

**A.I. In Law: Adversary or Ally?
Addressing the Possible
Implications of
A.I. Technology in Law
and
the Necessity of Regulation**

**Abe Jonathan Selvas
Stanford University**



Topic(s): Legal Field, Artificial Intelligence, Techno-solutionism, Legal Studies, Law Practice, Discrimination, Malpractice.

Abstract

The integration of Artificial Intelligence (AI) into the legal profession presents both groundbreaking opportunities and significant risks. AI-driven tools offer the potential to automate legal research, contract analysis, and case prediction, increasing efficiency and expanding access to legal services. However, recent legal cases and regulatory developments underscore the dangers of overreliance on AI in law, particularly concerning hallucinated legal citations, algorithmic bias, and privacy violations. This paper critically examines the techno-solutionist mindset that views AI as

the answer to workload issues in the legal profession, contrasting it with the documented shortcomings of AI systems in practice. Drawing on recent case studies, regulatory initiatives, and empirical research, this paper highlights the risks of unregulated AI, including the amplification of systemic discrimination, ethical concerns in criminal justice applications, and the erosion of legal accountability. By analyzing regulatory frameworks from the EU AI Act (2024), FTC guidance on AI regulation, and recent court rulings on AI misuse in law, this paper proposes a dual regulatory framework that combines government oversight with internal legal institution governance. This approach aims to ensure AI is used in a transparent, accountable, and ethical manner. The paper addresses concerns regarding AI's impact on employment in the legal sector, particularly for marginalized law students and early-career professionals. Ultimately, it argues that while AI can serve as a transformative tool, its integration must be guided by rigorous regulatory safeguards, bias mitigation strategies, and human oversight to prevent harm and uphold the principles of justice.

Introduction

Artificial Intelligence (AI) has rapidly transformed industries ranging from finance and healthcare to education and law. AI-driven tools now assist legal professionals with tasks such as legal research, contract review, case prediction, and document drafting. While these advancements promise to enhance efficiency, reduce costs, and expand access to legal services, recent legal controversies and regulatory developments have exposed significant risks. Cases such as *Mata v. Avianca* (*Mata v. Avianca*, 2023; Weiser, 2023) where AI-generated legal citations proved fictitious, and the Federal Trade Commission's (FTC) warnings about

deceptive AI legal tools highlight the unreliability and ethical pitfalls of current AI applications in law (FTC, 2024). Furthermore, the persistence of algorithmic bias—documented in studies like *Gender Shades (2018)*—raises concerns that unregulated AI could exacerbate systemic discrimination in legal decision-making, disproportionately impacting marginalized communities. This paper explores the promises and perils of AI integration in the legal profession, examining how regulatory models from other fields, such as finance and autonomous systems, can inform best practices in legal AI governance. The techno-solutionist mindset, which assumes AI can independently solve legal inefficiencies without human oversight, is critically assessed against empirical evidence showing that AI still struggles with accuracy, bias, and ethical compliance. While AI offers transformative potential, its deployment in law must be guided by best practices that prioritize transparency, accountability, and fairness.

To address these challenges, this paper advocates for a dual regulatory framework that combines government oversight with internal governance by legal institutions. Drawing from regulatory strategies such as the EU AI Act (2024), Federal Trade Commission (FTC) guidelines (2024), and proposed U.S. AI legislation, including the Future of Artificial Intelligence Innovation Act of 2024 (S.4178), the Federal Artificial Intelligence Risk Management Act of 2024 (H.R.6936), and the Safe and Secure Innovation for Frontier Artificial Intelligence Models Act (Colorado AI Act, 2024), this paper proposes a system of mandatory audits, bias mitigation protocols, and sandbox evaluations before AI tools are deployed in high-stakes legal environments (Colorado AI Act, 2024; Federal AI Risk Management Act, 2024; Future of AI Innovation Act, 2024). State-level AI

regulations, such as the Colorado AI Act (2024) and the Safe and Secure Innovation for Frontier Artificial Intelligence Models Act (California, 2024), serve as early models for AI governance that may influence broader federal policies and corporate compliance strategies. Given that companies often adjust their AI practices nationwide to align with the strictest state standards, these laws provide a blueprint for potential nationwide AI oversight, particularly in legal applications where fairness and accountability are critical. Additionally, this paper considers the impact of AI on employment and equity in the legal profession, particularly for early-career professionals and historically marginalized groups. Given AI's potential to amplify systemic discrimination and introduce legal inaccuracies, its unchecked use threatens the integrity of the justice system. A responsible and ethical approach to AI integration—centered on human oversight, regulatory compliance, and safeguards against bias—is essential to ensuring that AI serves as an ally in advancing justice rather than a mechanism for reinforcing inequities.

