ПОРІВНЯЛЬНЕ ПРАВОЗНАВСТВО

UDC 347.9:004.8
DOI: https://doi.org/10.31861/jiel.2026.2.83-93

Nelia Savchyn,
Candidate of Science of Law (PhD in Law),
Associate Professor,
Assistant Lecturer at the Department of Procedural Law,
Yuriy Fedkovych Chernivtsi National University, Ukraine
e-mail: n.savchyn@chnu.edu.ua
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3200-7373

ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE IN THE JUDICIAL SYSTEM OF UKRAINE: INTERNATIONAL EXPERIENCE AND UKRAINIAN PRACTICE

This article examines the current state and prospects of using artificial intelligence (AI) technologies in Ukraine's judicial system. It analyses the international and national regulatory and ethical benchmarks for the use of AI in judicial proceedings, in particular the provisions of Opinion No. 26 (2023) of the Consultative Council of European Judges, the European Ethical Charter on the Use of Artificial Intelligence in Judicial Systems and their Environment, and the CEPEJ Guidelines on the use of generative artificial intelligence for courts. The article also outlines Ukrainian organisational approaches, notably the Regulation on the Use of Artificial Intelligence Technologies by Employees of the Office of the Supreme Court.

The main focus is a review of case law on parties' use of generative AI output, references to fictitious court decisions and legal positions, and AI use in drafting judicial acts. The article argues that AI output has no independent evidentiary value and cannot replace the judge's assessment of evidence, legal analysis or the reasoning of a court decision. It identifies the key risks of using AI: legal 'hallucinations', algorithmic bias, opacity, breaches of confidentiality, loss of professional autonomy, and unequal access to technology.

Effective integration of artificial intelligence technologies into Ukraine's judicial system requires not only the formal enshrinement of relevant rules, but also the development of a coherent institutional culture of responsible use. The introduction of AI must be accompanied by uniform methodological guidelines for courts and participants in the judicial process, improved systems for verifying the authenticity of electronic sources, and mechanisms for verifying results obtained using generative models. Ensuring the digital literacy of judges, court staff, lawyers and other participants in the administration of justice is of particular importance, as it is precisely their level of awareness that determines the limits of the safe and ethical use of such technologies. At the same time, it is emphasised that the digitalisation of the justice system must not lead to the devaluation of the human element, a decline in trust in the judiciary, or the erosion of guarantees of a fair trial.

The article concludes that the acceptable model for Ukraine is the assistive use of AI, under which technology supports administrative, analytical and information processes but does not take over the functions of the judge. It proposes ways of improving the legal framework: statutory definition of permitted and prohibited uses of AI, the introduction of standards for disclosing its use, and the provision of algorithmic audits, professional training for users and safeguards ensuring effective human oversight.

Keywords: *Supreme Court, e-justice, human oversight, judicial discretion, case law, judicial proceedings, artificial intelligence.*

ISSN 3083-7979

Савчин Неля. Штучний інтелект у судовій системі України: міжнародний досвід та українські практики.

У статті досліджено сучасний стан і перспективи застосування технологій штучного інтелекту в судовій системі України. Проаналізовано міжнародні та національні нормативно-етичні орієнтири використання штучного інтелекту в судочинстві, зокрема положення Висновку Консультативної ради європейських суддів № 26 (2023), Європейської етичної хартії щодо використання штучного інтелекту в судових системах та Керівних принципів СЕРЕЈ щодо використання генеративного штучного інтелекту в судах. Охарактеризовано українські організаційні підходи, зокрема Положення про використання технологій штучного інтелекту працівниками Апарату Верховного Суду.

Основну увагу приділено огляду судової практики щодо використання сторонами процесу результатів роботи генеративного штучного інтелекту, посилань на вигадані судові рішення та правові позиції, а також використання ШІ під час підготовки судових актів. Обґрунтовано, що результати роботи штучного інтелекту не мають самостійного доказового значення та не можуть замінювати суддівську оцінку доказів, правовий аналіз і мотивування судового рішення. Визначено ключові ризики застосування ШІ: правові «галюцинації», алгоритмічну упередженість, непрозорість, порушення конфіденційності, втрату професійної автономії та нерівність доступу до технологій.

