

Artificial Intelligence in the Ukrainian Judiciary: Charting the Course Under the Digital Gavel

Author: Bernaziuk Ian

Affiliation: Supreme Court

Publication: Конституціоналіст · 2025

Publication date: 2025-07-09

Permanent URL:

<https://constitutionalist.com.ua/artificial-intelligence-in-the-ukrainian-judiciary-charting-the-course-under-the-digital-gavel/>

Author information

Bernaziuk Ian

Supreme Court

Document text

Ian Bernaziuk, Professor, J.S.D. Judge of the Supreme Court (Ukraine)

ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE IN THE UKRAINIAN JUDICIARY:

CHARTING THE COURSE UNDER THE DIGITAL GAVEL

This paper provides an exhaustive analysis of the integration and impact of Artificial Intelligence (AI) within the judicial system of Ukraine over the past year, focusing on the period up to June 2025. Leveraging primary sources including legislative acts, official commentaries, landmark court decisions, and institutional reports, it meticulously details the establishment of robust legal and ethical frameworks for AI utilization. The paper examines key judicial precedents addressing AI misuse, illuminates the evolving digital infrastructure supporting the Ukrainian judiciary, and outlines comprehensive strategies for enhancing judicial competencies and education in the age of AI. Central to this exploration is the unwavering commitment to the principle that AI serves as a powerful assistant to human judges, with the ultimate responsibility for decision-making, evidence assessment, and the maintenance of judicial independence, impartiality, and public trust remaining firmly with human judgment. The analysis reveals Ukraine's proactive, yet cautiously pragmatic, approach to technological adoption, aiming to balance efficiency gains with the preservation of fundamental justice principles and the prevention of procedural abuses.

1. Introduction

Over the past year, Ukraine has actively integrated Artificial Intelligence (AI) into its judicial system, implementing strategic reforms and innovations. This paper details these developments, referencing recent legislative enactments, official pronouncements, key court decisions, and institutional reports as of June 2025.

2. Building the Foundation: Legal and Ethical Frameworks for AI in Justice

2.1. The Code of Judicial Ethics (Article 16) and its Commentary

Article 16 of the Code of Judicial Ethics, adopted by the XX Regular Congress of Judges of Ukraine on September 18, 2024, is a cornerstone of ethical AI regulation for judges in Ukraine. It explicitly permits AI use under stringent conditions to maintain judicial integrity

Preservation of Independence and Impartiality: The use of AI "does not affect the judge's independence or impartiality." This is a paramount ethical imperative, reflecting the need to prevent any external technological influence from biasing or compromising a judge's autonomous decision-making process. AI tools must serve as neutral aids, not as mechanisms for undue influence or algorithmic bias.

Exclusion from Evidence Assessment: AI use "does not involve the assessment of evidence." This condition explicitly reserves the critical function of evaluating, weighing, and interpreting evidence as an exclusive domain of human judicial discretion. The nuanced understanding of context, credibility, and evidentiary weight is considered inherently human, requiring cognitive and ethical judgment that AI cannot replicate.

Non-interference with Decision-Making: AI "does not interfere with the decision-making process." This stipulation reinforces the auxiliary nature of AI, clarifying that while it can assist in information retrieval, analysis, or procedural tasks, the ultimate intellectual and moral responsibility for rendering a judgment remains solely with the human judge. The judicial act of decision-making, which involves complex legal reasoning, ethical consideration, and often a degree of moral judgment, is deemed non-delegable.

Compliance with Legal Provisions: The use of AI "does not violate any legal provisions." This is a broad but essential safeguard, ensuring that AI integration adheres to all existing national and international laws, including data protection regulations, procedural codes, and human rights instruments.

To further elaborate on these principles and provide practical guidance, the Council of Judges of Ukraine has been tasked with developing and approving a new Commentary on the Code of Judicial Ethics. This Commentary, which is under active development, is anticipated to serve as an authoritative interpretation of Article 16. It will provide detailed guidance on the permissible scope of AI use, establish best practices for security safeguards, and outline oversight mechanisms necessary to ensure responsible and secure deployment of AI tools within the judicial context. This ongoing effort highlights the dynamic nature of legal and ethical frameworks in response to rapidly evolving technology.