Literature Review & Background

Despite AI's growing influence, it remains an imperfect and evolving technology, particularly within law. Many legal scholars and practitioners acknowledge its potential but maintain cautious skepticism, recognizing that AI is far from infallible. A persistent issue is the phenomenon of "AI hallucinations," in which AI systems generate incorrect or entirely fictitious legal information, undermining the credibility of AI-assisted legal tools. The American Bar Association (ABA) has expressed serious reservations about the reliability of generative AI in legal research and document drafting, emphasizing risks related to accuracy, data privacy, and security concerns

(Kite-Jackson, 2023). In its ABA *TechReport 2023*, the organization highlights the limited AI literacy among legal professionals, with over half of surveyed attorneys reporting insufficient knowledge of AI-based tools, reinforcing the need for comprehensive training. Suffolk Law School Dean Andrew Perlman supports AI's role in enhancing legal practice but warns against uncritical reliance on AI-generated outputs without rigorous human oversight (Kite-Jackson, 2023).

Given these concerns, AI tools must undergo significant refinement before they can be considered reliable for high-stakes legal applications. Until then, ethical AI integration requires a balanced approach—ensuring equitable distribution of benefits and burdens, while safeguarding against systemic bias and discrimination. Research consistently demonstrates that AI, when trained on biased or unrepresentative data, amplifies existing inequalities rather than mitigating them. For example, Bender et al. (2021) in “On the Dangers of Stochastic Parrots” argue that large language models embed and reinforce structural biases, producing outputs that disproportionately harm underrepresented groups. Similarly, Virginia Eubanks (2018) in *Automating Inequality* illustrates how algorithmic decision-making in social services entrenches poverty and denies marginalized communities critical resources. The Gender Shades study (Buolamwini & Gebru, 2018) and the documentary *Coded Bias* (Kantayya, 2020) further expose how AI-driven facial recognition systems exhibit significant accuracy disparities for women and people of color, exacerbating issues of policing and surveillance-related discrimination.

While AI has the potential to transform legal practice, particularly in expanding access to legal aid, its unregulated or unchecked

deployment poses substantial risks. Until AI systems achieve sufficient reliability, they should be used cautiously and only in low-stakes legal scenarios. Regulatory mechanisms must be established to prevent misuse and protect vulnerable communities from unintended harm. Although most legal experts advocate for strong oversight, some policymakers and economists—such as Steven Davis, a senior fellow at the Hoover Institution—argue that excessive regulation could stifle innovation and hinder commercialization (Solomon, 2025). However, this perspective often reflects the privilege of those insulated from AI's harmful consequences rather than a genuine commitment to ethical AI deployment. Anti-regulatory arguments should therefore be carefully scrutinized, ensuring that the push for innovation does not come at the expense of legal integrity and social justice.

The rapid integration of AI into the legal profession presents a paradox: while it has the potential to enhance efficiency and democratize legal services, it also threatens to perpetuate systemic inequities. Legal professionals acknowledge AI's promise but remain wary of its practical and ethical limitations. Much of this skepticism stems from concerns about client harm, reputational risks, and legal liability, rather than a broader focus on preventing AI-driven discrimination. This paper aims to bridge that gap by raising awareness of the ethical implications of AI adoption in law, critiquing unregulated AI deployment, and advocating for robust regulatory mechanisms that protect those most at risk. By prioritizing fairness, accountability, and transparency, the legal profession can harness AI's transformative potential while mitigating its most pressing risks

Promises & Perils

Artificial Intelligence (AI) excels at processing and summarizing legal documents, providing concise overviews that can significantly expedite legal research—an invaluable tool for lawyers and law students facing extensive workloads. With the capacity to analyze large datasets, generate legal document templates, and assist in case preparation, AI can reduce time spent on routine tasks. AI also aids in time management and workflow organization, helping lawyers streamline administrative responsibilities. These efficiencies allow legal professionals to focus more on strategic casework and client interaction. However, while these benefits suggest greater accessibility to legal services, the risks posed by AI's limitations remain equally significant.

