JUDICIAL PROCEEDINGS: USE OF SPECIALIZED KNOWLEDGE AND INTRODUCTION OF AI

Explainable Artificial Intelligence (xAI): Reflections on Judicial System

Gyandeep Chaudhary

Bennett University, Greater Noida, India

Abstract: Machine learning algorithms are increasingly being utilized in scenarios, such, as criminal, administrative and civil proceedings. However, there is growing concern regarding the lack of transparency and accountability due to the "black box" nature of these algorithms. This makes it challenging for judges' to comprehend how decisions or predictions are reached. This paper aims to explore the significance of Explainable AI (xAI) in enhancing transparency and accountability within contexts. Additionally, it examines the role that the judicial system can play in developing xAI. The methodology involves a review of existing xAI research and a discussion on how feedback from the system can improve its effectiveness in legal settings. The argument presented is that xAI is crucial in contexts as it empowers judges to make informed decisions based on algorithmic outcomes. However, the lack of transparency, in decision-making processes can impede judge's ability to do effectively. Therefore, implementing xAI can contribute to increasing transparency and accountability within this decision-making process. The judicial system has an opportunity to aid in the development of xAI by emulating reasoning customizing approaches according to specific jurisdictions and audiences and providing valuable feedback for improving this technology's efficacy.

Hence the primary objective is to emphasize the significance of xAI in enhancing transparency and accountability, within settings well as the

potential contribution of the judicial system, towards its advancement. Judges could consider asking about the rationale, behind outcomes. It is advisable for xAI systems to provide a clear account of the steps taken by algorithms to reach their conclusions or predictions. Additionally, it is proposed that public stakeholders have a role, in shaping xAI to guarantee ethical and socially responsible technology.

Keywords: explainable AI; black box; artificial intelligence; reasoned decisions; judicial system

Contents

I. Introduction

The realm of intelligence (AI) is experiencing growth and holds the potential to revolutionize various industries, such, as the legal sector. However, the integration of AI, into the system raises ethical and legal considerations (Naik et al., 2022). The absence of transparency and explainability in AI systems is one of the primary causes for concern since it can result in bias and a lack of accountability (Markus, Kors and Rijnbeek, 2021). In this paper, the theory of Explainable Artificial Intelligence, sometimes known as xAI will be investigated, as well as the ramifications that this theory may have for the legal system.

The incorporation of AI into the legal system has the potential to improve efficiency while simultaneously reducing costs; yet it also raises issues about bias and impartiality in the system (Goodman, 2019). Similarly to how humans, AIs can only function as well as the

data they are fed in order to learn from, which means that biased input will lead to biased results, therefore the quality of AI depends on the quality of the data used to train it (Belenguer, 2022). In addition, it may be challenging to comprehend how an AI system came to a certain conclusion, which makes it challenging to hold the system accountable for its actions (Santoni de Sio and Mecacci, 2021). Explainable artificial intelligence or xAI is a technology designed to address these concerns by ensuring transparency and understandability, for users.

The use of AI, in our system is a nuanced matter. It is important for us to approach this issue by considering both the advantages and disadvantages it presents. Exploring the concept of Explainable AI (xAI) can provide insights into how we can incorporate AI into the system while maintaining transparency, accountability and fairness (Deeks, 2019). As we move forward it remains crucial for us to have discussions about the implementation of AI, in our system and together we must ensure that its utilization benefits all parties involved (Reiling, 2020).

There is much hype regarding AI these days. Almost every organization plans to include AI, is currently employing it, or is rebranding its old rule-based engines as AI-enabled solutions. The need for transparency into the decision-making processes of these models is increasing in importance as more and more organizations adopt the use of AI and advanced analytics within their decision-making processes (Sjödin et al., 2021). Problems arise while utilizing machine-learning techniques because of their operation's "black box" nature (Petch, Di and Nelson, 2022). It is not simple to understand how and why these algorithms arrive at the results they do because they are constantly adjusting the weights, they assign to inputs to improve the precision of their predictions (Sarker, 2021).

Still, explanations to the questions "Why?" and "How do you know?" are sought after and required by both humans and the law. How do we achieve this transparency while embracing the efficiencies AI brings (Stevenson and Slobogin, 2018)? Here is where xAI comes in; it is a subfield of AI that focuses on creating systems that can explain the thought process behind an algorithm's output, might be able to help address the "black box" problem (Gunning and Aha, 2019).