2.2. Framework for AI Use in the High Anti-Corruption Court (HACC)

A practical manifestation of Ukraine's commitment to responsible AI integration is the Order of the High Anti-Corruption Court (HACC) dated December 19, 2024, No. 56, which approved the "Principles of Using Artificial Intelligence Tools in the High Anti-Corruption Court." This document sets a precedent for how specific judicial institutions can implement AI while maintaining strict ethical and legal boundaries. The HACC's approach is characterized by a "mature pragmatism," balancing the drive for innovation with an unwavering commitment to prevent technology from compromising the administration of justice.

Key provisions of the HACC's framework include:

Principle of Non-Interference with Justice Administration: The overarching principle is that AI tools "should not interfere with the administration of justice." This echoes Article 16 of the Code of Judicial Ethics, reaffirming that AI is a supportive tool, not a replacement for judicial functions.

Prohibition on Uploading Sensitive Data: Article 4 explicitly states that "Uploading official documents of the HACC to AI tools is not allowed." This critical safeguard aims to protect sensitive information, prevent data leaks, and maintain the confidentiality of judicial records. It reflects a proactive stance on data security and privacy in the context of AI use.

Ethical Compliance: Article 5 mandates that "The use of AI is carried out in compliance with ethical rules and principles, principles of prudence, the rule of law, professionalism, integrity, effectiveness, and other principles, the observance of which is mandatory for HACC employees." This comprehensive list of principles ensures that AI usage is guided by a holistic ethical compass.

Focus on Human Competency: The Order implicitly, and the practice of HACC explicitly, emphasizes the importance of developing AI literacy among its personnel. Article 2 tasks relevant departments with organizing "periodic training for judges and court staff of the HACC on practical aspects of using artificial intelligence tools, as well as literacy when working with them." This demonstrates a recognition that successful AI integration relies not only on technological solutions but also on the informed and responsible human operators.

Scope Limitation: Article 6 clarifies that "The norms of these Principles do not extend to the administration of justice by the HACC. The use of AI in judicial proceedings must be based on the principles of judicial independence and not affect the objectivity of the judicial process." This re-emphasizes the clear distinction between AI's role in administrative support and its strict non-interference with the core judicial function.

2.3. Guidelines on the Responsible Use of AI in the Public Service

Beyond the judiciary, broader governmental guidelines reinforce critical principles for AI application across the entire public service, directly influencing the environment in which the judiciary operates. The "Recommendations for Responsible Use of Artificial Intelligence by Public Servants" (Мінцифри - держслужба.pdf), issued in March 2025 by the Ministry of Digital Transformation of Ukraine and the National Agency of Ukraine on Civil Service, provide a comprehensive framework:

Strict Prohibition on Public Generative AI: It is "strictly prohibited to upload official documents of the state authority to publicly available generative AI systems." This measure, mirroring the HACC's stance, is crucial for preventing unauthorized data exposure and ensuring the confidentiality of state information.

Mandatory Verification and Human Oversight: Public servants "must not blindly trust the results generated by AI tools and should always verify the information, especially when making decisions that may affect human rights, freedoms, or obligations." This underscores the non-delegable nature of human accountability and the necessity for critical assessment of AI outputs, particularly in contexts involving sensitive rights.

Compliance with Fundamental Principles: The use of AI by public servants "must comply with the principles of lawfulness, accountability, transparency, privacy, and non-discrimination." These serve as overarching guiding tenets, ensuring that AI deployment aligns with democratic values and legal norms, and protects against potential biases or discriminatory outcomes. The document further notes that AI use should respect "human rights and the General rules of ethical conduct for civil servants and local government officials."