Установлено, що ефективна інтеграція технологій штучного інтелекту в судову систему України потребує не лише формального закріплення відповідних правил, а й формування цілісної інституційної культури відповідального їх використання. Наголошено, що впровадження ШІ має супроводжуватися розробленням єдиних методичних рекомендацій для судів та учасників судового процесу, удосконаленням системи перевірки достовірності електронних джерел, а також створенням механізмів верифікації результатів, отриманих за допомогою генеративних моделей. Особливого значення набуває забезпечення цифрової компетентності суддів, працівників апарату судів, адвокатів та інших учасників правозастосування, оскільки саме рівень їхньої обізнаності визначає межі безпечного й етичного використання таких технологій. Водночас підкреслено, що цифровізація правосуддя не повинна призводити до знецінення людського чинника, зниження довіри до судової влади чи розмивання гарантій справедливого судового розгляду.

Зроблено висновок, що допустимою моделлю для України є асистивне використання штучного інтелекту, за якого технологія підтримує адміністративні, аналітичні та інформаційні процеси, але не перебирає на себе функції судді. Запропоновано напрями вдосконалення правового регулювання: нормативне визначення дозволених і заборонених видів використання ШІ, запровадження стандартів розкриття факту його застосування, забезпечення аудиту алгоритмів, професійної підготовки користувачів і гарантій ефективного людського контролю.

Ключові слова: *Верховний Суд, електронне правосуддя, людський контроль, суддівський розсуд, судова практика, судочинство, штучний інтелект.*

Introduction. Artificial intelligence is one of the most important technologies driving the digital transformation of modern society. Its use extends to public administration, education, medicine, finance, research and the legal profession. The judicial system is not immune to these processes either, since the volume of legislation, case law, evidentiary information and organisational data is constantly growing. In these circumstances, AI

ISSN 3083-7979

technologies can facilitate information retrieval, the generalisation of case law, the automation of technical operations, the organisation of court work and wider access to justice.

At the same time, judicial proceedings are special in nature. A court decision is the outcome of the administration of justice, which rests on an independent assessment of evidence, the application of legal rules, an individualised analysis of the circumstances of the case, and the personal responsibility of the judge. The use of AI technologies in courts therefore cannot be treated solely as a matter of technical modernisation. It is directly linked to the guarantees of judicial independence, the right to a fair trial, the principles of adversarial proceedings, equality of the parties and reasoned court decisions, personal data protection, and public trust in justice.

The relevance of this study stems from the fact that AI is already in use in the Ukrainian legal community. Courts and court staff use digital tools to search for and systematise information, analyse case law, transcribe, translate and automate certain workflows. At the same time, participants in proceedings use generative systems to draft procedural documents, conduct legal research and build their arguments. Ukrainian courts are already encountering filings that contain fictitious court decisions, incorrect case numbers or legal conclusions generated by AI systems.

The problem lies in the absence of comprehensive and sufficiently detailed legislative regulation of the use of AI in judicial proceedings. Current approaches are being shaped by international standards, ethical instruments, internal acts of judicial bodies, professional recommendations and case law. It is therefore particularly important to examine how Ukrainian courts define the permissible limits of AI use and what procedural consequences they attach to the improper use of its output.

The aim of the article to identify the legal and organisational framework for the use of artificial intelligence in the judicial system of Ukraine and to analyse current case law on the admissibility of the use of generative AI output by courts and participants in proceedings.

Literature Review. The use of artificial intelligence in judicial proceedings has been examined by Ukrainian and foreign scholars, judges, and representatives of judicial self-governance bodies and the legal professions. The theoretical potential and risks of AI in judicial proceedings have been considered by D. Bielov and M. Bielova, who highlight the possibilities of automated processing of legal information, analysis of large bodies of court decisions, and prediction and identification of patterns in case law [1, p. 317].

The legal and organisational framework for the use of AI in the work of Ukrainian courts has been studied by V. Riadinska and O. Karpushova. The authors argue in favour of an intelligent assistance model, under which AI performs auxiliary analytical and administrative functions while the final decision remains with a human [2].

The criminal procedure aspect of the use of AI technologies has been explored by S. Krushynskyi. He analyses the potential uses of AI in criminal proceedings while drawing attention to the risks of legal 'hallucinations', bias and breaches of privacy, and to the need to comply with European standards of justice [3, p. 119].

