The OSCAR PUBLISHING Services
International Journal of Law And Criminology

VOLUME Vol.05 Issue03 2025
PAGE NO. 1-7

Ensuring AI Accountability in Judicial Proceedings: An Actor–Network Theory Perspective

Song Yun-ah
Department of International Trade, Pusan National University, Busan, Republic of Korea

Received: 03 January 2025; **Accepted:** 02 February 2025; **Published:** 01 March 2025

Abstract: Artificial Intelligence (AI) is increasingly being incorporated into judicial proceedings, from predictive algorithms for sentencing and risk assessment to AI-powered tools for case management. As AI continues to shape the legal landscape, questions regarding accountability in judicial proceedings become more pressing. This paper adopts an Actor–Network Theory (ANT) framework to explore the roles played by human and non-human actors—such as judges, lawyers, AI systems, and legal institutions—in establishing accountability in AI-driven legal processes. Through this lens, we examine the dynamics between these actors and the implications of AI's role in legal decision-making. The study identifies key challenges surrounding AI accountability in judicial proceedings, highlighting the need for transparent and responsible AI development, while proposing pathways for integrating AI tools ethically and equitably into judicial processes.

Keywords: AI Accountability, Judicial Proceedings, Actor–Network Theory, Legal Technology, Court Systems, AI Systems, Law and Technology, Ethics in AI, Legal Decision-Making, AI Transparency.

Introduction: The increasing adoption of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in judicial proceedings has triggered a significant shift in how legal decisions are made and how justice is administered. From predictive algorithms used in sentencing to AI-driven tools for case management and legal research, AI promises to enhance the efficiency and accuracy of judicial systems worldwide. These technologies have the potential to reduce human biases, accelerate the adjudication process, and assist in complex decision-making tasks by analyzing vast amounts of data quickly and effectively.

However, as AI systems become more integrated into legal processes, they also raise fundamental questions about accountability. Accountability in judicial proceedings refers to the responsibility and liability for actions and decisions made within the legal process. When AI systems play a central role in shaping decisions, it becomes unclear who should be held accountable when an AI-driven decision leads to an unjust or incorrect outcome. This dilemma is especially important in the context of AI's involvement in areas such as sentencing, parole decisions, risk assessments, and predictive policing.

AI accountability concerns are compounded by several factors. First, many AI algorithms used in the legal system, such as those employed for risk assessments and predictive sentencing, are often described as "black boxes"—complex systems where the rationale behind a given decision is not easily understood or accessible, even to those who use them. This opacity challenges the principles of transparency and fairness, two foundational elements of justice. When an AI system outputs a recommendation or decision, the individuals affected by that decision, as well as the legal professionals involved, may be unable to discern why the system arrived at a particular conclusion. This lack of transparency creates difficulties in holding AI systems accountable for their outputs.

Second, AI systems in judicial settings often rely on historical data to inform their predictions. This raises the possibility of bias in AI systems, particularly if the data used to train these systems reflect existing social or systemic inequalities. For example, in the case of predictive policing algorithms, the data might be skewed by historical biases in police practices, leading AI systems to disproportionately target marginalized communities. Similarly, sentencing algorithms might perpetuate racial or socio-economic disparities if they are trained on biased historical data. Such biases in AI

decision-making can undermine the fairness of judicial processes and potentially exacerbate existing inequalities.

Given these challenges, it is essential to examine the concept of AI accountability through a more nuanced lens. Traditional accountability frameworks in the legal system focus on human actors—judges, lawyers, and legal institutions—and their responsibility for ensuring just outcomes. However, AI systems complicate this framework because they introduce non-human actors into the decision-making process. As AI systems become more autonomous and pervasive in legal settings, the question arises: who is responsible for the decisions made by AI in judicial contexts?

This paper adopts an Actor–Network Theory (ANT) framework to explore how accountability operates in the context of AI-driven judicial processes. ANT offers a unique perspective by focusing not only on human actors, such as judges, lawyers, and developers, but also on non-human actors, such as AI systems and the technology itself. According to ANT, both human and non-human actors form networks of relationships that shape and influence outcomes. In the context of AI in the judicial system, this means considering how AI systems interact with human actors and how these interactions contribute to the final legal decisions. ANT allows us to view AI as an active participant in the network of judicial proceedings rather than just a passive tool, and it highlights the shared responsibility of human and non-human actors in ensuring accountability.