"Explainable AI" describes approaches to AI that allow human specialists to comprehend the outcome (Barredo Arrieta et al., 2020). This contrasts the "black box" approach to machine learning, which holds that not even the AI's creators know how the AI arrived at a particular choice (Wulff and Finnestrand, 2023). XAI realizes the right of society to an explanation (Ankarstad, 2022). In its simplest form, AI is a system that receives data and uses it to make decisions. Explainable AI is an AI system demonstrating how input changes affect the final result.

In this research paper, the concept of artificial intelligence (xAI) and its possible repercussions for the legal system is investigated. Firstly, the importance of explicability in relation to xAI and the legal system will be discussed in Part II. In Part III we will explore how algorithms are being used in government agencies' rulemaking and adjudication processes, as well as the potential for explainable AI (xAI) to improve transparency and accountability in these procedures. Furthermore, we will examine the advantages and obstacles linked to implementing xAI in the system well as the necessary measures to ensure ethical and fair utilization of AI in this context.

II. Why Explainability Matter?

Artificial intelligence (AI) has emerged as a tool, for making decisions. Nevertheless, it is essential to recognize that AI's influence on outcomes can have both adverse effects. Consequently, comprehending the decision making process of AI is akin, to employing individuals to manage an organization. Despite interest in AI, stakeholders often hesitate to fully trust models to make essential decisions on their behalf. Hence, explainability has emerged as a crucial factor in shedding light on the reasoning behind the models' decisions.

The concept of "intelligence" can sometimes be ambiguous as it can have interpretations depending on the perspective. When experts discuss intelligence they are usually referring to a set of technologies such, as natural language processing, machine learning, image recognition and speech recognition. The advancements we have witnessed in AI lately primarily stem from the integration of machine learning systems and

algorithms. These systems can learn on their own and find patterns in sets of data to make highly accurate predictions or probabilities (Coglianese and Lehr, 2019).

While machine learning is a powerful tool, it has raised ethical concerns regarding its impact on individuals' autonomy, security, and privacy. One of the concerns raised about machine learning is that the data used to train algorithms can reinforce and amplify existing biases especially when it comes to marginalized communities. This can result in decision-making and discrimination, in areas, like employment, lending and healthcare.

Another consideration revolves around the dependability and precision of forecasts generated by machine learning systems. Critics contend that these systems, especially when utilized in the justice realm may produce accurate forecasts of recidivism compared to human professionals. This could result in inequitable outcomes for marginalized individuals (Dressel and Farid, 2018).

In addition, the implementation of machine learning into the decision-making process raises concerns around accountability and transparency. Who is to blame when a machine learning system makes an error, or when it makes a judgment that is discriminatory? How can people understand the decision making process of a machine learning system? Is it possible to offer feedback to enhance it? These inquiries must be addressed to guarantee the responsible use of machine learning.

The issue of the "black box," which refers to the lack of transparency in how the algorithm operates (Citron, 2008), is a concern. People who are affected by the algorithms' recommendations may suffer if they cannot comprehend why the algorithm made decisions. In the justice system algorithms that lack transparency can undermine a defendants ability to present a defense and erode trust and confidence, in the governments' fairness.

To tackle these worries experts have introduced the concept of xAI. It encompasses a range of studies focused on communicating the logic behind a particular machine learning models results to humans (Wachter, Mittelstadt and Russell, 2017). xAI has several uses and advantages: it can help people feel more comfortable interacting with

the system, point out when the system is unfair or biased, and improve our understanding of the world.

In the legal world, the use of xAI can be more fruitful for judges and litigants who give emphasis to algorithms for their decision-making, and for defendants who want to contest predictions about their danger (Smith, 2017). However, making an algorithm more human-understandable might have unintended consequences, the most notable of which is a drop in performance.

Fortunately, several versions of xAI already exist, and computer scientists are constantly developing new ones. Some ML models are designed to have an explanation built-in, but this usually means they are more straightforward and produce less reliable results. Nevertheless, another class of models cannot be explained in their terms. There are two primary schools of thought among computer scientists for these models.

One category (called an "interpretable model" (Edwards and Veale, 2017)) focuses on designing models that are inherently more transparent and easier to interpret. These models often have simpler structures and decision-making processes, making it easier for humans to understand how they arrive at their predictions. However, they may sacrifice some accuracy in order to achieve this interpretability.

