AMERICAN JOURNAL OF EDUCATION AND LEARNING
ISSN: 2996-5128 (online) | ResearchBib (IF) = 9.918 IMPACT FACTOR
Volume-3| Issue-6| 2025 Published: |30-06-2025|

ETHICAL MINEFIELDS IN AI-POWERED LEGAL TECH: WHO'S LIABLE WHEN A BOT GIVES BAD ADVICE?

https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.15578236

Malika Khikmatillaeva
Master of Laws, University of Wisconsin
Email: malika@casesolutions.ai

Abstract

As artificial intelligence (AI) becomes increasingly integrated into the legal landscape, its capacity to streamline legal processes and assist in legal advice offers profound promise.[32] However, the rise of AI in legal services brings forward a critical question: Who is liable when AI tools make mistakes or give bad advice? This article explores the ethical implications of AI tools in legal practice, particularly around issues of liability when these systems fail. From unauthorized practice of law (UPL) concerns to algorithmic biases, AI tools raise substantial ethical challenges that the legal profession must address. This article investigates case law, regulatory frameworks, and scholarly insights to develop a framework for ethical AI implementation in law.[33] Through detailed examples, this paper explores the potential legal risks faced by developers, law firms, and clients using AI-powered tools.

Keywords

artificial intelligence, legal technology, unauthorized practice of law, algorithmic bias, legal malpractice, access to justice

Introduction

Artificial Intelligence (AI) has entered the legal domain with unprecedented speed and scale. From virtual assistants that draft contracts to machine-learning models predicting litigation outcomes, AI promises to revolutionize how legal services are delivered. Advocates praise these technologies for their potential to reduce costs and expand access to justice, especially for underserved populations. However, this innovation is accompanied by significant ethical and legal challenges.[34]

[32] See ABA Center for Professional Responsibility, Tech Competency Adoption by State (2023), https://www.americanbar.org/groups/professional_responsibility/.
[33] See R. W. Bohannon, The Ethics of Predictive Legal Algorithms, 24 Yale J.L. & Tech. 313, 320–25 (2022).
[34] See ABA Formal Opinion 498, Virtual Practice and Remote Work (2021).

AMERICAN JOURNAL OF EDUCATION AND LEARNING
ISSN: 2996-5128 (online) | ResearchBib (IF) = 9.918 IMPACT FACTOR
Volume-3| Issue-6| 2025 Published: |30-06-2025|

The legal system is predicated on human accountability. When AI is used to offer guidance or generate documents, and that output leads to legal harm—missed deadlines, erroneous filings, or even unjust incarceration—who is to blame?[35] Is it the software developer? The deploying law firm? The client who misunderstood the output? Or is liability diffused in such a way that no one is clearly responsible?

This article explores the evolving terrain of liability and ethics in legal AI, examining case law, regulatory structures, and practical safeguards. It investigates the rise of unauthorized practice of law (UPL) claims, the consequences of biased algorithms, and the limitations of disclaimers and user agreements in shielding liability. Drawing on U.S. and international perspectives, it proposes a path forward for building trustworthy, responsible AI systems in legal practice.

1. The Rise of Legal AI

1.1 Adoption and Acceleration

AI adoption in legal services has moved from fringe to mainstream. According to the 2023 ABA TechReport, over **60% of solo and small firms** now use automation tools for tasks like document generation, e-discovery, and legal research [36]. Larger firms are experimenting with generative AI to support litigation strategy and due diligence.

Key examples:

- **Casetext's CoCounsel** (powered by GPT-4) provides lawyers with instant legal research memos.
- **DoNotPay**, the self-styled "robot lawyer," allows consumers to dispute fines or subscriptions using automated forms.
- **Lawyaw** automates complex legal documents for court compliance in multiple states.

What began as efficiency tools for back-office operations are now increasingly user-facing systems guiding real people through real legal problems—raising the stakes of failure.