The primary aim of this study is to investigate how AI accountability can be conceptualized in judicial proceedings through the lens of ANT. By examining the relationships between actors such as judges, AI developers, legal institutions, and the AI systems themselves, this paper will uncover the complexities of accountability in AI-driven legal systems. In doing so, it will provide insights into the ethical and practical challenges of using AI in the justice system, as well as propose potential pathways for enhancing AI accountability in judicial contexts.

In addition to addressing questions of accountability, this paper will explore the broader implications of integrating AI into judicial decision-making. How do AI systems affect the role of human judges? What are the potential risks and benefits of using AI in high-stakes decisions that can affect individuals' lives? What safeguards should be in place to ensure that AI systems are transparent, fair, and free from bias? These questions are central to the ongoing debate about the ethical and legal implications of AI in the justice system, and they form the foundation for the discussion in this paper.

Ultimately, the goal of this research is to contribute to the development of responsible, ethical frameworks for the use of AI in judicial proceedings. As AI technologies continue to advance, ensuring accountability will be critical to maintaining public trust in the judicial system and ensuring that technology serves justice rather than undermining it.

The integration of Artificial Intelligence (AI) into judicial proceedings is transforming how legal decisions are made, and it is raising significant concerns about accountability, fairness, and transparency. AI systems are now being utilized in various ways within the legal domain, such as in predictive policing, risk assessments for bail or parole decisions, sentencing algorithms, and even the use of AI-powered systems for legal research and case management. These technologies promise increased efficiency, reduced bias, and better outcomes; however, they also introduce a range of ethical, legal, and practical challenges.

One of the central issues surrounding AI in judicial contexts is accountability. Who is responsible if an AI system makes an erroneous or biased decision that impacts an individual's legal rights or freedom? Traditional legal frameworks are not always well-suited to address the complexities introduced by AI technologies. In particular, questions arise regarding the responsibility of judges, lawyers, developers, and institutions when an AI system's output influences legal decision-making.

This paper employs Actor–Network Theory (ANT) as a framework to examine the various human and non-human actors involved in judicial proceedings where AI is used. By analyzing the networks of interactions between these actors, we seek to uncover the dynamics of accountability and how these relationships influence the legal process. ANT, which emphasizes the importance of both human and non-human actors in shaping outcomes, is a useful tool for understanding the complex interactions between technology and law.

METHODS

This paper adopts a qualitative, theoretical approach, primarily drawing upon the framework of Actor–Network Theory (ANT) to analyze AI accountability in judicial proceedings. The research focuses on:

1. Literature Review: The first step involved reviewing existing literature on AI's role in judicial proceedings, ethical issues surrounding AI, and the application of Actor–Network Theory in legal contexts. Key academic articles, legal journals, and case studies related to AI in courts, such as the use of COMPAS for risk assessments, were analyzed to understand the current discourse on

AI accountability in the legal field.

2. Case Study Analysis: Several case studies were reviewed to explore real-world instances of AI implementation in judicial proceedings. This included the use of sentencing algorithms in the United States and the use of AI-powered case management systems in European courts. The analysis aimed to identify patterns of accountability, including who is responsible when AI systems contribute to legal decisions that affect individuals' lives.

3. Actor–Network Theory Application: ANT was applied to map out the various human and non-human actors involved in the deployment of AI in judicial settings. These actors include judges, AI developers, legal practitioners, litigants, and the AI systems themselves. By examining the relationships and networks among these actors, the paper aims to understand how accountability is distributed and how decisions are made within these networks.

4. Interviews and Expert Opinions: To further refine the analysis, interviews were conducted with experts in the fields of AI ethics, law and technology, and legal theory. These experts provided insights into the practical challenges and ethical considerations of integrating AI into judicial systems, as well as their thoughts on ensuring accountability in such contexts.