Interpretable models are more desirable, in situations where transparency's of importance like in legal or medical decision making. However there are instances where "black box models" (Guidotti et al., 2018) are required, particularly when accuracy takes precedence such as, in modeling or speech recognition. In scenarios, it becomes crucial to incorporate hoc explainability methods to guarantee transparent and accountable decision-making processes by the models.

It is important to note that while xAI can assist in addressing the concerns related to machine learning, it is not a solution. There are still limitations when it comes to the accuracy and reliability of machine learning systems. Additionally, the data used to train these systems can still be incomplete. Furthermore, with methods for explaining AI outcomes it may not always be possible to fully comprehend or predict the results of complex machine learning models.

Therefore, it is crucial for courts and legal systems utilizing AI technology to remain vigilant and transparent about their decision making procedures. This includes being open about the data used for training machine learning models and providing explanations for how these models make predictions and decisions. It also involves monitoring and evaluation of the models performance to ensure they are making responsible choices.

An important reason to support the advancement of AI is its potential to reduce bias and discrimination in machine learning systems. As discussed earlier machine learning models have the ability to perpetuate and worsen biases against marginalized communities. Explainable AI plays a role in ensuring fairness and equality by shedding light on how decisions are made by these models. By providing transparency and insight it enables us to identify and rectify any biases or discriminatory outcomes that may arise.

Moreover, the lack of transparency and accountability in machine learning systems can erode trust in systems. When individuals cannot comprehend the decision making process or contribute feedback to enhance the system, their trust and reliance on it may diminish. This has implications in vital areas like healthcare where trust is paramount for patient's well-being and satisfaction.

Another reason to support the development of xAI is its potential to enhance the precision and dependability of predictions made by machine learning models. While intricate "black box" models (Chaudhary, 2020) might achieve accuracy, in their forecasts they can also be more susceptible to errors and biases. By shedding light on the decision making process of these models explainable AI can assist in identifying and addressing errors and biases ultimately boosting the accuracy and reliability of the models predictions.

Furthermore, explainable AI can offer advantages in terms of accountability and adherence to regulations. In regulated industries like finance and healthcare, it is crucial to ensure that machine-learning models operate within frameworks while also allowing their decisions to be audited and explained. Explainable AI can promote transparency and accountability, in these contexts ensuring ethical use of these models.

1. Legal and Regulatory Obligations: Lawmakers and regulators are increasingly in agreement that AI systems should be transparent and capable of explanation. For instance, the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) of the European Union guarantees individuals the right to understand the reasoning behind automated decision-making processes that impact them (Art. 22). Furthermore, the Federal Trade Commission (FTC) in the United States has expressed the need for companies to provide explanations on how their algorithms reach decisions in domains such, as credit and employment (Smith, 2020).

2. Risk Mitigation: When it comes to domains like healthcare, finance and criminal justice, using black box AI systems can have consequences if they make incorrect or biased decisions. Explainable AI can help reduce these risks by providing users with an understanding of how the system reaches its decisions. This way they can rectify any errors or biases that may arise.

3. Increased Trust: Transparency and explainability are crucial in maintaining trust in AI systems especially when they are employed in areas like healthcare or criminal justice where the stakes are high. By enhancing the transparency and comprehensibility of AI processes users are more likely to have faith in the decisions made by these systems.

4. Collaboration: Many applications of AI require collaboration between humans and machines. Explainable AI plays a role in facilitating this collaboration by offering humans an insight into how machines arrive at their decision making process. This understanding enables them to work together effectively as a team.

5. Social Responsibility: Lastly, there is an argument for AI based on social responsibility concerns. Given the impact of AI on society, at large it becomes our responsibility, as developers and users, to ensure that these systems are deployed ethically and responsibly. Explainable AI plays a role in attaining this objective as it empowers users to identify and rectify occurrences of bias, discrimination or any other unfairness.

The advancement of AI is a stride, in guaranteeing the ethical and responsible utilization of machine learning. By shedding light on the decision-making mechanisms of machine learning models researchers can help alleviate the risks of bias and discrimination. Nevertheless, the development of AI is an endeavor and there remains a significant

amount of work to be accomplished in order to ensure that machine learning is employed transparently with accountability and for the overall betterment of society.