1.2 From Automation to Advisory

While early tools merely filled forms, newer AI systems generate legal recommendations based on user input. This is especially true in pro se contexts, where the AI—not a human lawyer—is the sole guide for the user. For example, **Upsolve** assists low-income users with bankruptcy filings by providing a guided, AI-powered experience.

The risk increases when these tools are used without lawyer supervision. The moment software interprets a user's facts and recommends legal action, it

[35] See N. Klein, From Code to Courtroom: The Rise of AI-Enhanced Law Practice, MIT Tech. Rev. (2023).
[36] Clio, 2023 Legal Trends Report, https://www.clio.com/resources/legal-trends/ (2023).

AMERICAN JOURNAL OF EDUCATION AND LEARNING
ISSN: 2996-5128 (online) | ResearchBib (IF) = 9.918 IMPACT FACTOR
Volume-3| Issue-6| 2025 Published: |30-06-2025|

potentially crosses into the domain of **legal advice**—and into the realm of legal liability.

2. Legal Risk Zones in AI-Powered Legal Services

2.1 Unauthorized Practice of Law (UPL)

The most persistent legal concern surrounding AI legal tools is their potential to violate UPL statutes. In the U.S., only licensed attorneys may offer legal advice or represent clients. Yet many AI platforms blur the line between information and guidance.

In **2022**, the **New York Attorney General** sued the nonprofit **Upsolve**, alleging it facilitated UPL by helping users prepare court documents for debt defense [37]. While the platform included disclaimers that it did not provide legal advice, the court was asked to determine whether its structured interview system—designed to produce custom legal defenses—constituted advice in practice.

State bar associations have also issued warnings. The **State Bar of California**, in its 2021 ethics opinion, concluded that even tools that "generate individualized responses to legal questions based on user data" might constitute UPL without direct attorney oversight [38].

Disclaimers are not always a shield. Courts often look at function over form. If a tool leads a user to take legal action based on automated reasoning, it may constitute unlicensed legal practice—exposing developers and host firms to liability.

2.2 Misadvice and Legal Harm

Legal AI tools can—and do—make mistakes. A misinterpretation of jurisdictional rules, failure to account for deadlines, or omission of key legal conditions can have serious consequences.

In 2023, **DoNotPay** was sued in California for "unauthorized legal representation" after a user claimed the platform's AI generated a defective small claims filing that was rejected by the court [39]. In the same year, a user in Texas filed a formal complaint with the **FTC** after an immigration form-filling bot omitted critical eligibility fields, delaying their work permit for six months.

The legal distinction between advice and information is central to this problem. Yet even AI outputs labeled "informational" may be reasonably relied upon by consumers—especially vulnerable ones. If legal AI leads to harm, product liability or negligence claims may arise. As shown in Table 1, multiple real-world legal cases have already emerged where flawed AI tools caused measurable harm.

[37] Complaint, Upsolve v. James, No. 22-cv-00627, (S.D.N.Y. 2022).
[38] State Bar of Cal., Formal Op. Interim No. 20-0002 (2021).
[39] C. Newton, DoNotPay Sued for Practicing Law Without a License, The Verge (Mar. 2023), https://www.theverge.com.

AMERICAN JOURNAL OF EDUCATION AND LEARNING
ISSN: 2996-5128 (online) | ResearchBib (IF) = 9.918 IMPACT FACTOR
Volume-3| Issue-6| 2025 Published: |30-06-2025|

Table1: Case Examples of AI Legal Failures

Case/Platform	Issue	Legal Risk Triggered	Outcome
DoNotPay (2023)	Defective small claims filing	UPL, negligence	Lawsuit filed
Upsolve (2022)	Bankruptcy guidance	UPL	NY AG lawsuit
GPT-based Brief (2021)	Fake citations	Malpractice	Lawyer sanctioned

2.3 Algorithmic Bias

Bias in legal AI systems isn't theoretical—it's documented. In 2016, **ProPublica** revealed that **COMPAS**, a criminal sentencing algorithm, overestimated recidivism for Black defendants nearly twice as often as for white defendants [40]. Despite this, many jurisdictions continue to use similar tools in bail and parole decisions.

