



ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE IN LEGAL EDUCATION: OPPORTUNITIES, CHALLENGES, AND ETHICAL IMPLICATIONS FOR THE FUTURE OF LEGAL PRACTICE

Dr. Akshatha A.P.¹

¹ Principal, Vivekananda Law College, Puttur, D.K. Karnataka

Abstract

Over the past three years law schools have changed in ways nobody planned for. Artificial intelligence has moved from the margins of the syllabus into the ordinary working day of students and teachers, so that law is now researched, taught and drafted with machine assistance, and in a few jurisdictions decided with it too. This article sets out to examine what that shift involves. It follows a line of development from case-method instruction, through the migration of legal materials to electronic databases and the arrival of e-filing, to classrooms in which adaptive modules and natural-language research tools come pre-installed. There are things here worth having. Retrieval is quicker. A student can rehearse drafting far more often than any teacher could realistically mark, run an advocacy simulation on a Tuesday evening, or work through a module pitched to what she personally got wrong last week; and legal aid, at the far end of all this, might reach people it does not reach now. The costs are no less concrete. Uneven distribution of infrastructure. Lack of training to the faculties. No judicial decisions on generative systems produce authority. Difficulties in auditing authorship to police and student data accumulates servers. Worst of all, students may quietly stop doing the analytical work a legal education exists to teach.

¹ Principal, Vivekananda Law College, Puttur, D.K. Karnataka

The argument is grounded in Indian law throughout. Four sources do most of the work: the privacy right recognised in *Justice K.S. Puttaswamy (Retd.) v. Union of India*,²; the Digital Personal Data Protection Act, 2023³; the Information Technology Act, 2000⁴; and the positions the University Grants Commission and the Bar Council of India have taken, or in the Bar Council's case declined to take. Indian material is thin, so researcher has supplemented it from three comparative sources: the UNESCO Guidance for Generative AI in Education and Research (2023)⁵, the OECD Recommendation on Artificial Intelligence (OECD/LEGAL/0449)⁶, and Regulation (EU) 2024/1689.⁷ The method is doctrinal. Fifteen findings emerge, and fifteen recommendations follow from them, addressed to universities, the Bar Council, the UGC, faculty and students. There is a potential force on legal education in choosing between human judgment and AI assistance. The real choice is not whether AI will become part of legal education, but how it will be used. Law schools can either adopt it in a structured way, with proper supervision, verification, and meaningful human oversight, or allow it to spread without guidance. If left unchecked, its use could undermine analytical rigour, weaken professional responsibility, and widen existing challenges in access to justice.

Keywords: Artificial Intelligence; Legal Education; Legal Technology; Data Protection; Academic Integrity; Access to Justice; Algorithmic Accountability; Bar Council of India

1. Introduction

1.1 The Meaning of Artificial Intelligence

Artificial intelligence is often described in different ways, depending on who is defining it and the purpose behind the definition. In its broadest sense, it refers to computer systems capable of performing tasks that are typically associated with human intelligence, such as understanding language, recognizing patterns, making predictions, drawing inferences, and supporting decision-making. Within legal technology, AI is commonly divided into two broad categories: *narrow AI*, which is designed to perform specific tasks such as document review or citation checking, and *generative AI*, which produces new text in response to user prompts.

While these classifications are useful for explaining the technology, they are less helpful in understanding its implications for legal education. For the purposes of this article, a more meaningful distinction is functional. Some AI systems assist by locating, organizing, and presenting existing legal information, whereas others generate original legal prose that closely resembles legal reasoning without possessing the judgment, professional responsibility, or ethical understanding that underpins the practice of law. This distinction is central to the discussion that follows, as many of the opportunities and challenges associated with AI in legal education, particularly concerns about fabricated information, overreliance, and academic integrity, arise from this generative capability.

1.2 Evolution of Artificial Intelligence

The development of artificial intelligence is often described as unfolding in three broad phases, although the transition from one stage to another has never been entirely clear-cut. The earliest phase, during the 1970s

² *Justice K.S. Puttaswamy (Retd.) v. Union of India*, (2017) 10 SCC 1 (India).

³ Digital Personal Data Protection Act, No. 22 of 2023, India Code (2023).

⁴ Information Technology Act, No. 21 of 2000, India Code (2000).

⁵ UNESCO, Guidance for Generative AI in Education and Research (UNESCO 2023).

⁶ OECD, Recommendation of the Council on Artificial Intelligence, OECD/LEGAL/0449 (adopted 2019, amended 2024).

⁷ Regulation (EU) 2024/1689 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 13 June 2024 Laying Down Harmonised Rules on Artificial Intelligence (Artificial Intelligence Act), 2024 O.J. (L 1689) 1.

and 1980s, was marked by the rise of expert systems that attempted to replicate legal reasoning through sets of predefined "if-then" rules. While these systems showed promise, they also revealed an important limitation. Legal reasoning is not simply a matter of applying fixed rules; it is deeply interpretive, shaped by context, competing principles, and human judgment. As a result, much of the complexity of legal decision-making proved resistant to this rule-based approach. What came next, the statistical and machine-learning systems of the 1990s onwards, worked better largely because they were less ambitious, restricting themselves to ranking cases by relevance and predicting outcomes from the historical record. The current phase belongs to large language models trained on very large text corpora, which will summarise a judgment, draft a clause, take one side of a Socratic exchange, and produce paragraphs of confident legal prose on request. Each phase has altered legal teaching to some degree. What distinguishes the present one is its speed: generative tools were embedded in the working habits of students and faculty well before any institution had settled a considered view about them.