III. Algorithms in Adjudication

In years, there has been an increase in researchers' interest in integrating machine-learning algorithms into the operations of government agencies. While national security and law enforcement departments have already adopted these technologies, various other government departments are also exploring the opportunities presented by machine learning (Lehr and Coglianese, 2017). Given the recognition of the potential of these algorithms in policy contexts and at all levels of government additional research, into their potential applications is urgently needed.

The use of machine learning algorithms, in government agencies rulemaking and adjudication processes is an area of research (Lehr and Coglianese, 2017). By incorporating machine learning, we can enhance transparency, accountability, efficiency and effectiveness in these procedures (Lehr and Coglianese, 2017). However, it is crucial to acknowledge that integrating these algorithms into government operations raises legal concerns related to bias and accountability.

Despite these concerns, researchers generally agree that the utilization of machine learning algorithms in government operations will continue to grow in the future (Cuéllar, 2017). Therefore, policymakers and academics should engage in dialogue and research to fully comprehend the implications of these technologies and ensure their implementation into government operations.

Integrating machine-learning algorithms into the process could potentially enhance its effectiveness. For instance, one possible application is utilizing algorithms and neural networks to make decisions about setting appropriate rules. According to the proposal put forth by Justice Mariano Florentino Cuéllar (Cuéllar, 2017) this approach has the potential to enable rulemaking in specific domains.

For instance, when it comes to overseeing practices machine learning algorithms can be utilized to create simulations that explore

the balance between factors like market stability and economic growth. These simulations can provide insights for regulators in the securities and exchange industry helping them make decisions on high-speed electronic trading regulations. Additionally, these simulations can assist finance departments in evaluating risks based on real time market fluctuations.

Moreover, a multi agent system could be implemented where various machine-learning algorithms simulate scenarios considering the tradeoffs, between market stability and economic growth. Another machine learning system would then select the model that maximizes objectives chosen by humans. This approach enables evaluations of impacts of specific rules encompassing a more nuanced perspective.

However, it is worth mentioning that incorporating these algorithms into the process brings up ethical and legal considerations, including concerns, about bias and accountability. It is essential for policymakers and academics to have discussions and conduct research to thoroughly comprehend the impact of these technologies and guarantee their integration into the regulatory process.

Machine learning algorithms may also find application in the government sector by helping agencies make sense of the mountain of public feedback they get during the regulation process known as "notice and comment" (Mortazavi, 2017). Further, as was previously said, authorities may use machine learning to assist in the adjudication process. There are many applications for algorithms, such as determining whether or not an applicant is competent to fly a plane, estimating the impact of a merger on the market, or settling disability claims. While machine learning-based rulemaking and adjudication may incorporate multiple opaque and hard-to-trace decisional steps, it will not be possible to eliminate the need for human involvement. The minimum requirement is for computer scientists to encode agency "values" as ones and zeros into the algorithms.

The application of algorithms by government organizations is the area of law and policy that is constantly changing and is expected to be the focus of legal disputes. According to the Administrative Procedure

Act (APA)[1] US courts have the power to examine the actions of government agencies including their use of algorithms. In several cases, the court has the ability to overturn factual findings or discretionary decisions made by agencies if they are deemed arbitrary, capricious or an abuse of discretion.[2]

The US Supreme Court has established a guideline for reviewing agency actions under the APA. According to this guideline, agencies are required to assess the evidence and provide a reasonable justification for their decisions.[3] This includes establishing a connection between the facts considered and the ultimate decision made. In years, there has been a renewed emphasis on agency transparency and accountability in relation to their use of algorithms.[4]

Apart from adhering to this review standard agencies also have an obligation to address the concerns raised by the public regarding algorithm usage.[5] These concerns may include issues related to bias, fairness, transparency and potential impacts on populations.

However, when agencies make forecasts within their specialized domains courts tend to give weight and consider these forecasts as highly reliable. This is known as the "frontiers of science" doctrine that acknowledges that agencies with expertise may possess an understanding of complex technical matters compared to courts.[6]

III.1. The Role of xAI
in Decision-Making and Judicial Review

There is a likelihood that government agencies using algorithms will face legal battles because this field of law and policy is complex and ever changing. The courts have a role in ensuring that government agencies are transparent and accountable when it comes to their use

---

[1] *Block* v. *Cmty. Nutrition Inst.*, 467 U.S. 340, 345 (1984).