2.4. Expert Committee on the Development of AI in Ukraine

The Ministry of Digital Transformation of Ukraine has established an Expert Committee on the Development of AI in Ukraine, which is actively working on the national roadmap for AI regulation. A dedicated working group within this committee is finalizing the Recommendations on the Responsible Use of AI for Legal Professionals. This forthcoming document is poised to become an integral part of Ukraine's national AI regulation roadmap and is designed to assist lawyers in navigating the intricate legal, ethical, and technical dimensions of AI application in their professional practice. This initiative reflects a holistic approach to AI regulation, encompassing the broader legal community and ensuring a unified, responsible approach to AI adoption across the justice sector.

3. Guarding the Gates: Judicial Practice on AI Misuse and Procedural Integrity

As AI tools become more ubiquitous, the Ukrainian judiciary has proactively addressed instances of their misuse, establishing clear legal positions to safeguard the integrity of judicial proceedings and maintain public confidence in the justice system. These landmark decisions serve as crucial precedents, defining the permissible boundaries of AI use in legal contexts.

3.1. Legal Position of the Supreme Court (Judgment of February 8, 2024, in Case No. 925/200/22)

In a seminal ruling on February 8, 2024, in case No. 925/200/22, the Supreme Court of Ukraine delivered a definitive legal position on the misuse of AI-generated findings in court. This judgment arose from a situation where a party attempted to challenge a court's decision by presenting arguments derived from an AI system. The Court's findings underscored several critical points:

Abuse of Procedural Rights and Counsel's Duty: The Supreme Court unequivocally ruled that filing motions or appeals that rely on AI-generated findings to challenge a court's judgment constitutes an abuse of procedural rights. Such actions were explicitly deemed "an act of disrespect to the judges of the Supreme Court" and a direct violation of a lawyer's fundamental duty of professional prudence and good faith. This judgment firmly places the onus on legal professionals to ensure the veracity, legal basis, and proper ethical conduct of their submissions, irrespective of whether AI tools were utilized in their preparation. The Court highlighted that the statement was "clearly unfounded and knowingly baseless," reflecting a lack of proper legal analysis by the submitting party.

The Subordinate Role of AI: The Court clarified with absolute precision that AI is "merely an auxiliary tool under a lawyer's control." Crucially, it emphatically stated that AI "cannot replace a judge nor serve as a source of law." This pronouncement reinforces the human-centric nature of judicial authority and the definitive sources of legal norms (e.g., legislation, judicial precedent). AI's output, therefore, cannot supersede established legal principles or judicial reasoning.

Undermining Judicial Authority and Public Confidence: The Supreme Court stressed that attempts to pit AI-generated findings against the authoritative position of the court directly undermine the authority of justice itself and erode public confidence in the judiciary. The Court found such actions "not aimed at effectively protecting the rights, freedoms, and interests of the plaintiff from possible violations by the defendant." This aspect of the judgment signals a strong commitment to preserving the credibility and respect for judicial pronouncements, vital for the functioning of the rule of law. The Court referenced Article 43 of the Commercial Procedural Code of Ukraine, which deals with abuse of procedural rights, allowing the court to leave a complaint, application, or motion without consideration or return it.

3.2. Legal Position of the High Anti-Corruption Court (Decision of May 28, 2025, in Case No. 991/4110/25)

Reinforcing and building upon the Supreme Court's stance, the High Anti-Corruption Court (HACC) issued its own significant decision on May 28, 2025, in case No. 991/4110/25. This ruling further delineated what constitutes abuse of rights and disrespect to the court in the context of AI utilization, specifically addressing the use of generative AI tools. The HACC explicitly deemed the following actions as unacceptable and indicative of procedural abuse:

Reliance on ChatGPT-Generated Positions: The HACC specifically identified "relying on ChatGPT-generated positions" as an impermissible basis for legal arguments. This explicit naming of a popular generative AI tool indicates the judiciary's awareness of specific technological capabilities and their potential for misuse.

