Grenze International Journal of Engineering and Technology, January Issue

Toward Legal Reasoning Automation: Predicting Court Decisions with NLP and Deep Learning Approach

Shyamrao A. Gade[1] and Sivaram Ponnusamy[2]
[1-2]School of Computer Sciences and Engineering, Sandip University/Department of Computer Science and Engineering, Nashik, India
Email: shyamgade2023@gmail.com, p.sivaram@sandipuniversity.edu.in

***Abstract*—Innovations are essential to keep up with the swift changes occurring in both national and international legal frameworks. A developing field that combines law and technology is predictive justice, which utilizes deep learning (DL) and natural language processing (NLP) methods to forecast court rulings by analyzing legal data. This study examines recent predictive justice research and compares key areas where deep learning (DL) may be more suitable for modeling complex decision-making processes and those that require the extraction and analysis of large volumes of legal text using natural language processing (NLP). In this article, we present a feasible framework to aid in improving AI applications in law, utilizing specific metrics and their measurement processes across various legal contexts. From a practical perspective, we need to take a hard look at larger issues related to data privacy, ethical concerns, and the interpretability of AI models, which can increase transparency and equitable legal applications. This study is a valuable resource for academics and practitioners seeking to develop and utilize innovative predictive justice technology, as it combines strategies to achieve the state-of-the-art.**

***Index Terms*—Predictive Justice, Legal NLP, Deep Learning, Judicial Systems, Legal AI, Decision Forecasting.**

I. INTRODUCTION

Artificial intelligence has numerous applications in the judicial system, from basic document review automation to advanced judgment support systems. By utilizing historical data, artificial intelligence can search records available in the court and easily identify the president, as well as predict the outcome of the court case. Three fundamental factors help to define AI's place in legal systems:

- Predictive analytics involves estimating case outcomes, evaluating sentencing trends, and prioritizing cases based on data-driven insights.
- Automation handles routine tasks, including scheduling, document verification, tracking, and case filing.
- AI-augmented decision-making mainly refers to the use of decision-support technologies that help judges by providing insightful information from previous verdicts and legal precedents. [1]

By incorporating artificial intelligence into e-court systems, human error and bias can be reduced while also enhancing the accuracy and efficiency of the court process.
Modern technologies are fundamentally transforming the court system and will ultimately lead to fairer and more effective courts.

Grenze ID: 01.GIJET.12.1.535
© Grenze Scientific Society, 2026

Predictive justice is one such development, a contemporary approach that utilizes artificial intelligence (AI) to support courts, governments, and legal professionals in making informed decisions. Using NLP (natural language processing) and DL (deep learning) approaches, predictive justice can examine vast volumes of legal data to forecast case outcomes, record results, identify emerging legal patterns, and support informed decision-making. Modern technologies are fundamentally changing the court environment, which will ultimately lead to more fair and efficient courts. Among these advances is predictive justice, a novel strategy that leverages artificial intelligence (AI) to support courts, governments, and legal academics in making data-driven decisions. Predictive justice may assess enormous amounts of legal data using NLP (natural language processing) and DL (deep learning) techniques to estimate case outcomes, document findings, detect emerging legal trends, and inform more informed judgments.

This paper investigates the current research on NLP and DL approaches for judicial decision modeling, verdict consistency, and the extraction of essential knowledge from legal documents. Reviewing recent studies, the paper demonstrates how predictive justice may be applied to enhance judicial systems while addressing specific concerns, such as data privacy, ethical quandaries, and pragmatic limits, including algorithmic biases.

This work's principal contributions are

- A thorough analysis of the new predictive justice literature that examines the legacy of NLP and DL approaches in the legal field.
- The proposed new approach can be applied in the Indian judicial system.
- The discussion about the challenges of integrating AI into judicial processes encompasses concerns regarding interpretability, data bias, and ethical implications.
- An examination of the literature's methods, available datasets, and predictive justice assessment metrics.

The remainder of the paperwork is organized as follows: Section II presents a survey of the literature on predictive justice, with a focus on NLP and DL applications. Section III describes the datasets, methods, and assessment criteria used in predictive justice. In Section IV, which describes the datasets, methods, and assessment criteria used in predictive justice. Some of the difficulties and disadvantages of AI-based predictive justice systems, including moral and legal concerns, are addressed in Section V. Possible future directions are outlined in Section VI. This paper concludes in Section VI with a summary of the study's key findings and contributions.

