, analyzing evidence, and even writing out court decisions in some specific types of cases. While the Chinese model has made big improvements in efficiency, some people say it focuses more on making government processes faster rather than protecting

[11] Aziz Z. Huq, *Racial Equity in Algorithmic Criminal Justice*, 68 Duke L.J. 1043 (2019).
[12] *State v. Loomis*, 881 N.W.2d 749 (Wis. 2016).
[13] Muthumaniraja, S. (2026). Rethinking English Language Education in the Age of Artificial Intelligence: From Language Proficiency to Human Competencies. ShodhAI: Journal of Artificial Intelligence, 3(2), 15–29. https://doi.org/10.29121/shodhai.v3.i2.2026.97.

individual rights. The way China uses AI in their courts shows what's possible with technology in legal systems, but it also reminds us that we need to make sure people's rights and fair processes are always protected. No AI-made legal authority should be considered as a real legal authority unless it is checked against an official legal source on its own. For India, the lesson is not definitely about copying laws from other countries. [14]

India should create an AI system for the courts that works well with its constitution, ensures judges can make fair decisions on their own, handles the court system across different states, supports multiple languages, helps people who don't have good internet access, uses a lot of court data, uses the existing online court system, and follows the country's rules on protecting personal information. [15]

VIII.CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

Based on the comprehensive analysis conducted in this research, several key findings emerge regarding the constitutional implications of AI integration in the Indian judiciary.

AI is already playing an important role in the Indian court system and should not be seen just as something that will happen in the future. e-Courts Phase III lays a strong technological base for using AI in judicial management.

The main issue in the implementation and use of artificial intelligence does not lie in the constitution bias, but whether using it harms things like equal treatment, personal privacy, respect for people, fair processes, or the ability to get justice. Right now, the Indian judiciary is using AI, but it's not used very widely. This limited use shows that there are still shortcomings in its adoption and implementation. The lack of clear rules that specifically deal with AI bias in court situations can lead to issues that infringe Articles 14 and 21. Without proper precautions, even AI systems that are meant to do good can weaken the basic rights guaranteed by the constitution, such as equality and fair treatment in legal matters. Further, AI-enabled services under the e-Courts project can contribute to India's Sustainable Development goals, especially SDGs 9, 10 and 16, only when efficiency and innovation are pursued within a constitutional framework guaranteeing equality, privacy, procedural fairness, transparency, accountability and meaningful human oversight.

The current laws in India, like the Information Technology Act and new data protection rules, are not enough to deal with the special problems caused by biased algorithms in court decisions. These frameworks mainly pay attention to protecting data and ensuring technical security, instead of focusing on protecting constitutional rights when it comes to using AI. There is no specific regulatory mechanism that deals with the implementation of the artificial intelligence and related technology in the court procedures and delivery of justice.

When looking at how different countries are using AI in their courts, it shows that India is not keeping up with the best practices followed by other nations, especially the European Union, which has a strong focus on protecting people's rights through its approach to AI. India is good at developing technical AI, but the rules and laws for managing AI need a lot of improvement.

India's courts are going through a change in how they use technology, and things are moving to a new level now. The question is no longer if Indian courts should use technology, because the e-Courts Project has already made technology a key part of how the judiciary works. The bigger challenge is figuring out how to use more advanced technologies, especially Artificial Intelligence, in a way that doesn't weaken the basic rules that guide court decisions.

e-Courts Phase III provides an integral opportunity. The goal of building digital, online, and paperless courts along with smart systems, digitization, and new technologies can greatly improve access to justice and make court administration more efficient. However, efficiency alone should not be the only way to judge judicial technology. A court is very different from a regular government office because the decisions it makes can affect a person's freedom, belongings, respect, and basic rights protected by the constitution. The fairness of court decisions relies on logical reasoning, unbiased judgment, fair procedures, and being answerable to others. The constitutional rulings in Puttaswamy, Anuradha Bhasin, and Swapnil Tripathi, along with the Supreme Court's recognition of evidence gathered through technology in Praful B Desai, are all important legal decisions.

[14] Talbert, P. Y., & Talbert, P. S. (2026). Transforming Human Resources Operations Through Artificial Intelligence: Foundations, Opportunities, and Challenges. ShodhAI: Journal of Artificial Intelligence, 3(1), 20–28. https://doi.org/10.29121/shodhai.v3.i1.2026.65

[15] Nagwanshee, R. and Kumar, A. (2025). Traditional Economic Practices of Birhor Tribe of Chhattisgarh and Its Relevance for Sustainable Development., ShodhSamajik: Journal of Social Studies,2(2), 1–11. https://doi.org/10.29121/ShodhSamajik.v2.i2.2025.22.

The integration of AI into the e-Courts Project represents an important stage in the digital transformation of the Indian judiciary and has the potential to support India's Sustainable Development Goals. Its strongest connection is with SDG 16, particularly access to justice, effective institutions and the rule of law. It may also advance SDG 9 through digital innovation and infrastructure and SDG 10 by reducing certain geographical, linguistic and procedural barriers. However, technological efficiency should not be equated with justice. AI in courts must remain consistent with Articles 14, 19 and 21 of the Constitution, natural justice, judicial independence, privacy, open justice and procedural fairness. AI should function as an assistive technology and not replace judicial application of mind or human responsibility. Sustainable development by AI-enabled courts therefore require transparency, data protection, bias and accuracy testing, human review, accountability mechanisms and accessible alternatives for persons affected by the digital divide. The future of e-Courts project should consequently be understood as constitutionally compliant digital justice, where technological innovation, fundamental rights and sustainable development operate together.

The future of the Indian e-Courts Project should be built on a model that focuses on people, where Artificial Intelligence works under the watch of judges, has legal protections, ensures privacy, is accountable for its decisions, follows strong security rules, and has good ways to check and review its actions. India needs to create a clear set of rules that specifically deal with how AI is used in court processes. Further an independent regulatory body should be established with technical expertise and constitutional authority to oversee AI use in the judiciary and comprehensive training programs should be developed for judges, lawyers, and court staff on AI systems, their capabilities, limitations, and constitutional implications.