Professor David Wilkins (2024), in an interview with *Harvard Law Today*, highlights AI's potential to democratize access to legal services and disrupt traditional hierarchies in the profession. Some AI tools, as Wilkins notes, can produce work comparable to that of junior associates. However, the high incidence of “AI hallucinations”—where AI fabricates nonexistent legal precedents—undermines reliability. Wilkins warns that algorithmic opacity, legal inaccuracies, and potential discriminatory outcomes necessitate careful oversight. He emphasizes the importance of foundational legal training, as AI models require expert human judgment to ensure safe and effective deployment in the legal profession.

Beyond accuracy concerns, AI's predictive capabilities remain highly unreliable in legal contexts. Narayanan and Kapoor (2024) found that AI models tasked with predicting criminal justice outcomes achieved an accuracy rate of only 7%, demonstrating that AI cannot yet be relied upon for high-stakes legal decision-making. This inadequacy

poses serious risks for marginalized communities, particularly those who might rely on cost-effective but flawed AI-driven legal assistance. Instead of reducing disparities, poorly designed AI tools may entrench existing inequities, reinforcing systemic discrimination in the justice system.

Legal AI research tools have also come under scrutiny. Magesh et al. (2024) conducted an empirical evaluation of Lexis+ AI (LexisNexis), Westlaw AI-Assisted Research (Thomson Reuters), Ask Practical Law AI (Thomson Reuters), and GPT-4 (general-purpose AI chatbots). Their study challenges corporate claims that retrieval-augmented generation (RAG) can eliminate hallucinations, showing that hallucination rates remain between 17% and 33% across the tested platforms. They also identified systemic vulnerabilities in AI retrieval mechanisms, noting that AI struggles to interpret legal queries with necessary contextual nuance, leading to misleading outputs. Like other AI and legal experts, Magesh et al. stress the importance of legal professionals maintaining oversight to mitigate harm in high-stakes legal applications.

Alongside its accuracy and reliability challenges, AI raises serious ethical concerns regarding its impact on marginalized groups. McArthur and Kellermann (2024) argue that AI's deployment in law could exacerbate existing inequities, particularly for low-income individuals who may be misled by flawed AI-driven legal services. These issues underscore the urgent need for regulatory safeguards to ensure that AI is used ethically and equitably. While AI cannot fully replace lawyers, its increasing role in automating contract drafting and document review has sparked concerns about job displacement. Entry-level legal positions—often held by

individuals from historically underrepresented backgrounds—may be particularly vulnerable. This threat of AI-driven job loss could discourage students from marginalized communities from pursuing legal careers, weakening efforts to diversify the legal profession. For many first-generation law students and immigrant communities, law has traditionally served as a pathway to financial stability and social mobility—a dynamic that could be undermined if AI disproportionately limits employment opportunities.

AI's disproportionate impact on marginalized groups in the legal profession reflects a broader pattern of AI-related harm across multiple sectors. Theodore Kim (2021) extends this critique to autonomous vehicle technology, demonstrating that AI-driven transportation systems struggle to detect Black pedestrians, perpetuating racial bias in traffic safety. Abeba Birhane (2021) critiques AI systems built without cultural and contextual awareness, arguing that such models reduce individuals from the Global South to dehumanized data points. Similarly, Ruha Benjamin (2019) in *Race After Technology* describes how AI systems reproduce racial inequalities under the guise of technological progress. Bommasani et al. (2022) further highlight how the widespread reuse of machine learning components, such as training data and foundation models, exacerbates systemic harm for marginalized groups. This corporate and academic practice leads to "outcome homogenization", where historically disadvantaged communities experience compounding negative effects across multiple AI-driven systems.

Recognizing these risks, the National Artificial Intelligence Advisory Committee (2023) has warned that AI may amplify societal biases, particularly when marginalized groups lack access to AI

governance mechanisms. Parthasarathy and Katzman (2024) criticize top-down AI regulation approaches, arguing that such models often fail to address the unique challenges faced by marginalized communities. Instead, they advocate for grassroots involvement in AI policymaking, ensuring that those most affected by AI systems have a voice in shaping their governance. Decker et al. (2025) support the need for procedural fairness in algorithmic decision-making (ADM) systems, calling for urgent reforms to correct systemic flaws in AI design, deployment, and governance.