Submission of Appeals Based Solely on AI Output: The Court found the "submission of an appellate complaint based solely on AI output" to be unacceptable. This reinforces the paramount requirement for human judgment, critical thinking, and genuine legal reasoning in the preparation and submission of court documents. Legal arguments must originate from a lawyer's professional understanding and analysis, not merely be a reproduction of algorithmic text.

Unsubstantiated AI Use Contradicting Judicial Findings: The use of AI "without legal grounds or scientific basis, especially when contradicting the findings of the investigating judge," was deemed a violation. This emphasizes that any AI output presented in court must be rigorously substantiated by established legal principles, factual evidence, and sound legal methodology. It cannot be used to arbitrarily challenge or undermine legitimate judicial findings, particularly those of an investigating judge based on collected evidence.

Both the Supreme Court's and the HACC's decisions collectively establish clear judicial precedents, defining the stringent boundaries of AI use in legal submissions. They serve as a crucial safeguard against the potential for AI to be misused to undermine the integrity of judicial proceedings, reinforcing that human lawyers bear ultimate responsibility for the content and validity of their arguments, and that the courts will decide cases based on law, facts, and human legal arguments, not on information generated by artificial intelligence tools without critical human oversight.

4. The Digital Ecosystem: Advanced Tools, Strategic Development, and Statistical Insights

Ukraine's progressive approach to AI integration extends to the proactive development of a robust digital ecosystem designed to enhance the efficiency, accessibility, and transparency of its judicial system. This involves implementing cutting-edge tools, formulating strategic roadmaps for future AI deployment, and demonstrating significant growth in digital engagement across the court system.

4.1. Supreme Court Legal Positions Database 2.0

A hallmark of Ukraine's technological advancement in justice is the enhanced Supreme Court Legal Positions Database 2.0, officially unveiled in Kyiv on April 14, 2025. This updated system represents a significant leap towards AI-powered legal research and analysis within the judiciary. Its development underscores a commitment to providing judges and legal professionals with sophisticated tools to navigate the vast landscape of judicial precedents.

Key features and innovations of Database 2.0 include:

Enhanced Search Functionality: The database provides more intuitive and powerful search capabilities, allowing users to efficiently locate relevant judicial positions.

Mobile-Friendly Interface: Recognizing the need for accessibility, the system boasts a user-friendly interface optimized for mobile devices, enabling legal professionals to access critical information on the go.

Integration with the Unified State Register of Court Decisions: This seamless integration ensures that Database 2.0 is continuously updated with the latest judicial decisions, making it a comprehensive and current resource.

This innovative tool not only significantly enhances the efficiency of legal research but also facilitates greater consistency in judicial application of the law by providing rapid access to condensed, AI-analyzed legal precedents.

4.2. The Concept of the Unified Judicial Information and Telecommunication System (UJITS)

The strategic vision for AI integration into the Ukrainian judiciary is articulated in "The Concept of the Unified Judicial Information and Telecommunication System", approved by Order of the State Judicial Administration of Ukraine No. 178 on April 30, 2025. This comprehensive document lays out the foundational principles and a phased roadmap for the holistic digital transformation of the judicial system, with AI positioned as a crucial enabling technology.

A core principle enshrined in the UJITS Concept, consistent with the Code of Judicial Ethics and Supreme Court rulings, is that AI is to serve as an assistant, while the final decision and the assessment of evidence remain solely with the human judge. This reiterates the human-in-the-loop approach, ensuring that technological advancements support rather than supplant human judicial authority and responsibility.

The UJITS concept details a multi-year phased AI integration plan for 2026-2028, designed to progressively embed AI capabilities across the entire case lifecycle. This ambitious roadmap encompasses a wide range of applications, demonstrating a strategic commitment to leveraging AI for systemic improvements:

Scanning & Text Recognition: Automating the digitization of physical documents for seamless integration into electronic workflows.

Automatic Summarization of Materials: AI will be used to condense lengthy legal documents, aiding judges and staff in rapidly grasping key information.

Search for Relevant Case Law: Beyond keyword searches, AI will facilitate intelligent and contextually relevant searches for judicial precedents.