RESULTS

The application of Actor–Network Theory to AI accountability in judicial proceedings revealed several key findings:

1. Human and Non-Human Actors in AI-Driven Legal Processes: ANT emphasizes the importance of both human and non-human actors in shaping outcomes. In the context of judicial proceedings, AI systems are often viewed as passive tools that simply process data and provide outputs. However, ANT reveals that AI systems are active participants in shaping legal decisions, influencing how cases are handled and how judges and legal practitioners interpret and act on information.

o Judges: While judges retain ultimate decision-making authority, they are influenced by AI-generated recommendations or risk assessments. For example, predictive algorithms used in sentencing or parole decisions may affect how a judge views a defendant's likelihood of reoffending or the appropriate sentence.

o AI Systems: These systems, such as COMPAS or PACT, play an increasingly active role in providing data-driven predictions. However, their decision-making processes are often opaque, and the algorithms' inherent biases can influence judicial outcomes.

o Lawyers and Developers: Lawyers interpret AI-generated data, presenting it to the court, while developers build and update AI systems. The responsibility of these actors in ensuring that AI systems are functioning transparently and fairly is a key element of accountability.

2. Challenges of AI Transparency and Bias: One significant challenge identified through the ANT approach is the lack of transparency surrounding AI decision-making processes. AI algorithms, particularly in the judicial context, are often "black boxes," where even those who use them cannot fully understand how the algorithm arrives at its conclusions. This opacity makes it difficult to assess whether decisions made by AI are biased or unfair.

Example: COMPAS Algorithm – In the United States, the COMPAS (Correctional Offender Management Profiling for Alternative Sanctions) algorithm has been widely used to assess the risk of recidivism in criminal defendants. Research has shown that COMPAS may be biased against African American defendants, but due to the opacity of the algorithm, it is difficult to pinpoint exactly why certain outcomes occur. This issue illustrates the tension between the benefits of using AI for efficiency and the ethical challenges regarding fairness and transparency.

3. Distributed Accountability: The ANT framework reveals that accountability in AI-driven judicial proceedings is distributed across a network of actors. This means that no single actor can be entirely responsible for the actions of an AI system. For instance:

o Judges may be responsible for decisions but often rely on AI systems for assistance, which complicates the determination of liability when AI outputs result in harmful outcomes.

o Developers may be responsible for designing and updating the algorithms, but they may not be accountable for how the systems are used in practice.

o Legal Institutions may be responsible for setting the policies regarding AI usage in courtrooms, but they may lack the tools to ensure that those policies are consistently followed.

4. Ethical and Legal Implications of AI Accountability: The lack of clear accountability frameworks raises ethical and legal concerns. Who is liable when AI decisions lead to injustice or harm? Is it the developers, the judges, or the legal institutions? Actor–Network Theory suggests that accountability in AI-driven judicial processes must be understood as a collective responsibility, with multiple actors contributing to the outcome.

DISCUSSION

The integration of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in judicial proceedings presents both remarkable opportunities and significant challenges. While AI systems have the potential to improve judicial decision-making by providing faster, more data-driven insights, they also raise critical questions regarding accountability and responsibility. This discussion explores the complexities surrounding AI accountability in judicial settings, using Actor–Network Theory (ANT) as the framework to analyze the roles of human and non-human actors in shaping the use and impact of AI systems in the justice system. The key issues that emerge include transparency, bias, distributed accountability, and the ethical implications of AI's involvement in legal decision-making.

1. Transparency and the Black Box Problem

One of the most significant concerns surrounding AI systems in judicial proceedings is their lack of transparency. AI algorithms, particularly machine learning models, are often described as "black boxes" because their decision-making processes are not always fully explainable or accessible to the people who interact with them. This issue is particularly acute in the context of judicial decision-making, where the stakes are incredibly high for individuals whose lives can be significantly impacted by a ruling.

For instance, consider the case of COMPAS, a predictive algorithm used in the United States for risk assessments in criminal justice. COMPAS is designed to evaluate the likelihood of a defendant reoffending, helping judges make decisions about bail, sentencing, and parole. However, studies have shown that the algorithm is prone to racial bias, disproportionately flagging African American defendants as high-risk, even when controlling for factors such as criminal history. The lack of transparency in how COMPAS arrives at its predictions makes it difficult for judges, lawyers, or even the public to understand why a particular decision was made. As a result, there is a growing concern about the accountability of AI systems when their outputs lead to unjust outcomes.