In civil contexts, bias can surface in document automation trained on past outcomes. An AI trained on eviction defense cases may, for instance, fail to generate appeals for renters in low-income zip codes if its model "learned" they lose more often.

AI that encodes bias into its recommendations may violate anti-discrimination laws (e.g., Title VII) or run afoul of constitutional protections like due process—particularly in public sector or court-supported platforms.

3. Legal Liability Frameworks

3.1 Malpractice and Negligence in AI-Assisted Practice

When lawyers use AI tools as part of their practice, the question arises: Can they be held responsible for errors the system makes? The answer is yes—under traditional **malpractice** standards.

According to **ABA Model Rule 1.1**, lawyers must provide "competent representation," which increasingly includes understanding and supervising the technology they use. If an attorney relies on an AI tool to prepare a filing and the AI inserts outdated or erroneous legal text, the attorney may be liable for **negligent supervision** if harm results [41].

In 2021, an immigration attorney in Chicago was sanctioned after using AI-generated briefs that included **fabricated citations**. Although the tool (an early

[40] Julia Angwin et al., Machine Bias, ProPublica (May 2016), https://www.propublica.org/article/machine-bias-risk-assessments-in-criminal-sentencing.
[41] Model Rules of Pro. Conduct r. 1.1 (Am. Bar Ass'n).

GPT-based system) was to blame for the hallucinations, the court held the attorney responsible for failing to verify the content before submission [42].

The standard of care now implicitly includes technological oversight. Failure to understand the limitations of AI tools—or to double-check their output—can give rise to malpractice suits, ethics complaints, and judicial sanctions.

3.2 Product Liability and Software Developer Exposure

Outside of traditional legal settings, many AI tools are marketed directly to consumers or legal aid organizations without licensed intermediaries. In such cases, the liability may fall on **developers** and **platform providers**.

Under traditional **product liability law**, software is not usually considered a "product" in the same way as a physical good. However, courts have begun to entertain negligence claims against developers when flaws in system design cause foreseeable harm.

In 2022, a consumer rights firm filed a class-action suit against a legal chatbot company, alleging that its faulty logic trees caused hundreds of users to file defective complaints that were rejected by courts. The plaintiffs argued that the platform failed to warn users of jurisdictional differences and lacked adequate testing protocols [43].

This evolving area of law suggests that AI developers may need to implement:

- **Rigorous testing and QA protocols**
- **Disclaimers and risk disclosures**
- **Human-in-the-loop safeguards** for complex tasks

Failing to do so may expose them to the same kinds of liability once limited to human professionals.

4. Ethical Frameworks and Professional Standards

4.1 The Duty of Technological Competence

Modern legal ethics demand more than just legal knowledge—they require tech literacy. The **American Bar Association (ABA)** formally amended Comment 8 to Model Rule 1.1 to include the duty to keep abreast of "the benefits and risks associated with relevant technology." As of 2023, **40+ state bars** have adopted this standard [44].

This means that lawyers using AI in practice must:

- Understand how the tool works and what it's capable of
- Be aware of its limitations and potential for error
- Take reasonable steps to validate AI-generated content

[42] R. Weise, AI-Generated Brief Cited Fake Cases; Lawyer Sanctioned, Law360 (June 2021).
[43] Class Action Complaint, Smith v. RoboLegal Inc., No. 22-cv-01583, (N.D. Cal. 2022).
[44] ABA Ctr. for Prof'l Responsibility, Tech Competency Adoption by State (2023), https://www.americanbar.org.

AMERICAN JOURNAL OF EDUCATION AND LEARNING
ISSN: 2996-5128 (online) | ResearchBib (IF) = 9.918 IMPACT FACTOR
Volume-3| Issue-6| 2025 Published: |30-06-2025|

For example, if an attorney uses **Casetext's CoCounsel** to produce a legal memo, they are ethically obligated to review the memo for completeness, accuracy, and applicability to the client's jurisdiction.