1.3 Emergence of AI in Legal Education

Legal education has never absorbed new technology quickly, and the reasons for this are structural. A discipline built on precedent, taught through the case method and policed by bar examinations offers the early adopter very little. Generative AI, when it arrived, therefore came from outside, carried on the same wave of consumer chatbots that reached the rest of higher education, and most universities waited to see how serious the problem would become before committing anything to writing. The most useful evidence available is the scoping review by Steve Lorteau and Douglas Sarro, which synthesises eighty-two academic works published between January 2020 and April 2025 across twenty-six jurisdictions.⁸ Two of its conclusions sit awkwardly together and should be read together: large language models perform below average on law-school assessments unless prompted with considerable care, yet they are of concrete value as teaching aids, drafting assistants and organisers of interactive exercises. Indian commentators describe adoption in this country as patchy, with trained faculty and structured programmes falling well short of what demand would justify.

1.4 The Need for AI-Driven Legal Learning

Why pursue AI-driven legal learning at all? Three pressures, and only one of them is really about technology. The profession has already moved: research, due diligence, contract review and e-discovery are done with these tools now, so the graduate who has never opened one starts behind, and the gap compounds. Then there is India's access-to-justice deficit. With the arrears the courts are carrying, and so few lawyers practising outside the cities, AI-assisted legal aid, legal literacy tools and translation earn attention on instrumental grounds alone. The third pressure is closer to home. Students arriving at Indian law schools, above all in the five-year integrated programmes that recruit straight out of school, come with wildly uneven preparation, and adaptive technology is at least a plausible answer to that.

2. Artificial Intelligence and Legal Education

2.1 Evolution of Legal Education

The Indian law degree started as an apprenticeship. Students learned in the chambers of practising advocates. University law departments, growing up through the colonial and early post-independence decades, formalised that training without displacing it. Then came 1987, and the National Law School of India

⁸ Steve Lorteau & Douglas Sarro, Artificial Intelligence in Legal Education: A Scoping Review, 60 Law Teacher, no. 1 (2026), <https://doi.org/10.1080/03069400.2025.2592440>.

University at Bangalore, whose template has shaped elite legal education ever since. Each of these stages brought teaching nearer to professional competence. The method underneath barely moved until the digital era: students learned law by arguing their way through judicial reasoning, one case at a time.

2.2 Traditional Legal Education

Once the variations between institutions are stripped away, traditional Indian legal education reduces to four elements: lectures, moots, doctrinal examinations and the clinical work required by the Bar Council of India. Its virtues are substantial, since students read primary texts closely and are made to argue about them at length. Its failings will be familiar to anyone who has taught within the system: classes too large to teach properly, faculty-student ratios that make individual feedback impossible, limited practical exposure outside a handful of well-known institutions, and an examination culture that rewards memory more reliably than analysis.

2.3 Digital Transformation

Digitisation proceeded in stages and largely without announcement. Legal research moved from the print reporters to SCC Online and Manupatra; the judiciary adopted case management and e-filing; and the pandemic then shifted a great deal of teaching online within a matter of weeks, whether or not institutions were prepared for it. The AI layer is now being constructed on top of that digital layer and on the working habits it left behind.

2.4 AI-Powered Legal Education

The applications grouped under this heading are separated below for convenience of exposition. In practice they overlap considerably, and most institutions encounter them as a single bundle, not as a series of discrete choices.

2.5 Smart Classrooms

A smart classroom consists of a collection of small automations: attendance tracking, live transcription, notes generated without anyone taking them, and dashboards indicating to faculty which students have stopped participating. Within Indian law schools this equipment is concentrated almost entirely in the better-funded National Law Universities and private universities. The pattern of distribution simply reproduces the digital divide discussed in Part 4.

2.6 Adaptive Learning

Adaptive platforms alter the sequence and difficulty of the material a student encounters, whether in a constitutional law module or across a series of contract-drafting exercises, according to what the student has already demonstrated. In theory the appeal is obvious: weaker students receive additional scaffolding, stronger students are not held back, and the teacher's attention is freed for the cases that require it.

2.7 Personalised Education

Personalisation extends the same logic, tuning readings, practice questions and feedback to the particular errors an individual student repeat. Its advocates describe engagement that is more intuitive and more student-centred, and hope that it will narrow the gap between students who arrived from very different schools. One objection should be taken seriously. An engine trained on thin or unrepresentative data will reproduce whatever pattern it was given, and there is no guarantee that the pattern favours the students who most need assistance.

2.8 Legal Research Automation

AI-assisted research tools, including natural-language case search, automatic headnote generation and citation networks, can compress hours of retrieval into minutes. The quality of the output depends on two unglamorous variables: the database sitting behind the tool, and the precision with which the question was framed.

2.9 Virtual Legal Assistants and AI Tutors

Chatbot assistants and AI tutors will answer a doctrinal question at two in the morning, generate flashcards and conduct Socratic practice dialogues of a kind. Used well, they extend what a teacher is able to offer. They do not replace one, and students are better told so directly than left to discover it in a viva.

2.10 AI-Powered Assessment

Automated essay scoring promises consistency, and much faster feedback, both of which matter where scripts can take months to come back. What happens inside the machine is another matter. Scoring rubrics are seldom open to inspection, and nobody has yet settled whether an automated marker can tell genuine originality in legal argument from a familiar pattern competently reproduced.

2.11 Online Legal Education

Massive open online courses, university-hosted online LL.M. programmes and hybrid delivery have carried legal education well beyond the campus catchments that once determined who could study law. AI now operates inside most of these platforms, running proctoring, recommending content and moderating discussion forums, usually without students noticing its presence.