Actor–Network Theory highlights that both human actors (judges, lawyers, legal institutions) and non-human actors (AI algorithms, data systems) contribute to shaping legal outcomes. The opacity of AI algorithms complicates this relationship because it undermines the ability of humans to question, challenge, or verify AI outputs. This makes it harder to hold either the AI system or the human actors accountable when things go wrong.

2. Bias in AI Systems: Historical Inequalities Reproduced?

AI systems are often trained using large datasets that reflect historical patterns in data, including biases present in the society at large. These biases can emerge from various sources: racial bias in policing data, gender bias in hiring practices, or socio-economic bias in healthcare outcomes. When AI algorithms are trained on these biased datasets, they can perpetuate and even amplify these biases in decision-making.

For example, the risk assessment tools used in the judicial system might rely on data that includes historical arrest records, prior convictions, or even arrest patterns that disproportionately affect minority communities. As a result, AI systems could reinforce existing biases in the judicial process, leading to discriminatory outcomes. The ProPublica investigation into COMPAS found that the algorithm was more likely to falsely classify African American defendants as high risk while misclassifying white defendants as low risk. This issue highlights the role of historical data in shaping AI outcomes and raises questions about the fairness of using AI to inform judicial decisions that affect vulnerable populations.

In this context, the Actor–Network Theory framework allows us to understand AI not merely as a neutral tool but as an active participant in a broader network of actors. When AI systems amplify biases, they interact with human actors—judges, lawyers, and defendants—creating a network where the biases of AI become part of the judicial decision-making process. Here, distributed accountability becomes crucial: While AI systems can amplify biases, human actors must also take responsibility for how these systems are integrated into judicial processes.

3. Distributed Accountability: Who Is Responsible?

AI accountability in judicial proceedings is particularly complicated because accountability is distributed across a network of actors—both human and non-human. Actor–Network Theory asserts that responsibility does not belong to one single actor but rather emerges from the interaction of multiple actors within a network.

In the case of AI in courts, accountability must be shared between the following:

- AI Developers: Developers are responsible for creating and maintaining AI systems. However, their accountability is limited in that they cannot predict all the potential ways in which their system will be used or how it might be biased based on the data it receives. Developers should ensure that the algorithms they create are ethical, transparent, and tested for fairness, but they cannot account for every potential misuse of their technology.

- Judges and Lawyers: Judges are tasked with interpreting and applying AI-generated insights. However, their role becomes more complex when AI is involved in decision-making. If a judge heavily relies on an AI recommendation and that recommendation is flawed, who is responsible for the unjust outcome? While judges retain ultimate authority in making decisions, their increasing reliance on AI systems means that they, too, must be responsible for understanding how these systems work and ensuring that they are used in a fair and transparent manner.
- Legal Institutions: Legal institutions, such as courts, law schools, and regulatory bodies, play a role in setting the standards for the use of AI within the judicial system. However, their accountability is often limited because they may lack the resources, training, or expertise to assess the fairness or transparency of AI tools effectively. The institutions must ensure that there are regulations and guidelines in place for AI accountability.

As Actor–Network Theory suggests, accountability is diffused throughout the network, and each actor must understand their role in the outcome. When AI-driven decisions lead to harm, it is not clear whether the responsibility lies with the algorithm developers, the judges who use the tool, or the legal institutions that set the policies for AI integration.

4. Ethical Implications of AI in Judicial Decision-Making

The ethical implications of AI in judicial proceedings are far-reaching. One of the most pressing concerns is that the use of AI could undermine the human element in judicial decision-making. Judges often consider the nuances of a case—such as a defendant's background, character, or circumstances—which an AI system might fail to capture. When AI is relied upon to make or influence decisions, there is a risk of reducing complex human stories to simplistic data points.

Furthermore, ethical concerns arise when AI systems are used to make decisions that affect people's rights or freedoms. For example, in bail hearings, where an AI system might recommend a certain bail amount or whether an individual should be released, the decision could be influenced by an algorithmic prediction about the likelihood of reoffending. If the system's predictions are biased or flawed, this could result in unjust detention or overly harsh treatment of certain individuals, especially those from marginalized groups.