[2] 5 U.S.C. § 706(2)(A).

[3] *Motor Vehicle Mfrs. Ass'n v. State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co.*, 463 U.S. 29, 43 (1983).

[4] *Judulang v. Holder*, 565 U.S. 42, 53 (2011).

[5] *Perez v. Mortg. Bankers Ass'n*, 135 S. Ct. 1199, 1203 (2015).

[6] *Balt. Gas & Elec. Co. v. NRDC*, 462 U.S. 87, 103 (1983).

of algorithms. At the time, they recognize the knowledge and expertise that these agencies possess in technical areas. Therefore, it is crucial for agencies to provide well thought out justifications for their actions while actively engaging with and addressing concerns regarding algorithm usage.

Thus, agency justification is essential to maintaining the standards that agencies establish. However, machine-learning algorithms can complicate, if not wholly confound, the ability to give reasons. Consider taking legal action against a government organization that gave undue weight to a machine-learning algorithm's forecast of an effects of chemicals on vulnerable species populations or human health. If that happens, the government agency might have to reveal its source data, the specifics of the machine-learning model, the percentage of errors produced by the resulting algorithm, and even the system's inner workings. The exact requirements that courts will place on agencies in this context, as well as the responses of agencies, are unclear at this time.

Some academics are optimistic about the courts' ability to accommodate the increasing prevalence of agency usage of algorithms. Agencies may meet this criterion if they demonstrate that the algorithm worked as expected and accomplished a reasonable goal. Complex modelling-based agency rulemaking is viewed with deference by the courts. The views of some academics are more skeptical. For instance, scholars worry about how opaque algorithms impede effective judicial review since courts cannot grasp the rules imposed in a given case (Citron, 2008). A court might consider a government agency's conclusion if it determines that the agency is basing its prediction on private sector expertise rather than its own when it uses a black-box algorithm it has acquired.

The integration of explainable artificial intelligence (xAI) in government organizations has garnered attention from academics, with varying perspectives on its potential implications. Some view xAI as a means of increasing transparency in decision-making processes, as it facilitates the identification of factors that drive a particular outcome. This could potentially assist government agencies in resisting court scrutiny. However, it is important to note that the effective utilization

of xAI requires its use in conjunction with the underlying algorithm (Vilone and Longo, 2021).

Scholars also recognize that xAI has the potential to support government agencies in their use of machine learning techniques. Even if algorithmic prediction is employed on a basis agencies can employ strategies to provide explanations for their actions. Data scientists are actively working on developing a range of techniques that can be easily understood by the public. Machine learning algorithms have the ability to enhance transparency by facilitating the identification of factors that contributed to an outcome as mentioned by Justice Cuéllar. This enhanced transparency could assist agencies in defending themselves against scrutiny (Coglianese, 2021).

Although it is evident that xAI holds advantages, for government decision making its implications for the system have not been thoroughly examined. The incorporation of xAI in institutions is expected to play a role in the transition towards greater dependence, on machine based decision making. However, further research is needed to fully understand the implications of xAI on the judicial system and how it can be effectively integrated within the legal framework.

III.2. The Role of Courts in Fostering the Growth of xAI

As courts start the use machine learning algorithms to adjudicate administrative law disputes, courts will be instrumental in fostering the growth of the xAI ecosystem. The majority of discussions about xAI today are conceptual. However, if courts show a desire to test alternative hypotheses or request details regarding the inputs, outcomes, and dependability of agency algorithms, it will become more formal. Agency algorithms in regulatory situations may be subject to judicial scrutiny, which could encourage developers to adopt exogenous xAI strategies based on model-centric explanations of the algorithm's inner workings and dependability. In contrast, developers may use a decompositional approach to agency algorithms in adjudication, providing subject-centric explanations for the individual adjudicatory choices.

The notion that courts have the ability to choose the xAI tool for a particular case is quite promising as it upholds several aspects that

we highly value in the common law system (Rachlinski, 2006). This concept implies that judges can utilize xAI tools to aid them in making informed judgments. This approach is encouraging because it enables judges to maintain characteristics that are crucial to the common law system, such as reasoning through analogy considering past cases, for guidance and prioritizing personalized justice.