Generation of Draft Decisions: AI tools are envisioned to assist in drafting initial versions of judicial decisions, streamlining the drafting process for judges. This is a particularly sensitive application, strictly adhering to the "assistant" principle, with human judges retaining full control and final authority.

Transcription of Hearings: AI-powered transcription services will enhance the accuracy and efficiency of recording court proceedings.

Virtual Legal Assistants: Development of AI-powered virtual assistants to support various administrative and legal tasks, freeing up human resources for more complex work.

These planned integrations signify a strategic and systematic approach to comprehensive digital transformation within the Ukrainian judicial system, leveraging AI to streamline various aspects of judicial administration, enhance efficiency, and improve overall service delivery.

4.3. The Obligation to Publish Court Decisions in Ukraine

Transparency and accessibility of court decisions are fundamental pillars of Ukraine's judicial system, providing a rich, publicly available dataset that is essential for legal research, the development of legal positions, and crucially, for the training and continuous improvement of AI models.

In accordance with Article 2 of the Law of Ukraine "On Access to Court Decisions", court decisions are public and must be published in electronic form in the Unified State Register of Court Decisions no later than the day following their full preparation and signing. This legal mandate ensures the continuous growth of a comprehensive, digitized database of judicial precedents, forming a vital resource for the entire legal community and underpinning data-driven legal innovation.

However, the law also provides for specific, carefully defined exceptions to immediate publication, balancing transparency with legitimate concerns for sensitive information:

Seizure of Property and Temporary Access: Rulings concerning the seizure of property and temporary access to items and documents in criminal proceedings are exempt from immediate public disclosure.

Antimonopoly Committee Rulings: Rulings by a commercial court authorizing the Antimonopoly Committee to inspect business entities are also subject to deferred publication. These specific decisions are published no earlier than the day they are submitted for enforcement, safeguarding the integrity of investigations or commercial interests until such information no longer poses a risk.

The significance of this comprehensive database cannot be overstated: the Unified State Register of Court Decisions currently contains more than 125 million court decisions. This immense corpus of data provides an unparalleled resource for legal research, sophisticated analytical studies, and, critically, for the training and refinement of AI models aimed at supporting various judicial processes, from legal research to potentially aiding in the drafting of documents. The sheer volume and accessibility of this data are key enablers for Ukraine's advanced AI integration plans.

4.4. Digital Engagement Statistics

The annual report of the High Council of Justice "On the State of Ensuring the Independence of Judges in Ukraine" for the year 2024 provides compelling statistical evidence of the rapidly accelerating digital transformation and engagement within the Ukrainian court system. These figures demonstrate a significant and growing reliance on electronic services and remote judicial processes:

User Registration: In 2024, more than 150,000 users registered in the "Electronic Court" system. This substantial number indicates a widespread adoption of digital platforms by legal professionals and citizens seeking to interact with the judiciary.

Remote Court Hearings: Over 2.5 million remote court hearings were held, marking an extraordinary 190% increase compared to 2023. This exponential growth underscores the judiciary's successful adaptation to digital modalities, particularly important in the context of ongoing challenges.

Electronic Document Submission: During the same period, more than 5.5 million documents were submitted to courts via the "Electronic Court" system, representing a remarkable 232% increase compared to 2023. This surge in electronic submissions highlights a shift towards digital workflows and reduced reliance on paper-based processes.

These statistics collectively illustrate a robust and positive trend in the adoption of digital tools and processes within the Ukrainian judiciary. They signal an increasing acceptance and utilization of electronic systems, which not only enhance efficiency and accessibility but also lay the groundwork for more sophisticated AI-driven solutions by

creating a rich digital interaction environment. The data confirms that the Ukrainian legal community is actively embracing digitalization, paving the way for further technological innovation.