A separate line of research concerns the use of AI in judicial decision-making. O. Tehza analyses predictive analytics, natural language processing, generative AI and automated case management. The author identifies the risks of algorithmic discrimination, algorithmic opacity, weakening of judicial independence and declining trust in the judicial system [4].

At the same time, academic and practice-oriented publications have not examined in sufficient depth current Ukrainian case law on the use of AI as such. Separate analysis is

ISSN 3083-7979

needed of court decisions that assess parties' references to ChatGPT, documents containing fictitious legal positions, the use of generative systems in drafting judicial acts, and the procedural consequences of failing to verify AI output properly.

Results and Discussion.

International standards for the use of AI

International standards for the use of artificial intelligence in judicial proceedings proceed from a human-centred model of justice. According to Opinion No. 26 (2023) of the Consultative Council of European Judges (CCJE), 'Moving forward: the use of assistive technology in the judiciary', technology can increase the speed, efficiency and accuracy of court work, but it should support judges, not replace them [5].

The CCJE notes that the use of AI in the judiciary is still largely at an early stage and concerns administrative and auxiliary functions: speech recognition, translation, automated anonymisation of court decisions, electronic filing, case management, videoconferencing and information retrieval. Ultimate responsibility for a court decision must remain with a human [5].

The CCJE Opinion rests on the need to reconcile technological development with the principles of the rule of law, judicial independence, impartiality, access to justice, transparency, security and accountability. Judicial autonomy is of particular importance: judicial bodies should take part in the development, procurement, implementation and oversight of the technological systems used by courts.

The European Ethical Charter on the Use of Artificial Intelligence in Judicial Systems and their Environment sets out five core principles: respect for fundamental rights; non-discrimination; quality and security; transparency, impartiality and fairness; and 'under user control'. These principles are relevant not only to the technical design of systems but also to the assessment of the specific ways in which they are used [6].

In 2025, the CEPEJ adopted the Guidelines on the use of generative artificial intelligence for courts. The document steers courts towards the safe, responsible and lawful use of generative systems. Generative AI may be used for case management, document processing, information services and the preparation of standard materials. At the same time, matters concerning fundamental rights, minors, legally incapacitated persons or deprivation of liberty require full human judicial involvement, and the use of AI must be confined to technical support [7].

The CEPEJ Guidelines also envisage the possibility of introducing procedures under which courts may require parties or their representatives to disclose the use of generative AI in preparing procedural documents, conducting legal research or gathering evidence, where this is necessary in a particular category of cases. Such an approach is intended to ensure procedural good faith, verifiability and equality of the parties [7].

A benchmark for European regulation is Regulation (EU) 2024/1689, known as the Artificial Intelligence Act. It is based on a risk-based approach and imposes different levels of requirements depending on the potential harm that a given system may cause. AI systems intended to assist judicial authorities in researching and interpreting facts and the law and in applying the law to a concrete set of facts are classified as high-risk. This approach reflects the potential impact of algorithmic output on fundamental rights, access to justice and a fair trial [8].

National framework for the use of AI

In Ukraine, at the time of writing, no comprehensive special law on the use of AI in the judicial system has established a complete regulatory model. Nevertheless, the relevant approaches are gradually taking shape on the basis of the Concept for the Development of

ISSN 3083-7979

Artificial Intelligence in Ukraine, the Code of Judicial Ethics, international standards, training activities and internal acts of the judiciary.

Of particular importance is Article 16 of the Code of Judicial Ethics, under which a judge may use artificial intelligence technologies provided that such use does not affect the judge's independence and impartiality, does not concern the assessment of evidence or the decision-making process, and does not breach statutory requirements [9].

This provision draws a fundamental line: a judge may use AI as an auxiliary tool but may not delegate to technology his or her own powers to assess evidence, give a legal characterisation, establish the facts of the case or reach a conclusion.

A further step was the approval by the Supreme Court of the Regulation on the Use of Artificial Intelligence Technologies by Employees of the Office (Aparat) of the Supreme Court by Order No. 117 of the Head of the Office of the Supreme Court of 8 December 2025. The document proceeds from the premise that AI is an auxiliary tool and cannot replace human professional judgement, critical thinking and legal assessment [10].