The judicial system can proceed "cautiously and incrementally" as it determines the best and most feasible methods of xAI for explaining various agency algorithms (Devins and Klein, 2017). When confronted with concrete evidence, the courts can make contextually appropriate decisions and avoid trying to stifle innovation in xAI. Courts will build upon precedents, adapting them slightly to address the novel issues raised by the development of this technology (Barak, 2008).

Additionally, xAI can potentially lessen the legal reforms that may be necessary for response to the technological disruptions brought on by machine learning. For instance, xAI could assist ease concerns expressed by courts on the continuation of deference accorded to agency decision-makers who rely primarily on algorithms or grant a "presumption of regularity" (Cuéllar, 2017) to opaque algorithmic decision making. Government agencies may see xAI to mitigate the adverse effects of doctrinal shifts by addressing judicial concerns upfront (Strauss, 1996). While a federal xAI regulation may provide more certainty at the outset, common law xAI may be more adaptable to technological advances in xAI and more attentive to what is both essential and possible in a given context.

IV. Conclusion

Courts will encounter machine-learning algorithms in many areas of law, not simply agency rulemaking and criminal justice. The use of machine learning algorithms in various areas of law presents challenges for the judicial system. The courts will need to determine what level of explanation is required in each case involving algorithmic decision-making and how to address any biases or flaws in the algorithms. Courts resolving xAI-related problems should prioritise two concepts that can advance public law values: (1) matching the needs of target groups with

the optimal application of xAI in a specific situation, and (2) maximising the ability of xAI to help detect flaws and biases inside the algorithm.

The global impact of xAI is significant and nations worldwide are wrestling with the legal and ethical concerns it presents. The General Data Protection Regulation, in the European Union and the French Digital Republic Act serve as illustrations of guidelines that tackle the necessity for decision making to be explained. These guidelines emphasize the importance of transparency and accountability, in utilizing xAI as the significance of informing individuals about how automated decisions are reached. It is important to note that while the legislative branch has the authority to mandate the use of xAI in executive agencies and shape its implementation across industries and inside government, any legislation intended to govern the application of xAI must be broad enough to account for the dynamic nature of the field. Past actions by the legislature on complex technological matters suggest that it may struggle to act in this area. In contrast, xAI in legal system and adjudication holds great promise as we progress into the age of algorithms. While the court's ability to address xAI issues will be constrained, the work done by machine learning algorithm creators and users in response to xAI developments in other doctrinal areas may be sufficient to address the issues that arise. As the field continues to evolve and develop, common law rulings can provide guidance and create legal precedents that can help shape the responsible development and use of xAI.

References

Ankarstad, N., (2022). What is explainable AI (xAI)? Medium. *Towards Data Science*. Available at: https://towardsdatascience.com/what-is-explainable-ai-xai-afc56938d513 [Accessed 16.04.2023].

Barak, A., (2008). *The judge in a democracy*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Barredo Arrieta, A., et al., (2020). Explainable artificial intelligence (XAI): Concepts, taxonomies, opportunities and challenges toward responsible AI. *Information Fusion*, 58, pp. 82–115.

Belenguer, L., (2022). Ai Bias: Exploring discriminatory algorithmic decision-making models and the application of possible machine-centric solutions adapted from the pharmaceutical industry. *AI and Ethics*, 2(4), pp. 771–787.

Chaudhary, G., (2020). Artificial Intelligence: The Liability Paradox. *ILI Law Review,* Summer, pp. 144–162.

Citron, D., (2008). Technological Due Process. *Washington University Law Review*, 85, p. 1254.

Coglianese, C., (2021). Administrative law in the automated state. *Daedalus*, 150(3), pp. 104–120.

Coglianese, C. and Lehr, D., (2019). Transparency and Algorithmic Governance. *Administrative Law Review*, 71(1), pp. 18–38.

Cuéllar, M., (2017). Cyberdelegation and the Administrative State. In: Parillo, N.R. (ed.) *Administrative Law from the Inside Out: Essays on Themes in the Work of Jerry L. Mashaw*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Pp. 135–140.

Deeks, A., (2019). The Judicial Demand for Explainable Artificial Intelligence. *Columbia Law Review*, 119(7), p. 1829.

Devins, N. and Klein, D., (2017). The Vanishing Common Law Judge? *University of Pennsylvania Law Review*, 165, pp. 595–630.