II. Literature Review

A Study Investigated machine learning classifiers, including decision trees, random forests, and support vector machines, to predict the outcomes of legal cases. [2] Their experiments demonstrated that a data-driven, non-monolithic approach could effectively categorize case outputs and assist judicial decision-making. The study compared classifier performance and highlighted the potential for such methods to enhance legal analysis while identifying avenues for future refinement in this domain. A study proposes a hybrid LSTM+CNN model to enhance court judgment prediction by jointly learning temporal dependencies (via LSTM) and spatial features (via CNN) from legal documents. [3] Optimized feature selection reduces misclassification, resulting in more accurate rulings and forecasts. When evaluated in terms of privacy theft lawsuits, the model outperforms state-of-the-art methods, demonstrating significant advancements in the field of law. Investigate machine learning approaches for predicting European Court of Human Rights decisions using natural language processing techniques. [4] Their study demonstrates that while ML classifiers can effectively analyze case data and forecast rulings, they exhibit inconsistencies in their predictions. The author identifies the key limitations in the current models' efficiency in recognizing the meaning in legal texts and concepts, suggesting that a more detailed integration of legal principles could significantly improve prediction accuracy by handling complex legal decisions.

An NLP-based approach for predicting European Court of Human Rights decisions using SVM classifiers and textual features extracted from case rulings. [5] Their method combines legal document analysis with cultural indicators to predict judicial outcomes with greater accuracy. While results indicate the potential of automated legal prediction systems, the authors emphasize that such tools would require broader contextual understanding to be fully valuable for legal scholars and practitioners. An explainable AI (XAI) framework was developed for predicting court decisions in cases involving internet privacy violations. [6] Their model integrates machine learning with interpretability techniques to enhance both prediction accuracy and decision transparency in judicial systems. The approach demonstrates how AI can enhance consistency and fairness in privacy-related decisions while maintaining the explainability essential for legal applications. Results indicate that the framework has the potential to serve as a decision-support tool that balances performance with interpretability

requirements specific to the legal domain. A novel topological learning framework that combines topological data analysis (TDA) with conventional machine learning to enhance legal judgment prediction. [7] Their approach leverages the inherent structure of judicial documents to identify complex relationships between historical cases, resulting in improved accuracy compared to standalone methods. The results underscore the importance of capturing structural patterns in legal texts and establish topological learning as a promising direction for legal analytics research.

The author enhances judgment prediction by integrating legal knowledge graphs with deep learning, creating a hybrid model that outperforms conventional neural networks. [8] Their approach uses structured legal knowledge to guide case analysis, improving both accuracy and interpretability. The model demonstrates how domain-specific information can refine AI-driven legal decision-making while maintaining higher fidelity in predictions. A structured text-to-text transformer framework designed for predicting legal decisions, capturing complex linguistic patterns and interrelationships within legal documents. [9] Their dependent learning system adapts to diverse legal systems and case types while explicitly modeling prediction uncertainty. The approach demonstrates superior performance in handling varied legal contexts compared to conventional methods, particularly in processing lengthy and nuanced legal texts, which are critical for accurate judgment forecasting.

The study presents a critical analysis of legal judgment prediction (LJP) systems, identifying key limitations in current approaches and proposing research directions to advance the field of LJP. [10] The authors emphasize the necessity of incorporating multifaceted legal elements, including case complexity and judicial reasoning patterns, into machine learning frameworks. They advocate for integrating substantive legal knowledge with state-of-the-art ML techniques to develop more robust and legally grounded prediction models, highlighting this synergy as crucial for meaningful progress in LJP systems. The paper examines the ethical and practical implications of autonomous AI in legal reasoning and judgment prediction. The study [11] Critically analyzes the challenges of transparency, explainability, fairness, and accountability in AI-assisted judicial systems. While demonstrating methods to enhance model interpretability, the author concludes that AI should serve only as a decision-support tool for human judges, arguing that fully autonomous systems cannot ethically or functionally replace human judicial reasoning.

[12] Propose an interpretable legal judgment model that employs an incremental question-answering framework to enhance both performance and explainability. Their neural network iteratively queries case details, generating human-understandable rationales for predictions while improving accuracy. This approach specifically addresses the need for reliable, lawyer-friendly AI tools by prioritizing transparent decision-making processes in legal analytics. [13] Propose a multi-stage representation learning framework that progressively builds case understanding from basic facts to complex legal reasoning, mirroring the human judicial analysis process. Their hierarchical model dynamically refines case representations through successive processing stages, achieving both improved prediction accuracy and enhanced interpretability. The biologically inspired architecture demonstrates how AI can emulate real-world legal decision-making processes, providing practical and transparent solutions for predicting court judgments.