Regulation

Artificial intelligence (AI) presents a significant challenge in legal contexts, raising concerns about accuracy, accountability, and ethical use. An anonymous paralegal from the Law Office of Cauble & Whittington LLP in Grants Pass, Oregon, highlights the risks:

AI is on a slippery slope toward becoming too powerful. In educational institutions, issues like plagiarism and reliance on AI can lead to gaps in understanding legal material. In law firms, the unchecked use of AI can result in the oversight of inaccurate information, potentially leading to malpractice claims. Given these risks, law schools and firms must implement regulations and procedures to ensure responsible AI use.

This statement underscores the urgency of regulating AI in legal education and practice. Law schools train the future attorneys, paralegals, and judges responsible for upholding justice within a legal system

rooted in centuries-old laws. Without proper oversight, AI could reinforce existing disparities, misinterpret legal doctrines, and introduce new ethical dilemmas. To safeguard the legal profession and the public, institutions must adopt structured regulations that govern AI use in legal research, case analysis, and judicial decision-making.

The Need for AI Regulation in Law

Effective AI regulation in law requires an understanding of legal theory, algorithmic errors, and the broader social harms these systems can inflict. Hoffmann-Riem (2020) examines the complexities of AI regulation, arguing for a comprehensive framework that balances innovation with public interest and societal well-being. He critiques corporate self-regulation and advocates for a hybrid model incorporating public oversight, transparency, and accountability mechanisms to mitigate risks such as algorithmic bias and privacy violations.

One example of AI-induced harm can be seen in the financial sector, where algorithmic decision-making has perpetuated discrimination. Evans et al. (2021) highlight how biased financial models have entrenched racial inequities, noting that:

If lenders incorporate data that regulators previously discouraged human underwriters from using, they risk automating bias, creating new pathways of discrimination that calcify racial inequities.

Similar concerns arise in legal AI, where biased data can lead to unjust sentencing recommendations, discriminatory hiring practices, and flawed legal analyses. Buckley et al. (2021) propose regulatory

models for AI in finance that emphasize human oversight, transparency, and stakeholder collaboration—principles that could serve as a blueprint for AI governance in law.

A Dual Approach to AI Regulation in Law

To mitigate AI's risks while harnessing its benefits, a dual regulatory framework is needed—one that combines government oversight with proactive measures from legal institutions. Key recommendations include:

1. **Mandatory Sandbox Evaluations** – Similar to financial sector practices (Evans et al., 2021), controlled testing environments should be required for AI tools before full-scale deployment in legal practice. These evaluations would identify biases and inaccuracies, ensuring compliance with ethical and legal standards.
2. **Establishment of a Legal AI Regulatory Agency** – A specialized government agency, akin to the FDA or IRS, should oversee AI applications in law. This body would enforce compliance, investigate misuse, and mandate transparency in algorithmic decision-making.
3. **Education and Certification Programs** – Legal professionals must undergo training on the ethical implications and responsible use of AI. Certification programs should ensure that attorneys, judges, and paralegals are equipped to evaluate AI-generated legal analyses critically.

4. **Bias Mitigation Teams in Legal Institutions** – Law firms and legal organizations should establish internal teams dedicated to identifying and addressing discriminatory biases in AI systems. Lessons from finance and law enforcement demonstrate the necessity of proactive bias detection and mitigation.
5. **Transparency and Accountability Offices** – Legal institutions must adopt clear transparency protocols to govern data privacy, security, and AI decision-making processes. Ethics offices should be created to monitor AI usage, address misconduct, and promote responsible AI governance.

Balancing Innovation with Ethical Oversight

While Hoffmann-Riem (2020) advocates for top-down regulatory measures, Braun (2024) critiques centralized AI governance, arguing that it may inadvertently reinforce systemic inequities. Instead, Braun calls for grassroots involvement, advocating for community-driven oversight mechanisms that ensure marginalized voices are included in AI policymaking. Decker et al. (2025) emphasize the need for relational justice in AI governance, promoting public engagement and procedural fairness to address the societal impacts of AI.

A hybrid approach that integrates top-down regulation with localized governance offers a more dynamic and inclusive pathway forward. Drawing on financial sector models, legal institutions can implement adaptive regulatory frameworks that balance AI innovation with ethical responsibility. By embedding human oversight into automated processes and prioritizing transparency, the

legal profession can mitigate AI's risks while leveraging its transformative potential.