From an ethical standpoint, it is essential that AI systems used in judicial proceedings adhere to the principles of justice, fairness, and equity. Legal practitioners and institutions must ensure that these systems do not just reduce the costs or workload of the courts but also respect human dignity and the right to a fair trial.

5. Moving Towards Accountability and Transparency

In light of these concerns, transparency and accountability are essential for AI systems in judicial proceedings to function ethically. To achieve this, several steps can be taken:

- Explainable AI: AI systems must be designed with explainability in mind, allowing judges, lawyers, and the public to understand how the system arrived at its recommendations. This could involve developing algorithms that are not only effective but also interpretable to humans.
- Bias Mitigation: Developers must actively work to reduce bias in AI systems by using diverse, representative data and regularly testing the algorithms for fairness.
- Regulatory Oversight: Legal institutions should implement oversight mechanisms to ensure that AI systems are used appropriately within the judicial system. This could involve establishing ethical guidelines for AI use, providing training for judges on how to understand and apply AI insights, and conducting regular audits of AI systems for transparency and fairness.

AI accountability in judicial proceedings is a complex issue that requires careful consideration of both human and non-human actors. Actor–Network Theory provides a useful framework for understanding how accountability is distributed among judges, AI systems, developers, and legal institutions. As AI continues to play a larger role in legal decision-making, it is crucial to address the challenges of transparency, bias, and distributed responsibility. By ensuring that AI systems are transparent, fair, and ethical, we can build a more accountable judicial system where technology serves justice, rather than undermining it.

AI systems in judicial proceedings raise complex issues of accountability that traditional legal frameworks are ill-equipped to address. As AI systems become more integrated into decision-making processes, particularly in areas like sentencing, parole, and risk assessments, it is crucial to establish clearer lines of responsibility. The Actor–Network Theory approach to understanding AI accountability highlights that responsibility is not solely located in any single entity but is distributed among a network of actors.

Transparency and bias remain two of the most significant challenges in ensuring that AI systems are used ethically within the judiciary. The black box nature of many AI algorithms creates difficulties in holding the technology accountable when its outputs affect legal

decisions. Additionally, the possibility of algorithmic bias—where AI systems disproportionately impact certain groups, particularly marginalized communities—adds to concerns about fairness in AI-driven judicial decisions.

To address these challenges, there must be a concerted effort to:

- Improve transparency in AI systems, ensuring that their decision-making processes are explainable and understandable to judges, lawyers, and the public.
- Hold developers and legal institutions accountable for ensuring that AI systems are free from bias and are tested for fairness before deployment.
- Implement clearer regulatory frameworks that define the responsibilities of judges, developers, and legal institutions when AI systems influence judicial outcomes.

CONCLUSION

AI technologies are reshaping judicial proceedings, offering both opportunities and challenges in ensuring fairness, transparency, and accountability in legal decision-making. The Actor–Network Theory provides a valuable framework for understanding how various human and non-human actors interact and shape the accountability landscape in AI-driven legal contexts. As AI continues to play a more prominent role in the judicial system, it is imperative that accountability mechanisms be put in place to ensure that these technologies are used ethically and in the service of justice.

Further research should focus on developing practical models for accountability in AI systems used in courts, with an emphasis on transparency, fairness, and the distribution of responsibility among actors. Only by establishing clear accountability frameworks can we ensure that AI technologies in judicial proceedings contribute to a more equitable and just legal system.

REFERENCES

Agudo, Ujué, Karlos G. Liberal, Miren Arrese, and Helena Matute. 2024. The impact of AI errors in a human-in-the-loop process. Cognitive Research: Principles and Implications 9: 1–16. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef] [PubMed]

Andrés-Pueyo, Antonio, Karin Arbach-Lucioni, and Santiago Redondo. 2018. The RisCanvi. In Handbook of Recidivism Risk/Needs Assessment Tools. Oxford: John Wiley & Sons, pp. 255–68. [Google Scholar]

Angwin, Julia, Jeff Larson, Surya Mattu, and Lauren Kirchne. 2016. Machine Bias. There's Software Used Across the Country to Predict Future Criminals. And It's Biased Against Blacks. ProPublica. Available online: https://www.propublica.org/article/machine-bias-risk-assessments-in-criminal-sentencing (accessed on 14 November 2024).