The paper proposed a research model that postulated law search as a prediction problem and presented machine learning mechanisms for predicting relevant legal precedents in any given case. [14]. The authors train a prediction algorithm based on neural networks for discovering legal cases. The product is designed to assist legal professionals in automating the process of finding precedent cases and reducing the time spent on research. It demonstrates the effectiveness and trustworthiness of machine learning search options in aiding legal decision-making. Authors discuss how deep learning models have been used in legal classification to address such problems. [15] The article examines the advantages of employing deep learning over traditional algorithmic methods, particularly since legal data is often highly unstructured and voluminous. Finally, the paper concludes with directions for future research and highlights that deep learning could have a profound impact on the law as an industry. The authors develop deep learning models (CNN and LSTM) tailored explicitly for predicting Indian Supreme Court judgments by analyzing historical case data. [16] Their approach uniquely incorporates India-specific legal factors, including judicial delays and regional jurisprudence, demonstrating significant effectiveness in predicting case outcomes while maintaining relevance to the local judicial context.

Almuslim and Inkpen present a BERT-based legal judgment prediction system for Canadian appeal cases that effectively handles complex, lengthy legal documents. [17] Their model combines pre-trained word embeddings with classification algorithms to achieve high accuracy in predicting appeal outcomes (i.e., whether an appeal is overturned or upheld), demonstrating NLP's capability to process voluminous appellate briefs that contain intricate legal reasoning and extensive case references. The research demonstrates that deep learning models can outperform human experts in predicting outcomes of Brazilian federal court appeals while matching inter-expert agreement rates. [18] Their findings underscore the distinct value of AI for complex, low-salience criminal cases

in specialized legal domains where precedents are limited. The study establishes deep learning as a viable tool for enhancing decision-making in challenging judicial contexts.

Wang developed a BERT-based judgment prediction model that leverages contextual embeddings to capture nuanced legal language across English and German texts from UK, German, and French courts. [19] Their transformer architecture significantly outperforms traditional ML methods, demonstrating the critical advantage of context-aware modeling in legal NLP applications while achieving high cross-jurisdictional prediction accuracy. The paper proposes an ensemble learning approach for matching legal document similarity that integrates multiple machine learning models to enhance retrieval accuracy. [20] Their system demonstrates superior performance in identifying legally relevant cases compared to individual models, offering enhanced efficiency and precision for legal search applications. The results highlight the method's potential as an effective tool for legal professionals conducting case research.

Rana investigates AI applications in the Indian judiciary, focusing on fact-based case outcome prediction while emphasizing the assistive (non-replacement) role of AI for judges. [21] Their work highlights the critical need for explainable and fair AI models in legal systems, addressing current limitations in transparency and accountability. The study provides a framework for developing judicial AI tools that process legal documents and analyze case facts while maintaining human oversight, as well as an LSTM-based deep learning model for predicting legal judgments that effectively process case details and historical judgments. [22] Their approach demonstrates superior handling of large datasets and improved accuracy over conventional machine learning methods by capturing temporal and spatial dependencies in legal sequences. The study establishes LSTM networks as a robust foundation for legal prediction tasks while outlining optimal scenarios for deep learning implementation in judicial analytics. A hybrid CNN-LSTM model for automating legal judgment prediction in Indian courts, demonstrating how AI can address case backlogs through accurate outcome forecasting. [23] Their deep learning approach combines convolutional feature extraction with sequential case pattern analysis, significantly improving predictive accuracy for complex legal matters while optimizing judicial resource allocation. The study provides empirical evidence for AI's transformative potential in streamlining overburdened legal systems.