3. Opportunities Created by Artificial Intelligence

3.1 Improved Legal Research and Intelligent Case Law Analysis

Given a well-framed question, an AI-enabled research platform will retrieve relevant precedent from a very large database, flag authority that has been overruled or distinguished, and produce a serviceable first summary. The pedagogical gain here is one of proportion. Less of a student's week is consumed by retrieval and more of it is available for working out what the material means and how an argument might be built from it.

3.2 Drafting Assistance

A generative tool will produce a first-draft pleading, clause or memorandum within seconds, and such a draft is more useful in a classroom than a model answer. Handed to students with instructions to identify the weak reasoning, the missing element and the assertion supported by nothing, it teaches critical reading in a way that polished examples seldom achieve. Students who have taken a machine draft apart tend afterwards to read their own work differently.

3.3 Personalised Learning and Virtual Moot Courts

Simulation tools, among them virtual moot platforms that generate opposing arguments or imitate questioning from the bench, allow a student to practise repeatedly and at low stakes without waiting for a faculty member to become available. In institutions where a single teacher supervises forty mooters, this matters more than it

may appear. Such tools sit alongside the supervised moot training required under the Bar Council of India's clinical education norms; they do not discharge that requirement.

3.4 Predictive and Learning Analytics

Applied to student performance data, predictive analytics can identify a student in difficulty weeks before the mid-semester examination. Judicial analytics serve a different purpose and require greater caution. Used carefully, though, they show students how sentencing or interim-relief practice actually differs from bench to bench. That is a useful corrective to the notion that litigation strategy can be picked up from appellate judgments alone.

3.5 Language Translation and Access to Justice

India's linguistic range makes machine translation of judgments and legal materials into regional languages something more than a convenience. It complements the Tele-Law programme and might in time do a good deal more. Legal aid chatbots, carefully deployed, can put preliminary legal information in front of people who currently have none. What they cannot do is give legal advice. That limit belongs in the design of the tool, visible to the user, not buried in a disclaimer at the foot of the screen.

3.6 Legal Innovation, Skill Enhancement, and Continuing Professional Development

A student who has worked with these tools across the degree leaves holding what firms and in-house teams now call, a little awkwardly, the competencies of the legal technologist. The same familiarity lowers the cost of learning later, after graduation, when nobody hands you a reading list and keeping current is your own problem.

3.7 Increased Efficiency

Put together, the gains show up at three levels. Students get feedback sooner. Faculty carry less administration. Institutions can teach at a greater scale, and that last point warrants emphasis in a system where many law schools run on a fraction of the staff their student numbers would require.

4. Challenges in AI-Based Legal Education

4.1 The Digital Divide and Infrastructure Limitations

Reliable internet, institutional licences and personal devices are not evenly distributed across Indian law schools, and enthusiasm about AI does nothing to alter that. National Law Universities and well-funded private institutions can purchase sophisticated tools together with the training needed to use them; a great many state and affiliated colleges can purchase neither. Left unaddressed, the outcome is a two-tier system in which AI literacy becomes one more advantage the privileged student arrives already holding, instead of something the institution supplies.

4.2 Faculty Resistance and Lack of AI Literacy

Faculty scepticism about generative AI looks much the same in law as in any other discipline. Most law teachers have had no structured training in these tools and have formed their views from newspaper coverage and from instances of student misuse. Others resist on more considered grounds, taking the view that AI will further thin an engagement with primary sources that was already thinner than anyone would wish.

4.3 Cost of Implementation

Adopting AI in legal education involves far more than simply purchasing software. Enterprise-grade legal AI platforms require expensive licensing, faculty need training to use them effectively, and institutions must invest in ongoing technical support and maintenance. These are recurring costs rather than one-time investments, covering subscriptions, staff, and system upkeep. For many law schools, particularly those outside the National Law University system, meeting these expenses is likely to be difficult without external financial support or targeted funding from the UGC.

4.4 Addiction to AI and lack of analytical thinking

If I had to pick the most common objection to the use of AI summaries and AI drafts from the first year, and also the one I find most difficult to rebut, it would be that one would never be able to develop the ability to reason through a legal problem without AI assistance. This ability isn't developed overnight. It arises from the kind of tedious, awkward encounter with a challenging text the case method requires people to have, and there's no alternative to this. It's not just speed for depth, either. Legal reasoning is a certified Professional Skill. Where it doesn't materialise, the cost is realised much later, when representation is received by clients, and when the courts have to deal with the consequences as a result of this.

4.5 Algorithmic Bias

The biases in historical legal data will be reflected in a system trained on that data, but will appear as though it's neutral, making it much more difficult to attack than a biased human would be. The typical example is predictive sentencing tools, and the other is resume-screening tools used in recruitment of clerks. If it becomes a weapon of this kind being used for shaping access to opportunity within an educational institution, it is not a moral matter any longer. Articles 14 and 15 of the Constitution are now directly engaged.

4.6 Hallucination in AI Systems

Fluency is not accurate and generative systems provide a lot of the former without the need of the latter. References to opinions in which no cases were decided. Name of a case that has been made up. Statutory provisions which were never there in the Acts. The accepted term for this is hallucination, which seems a bit too mild of a term when it is applied to a legal context, where accurate citations and verified authority are being taught. Now, citations that have been "fabbed" appear in courts in a number of countries. In *Mata v. Avianca, Inc.*, Judge Castel sanctioned counsel who prepared a brief using the AI program ChatGPT on the basis of six fictional cases and who then continued to stand behind those citations after the court started posing questions.⁹ Even that one incident is sufficient to teach students how to take anything from AI with a grain of salt, as it should be done every single time without fail.