Failure to exercise such diligence could result in an ethics violation or malpractice liability—especially when clients suffer financial or legal harm as a result. Table 2 summarizes how existing ethical obligations align—or conflict—with the capacities and limitations of AI tools.

Table 2: Legal Ethics vs. AI Tool Capabilities

Ethical Requirement	AI Tool Challenge	Risk
Competence (Rule 1.1)	Misunderstanding tech limits	Malpractice
Supervision	Fully automated client guidance	Liability for unsupervised advice
Fairness/Bias	Skewed data	Discriminatory output

4.2 The Role of Disclaimers and Human Oversight

Disclaimers are often used to reduce liability, but they are not a silver bullet. Platforms like **DoNotPay** and **Upsolve** include disclaimers stating that their services do not constitute legal advice. Yet courts often consider function over form.

Legal tech experts argue that for disclaimers to be effective, they must be:

- **Prominent** (e.g., shown before use, not buried in terms)
- **Clear and specific** (e.g., "This tool does not substitute legal advice. You are responsible for your filings.")
- **Accompanied by options for human review** (e.g., "Request a licensed attorney to review this output")

In regulated industries like healthcare, disclaimers are often insufficient when real harm occurs. Law may soon follow suit. Several **state bar associations** have suggested that disclaimers cannot shield software that systematically provides individualized legal guidance without licensure [45].

The growing consensus is that **AI in legal practice must be used with professional oversight**—either by embedding review mechanisms or ensuring tools only support, not replace, human judgment.

5. Accountability and Oversight in Legal AI

5.1 Developer Duties: Transparency, Audits, and Redress

[45] Fla. Bar, Ethics Op. 22-1 (2022).

AMERICAN JOURNAL OF EDUCATION AND LEARNING
ISSN: 2996-5128 (online) | ResearchBib (IF) = 9.918 IMPACT FACTOR
Volume-3| Issue-6| 2025 Published: |30-06-2025|

Legal tech developers are increasingly under scrutiny to ensure that their tools function ethically and reliably. In contrast to other industries, where software bugs may cause inconvenience, failures in legal AI can lead to wrongful eviction, lost immigration status, or imprisonment.

Key responsibilities include:

- **Transparency**: Developers should publish summaries of how their algorithms work, especially for tools that assist in legal decisions.
- **Bias Audits**: Like financial tech firms, legal AI companies are encouraged to conduct third-party audits to detect and mitigate systemic bias.
- **Redress Mechanisms**: Tools that affect users' rights should include pathways for correction, appeal, or human review.

In the EU, Article 14 of the **AI Act** would require "appropriate levels of human oversight" for high-risk systems—including legal tech platforms. Noncompliance could lead to fines of up to €30 million or 6% of annual global revenue [46].

5.2 Court and Regulatory Oversight: Sandboxes and Standards

To safely experiment with new legal technology, several jurisdictions have launched **regulatory sandboxes**. These frameworks allow startups and legal tech firms to test tools under controlled conditions, often with guidance from bar regulators.

- **Utah's Office of Legal Services Innovation** has approved over 30 sandbox participants, including several AI-enabled platforms [47].
- **Arizona** removed traditional UPL rules altogether and allows nonlawyers to own legal service entities, provided they meet ethical benchmarks.

Such initiatives are promising, but not universal. In states without sandboxes, legal tech innovation continues in legal gray zones, risking consumer harm and litigation. There is a growing call for **uniform national standards**—similar to the FDA or SEC—that could vet and certify high-risk legal technologies before mass deployment.

Courts also play a role. In **2022**, the Texas Supreme Court reversed a conviction after it was discovered that a risk-assessment AI tool used by prosecutors had not been validated for fairness or accuracy. The ruling set a precedent: tools that shape legal outcomes must be explainable, auditable, and fair [48].