A machine learning framework for predicting discretionary damages in fatal accident cases, evaluating the performance of multiple models in assessing compensation for mental suffering. [24] Their approach incorporates accident severity, legal arguments, and precedent analysis to reduce subjectivity in damage awards. Results demonstrate AI's potential to mitigate bias in judicial decisions involving complex, subjective legal determinations. A hybrid LSTM-CNN architecture for predicting legal judgments is explained in the model, which simultaneously captures sequential reasoning patterns (via LSTM) and document spatial features (via CNN). [25]

Their deep learning approach demonstrates enhanced accuracy in processing complex legal documents, particularly effective for cases involving lengthy texts and intricate legal arguments. The results validate the complementary strengths of sequential and spatial analysis in legal NLP applications. A sentiment-enhanced legal prediction framework combining random forest classifiers with textual sentiment analysis of judicial opinions introduced by the author. [26] Their novel approach extracts linguistic and emotional cues from case law to identify potential biases and improve outcome forecasting, demonstrating how affective computing can augment traditional legal analytics. The model's performance on real-world datasets establishes sentiment analysis as a valuable dimension in judicial decision prediction systems.

III. Proposed Approach Component

A. Input Layer

User Interfaces: Lawyers and citizens can access the system through a web portal or via an API interface for integration with court system interfaces.

Input Data Types: Information reports (FIR) plus case summaries in free text, key case element forms, and document uploads (OCR/PDF).

B. Pre-processing

Data Text Processing: For scans containing text images, OCR is applicable, and entity recognition is performed on legal parties, statutes (sections), and key facts (identifying parties, dates, locations, and charges).

C. Core Prediction

Model Selection: Hybrid systems that have transformer structure NLP models, Legal BERT, or its variants.

Training Dataset: Historical cases with corresponding outcomes alongside associated legal texts containing statutes and punishment policies, interspersed with their references.
Prediction Tasks: Binary/multi-class verdict prediction, classifying sentence severity, and regression analysis on fine/compensation amounts forecasting.

D. Creating the Knowledge Base

Components include the Indian Penal Code database and other related laws, a historical database of cases adjudicated with accompanying comments, and an outcome resolution. Judicial decision patterns for professional judges, per judge, within regions and states, and deviations from norms rationally defined by lawyers' sentence heuristics that vary by region or state, justify deviations from norms in sentencing heuristics. Update mechanism adding new judgment, interrogating (observing) changes to law/new decree, amending law, observing Law Watch changes; updates legislation policy enacted changes, answering questions concerning statutes, amendments, and policy changes.

E. Add the Explanation

This component describes the pre-sentenced terms, expected result maps, and suggested ranges; computes the assessed factors; and explains the results of these assessments.

F. Output Layer

Formats: comprehensive PDF reports, engaging web dashboards, API responses for seamless integration, and SMS/email notifications for monitoring cases.
User-specific Views:
For the Public: Overall likelihood assessments
For Lawyers: Tactical Suggestions
For Judges: Tools for Decision-Making Support

VI. Datasets, Methodologies and Evaluation Metrics in Predictive Justice

The development of AI models for predictive justice necessitates the availability of reliable legal information, trustworthy processing and analysis techniques, and suitable evaluation criteria to achieve efficient and equitable outcomes.
These are all significant topics that will be covered in this section.

A. Datasets

Legal datasets, which are used to train and validate AI models, are crucial for predictive justice, including court rulings, laws, contracts, and other legal documents. The quality and representativeness of these datasets have a significant impact on the performance of AI systems.

B. Types of Datasets

Different types of papers are used by legal systems to facilitate analysis and informed decision-making. Case law databases offer records of previous rulings that aid in comprehending legal precedents. Examples of these databases are the US Supreme Court Database and the European Court of Human Rights (ECHR) dataset. Courts follow statutory writings, such as statutes and constitutions, while interpreting and implementing the law. To examine business conditions, ensure compliance, and resolve disputes, contracts and agreements are essential. Similar to this, legal opinions and briefs include thorough justifications and arguments from lawyers and judges that aid in understanding the decision-making process.

C. Challenges with Datasets

Researchers often face restricted access to legal datasets since many are proprietary or only partially available. Legal documents also contain sensitive information, which requires anonymization to protect the identities of the involved parties.
Additionally, differences in legal systems and languages limit the ability to develop AI models that work universally across jurisdictions.

D. Methodologies

It includes the application of cutting-edge artificial intelligence methods to derive insights from legal records, generate predictions for outcomes, and support judges in making informed decisions.

E. Natural Language Processing (NLP) Approaches

Cleaning and arranging unstructured texts is the first step in processing legal documents. Legal documents can be converted into machine-readable formats with the help of feature extraction algorithms such as BERT, Word2Vec, and TF-IDF.