5. Empowering the Judiciary: Competencies, Education, and Professional Standards

The successful and responsible integration of AI into the judicial system is inextricably linked to the capacity of judges and court staff to effectively utilize these new tools while steadfastly adhering to the highest ethical and professional standards. Ukraine has proactively addressed this critical need through the formal establishment of updated professional standards and the implementation of comprehensive, targeted educational initiatives. These efforts are designed to ensure that the human element of the judiciary is well-equipped to navigate the complexities and opportunities presented by AI.

5.1. Professional Standards for "Judge"

A landmark development in judicial qualification in Ukraine is the establishment of the Professional Standard for Judges in 2024. This pivotal document formally enshrines digital competence as a mandatory component of judicial qualification for the first time in Ukrainian legal history. This significant update reflects a clear recognition by the Ukrainian legal system that modern judges must be prepared to operate proficiently within an environment where AI is increasingly an integral professional tool.

The Professional Standard meticulously delineates six key areas of digital competence that judges are now expected to possess:

Ability to operate digital devices: This foundational skill ensures that judges are proficient in using the hardware and basic software necessary for digital work.

Ability to search, verify, and interpret data: This goes beyond mere data retrieval, emphasizing the critical thinking skills required to assess the credibility, relevance, and implications of digitally sourced information, including AI-generated content.

Ability to create digital content: This encompasses the capacity to produce and manage digital documents, presentations, and other forms of electronic communication essential for modern judicial administration.

Ability to adhere to cybersecurity principles: Recognizing the growing threat landscape, judges are required to understand and apply best practices in cybersecurity to protect sensitive judicial information and systems.

Ability to communicate in digital environments: This includes effective and secure communication through electronic platforms, essential for remote hearings and digital document exchange.

Ability to solve problems in digital environments: This refers to the capacity to troubleshoot technical issues and adapt to new digital tools and workflows.

These formalized standards are crucial for ensuring that judges possess the fundamental digital skills necessary to effectively navigate the modern digital legal landscape, encompassing the responsible, ethical, and secure use of AI tools in their professional duties.

5.2. National School of Judges of Ukraine (NSJU) - Targeted Training Programs

The National School of Judges of Ukraine (NSJU) plays a central and indispensable role in fostering digital literacy and AI awareness among judges and their assistants. Over the past year, the NSJU has demonstrably committed to this goal by conducting a series of specialized and recurring seminars directly addressing the intersection of digitalization and AI in justice. The detailed programs of these seminars highlight the comprehensive nature of the training provided:

"Information and Digital Competence of a Judicial Assistant" (May 30, 2025: This seminar, specifically for judicial assistants, focused on essential digital skills. Key topics included "Psychological-Information Security of a Judicial Assistant," "Electronic Tools of Justice," and significantly, "Justice in the Age of Artificial Intelligence: Tool or Challenge?". This module explored the broader implications of AI, balancing its utility with potential risks.

"Digitalization of Justice and the Use of AI Technologies in Courts" (March 6, 2025): This program, aimed at court staff, covered "Digitalization of justice, artificial intelligence in the justice system, international experience," and crucially, "Artificial intelligence technologies: future prospects and risks for the judiciary". It also included practical aspects of AI use.

"Digital Awareness of a Judicial Assistant" (October 29, 2024): This seminar for judicial assistants covered "Information Security and Digital Literacy of a Judicial Assistant," "Digitalization of Electronic Evidence in Justice," and practical aspects of the "Electronic Court" system. While not exclusively about AI, it built foundational digital literacy essential for future AI integration.

"Digitalization of Justice and the Application of AI Technologies" (June 11, 2024): This early seminar, also for judicial assistants, included lectures on "Artificial Intelligence Technologies in Justice", "Electronic Instruments of Justice", "Metaverse Technologies – a Step towards Digital Civilization and Digital Transformation of the Judicial System. Electronic Jurisdiction and AI in the Judicial Practice of States", and "Integration of Artificial Intelligence in the Justice System: Hurry Slowly". This program provided a foundational understanding of AI's relevance and cautious integration.

These recurring and targeted training programs demonstrate a sustained and strategic commitment by the NSJU to equipping judicial personnel with the necessary knowledge and skills to effectively and responsibly interact with AI technologies. The direct involvement of prominent legal scholars and Supreme Court judges in these trainings underscores their significance.