4.7 Academic Misconduct and Plagiarism

Undisclosed use of generative AI in assignments, dissertations and doctoral theses raises questions of authorship that the existing regulatory framework was never designed to answer. India's plagiarism regulations operate through a tiered, similarity-based penalty structure built around textual copying, which is close to useless against text that copies nothing and matches nothing. The UGC has issued supplementary

⁹ *Mata v. Avianca, Inc.*, 678 F. Supp. 3d 443 (S.D.N.Y. 2023).

guidance asking institutions to remain alert to AI-generated content, but guidance cannot repair a definition framed for a different problem.

4.8 Data Privacy and Cybersecurity

Learning platforms collect a great deal of information about how students behave and how they perform, at a level of detail no paper register ever produced. Collection on that scale engages the fundamental right to privacy recognised in *Justice K.S. Puttaswamy (Retd.) v. Union of India*,¹⁰ and is now regulated by the Digital Personal Data Protection Act, 2023¹¹. Cloud-hosted tools also widen the cybersecurity exposure of institutions that frequently employ nobody whose actual job is information security.

4.9 Reliability of AI-Generated Legal Research and Quality Assurance

An institution bringing AI into its curriculum must build the checking apparatus at the same time and not afterwards: quality assurance, verification protocols and disclosure requirements. Where these are absent, AI-assisted work drifts below the evidentiary and citation standards professional legal work demands, and the drift is gradual enough that nobody notices until a piece of it fails publicly.

5. Ethical Implications

5.1 The principle of professional ethics, confidentiality and data protection.

Professional ethics in the law is based on privacy and competent representation, and both are invoked as soon as a student enters case information into a software that is not his/her own. The Bar Council of India Rules do not stop and the general duty of care doesn't stop just because the recipient is a machine. However, in most instances, no party has read the vendor's terms sufficiently to state on whose eyes the input falls or who else will see it or retain it for how long. On top of this come the consent and purpose-limitation duties of the Digital Personal Data Protection Act, 2023¹² that data fiduciaries are required to abide by when it comes to student data and, in clinical settings, client data as well. Then there are the duties of the Digital Personal Data Protection Act, 2023 that law schools and legal-AI vendors must keep to when it comes to student data and, in clinical contexts, client data as well.

5.2 Transparency, Explainability and Accountability

While many machine learning systems cannot explain why a result was reached, this is what a great many systems cannot. In law, it is not simply a quibble, reasoned justification forms part of the legitimacy of a decision, which is judged, a grade, or an offer of admission. The ethical bases agree on this very limited ground: The person whose rights or opportunities are impacted by an automated system should be able to request an explanation and have the decision reconsidered by a human.

5.3 Fairness and Bias

A student's journey through an institution goes through a number of points of fairness concerns. One of these are admissions algorithms. A second (and the studies here make uncomfortable reading) is automated

¹⁰ Supra note 2.

¹¹ Digital Personal Data Protection Act, 2023, supra note 3.

¹² Digital Personal Data Protection Act, 2023, supra note 3.

proctoring, which has been proven to be quite adept at reading into darker skin pigments, or the movements of disabilities, as cheating. A third occurs if the predictive tools are machine-learned from skewed litigation data. A third is when the predictive tools are machine-learned from skewed litigation data. The practical lesson will be on the aspect of sequence. Bias auditing should happen prior to adoption as an audit performed afterwards has a victim.

5.4 Responsible AI and Human Oversight

For all the disagreement about AI governance, the international instruments point one way. UNESCO's Guidance for Generative AI in Education and Research (2023)¹³ asks institutions to work out what they are trying to achieve pedagogically before working out what to buy. The OECD Recommendation on Artificial Intelligence (OECD/LEGAL/0449, adopted 2019, amended 2024)¹⁴ names human-centred values, transparency, robustness and accountability as its governing principles. India has endorsed them.

5.5 Academic Integrity, Copyright, and Intellectual Property

Generative AI unsettles the conceptions of authorship and originality on which plagiarism policy and copyright law both depend. Under the Copyright Act, 1957¹⁵, authorship vests in a person. Whether AI-assisted or AI-generated content can attract copyright at all, and who should be named as author if it can, has been answered neither by the Indian courts nor by the Copyright Office, and the question will not remain theoretical for much longer.

5.6 Ethical Obligations of Future Lawyers

Habits formed in a classroom travel into practice, which is why law schools carry a particular responsibility here. Take a graduate who never learned to verify AI output, or to disclose its use where disclosure is expected, or to notice the point at which a tool stops being reliable. The gap travels with that graduate into court, and before clients entitled to assume otherwise. Build the habit early, then, and build it through teachers who can be seen practising it themselves.

6. Artificial Intelligence and the Future of Legal Practice

6.1 AI-Assisted Law Firms and Legal Analytics

Due diligence review, research, litigation analytics: firms are using AI across all three already, and what this does to entry-level work is larger than most curricula have admitted. The junior associate spends less of the day now reading through boxes of documents. Most of it goes on supervising a machine and verifying what it produced, which is a different skill, and harder to teach than the one it replaces. Better for curriculum design to anticipate the shift than to learn of it from the placement statistics.

6.2 Predictive Litigation, Smart Contracts, and Contract Automation

Using predictive analytics to value cases and shape settlement strategy is uncontroversial enough. Smart contracts are harder. Code that performs a contractual obligation automatically, once a condition is met, does

¹³ UNESCO Guidance, supra note 5.