Important components, including legislation, parties, and dates, are identified by Named Entity Recognition (NER). Sentence categorization aids tasks such as judgment prediction and argument mining by further classifying sentences into distinct groups.

F. Deep Learning Approaches

To analyze the sequential nature of legal documents, RNNs often collaborate with LSTM units. Deep contextual awareness is provided by sophisticated models such as BERT and GPT, which makes them helpful in evaluating legal data.

By assisting the model in focusing on key aspects of documents, attention mechanisms enhance the model's accuracy and clarity. To improve prediction performance, hybrid models combine a CNN for feature extraction with an RNN or an LSTM for handling sequences.

G. Evaluation Metrics

Predictive justice researchers assess AI models based on interpretability, accuracy, and fairness. Metrics such as accuracy, recall, and F1-score are frequently used to assess how well the model handles both accurate and inaccurate predictions.

Additionally, AUC-ROC helps in evaluating the model's ability to make choices across classes in both basic and multi-class tasks.

H. Metrics for Fairness

To ensure the model works equally effectively for everyone, researchers examine whether predictions have an unfair impact on particular groups. They also emphasize how simple it is for lawyers to understand the model's judgments. Attention mapping is a tool that helps illustrate which textual elements influence the model's predictions.

I. Metrics for generalizability

To verify the model's applicability, researchers test it in various legal systems. By analyzing the outcomes when working with unclear or insufficient data, they also assess their ability to adapt to these situations.

V. Challenges and their Addressing with Artificial Intelligence to Legal Systems

Artificial intelligence has considerable potential to enhance our legal systems, but it also raises significant ethical and operational concerns. Concerns such as data bias, transparency, privacy, and accountability are significant hurdles that we need to address. [27] When historical data is biased, it can lead to unfair outcomes, particularly impacting minority groups. The complexity of models like LSTM and Transformers can make it tough for legal professionals to grasp how predictions are formed, which can erode trust and acceptance.

Courts are grappling with ethical questions about who is responsible for decisions made by AI and how to prevent misuse or undue influence.

The risk to privacy increases when sensitive legal data is used for training these models. To navigate these challenges, the legal field needs to establish clear ethical standards, employ techniques to mitigate bias, and adopt explainable AI to promote transparency and accountability. Regular audits and oversight can help ensure fairness, accountability, and adherence to legal standards.

VI. Future Directions in Predictive Justice

Early automated justice systems relied on limited datasets and technology; however, researchers have since identified ways to enhance AI for fairness and improve its capabilities. The paper suggests future directions to overcome current barriers and expand legal AI applications:

A. Multilingual and Cross-Jurisdictional Models

When it comes to multilingual and cross-jurisdictional models, legal AI must be versatile enough to handle multiple languages and adapt to diverse legal systems, even when laws and cultural nuances vary significantly across different jurisdictions.

B. Multimodal Data Integration

As for multimodal data integration, the future of these systems may see a blend of text and visuals, such as contracts or photographic evidence, along with speech-to-text technology to capture court proceedings in real-time.

C. Ethical AI in Legal Frameworks

Researchers must detect and mitigate bias in legal datasets when designing AI systems that adhere to ethical principles, such as equality and privacy.

D. Blockchain for Data Security:

Pairing AI with blockchain can protect legal records from tampering and enable smart contracts with predictive dispute resolution.

E. More Innovative Legal AI Models

Domain-specific models (e.g., LegalBERT) enhance accuracy, and continuous learning enables AI to adapt to new laws and rulings. [28]

F. Collaborative AI Systems:

AI should assist, not replace legal professionals, and crowdsourced data annotation can diversify training perspectives.

By advancing these areas, predictive justice can create fairer and more efficient legal systems worldwide, while unlocking new AI applications in law.

VII. Conclusion

Advances in NLP and deep learning are transforming the legal industry, enabling predictive justice to deliver data-driven insights and streamline judicial processes. While this emerging field enhances efficiency and consistency in court outcomes, we must address critical ethical concerns, including bias, transparency, and accountability, to ensure fairness and justice. To build trustworthy AI for justice, we need rigorous evaluation metrics that prioritize explainability and fairness. Looking ahead, multilingual models, federated learning, and blockchain integration can further refine predictive justice, making it more scalable and equitable for all.