Conclusion

The integration of AI into the legal profession presents a paradox: while it offers unprecedented efficiencies and expanded access to justice, it also carries significant risks, particularly for marginalized communities. Without robust regulatory structures, AI's tendency to generate inaccurate legal analyses, automate bias, and erode accountability could profoundly undermine public trust in the legal system. However, as this paper has argued, the risks of AI can be mitigated through a multi-layered governance approach that balances innovation with legal and ethical safeguards. A critical takeaway from this discussion is that law cannot remain reactionary to AI developments; it must proactively shape AI's role within legal institutions. Relying on ad hoc responses to AI-related legal failures is inadequate. Instead, law firms, courts, and policymakers must anticipate risks and implement structures that ensure AI serves justice rather than distorts it. Such an intervention requires:

- Mandating continuous AI evaluation through sandbox testing and certification requirements before AI systems are deployed in legal contexts.
- Institutionalizing oversight bodies that enforce AI governance standards, similar to regulatory agencies in finance and healthcare.
- Embedding equity-focused safeguards that specifically address AI's disproportionate impact on historically marginalized communities.
- Advancing interdisciplinary collaboration, where legal experts,

technologists, and ethicists co-develop AI governance frameworks that evolve alongside technological advances.

Perhaps the most urgent challenge is ensuring that the legal profession avoids complacency in the face of AI's rapid adoption. AI's influence on case law, due process, and judicial decision-making will only deepen. If regulatory interventions fail to keep pace with AI's evolution, we risk normalizing algorithmic decision-making in ways that disempower both legal professionals and the communities they serve.

The legal profession is at a crossroads: will AI be wielded as a tool for justice, or will it exacerbate systemic inequities? The answer depends on the legal community's willingness to actively shape AI's trajectory rather than merely adapting to it. The call to action is clear: regulatory frameworks must not only protect against immediate harms but also envision a legal system where AI enhances, rather than diminishes, the pursuit of justice. The time to build that future is now.

References

- Bender, E. M., Gebru, T., McMillan-Major, A., & Shmitchell, S. (2021). On the dangers of stochastic parrots: Can language models be too big?  *Proceedings of the 2021 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, 610–623. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3442188.3445922>
- Benjamin, R. (2019). *Race after technology: Abolitionist tools for the new Jim Code*. Polity Press.
- Birhane, A. (2021). Algorithmic injustice: a relational ethics approach. *Patterns*, 2(2).
- Bommasani, R., Creel, K. A., Kumar, A., Jurafsky, D., & Liang, P. (2022). Picking on the same person: Does algorithmic monoculture lead to outcome homogenization? *36th Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*. Retrieved from <https://worksheets.codalab.org/worksheet/s/0x807c29f8eb574d1fba8f429ec78b5d1b>
- Buckley, R. P., Zetsche, D. A., Arner, D. W., & Tang, B. W. (2021). Regulating artificial intelligence in finance: Putting the human in the loop. *The Sydney Law Review*, 43(1), 43-81.
- Buolamwini, J., & Gebru, T. (2018, January). Gender shades: Intersectional accuracy disparities in commercial gender classification. In *Conference on fairness, accountability and transparency* (pp. 77-91). PMLR.
- Braun, D. (2024). Why "Artificial Intelligence" Should Not Be Regulated. *Digital Government: Research and Practice*.
- California State Legislature. (2024). *Safe and Secure Innovation for Frontier Artificial Intelligence Models Act*. Retrieved from https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Regulation_of_artificial_intelligence
- Colorado General Assembly. (2024). *Colorado AI Act*. Retrieved March 12, 2025 from <https://www.whitecase.com/insight-our-thinking/ai-watch-global-regulatory-tracker-united-states>
- Decker, M. C., Wegner, L., & Leicht-Scholten, C. (2025). Procedural fairness in algorithmic decision-making: the role of public engagement. *Ethics and Information Technology*, 27(1), 1.
- European Parliament. (2024). *Regulation (EU) 2024/... of the European Parliament and of the Council on artificial intelligence (AI Act)*. Retrieved from