¹⁴ OECD Recommendation, supra note 6.

¹⁵ Copyright Act, No. 14 of 1957, India Code (1957).

not follow the human sequence of formation, breach and remedy that the Indian Contract Act, 1872¹⁶ presupposes, and Indian courts have had almost no occasion to work out what follows from that mismatch.

6.3 E-Discovery and Online Dispute Resolution

E-discovery tools accelerate the identification of relevant documents in heavy litigation and arbitration, and the saving is measured in weeks. Online dispute resolution platforms, promoted by NITI Aayog in its ODR policy plan¹⁷ and by the judiciary for high-volume, low-complexity disputes, use AI to triage cases and propose settlements. Questions of consent and comprehension arise which enthusiasm for scale tends to hurry past.

6.4 AI-Assisted Compliance and Client Counselling

Compliance work in banking, data protection and securities law now leans heavily on automated monitoring, and client counselling is beginning to follow, with preliminary risk assessments generated by machine and subsequently reviewed by a lawyer. Whether that review is real or nominal is a question a law school ought to put to its students before an employer puts it to them.

6.5 The Role of Lawyers, Future Legal Skills, and Human-AI Collaboration

On the whole the comparative literature does not predict that AI will replace lawyers. It predicts that AI will absorb particular tasks, and that a legal professional's value will move towards judgment, negotiation, advocacy and honest counsel, which are the things machines do worst. Assuming that reading holds, and I think broadly it does, a curriculum has to do two jobs at once: build those durable human competencies, and teach technical AI literacy alongside them. Treating the two as a choice is how institutions end up doing neither well.

7. Legal and Regulatory Framework

7.1 Constitutional Considerations

The constitutional starting point is Article 21. Its guarantee of life and personal liberty was read in *Justice K.S. Puttaswamy (Retd.) v. Union of India*,¹⁸ to include an independent right to privacy with informational privacy among its facets, so that any AI system profiling students or litigants engages that right directly. Articles 14 and 15 supply the equality framework against which algorithmic bias in admissions, grading or the allocation of legal aid must be tested. Article 19(1)(a), as construed in *Shreya Singhal v. Union of India*,¹⁹, limits how loosely a future AI statute may be drafted, a constraint Indian legislative drafting has required before.

7.2 Digital Personal Data Protection Act, 2023

The DPDP Act is built on consent, imposes purpose limitation and data minimisation on data fiduciaries, and establishes a Data Protection Board with adjudicatory powers. Its application to AI-enabled learning management systems and legal-AI platforms holding student and client data is straightforward as a matter of

¹⁶ Indian Contract Act, No. 9 of 1872, India Code (1872).

¹⁷ NITI Aayog, Designing the Future of Dispute Resolution: The ODR Policy Plan for India (2021).

¹⁸ Supra note 2.

¹⁹ *Shreya Singhal v. Union of India*, (2015) 5 SCC 1 (India).

law. Whether the institutions operating those systems understand that they are data fiduciaries is a separate question.

7.3 Information Technology Act, 2000

The IT Act supplies the baseline for electronic records, digital signatures, intermediary liability and cybersecurity obligations, and it reaches AI platforms operating as intermediaries or data processors. For an institution holding sensitive student data, the provision most likely to matter in practice is section 43A²⁰, with its standard of reasonable security practices. Alongside it sits the Bharatiya Sakshya Adhiniyam, 2023²¹, which now governs the admissibility of electronic records and will determine how machine-generated legal work product is proved should a dispute over it reach a court.

7.4 UGC and Bar Council of India Guidelines

The UGC's plagiarism regulations of 2018²² establish a tiered penalty structure keyed to textual similarity. Institutions have since been left to stretch that structure, with the help of later advisories, over a problem for which it was not drafted. The Bar Council of India continues to regulate legal education principally through curriculum and clinical-training mandates under the Legal Education Rules, and has said nothing specific about AI. Part 11 returns to that silence, which is by now the more serious of the two gaps.

7.5 National Education Policy, 2020

NEP 2020²³ commits itself to technology-enabled, multidisciplinary and skills-oriented higher education. Whatever one makes of the policy as a whole, it gives AI integration in legal curricula a footing that would otherwise be lacking. Its emphasis on critical thinking, flexible credit-based learning and the use of technology in teaching is directly usable by a law school designing an AI module and seeking institutional cover to do so.

7.6 International Instruments and Comparative Approaches

Three instruments repay comparison. The UNESCO Guidance²⁴ presses for an approach to AI in education that is human-centred, age-appropriate and respectful of rights, which is easier to endorse than to operationalise. The OECD AI Principles²⁵ set out inclusive growth, human-centred values, transparency, robustness and accountability as cross-cutting standards. Regulation (EU) 2024/1689, the Artificial Intelligence Act²⁶, is the most concrete of the three. It sorts systems by risk, and it puts those used in education and in the administration of justice into the high-risk tier, which brings obligations of conformity assessment, transparency and human oversight. There is something in that structure for Indian policymakers even if they decide against adopting it.

²⁰ Information Technology Act, 2000, Section 43A, supra note 4.

²¹ Bharatiya Sakshya Adhiniyam, No. 47 of 2023, India Code (2023).

²² University Grants Commission (Promotion of Academic Integrity and Prevention of Plagiarism in Higher Educational Institutions) Regulations, 2018, Gazette of India, pt. III sec. 4 (July 23, 2018).

²³ Ministry of Human Resource Development, National Education Policy 2020 (Govt. of India 2020).

²⁴ UNESCO Guidance, supra note 5.