Contributions of this paper include an exhaustive review and consolidation of current approaches and an assessment of pressing limitations, followed by actionable recommendations to address them for future work. This study, by providing an overview of existing literature and identifying areas for improvement, aims to lay the groundwork for future research and practice in legal AI. Predictive justice has the potential to be revolutionary, enabling the use of technology to create more just judicial systems. However, the latter requires responsible development, and that must also consider ethical, societal, and technical dimensions. This complex world of predictive justice, which seeks to provide decisions at scale, can only be improved through continued interdisciplinary research and collaboration, enabling it to serve the values of fairness, equality, and justice more effectively.

References

[1] Andriati Syarifah Lisa, Rizki Kiki Inneke, and Ain Nazwa Binti Mohd Malian, "Justice on Trial How Artificial Intelligence is Reshaping Judicial Decision-Making," Journal of Indonesian Legal Studies, vol. 9(2), no. 2, pp. 909–942, Dec. 2024, doi: https://doi.org/10.15294/jils.v9i2.13683.

[2] R. A. Shaikh, T. P. Sahu, and V. Anand, "Predicting Outcomes of Legal Cases based on Legal Factors using Classifiers," in Procedia Computer Science 167(2020), Elsevier B.V., 2020, pp. 2393–2402. doi: 10.1016/j.procs.2020.03.292.

[3] D. Alghazzawi, O. Bamasag, A. Albeshri, I. Sana, H. Ullah, and M. Z. Asghar, "Efficient Prediction of Court Judgments Using an LSTM+CNN Neural Network Model with an Optimal Feature Set," Mathematics, vol. 10, no. 5, Mar. 2022, doi: 10.3390/math10050683.

[4] M. Medvedeva, M. Vols, and M. Wieling, "Using machine learning to predict decisions of the European Court of Human Rights," Artif Intell Law (Dordr), vol. 28, no. 2, pp. 237–266, Jun. 2020, doi: 10.1007/s10506-019-09255-y.

[5] N. Aletras, D. Tsarapatsanis, D. Preoţiuc-Pietro, and V. Lampos, "Predicting judicial decisions of the European court of human rights: A natural language processing perspective," PeerJ Comput Sci, vol. 2016, no. 10, 2016, doi: 10.7717/peerj-cs.93.

[6] M. Park and S. Chai, "AI model for predicting legal judgments to improve accuracy and explainability of online privacy invasion cases," Applied Sciences (Switzerland), vol. 11, no. 23, Dec. 2021, doi: 10.3390/app112311080.