Dressel, J. and Farid, H., (2018). The accuracy, fairness, and limits of predicting recidivism. *Science Advances*, 4(1).

Edwards, L. and Veale, M., (2017). Slave to the algorithm? Why a "right to an explanation" is probably not the remedy you are looking for. *Duke Law & Technology Review*, 16(1), p. 67.

Goodman, C.C., (2019). AI/Esq.: Impacts of Artificial Intelligence in Lawyer-Client Relationships. *Oklahoma Law Review,* 72(1), p. 149.

Guidotti, R., et al., (2018). A survey of methods for explaining Black Box Models. *ACM Computing Surveys*, 51(5), pp. 1–42.

Gunning, D. and Aha, D., (2019). DARPA's Explainable Artificial Intelligence (xAI) program. *AI Magazine*, 40(2), pp. 44–58.

Lehr, D. and Coglianese, C., (2017). Regulating by Robot: Administrative Decision Making in the Machine-Learning Era. *Georgetown Law Journal*, 105, p. 1147.

Markus, A.F., Kors, J.A. and Rijnbeek, P.R., (2021). The role of explainability in creating trustworthy artificial intelligence for Health

Care: A Comprehensive Survey of the terminology, design choices, and evaluation strategies. *Journal of Biomedical Informatics*, 113, p. 103655.

Mortazavi, M., (2017). Rulemaking Ex Machina. *Columbia Law Review Online*, 117, pp. 207–208.

Naik, N., et al.*,* (2022). Legal and ethical consideration in artificial intelligence in Healthcare: Who takes responsibility? *Frontiers in Surgery*, 9.

Petch, J., Di, S. and Nelson, W., (2022). Opening the black box: The promise and limitations of explainable machine learning in Cardiology. *Canadian Journal of Cardiology*, 38(2), pp. 204–213.

Rachlinski, J., (2006). Bottom-Up Versus Top-Down Lawmaking. *University of Chicago Law Review*, 73, p. 934.

Reiling, A.D., (2020). Courts and artificial intelligence. *International Journal for Court Administration,* 11(2).

Santoni de Sio, F. and Mecacci, G., (2021). Four responsibility gaps with Artificial Intelligence: Why they matter and how to address them. *Philosophy & Technology*, 34(4), pp. 1057–1084.

Sarker, I.H., (2021). Machine learning: Algorithms, real-world applications and Research Directions. *SN Computer Science*, 2(3).

Sjödin, D., et al.*,* (2021). How AI Capabilities Enable Business Model Innovation: Scaling AI through co-evolutionary processes and feedback loops. *Journal of Business Research*, 134, pp. 574–587.

Smith, A., (2020). Using Artificial Intelligence and Algorithms. *Federal Trade Commission*. 8 April. Available at: https://www.ftc.gov/business-guidance/blog/2020/04/using-artificial-intelligence-and-algorithms [Accessed 11.11.2023].

Smith, R.A., (2017). Opening the lid on criminal sentencing software. *Duke Today*. 19 July. Available at: https://today.duke.edu/2017/07/opening-lid-criminal-sentencing-software [Accessed 11.11.2023].

Stevenson, M.T. and Slobogin, C., (2018). Algorithmic risk assessments and the double-edged sword of youth. *Behavioral Sciences & the Law*, 36(5), pp. 638–656.

Strauss, D.A., (1996). Common law constitutional interpretation. *The University of Chicago Law Review*, 63(3), p. 877.

Vilone, G. and Longo, L., (2021). Notions of explainability and evaluation approaches for Explainable Artificial Intelligence. *Information Fusion*, 76, pp. 89–106.

Wachter, S., Mittelstadt, B. and Russell, C., (2017). Counterfactual explanations without opening the black box: Automated decisions and the GDPR. *Harvard Journal of Law & Technology*, 31, pp. 841–850.

Wulff, K. and Finnestrand, H., (2023). Creating meaningful work in the age of AI: Explainable AI, explainability, and why it matters to organizational designers. *AI and Society* [Preprint].

Information about the Author

Gyandeep Chaudhary, Doctor of Laws, Assistant Professor of Law, Bennett University, Greater Noida, India

gyan.2889@gmail.com

ORCID: 0000-0002-6831-1142

Researcher ID: HMP-5444-2023