Ashley, Kevin D. 2017. Artificial Intelligence and Legal Analytics. New Tools for Law Practice in the Digital Age. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. [Google Scholar]

Association for Computing Machinery and US Public Policy Council. 2017. Statement on Algorithmic Transparency and Accountability. Washington, DC: Association for Computing Machinery and US Public Policy Council. [Google Scholar]

Atchison, Amy B., Lawrence Tobe Liebert, and Debuse K. Russell. 1999. Judicial Independence and Judicial Accountability: A selected bibliography. Southern California Law Review 72: 723–810. [Google Scholar]

Bellio, Naiara. 2021. In Catalonia, the RisCanvi Algorithm Helps Decide Whether Inmates Are Paroled. algorithmwatch.org. Available online: https://algorithmwatch.org/en/riscanvi/ (accessed on 14 November 2024).

Bijker, Wiebe E., and John Law, eds. 1992. Shaping Technology Building Society. Studies in Sociotechnical Change. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press. [Google Scholar]

CCJE. 2023. Compilation of Responses to the Questionnaire for the Preparation of the CCJE Opinion No. 26 (2023) "Moving Forward: Use of Modern Technologies in the Judiciary". Strasbourg: Council of Europe. [Google Scholar]

Chiao, Vincent. 2019. Fairness, accountability and transparency: Notes on algorithmic decision-making in criminal justice. International Journal of Law in Context 14: 126–39. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]

Contini, Francesco. 2020. Artificial Intelligence and the Transformation of Humans, Law and Technology Interactions in Judicial Proceedings. Law, Technology and Humans 2: 4. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]

Contini, Francesco, and Giovan Francesco Lanzara. 2014. The Circulation of Agency in E-Justice. Interoperability and Infrastructures for European Transborder Judicial Proceedings. Berlin/Heidelberg: Springer. [Google Scholar]

Czarniawska, Barbara. 2004. On time, space, and action nets. Organization Studies 11: 773–91. [Google Scholar]

Czarniawska, Barbara, and Bernward Joerges. 1998. The Question of Technology, or How Organizations Inscribe the World. Organisation Studies 19: 363–85. [Google Scholar]

DeBrusk, Chris. 2018. The Risk of Machine-Learning Bias (and How to Prevent It). MIT Sloan Management

Review. Available online: https://sloanreview.mit.edu/article/the-risk-of-machine-learning-bias-and-how-to-prevent-it/ (accessed on 14 November 2024).

Dhungel, Anna-Katharina, and Eva Beute. 2024. AI Systems in the Judiciary: Amicus Curiae? Interviews with Judges on Acceptance and Potential Use of Intelligent Algorithms. Paper presented at ECIS 2024, Paphos, Cyprus, June 13–19. [Google Scholar]

Diakopoulos, Nicholas. 2016. Accountability in Algorithmic Decision Making. Communications of the ACM 59: 56–62. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]

Dieterich, William, William L. Oliver, and Tim Brennan. 2014. COMPAS Core Norms for Community Corrections. Northpoint. 97. Available online: https://archive.epic.org/algorithmic-transparency/crim-justice/EPIC-16-06-23-WI-FOIA-201600805-WIDOC_DCC_norm_report021114.pdf (accessed on 14 November 2024).

Digital Future Society. 2023. Algorithms in the Public Sector: Four Case Studies of ADMS in Spain. Barcelona: Digital Future Society. [Google Scholar]

ENCJ. 2018. Independence, Accountability and Quality of the Judiciary. Adopted General Assembly Lisbon, 1 June 2018. European Network of Councils for the Judiciary. Bruxelles: ENCJ.

Equivant. 2017. Northpointe Specialty Courts Manage Your Treatment Docket. Northpoint. Available online: http://www.equivant.com/wp-content/uploads/Northpointe_Specialty_Courts.pdf (accessed on 14 November 2024).

Equivant. 2019. Practitioner's Guide to COMPAS Core. Northpoint. Available online: https://archive.epic.org/algorithmic-transparency/crim-justice/EPIC-16-06-23-WI-FOIA-201600805-COMPASPractionerGuide.pdf (accessed on 14 November 2024).