²⁵ OECD Recommendation, supra note 6.

²⁶ Regulation (EU) 2024/1689, supra note 7.

8. Case Studies: AI Adoption in Indian Law Schools

The National Law Universities got there first, as they usually do. SCC Online's AI-search features and Manupatra are built into their teaching, and a growing number of these institutions now run electives or certificate courses on law and technology, on legal analytics, or on AI and the law. Add the National Programme on Technology Enhanced Learning, and dedicated bodies such as India's Society for Artificial Intelligence and Law, and it is clear that real institutional effort is going into AI literacy within the academy. The literature is still consistent, though, about how few trained faculty and structured programmes exist across the system as a whole. A handful of well-resourced institutions cannot make that up.

From the other end of the system the picture inverts. State university law departments and affiliated colleges, which between them teach most of India's law graduates, report almost no institutional adoption at all. What they report instead is unregulated student use of consumer chatbots for assignments and examination preparation: the integrity and equity problems of Parts 4 and 5, with none of the pedagogical benefit. If a single fact about AI in Indian legal education belongs above the rest, this is it. The gap between the flagship National Law Universities and the wider affiliated-college system will decide whether AI narrows the existing disparities in the quality of legal education in this country or widens them. Nothing in current policy makes the first outcome look likely.

Some clinical programmes have started experimenting with AI-assisted legal aid, chatbot tools offering preliminary legal information alongside law school clinics, built on infrastructure such as the Tele-Law programme. What is missing is any published evaluation of what these experiments do for the people who use them. That absence is one of the clearer openings for empirical work, and Indian law schools are unusually well placed to take it up.

9. Relevant Case Law

No Indian court has yet decided a dispute arising directly from AI use within legal education, and Indian AI case law generally remains thin. This section therefore proceeds differently. It sets out the constitutional and regulatory jurisprudence on privacy, data protection, free speech and technology regulation that transfers most readily to this context, and identifies the doctrinal gap that legislation or litigation will eventually be forced to fill.

9.1 Privacy and Data Protection

Justice K.S. Puttaswamy (Retd.) v. Union of India,²⁷ recognised privacy as a fundamental right under Article 21 and established the proportionality standard that AI-enabled data collection in an educational setting must now satisfy. The Aadhaar judgment, *Justice K.S. Puttaswamy (Retd.) v. Union of India*,²⁸, applied that standard to large-scale biometric collection and algorithmic identity verification. It remains the closest Indian precedent on the proportionality and necessity analysis that would govern an institutional AI system processing biometric or behavioural data about students. AI-based examination proctoring is the obvious case awaiting a challenge.

²⁷ Supra note 2.

²⁸ *Justice K.S. Puttaswamy (Retd.) v. Union of India*, (2019) 1 SCC 1 (India) (Aadhaar case).

9.2 Technology Regulation and Free Speech

Shreya Singhal v. Union of India,²⁹ struck down section 66A of the Information Technology Act, 2000³⁰ as vague and overbroad. The principle it laid down, that technology regulation restricting speech must be narrowly tailored, will constrain any future Indian statute attempting to regulate AI-generated academic or professional content, and drafters would do well to keep the judgment open beside them.

9.3 Copyright and Authorship

No reported Indian decision has determined whether AI-generated or AI-assisted work attracts copyright, or how joint human-AI authorship would be treated under section 2(d) of the Copyright Act, 1957³¹. In November 2020 the Copyright Office registered the artwork 'Suryast', listing the RAGHAV Artificial Intelligence Painting App as co-author alongside Ankit Sahni, and subsequently issued a withdrawal notice drawing attention to sections 2(d)(iii) and 2(d)(vi) of the Act.³² The sequence says something about the state of official thinking. The position is a live doctrinal gap and not a settled rule, and it will most probably be resolved by a dispute nobody has anticipated.

9.4 The Doctrinal Gap

The absence of AI-specific Indian case law is itself one of this article's findings. Institutions, faculty and students are working with general constitutional and statutory guardrails and nothing more, in place of jurisprudence shaped around the particular risks AI creates in education. Part 11 sets out steps that would close that gap before contentious litigation closes it on terms we do not choose.

10. Tables

Table 1: Illustrative AI Tools Used in Legal Education

Category	Illustrative Tools / Platforms	Primary Use in Legal Education
Legal Research	SCC Online AI-Search, Manupatra, CaseMine	Locating authority, mapping citation histories, auto-drafted headnotes
Drafting Assistance	Generative AI chatbots, contract-drafting assistants	First-draft memoranda and clauses supplied to students for critique
Simulation & Practice	AI-assisted moot court and negotiation simulators	Repeat practice in argument; simulated questioning from the bench
Learning Management	AI-enabled LMS with adaptive modules	Sequencing of content to the individual learner; progress dashboards
Legal Aid & Translation	Chatbot-based legal information tools, machine translation	Preliminary legal information; materials in regional languages

²⁹ Supra note 19.

³⁰ Information Technology Act, 2000, Section 66A, supra note 4 (declared unconstitutional in *Shreya Singhal v. Union of India*, (2015) 5 SCC 1).

³¹ Copyright Act, 1957, supra note 15.

³² See Exclusive: Indian Copyright Office Issues Withdrawal Notice to AI Co-Author, Managing Intell. Prop. (2022), <https://www.managingip.com/article/2a5bqtj8ume32iwlao5y/exclusive-indian-copyright-office-issues-withdrawal-notice-to-ai-co-author>.