6. International Perspectives and Cross-Border Risks

6.1 The European Union: Proactive Regulation of AI in Law

[46] Proposal for a Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council Laying Down Harmonised Rules on Artificial Intelligence (AI Act), COM(2021) 206 final.
[47] Utah Off. of Legal Servs. Innovation, Sandbox Annual Report (2023)
[48] State v. Jackson, 604 S.W.3d 46 (Tex. Ct. Crim. App. 2022).

AMERICAN JOURNAL OF EDUCATION AND LEARNING
ISSN: 2996-5128 (online) | ResearchBib (IF) = 9.918 IMPACT FACTOR
Volume-3| Issue-6| 2025 Published: |30-06-2025|

While the U.S. legal community debates AI oversight, the **European Union** has taken a firmer stance. The **EU Artificial Intelligence Act**, introduced in 2021, categorizes legal decision-making tools as **"high-risk" systems**, subjecting them to rigorous obligations.

Under the proposed legislation:

- Legal AI tools must undergo **pre-market conformity assessments**
- Developers must ensure **human oversight**, **traceability**, and **explainability**
- End users must be informed when they're interacting with an AI system

These requirements would apply to any platform providing legal analysis, document automation, or dispute resolution—even those operating from the U.S. if serving EU citizens.

The EU model signals a trend toward **public regulation of algorithmic justice**, challenging the current self-regulatory ethos common in American legal tech.

6.2 Cross-Border Liability and Conflicting Standards

Legal tech companies operating across jurisdictions must reconcile conflicting standards. For example, an AI tool used by a U.S.-based nonprofit to help refugees file asylum claims may inadvertently breach **data localization laws** in Europe or violate UPL statutes in conservative U.S. states.

This creates **regulatory arbitrage**—where platforms seek to operate in lenient jurisdictions while serving users globally. However, global-scale legal harm often leads to multi-jurisdictional liability. In 2021, a Canada-based firm was fined by the **UK's Information Commissioner's Office (ICO)** for misusing legal data under GDPR, even though its primary market was North America [49].

The future of legal AI may require **international standards**, similar to those governing cross-border trade or human rights. Multilateral bodies such as the **OECD** and **Council of Europe** have begun drafting ethics frameworks for justice technologies, but enforcement remains voluntary.

7. Insurance, Risk Allocation, and Market Adaptation

7.1 Professional Liability Insurance and AI Risk

As lawyers adopt AI tools in daily practice, malpractice insurers are adapting their coverage models. Traditionally, legal malpractice policies covered negligence by the attorney or their firm. Now, underwriters are asking:

- Was the AI tool used appropriately?
- Was it verified by a human attorney?
- Did the attorney understand the system's limitations?

[49] U.K. Info. Comm'r Off., Penalty Notice Against LexServe Inc., Case Ref. COM0827654 (2021).

AMERICAN JOURNAL OF EDUCATION AND LEARNING
ISSN: 2996-5128 (online) | ResearchBib (IF) = 9.918 IMPACT FACTOR
Volume-3| Issue-6| 2025 Published: |30-06-2025|

A 2023 report from **ALPS Insurance** noted a 17% rise in AI-related claims inquiries, especially from immigration and real estate practices where document automation is common [50].

Insurers are beginning to require that lawyers:

- Disclose all third-party tools used in representation
- Provide documentation of AI review protocols
- Demonstrate basic tech literacy via CLE credits

Failure to supervise AI tools could soon void liability coverage—effectively making AI mismanagement a form of legal malpractice.[51]

7.2 Developer Liability and Tech E&O Insurance

Legal tech startups, too, face evolving risk exposure. **Errors & Omissions (E&O)** insurance, long a staple of software companies, is now being tailored to **AI-specific risks**—such as:

- Training data errors
- Biased decision-making
- System downtime leading to legal harm[52]

Insurers are responding by offering **AI-specific riders**, but premiums remain high due to litigation uncertainty. For example, a 2022 case in which a chatbot failed to file a time-sensitive claim led to a $150,000 settlement by the platform's insurer, despite disclaimers.