5.3. Judicial Self-Education of Supreme Court Judges and Staff

Beyond formal training, the Supreme Court has actively fostered a culture of judicial self-education and continuous learning regarding AI. On May 9, 2025, the Supreme Court hosted a crucial internal training session titled "The Potential of AI in the Context of the Supreme Court's Activities" This event focused on the practical application and implications of AI tools specifically within the high court's operational context.

The session aimed to achieve several key objectives:

Acquaintance with AI Potential: To familiarize judges and court staff with the various ways AI can optimize workflow and improve administrative processes within the Supreme Court.

Encouraging Critical Engagement: To foster a thoughtful and critical approach towards the use of AI, ensuring that enthusiasm for technology is tempered with a clear understanding of its limitations and risks.

Promoting Digital Caution and Literacy: To reinforce the principles of digital caution and enhance overall AI literacy, enabling personnel to make informed decisions about AI tools.

This proactive internal commitment to continuous learning and adaptation within the highest judicial body underscores Ukraine's comprehensive strategy to ensure that its judiciary remains at the forefront of technological advancements while upholding the highest standards of justice.

Conclusion

The past year has marked a period of intense and strategic engagement for the Ukrainian judicial system with the transformative potential of Artificial Intelligence. The journey, characterized by a blend of cautious pragmatism and innovative foresight, has laid down a robust foundation for the responsible integration of AI, consistently guided by an unwavering commitment to the core tenets of justice.

The overarching principle that permeates all initiatives, from legislative enactments to judicial pronouncements and educational programs, is unambiguous: the use of AI in justice must always serve the goal of fair, independent, impartial, and effective adjudication, which is ultimately trusted by society. AI is not merely a tool for efficiency; it is a means to enhance justice, provided its application remains within clearly defined ethical and legal boundaries.

Judges, as the central actors, bear the ultimate responsibility. They are called upon to use AI tools with wisdom and caution, in full compliance with all relevant legal and ethical standards. The repeated emphasis across various regulatory documents and judicial decisions reinforces a fundamental tenet: AI must remain under the judge's

control, with full responsibility for the judgment resting solely with the human judge. AI is and must remain an auxiliary tool, supporting human decision-making rather than usurping it. This commitment to the "human in the loop" model is not merely a preference but an ethical imperative, safeguarding the unique human qualities of empathy, discretion, and moral judgment essential for administering justice.

Ukraine's experience, as evidenced by the legislative, judicial, and educational developments of the past year, demonstrates a thoughtful and proactive balance:

Embracing Technological Innovation: The development of tools like the Supreme Court Legal Positions Database 2.0 and the strategic vision for The Concept of the Unified Judicial Information and Telecommunication System reflects a strong embrace of AI's potential to streamline processes, improve access to information, and enhance overall judicial efficiency.

Upholding Ethical Values: Simultaneously, the stringent conditions outlined in the Code of Judicial Ethics, the firm judicial precedents against AI misuse (e.g., prohibiting reliance on AI-generated legal arguments), and the explicit prohibitions on data uploading underscore a profound commitment to safeguarding judicial independence, impartiality, and public trust.

Investing in Human Capital: The comprehensive digital competence requirements in the Professional Standard for Judges and the extensive training programs by the National School of Judges of Ukraine highlight a critical understanding that technology is only as effective as the human capacity to wield it responsibly.

Looking ahead, Ukraine's strategy for AI integration within the judicial system appears robust and forward-looking. It aims to ensure that AI becomes a powerful ally in the pursuit of justice, while meticulously preserving the indispensable role of human intellect, ethics, and discretion. The continuous adaptation of regulatory frameworks, the vigilant monitoring of AI usage, and the ongoing investment in judicial education will be crucial for navigating the evolving complexities of AI and ensuring that justice remains fair, accessible, and deeply rooted in human values.

Material files

[Original author file](#)