Assessment	Automated essay-scoring and plagiarism/AI-detection tools	Faster feedback cycles; screening for integrity breaches
------------	---	--

Table 2: Opportunities versus Challenges

Opportunities	Corresponding Challenges
Retrieval that is quicker and wider in coverage	Fabricated authority passed on unchecked
Teaching pitched to the individual student	Uneven infrastructure between institutions
Drafting and simulation practice at scale	Dependence, and the loss of unaided reasoning
Wider reach for legal aid and legal literacy	Student data exposure and platform security risk
Cheaper continuing professional development	Licence cost, plus the faculty training gap
Analytics on learning and on judicial practice	Historical inequities reproduced as prediction

Table 3: Ethical Issues versus Legal Safeguards

Ethical Issue	Existing or Proposed Legal Safeguard
Informational privacy of students/clients	Article 21; Digital Personal Data Protection Act, 2023
Algorithmic bias in admissions/assessment	Articles 14, 15; proposed bias-audit requirements
Undisclosed AI use / plagiarism	UGC Plagiarism Regulations, 2018; later UGC advisories on AI-generated content
Vague or overbroad AI regulation	Shreya Singhal narrow-tailoring standard
Unclear AI authorship/copyright status	Copyright Act, 1957, s. 2(d) (interpretation pending)
Lack of transparency/explainability	UNESCO and OECD human-centred AI principles

11. Findings

The findings expose that AI offers significant opportunities for Indian legal education, but unequal access, unreliable outputs, regulatory gaps, privacy concerns, inadequate literacy, and ethical uncertainties require responsible, human-centred adoption.

- AI adoption across Indian law schools has been divided into two. A small number of well-resourced National Law Universities possess both the tools and the training, while the far larger body of affiliated colleges possesses neither. Left unaddressed, that division will widen the very disparities AI is said to remedy.
- Generative tools still perform unevenly on law-school tasks unless prompted carefully and checked afterwards, which makes unsupervised student reliance a pedagogical risk and not a shortcut.
- Among the harms attributed to AI in legal work, fabricated citations are the best documented and the most easily demonstrated.

- India's plagiarism framework was drafted to address copying. It has no purchase on machine-generated authorship, and further circulars will not give it any.
- The Bar Council of India has issued nothing on AI, whether in education or in practice, and that silence has itself become a regulatory problem.
- The Digital Personal Data Protection Act, 2023 plainly applies to AI-enabled learning platforms, though institutional awareness of the obligation appears to be very low.
- What actually constrains responsible institutional adoption is faculty AI literacy. Student AI literacy, which attracts most of the attention, is not the binding constraint.
- The legal aid applications look promising for access to justice, at least on their designers' account. Whether they work in Indian conditions has not been measured by anyone.
- Algorithmic bias in admissions, assessment and proctoring occupies a good deal of the comparable debate abroad. In Indian legal education policy it has drawn very little attention.
- Institutions here work without judicial guardrails, no Indian court having yet decided a dispute that specifically concerns AI use in legal education.
- Copyright in AI-assisted legal scholarship, under the Copyright Act, 1957, is still an open question, and Part 9.3 explains why it is likely to remain one for some time.
- Two templates are presently available to Indian regulators and worth their attention: the risk tiers of the EU AI Act, and UNESCO's human-centred guidance.
- Licensing cost operates as a material barrier for law schools outside the elite tier. Exhortation will not shift it; centralised procurement through the UGC or the Bar Council might.
- Virtual moot courts and AI-enabled simulations can provide students with valuable opportunities to develop practical legal skills through additional practice. However, these experiences cannot replace the supervised clinical training required under the rules of the Bar Council of India. Treating virtual exercises as equivalent to mandatory clinical education would overlook the distinct purpose and value of supervised, real-world legal training.
- Prohibition does not fit the professional ethics or the constitutional guarantees at stake. Neither does unrestricted adoption. A human-centred model that puts verification first does.

12. Suggestions

The suggestions emphasise responsible AI integration through institutional policies, faculty training, student literacy, regulatory reform, equitable access, ethical oversight, empirical research, and stronger safeguards for legal education.

12.1 For Universities and Law Schools

- Draft an institutional AI-use policy, and publish it. It should say which uses are permitted, which must be disclosed and which are forbidden, and it should reach teaching, assessment and research, not assignments alone.

- Make an AI-literacy and legal-technology module compulsory within the core curriculum, devoting as much time to the documented failure modes, hallucination foremost among them, as to what the tools do well.
- Require a disclosure statement for AI assistance in graded coursework, dissertations and theses, attached to the plagiarism declaration students already sign.
- Train the faculty before purchasing platforms for the students. Procurement that runs ahead of faculty development produces expensive licences and no change in the teaching.
- Constitute an AI ethics or technology committee to review new tools before they are deployed across a campus, and appoint at least one skeptic to it.

12.2 For the Bar Council of India

- Issue dedicated guidance, or amend the Legal Education Rules, to address AI use in legal education and in clinical training.
- Bring AI literacy, together with the professional responsibility questions attached to it, into the syllabus prescribed for the All India Bar Examination.
- Examine how bar associations in other jurisdictions have framed the duty of technological competence and the duty to supervise AI-assisted work product, and adapt that material to Indian conditions instead of importing it wholesale.

12.3 For the UGC and Policymakers

- The 2018 Plagiarism Regulations need amendment so that undisclosed AI-generated content is dealt with in express terms. As matters stand, each institution is left to read it in through circulars.
- Under-resourced state and affiliated colleges cannot reach these platforms at present prices, so a central fund, or a joint procurement mechanism, is needed if they are to reach them at all.
- Commission a national empirical study of AI adoption and outcomes across the whole spectrum of Indian law schools. The National Law Universities are the least representative place to look.
- Study the European Union's risk-tiered model and UNESCO's guidance as templates for an Indian framework on AI in education, with attention to what will and will not transfer.