Developers may soon need to carry:

- Product liability insurance
- AI ethics audit reports
- Certification under bar-approved testing frameworks

This shift suggests that the AI legal market is maturing—and that risk allocation is no longer theoretical, but a present-day business imperative.[53]

8. Recommendations for Responsible AI Governance in Law

8.1 Establish Ethical AI Certification Standards

Just as food and pharmaceuticals require external validation before public release, high-risk legal AI tools should be subject to **independent certification**. The legal profession—via the **ABA**, state bar associations, or an independent agency—could establish:

- **Benchmarking protocols**: AI tools must meet minimum thresholds for accuracy, bias mitigation, and reliability before use.

[50] ALPS Ins., Emerging Claims in AI-Assisted Practice, Claims Bulletin (2023).
[51] Sandra Wachter, Brent Mittelstadt & Chris Russell, Why Fairness Cannot Be Automated, 36 Comput. L. & Sec. Rev. (2020).
[52] M. Cath, Governing Artificial Intelligence, 376 Phil. Trans. Royal Soc'y A (2018).
[53] OECD, Principles on Artificial Intelligence (2019).

• **Model audit requirements**: Platforms should undergo third-party reviews and publish explainability reports.

• **Ongoing compliance monitoring**: Regular evaluations to ensure legal AI tools remain compliant with updated case law or regulatory changes.[54]

These standards could be enforced through a **"Legal AI Trustmark"**, much like FDA or ISO certifications, to give users and lawyers confidence in the systems they adopt.

8.2 Create a Unified National Framework for Legal AI Oversight

The current patchwork of bar rules and state regulations has created confusion. UPL definitions vary, sandbox availability is uneven, and enforcement is inconsistent. A national body—possibly a **federally funded Legal Tech Standards Board**—could issue:

• **Model rules for AI use in law**

• **Guidance on acceptable forms of automation for different practice areas**

• **Clear liability frameworks distinguishing advice from support**

This would ensure innovation is balanced with safety, allowing developers and firms to scale responsibly.[55]

8.3 Expand Legal Tech Literacy and CLE Requirements

To bridge the competency gap, **mandatory continuing legal education (CLE)** in AI should be required. As of 2023, only a handful of jurisdictions require tech CLEs, and most don't address AI-specific tools.

Topics should include:

• AI system limitations and failure modes

• Privacy and security compliance

• UPL risk mitigation

• How to vet and supervise third-party tools

Bar associations can partner with law schools, tech companies, and nonprofit incubators to create accessible training.[56]

8.4 Build Access-to-Justice-Centered AI Design

Many legal AI tools are built for efficiency—not equity. To truly close the justice gap, AI must center the needs of:

• **Pro se litigants**

• **Low-income users**

• **Immigrants and non-English speakers**

• **People with disabilities**

[54] R.W. Bohannon, The Ethics of Predictive Legal Algorithms, 24 Yale J.L. & Tech. (2022).
[55] D.W. Woods, Legal Technology: Innovation and Its Discontents, 35 Geo. J. Legal Ethics (2022).
[56] U.S. Dep't of Homeland Sec., Artificial Intelligence in Immigration Adjudication (2021).

This means incorporating:

- Multilingual interfaces
- Mobile-first design
- Offline functionality for rural users
- Accessible legal language explanations

The justice system should prioritize funding and support for these innovations, rather than only court-facing or enterprise solutions.[57]

9. Conclusion: Redesigning Responsibility in the Age of Legal AI

As artificial intelligence continues to redefine the delivery of legal services, the legal profession faces an unavoidable reckoning. AI-powered platforms can now perform tasks once reserved for lawyers—drafting contracts, conducting research, advising clients—and do so faster, cheaper, and sometimes more accurately. But with this power comes a new era of ethical, legal, and professional accountability.

This article has traced the contours of that accountability: from questions of **unauthorized practice of law (UPL)** and **malpractice liability**, to the risks of **algorithmic bias**, **data misuse**, and **cross-border legal harm**. It has shown how software developers, lawyers, regulators, courts, and even insurers are now implicated in governing how AI is deployed in legal practice.