[7] H. Zhong, Z. Guo, C. Tu, C. Xiao, Z. Liu, and M. Sun, "Legal Judgment Prediction via Topological Learning," Brussels, Belgium, Oct. 2018. [Online]. Available: https://github.
[8] Gan Leilei, Y. Yang, F. Wu, and Kun Kuang, "Judgment Prediction via Injecting Legal Knowledge into Neural Networks," 2021. [Online]. Available: www.aaai.org
[9] Y. Huang, X. Shen, C. Li, J. Ge, and B. Luo, "Dependency Learning for Legal Judgment Prediction with a Unified Text-to-Text Transformer," Dec. 2021, [Online]. Available: http://arxiv.org/abs/2112.06370
[10] M. Medvedeva, M. Wieling, and M. Vols, "Rethinking the field of automatic prediction of court decisions," Artif Intell Law (Dordr), vol. 31, no. 1, pp. 195–212, Mar. 2023, doi: 10.1007/s10506-021-09306-3.
[11] D. U. Socol De La Osa and N. Remolina, "Artificial intelligence at the bench: Legal and ethical challenges of informing - Or misinforming - Judicial decision-making through generative AI," Data For Policy, vol. 6, p. e59.1-e59.30, Dec. 2024, doi: 10.1017/dap.2024.53.
[12] H. Zhong, Y. Wang, C. Tu, T. Zhang, Z. Liu, and M. Sun, "Iteratively Questioning and Answering for Interpretable Legal Judgment Prediction," 2020. [Online]. Available: www.aaai.org
[13] L. Ma et al., "Legal Judgment Prediction with Multi-Stage Case Representation Learning in the Real Court Setting," in SIGIR 2021 - Proceedings of the 44th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval, Association for Computing Machinery, Inc, Jul. 2021, pp. 993–1002. doi: 10.1145/3404835.3462945.
[14] F. Dadgostari, M. Guim, P. A. Beling, M. A. Livermore, and D. N. Rockmore, "Modeling law search as prediction," Artif Intell Law (Dordr), vol. 29, no. 1, pp. 3–34, Mar. 2021, doi: 10.1007/s10506-020-09261-5.
[15] N. Bansal, A. Sharma, R. K. Singh, and R. K. A. Singh, "Review on the Application of Deep Learning in Legal Domain," pp. 374–381, 2019, doi: 10.1007/978-3-030-19823-7_31ï.
[16] S. Sharma, R. Shandilya, and S. Sharma, "Predicting Indian Supreme Court Judgments, Decisions, Or Appeals eLegalls Court Decision Predictor (eLegPredict)," Oct. 2021. doi: https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2110.09251.
[17] I. Almuslim and D. Inkpen, "Legal Judgment Prediction for Canadian Appeal Cases," in Proceedings - 2022 7th International Conference on Data Science and Machine Learning Applications, CDMA 2022, Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers Inc., 2022, pp. 163–168. doi: 10.1109/CDMA54072.2022.00032.
[18] E. J. de Menezes-Neto and M. B. M. Clementino, "Using deep learning to predict outcomes of legal appeals better than human experts: A study with data from Brazilian federal courts," PLoS One, vol. 17, no. 7 July, Jul. 2022, doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0272287.
[19] Y. Wang, J. Gao, and J. Chen, "Deep learning algorithm for judicial judgment prediction based on BERT," in Proceedings of the 2020 International Conference on Computing, Communication and Security, ICCCS 2020, Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers Inc., Oct. 2020. doi: 10.1109/ICCCS49678.2020.9277068.
[20] B. Fang, T. Cohn, T. Baldwin, and L. Frermann, "Super-SCOTUS: A multi-sourced dataset for the Supreme Court of the US," 2023. [Online]. Available: https://www.oyez.org/
[21] R. S. Rana, S. Singh, M. Aggarwal, and M. Badoni, "Unveiling the Future: Exploring AI Applications in the Indian Judicial System," in ISED 2023 - International Conference on Intelligent Systems and Embedded Design, Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers Inc., 2023. doi: 10.1109/ISED59382.2023.10444600.
[22] P. Madambakam and S. Rajmohan, "A Study on Legal Judgment Prediction using Deep Learning Techniques," in Proceedings - 2022 IEEE Silchar Subsection Conference, SILCON 2022, Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers Inc., 2022. doi: 10.1109/SILCON55242.2022.10028879.
[23] S. Ahmad, M. Z. Asghar, F. M. Alotaibi, and Y. D. Al-Otaibi, "A hybrid CNN + BILSTM deep learning-based DSS for efficient prediction of judicial case decisions," Expert Syst Appl, vol. 209, p. 118318, Dec. 2022, doi: 10.1016/J.ESWA.2022.118318.
[24] D. Hsieh, L. Chen, and T. Sun, "Legal judgment prediction based on machine learning: Predicting the discretionary damages of mental suffering in fatal car accident cases," Applied Sciences (Switzerland), vol. 11, no. 21, Nov. 2021, doi: 10.3390/app112110361.
[25] S. Senthil Pandi, A. M. Farook, and W. Kingston, "Scenario-based Deep Learning Prediction for Legal Judgment using LSTM and CNN," in Proceedings - 3rd International Conference on Smart Technologies, Communication and Robotics 2023, STCR 2023, Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers Inc., 2023. doi: 10.1109/STCR59085.2023.10397023.
[26] B. V. Pavani, D. Mahitha, P. Prabhakar, and P. B. Pati, "Identifying Sentiment in Legal Case Judgments using Random Forest Classifier," in 2024 IEEE 9th International Conference for Convergence in Technology, I2CT 2024, Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers Inc., 2024. doi: 10.1109/I2CT61223.2024.10544116.
[27] A. M. John, A. M. U., and J. T. Panachakel, "Ethical Challenges of Using Artificial Intelligence in Judiciary," IEEE International Conference on Metrology for eXtended Reality, Artificial Intelligence and Neural Engineering (MetroXRAINE), pp. 723–728, Apr. 2023, [Online]. Available: http://arxiv.org/abs/2504.19284
[28] I. Chalkidis, M. Fergadiotis, P. Malakasiotis, N. Aletras, and I. Androutsopoulos, "LEGAL-BERT: The muppets straight out of law school," in Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics Findings of ACL: EMNLP 2020, Association for Computational Linguistics (ACL), Nov. 2020, pp. 2898–2904. doi: 10.18653/v1/2020.findings-emnlp.261.