- <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX%3A32024R0000>
- Evans, C., Pence, K., & Federal Reserve Board of Governors. (2021, August 19). *How Can Regulation Facilitate Financial Inclusion in Fintech?*. San Francisco Fed. Retrieved October 30, 2024, <https://www.frbsf.org/community-development/publications/community-development-investment-review/2021/august/how-can-regulation-facilitate-financial-inclusion-in-fintech>
- Federal Trade Commission. (2024, September 25). *FTC announces crackdown on deceptive AI claims and schemes*. Federal Trade Commission. Retrieved March 12, 2025, from <https://www.ftc.gov/news-events/news/press-releases/2024/09/ftc-announces-crackdown-deceptive-ai-claims-schemes>
- Federal Artificial Intelligence Risk Management Act of 2024, H.R.6936, 118th Cong. (2024). Retrieved from <https://www.congress.gov/bill/118th-congress/house-bill/6936>
- Future of Artificial Intelligence Innovation Act of 2024, S.4178, 118th Cong. (2024). Retrieved from <https://www.congress.gov/bill/118th-congress/senate-bill/4178>
- Hoffmann-Riem, W. (2020). Artificial intelligence as a challenge for law and regulation. In T. Wischmeyer & T. Rademacher (Eds.), *Regulating Artificial Intelligence*. Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-32361-5_1
- Hoppner, Thomas, and Luke Streatfeild. *CHATGPT, Bard & Co.: An Introduction to AI for Competition and Regulatory Lawyers*. SSRN, 9 Hausfeld Competition Bulletin, 3 Mar. 2023, papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=4371681.
- Kantayya, Shalini, director. *Coded Bias*. 7th Empire Media, Accessed 2025.
- Kim, T. (2021, October 7). *Op-ed: AI Flaws Could Make Your Next Car Racist*. Los Angeles Times. <https://www.latimes.com/opinion/story/2021-10-07/op-ed-ai-flaws-could-make-your-next-car-racist>
- Kite-Jackson, D. W. (2023). 2023 Artificial Intelligence (AI) TechReport. *ABA TechReport*.
- Li, Jolie. "More People Might Misunderstand AI than You Think. Here's Why." *The Stanford Daily*, 17 Jan. 2025, stanforddaily.com/2025/01/17/why-people-misunderstand-ai/?utm_campaign=digest&utm_medium=email&utm_source=mailchimp&utm_content=Jan-17-2025.
- Lohr, Steve. *A.I. Is Coming for Lawyers, Again.*, Gale Academic OneFile, 11 Apr. 2023, <https://go.gale.com/ps/i.do?id=GALE%7CA744995045&sid=googleScholar&v=2.1&it=r&linkaccess=abs&issn=22699740&p=AONE&sw=w&userGroupName=anon~99c8fc67&aty=open-web-entry>
- Magesh, V., Surani, F., Dahl, M., Suzgun, M., Manning, C. D., & Ho, D. E. (2024). Hallucination-free? Assessing the reliability of leading AI legal research tools. *arXiv*.
- McArthur, A., & Kellermann, E. (2023, April 17). *Law's digital awakening: AI's growing impact on the legal world*. North Carolina Journal of Law & Technology. <https://ncjolt.org/laws-digital-awakening-ais-growing-impact-on-the-legal-world>.
- Narayanan, Arvind, and Sayash Kapoor. *Will AI Transform Law?*, AI Snake Oil, 24 Jan. 2024, www.aisnakeoil.com/p/will-ai-transform-law?r=2qha5&utm_campaign=post&utm_medium=web.
- Solomon, Sam. "Levin Calls for AI Investments at Hoover Institution Panel."

The Stanford Daily, 23 Jan. 2025,
stanforddaily.com/2025/01/22/levin-calls
-for-ai-investments-hoover/?utm_campai
gn=digest&utm_medium=email&utm_so
urce=mailchimp&utm_content=Jan-23-2
025.

Weiser, B. (2023, May 27). *Here's what happens when your lawyer uses ChatGPT*. *The New York Times*.
<https://www.nytimes.com/2023/05/27/ny-region/avianca-chatgpt-lawyer.html>

Wilkins, D. (2024, February 14). *The legal profession in 2024: AI*. Harvard Law Today. Retrieved from
<https://hls.harvard.edu>

Wischmeyer, T. (2018). Regulation of intelligent systems: A multidisciplinary approach. *Journal of Legal Studies in Technology and Ethics*, 32(1), 12–38.