12.4 For Faculty and Students

- Faculty should rebuild assessment around oral defence, in-class analysis and documented process, all of which are far harder to outsource to a chatbot than a take-home essay.
- Students should be taught to treat every piece of AI-generated legal content as an unverified first draft, to be checked against the primary source before it is used or cited.
- Both should be particularly sceptical of AI-generated citations, since that is where the risk has been demonstrated most often and where the professional consequences are most severe.

13. Conclusion

Artificial Intelligence is not a remedy for what ails legal education and it is not a threat to the legal profession. It's a potent but flawed tool and almost all aspects of its worth hinge on the rigour of the framework that is established around it. This is why now is the time to pay attention to Indian legal education being in the process of forming its habits; and habits, once formed, are hard to unset. The benefits available are very real in the field of research, in drafting practice, in personalised teaching, in access to justice. So is what comes with them: hallucinated authority, algorithmic bias, student data left exposed, and the slow erosion of the independent reasoning that legal training exists to produce. In my case the argument is one of balance, which is not in vogue, and which I believe to be the proper one. A law school which refuses to have them in its classes will send its graduates out unarmed and grudgingly behind a disadvantage. A law school which embraces them with no verification procedures, disclosure standards or human scrutiny has shifted the burden onto its students, and then onto its clients as well. The regulatory vacuum should be closed by such a conscious effort, rather than through the patchwork approach of addressing the first serious issue about misuse of AI in a court of law, better for the Bar Council of India and UGC to do so deliberately now; otherwise, it will be done by trial and error. The template has already been developed in part in the constitutional protections of privacy and equality understood with the Digital Personal Data Protection Act, 2023, and in other comparative documents like the UNESCO Guidance and EU AI Act.

The next phase of practice will be determined by the person who trains to work with them, to be able to supervise them, to suspect them, and not to rely on them. While AI may be used to assist in the development of a model, there is no consistent model of legal education that is congruent with the constitutional or professional values that a law degree is intended to pass on, except when AI is under the control of the professional and constitutional sensibilities of the practitioner. All that's needed is a bit of technology. This will need institutional will, which is the more difficult of the two.

Bibliography

Statutes

- Constitution of India.
- Information Technology Act, 2000 (India).
- Copyright Act, 1957 (India).
- Indian Contract Act, 1872.
- Digital Personal Data Protection Act, 2023 (India).
- Bharatiya Sakshya Adhiniyam, 2023 (India).

Case Laws

- *Justice K.S. Puttaswamy (Retd.) v. Union of India*, (2017) 10 SCC 1.
- *Justice K.S. Puttaswamy (Retd.) v. Union of India*, (2019) 1 SCC 1 (Aadhaar case).
- *Shreya Singhal v. Union of India*, (2015) 5 SCC 1.
- *Mata v. Avianca, Inc.*, 678 F. Supp. 3d 443 (S.D.N.Y. 2023).

Reports and Government Documents

- UNESCO, Guidance for Generative AI in Education and Research (UNESCO 2023).
- OECD, Recommendation of the Council on Artificial Intelligence, OECD/LEGAL/0449 (adopted 2019, amended 2024).
- NITI Aayog, National Strategy for Artificial Intelligence: #AIforAll (2018).
- NITI Aayog, Designing the Future of Dispute Resolution: The ODR Policy Plan for India (2021).
- UGC (Promotion of Academic Integrity and Prevention of Plagiarism in Higher Educational Institutions) Regulations, 2018.
- Ministry of Human Resource Development, National Education Policy 2020 (Government of India).

International Instruments

- Regulation (EU) 2024/1689 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 13 June 2024 Laying Down Harmonised Rules on Artificial Intelligence (Artificial Intelligence Act).

Journal Articles and Working Papers

- Steve Lorteau and Douglas Sarro, “Artificial Intelligence in Legal Education: A Scoping Review” (2026) 60(1) The Law Teacher, DOI 10.1080/03069400.2025.2592440.
- Parineeta Goswami, “Revolutionizing Legal Education: The Role of Artificial Intelligence in Shaping the Future of Law Teaching and Learning” (SSRN, 4 February 2025), abstract no. 5123719.
- Ishan Atrey, “Revolutionising the Legal Industry: The Intersection of Artificial Intelligence and Law” (SSRN, 22 April 2023), abstract no. 4632440.
- Ryan Calo, “Artificial Intelligence Policy: A Primer and Roadmap” (2017) 51 UC Davis Law Review 399.
- Daniel Schwarcz and others, “AI-Powered Lawyering: AI Reasoning Models, Retrieval Augmented Generation, and the Future of Legal Practice” (SSRN, 2025), abstract no. 5162111.
- Nachman N. Gutowski and Jeremy Hurley, “Forging Ahead or Proceeding with Caution: Developing Policy for Generative Artificial Intelligence in Legal Education” (SSRN, 2025), abstract no. 5076598.
- Khursheed Jami, “Bridging Law and Technology: The Role of AI in India’s Legal System” (2025) I HILSR Law Review (Jamia Hamdard).
- “Transforming Legal Aid in India: Can AI Bridge the Justice Divide?” (2024) ShodhAI: Journal of Artificial Intelligence, art. 33.
- Anil Kumar and Navya, “Artificial Intelligence (AI) and the Future of Law” (2025) 5(1) International Journal of Progressive Research in Engineering Management and Science 1134.