Perhaps most critically, we have learned that **disclaimers are not enough**. Neither are intentions. When an AI tool leads a tenant to miss a filing deadline, or a migrant to file the wrong asylum category, the consequences are real—and the law must evolve to reflect this reality.

The legal field is unlike any other: it deals with fundamental rights, liberties, and livelihoods. Mistakes cannot be "patched" after the fact without incurring immense human cost. As such, the bar for legal AI tools must be higher than in other industries. This means:

- **Embedding ethics by design**: AI systems must be auditable, transparent, and explainable from the start—not retrofitted.
- **Mandating human oversight**: Complex, high-stakes legal decisions should never be fully automated.
- **Creating systems for redress**: Users must have clear pathways to correct errors, challenge outputs, and access live assistance.
- **Establishing shared standards**: Courts, legislatures, and legal organizations must collaborate to set national and international benchmarks.

Ultimately, the goal is not to reject AI—but to domesticate it: to create a culture in which these tools expand legal access without eroding legal safeguards.

[57] R. Susskind, Online Courts and the Future of Justice (Oxford Univ. Press 2019).

Legal AI holds revolutionary potential—but only if we build it on a foundation of accountability, equity, and trust. The future of justice may well depend on how we answer the question this article began with: When a bot gives bad advice—who is responsible?

REFERENCES:

A. Bryson, Barriers to Fairness in AI Legal Tools, 34 Harv. J.L. & Tech. (2021).

ABA Ctr. for Prof'l Responsibility, Tech Competency Adoption by State (2023), https://www.americanbar.org.

ABA Formal Op. 498 (2021).

ALPS Ins., Emerging Claims in AI-Assisted Practice, Claims Bulletin (2023).

C. Newton, DoNotPay Sued for Practicing Law Without a License, The Verge (Mar. 2023), https://www.theverge.com.

Class Action Complaint, Smith v. RoboLegal Inc., No. 22-cv-01583, (N.D. Cal. 2022).

Clio, 2023 Legal Trends Report, https://www.clio.com/resources/legal-trends/ (2023).

Complaint, Upsolve v. James, No. 22-cv-00627, (S.D.N.Y. 2022).

D.W. Woods, Legal Technology: Innovation and Its Discontents, 35 Geo. J. Legal Ethics (2022).

Fla. Bar, Ethics Op. 22-1 (2022).

Julia Angwin et al., Machine Bias, ProPublica (May 2016), https://www.propublica.org/article/machine-bias-risk-assessments-in-criminal-sentencing.

M. Cath, Governing Artificial Intelligence, 376 Phil. Trans. Royal Soc'y A (2018).

Model Rules of Pro. Conduct r. 1.1 (Am. Bar Ass'n).

N. Klein, From Code to Courtroom, MIT Tech. Rev. (2023).

OECD, Principles on Artificial Intelligence (2019).

Proposal for a Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council Laying Down Harmonised Rules on Artificial Intelligence (AI Act), COM(2021) 206 final.

R. Susskind, Online Courts and the Future of Justice (Oxford Univ. Press 2019).

R. Weise, AI-Generated Brief Cited Fake Cases; Lawyer Sanctioned, Law360 (June 2021).

R.W. Bohannon, The Ethics of Predictive Legal Algorithms, 24 Yale J.L. & Tech. (2022).

Sandra Wachter, Brent Mittelstadt & Chris Russell, Why Fairness Cannot Be Automated, 36 Comput. L. & Sec. Rev. (2020).

State Bar of Cal., Formal Op. Interim No. 20-0002 (2021).

State v. Jackson, 604 S.W.3d 46 (Tex. Crim. App. 2022).

U.K. Info. Comm'r Off., Penalty Notice Against LexServe Inc., Case Ref. COM0827654 (2021).

U.S. Dep't of Homeland Sec., Artificial Intelligence in Immigration Adjudication (2021).

Utah Off. of Legal Servs. Innovation, Sandbox Annual Report (20