The Regulation prohibits: processing restricted-access information; processing materials containing personal data; predicting court decisions in specific cases; automatically generating procedural documents; analysing employee behaviour; using AI in a manner that may affect the independence and impartiality of judges.

Conversely, the permitted areas are defined as the generalisation of case law, analysis of court decisions, preparation of analytical materials, automation of repetitive workflows, the court's information activities, the creation of chatbots, translation of documents and professional development [11].

An example of the practical use of intelligent technologies at the Supreme Court is the Supreme Court's Database of Legal Positions. It is designed to search for relevant legal conclusions and does not provide for automated adjudication. This model is consistent with the assistive approach, under which technology facilitates access to legal information but does not replace judicial activity [11].

The National School of Judges of Ukraine plays an important role in building judges' competence. In 2024–2026, it held seminars and training events on the digitalisation of justice, the use of AI, information security, legal 'hallucinations' and the verification of output produced by language models [12; 13]. This shows that the technological transformation of the judicial system requires not only regulatory acts but also systematic training of judges and court staff.

Permissible areas of AI use

It is advisable to differentiate uses of AI in the judicial system according to the nature of the task and the degree of its impact on the administration of justice.

Administrative and technical areas include:

- electronic filing and sorting of documents;
- automatic speech recognition;
- transcription of court hearings;
- translation;
- anonymisation of court decisions;
- scheduling;
- allocation of organisational resources;
- informing participants via chatbots;
- preparation of statistical and analytical materials.

ISSN 3083-7979

Such functions do not usually involve an independent assessment of evidence or decision-making. Even in this area, however, it is necessary to ensure personal data protection, cybersecurity, verifiability of output, and the presence of a responsible official.

Analytical areas include searching for relevant case law, classifying court decisions, identifying recurring legal positions, summarising materials and preparing reference information. These processes can significantly reduce the time spent by a judge or a member of court staff, but search results cannot be treated as a final legal conclusion.

It is essential to distinguish between finding a legal position and applying it. Technology may offer a judge a list of decisions or text excerpts, but only the judge can determine whether the position in question is relevant, whether it is still current, whether it fits the facts of the case and whether it can serve as the basis for the reasoning.

The highest level of risk arises when AI is used to assess evidence, predict the decision of a particular judge, determine the credibility of testimony, automatically generate a legal characterisation or produce the final text of a court decision. Such use may amount to a covert delegation of judicial discretion to technology and call into question the legitimacy of the court decision.

Legal 'hallucinations' and professional responsibility

One of the most dangerous risks of generative AI is the production of plausible but inaccurate information. A system may generate a fictitious case number, a non-existent court decision, an incorrect date, or an inaccurate quotation from a legislative act, or it may attribute to a court a legal position that the court never actually expressed. This phenomenon has come to be known as legal 'hallucinations'.

The danger lies in the way such output is presented. AI often formulates its answers confidently, logically and in a stylistically persuasive manner, which may create an illusion of reliability. However, a language model is not an official register of court decisions, does not guarantee that legal information is up to date and bears no professional responsibility for the content of its answers.

Every reference obtained with the help of AI must therefore be checked against the primary source. For case law, that source is the Unified State Register of Court Decisions, the official website of the court or another authoritative resource. For legislation, official databases and the current versions of legislative acts must be used.

The duty of verification cannot be shifted to the court, the opponent or another party. Where a lawyer or another participant in proceedings files a document containing fictitious references, this may affect the assessment of his or her procedural good faith. In the presence of additional circumstances, such conduct may be regarded as an abuse of procedural rights or contempt of court.

At the same time, the mere fact of using AI should not automatically entail adverse procedural consequences. What is decisive is whether the user verified the output, whether he or she understood its content, whether the submission of inaccurate information hindered the consideration of the case, and whether there was an intention to mislead the court.

Case law on the use of AI by the parties

Ukrainian case law is gradually developing an approach to the use of AI by participants in proceedings. Case No. 925/200/22 is illustrative: there, the Commercial Court of Cassation within the Supreme Court considered a participant's reliance on information obtained with the help of ChatGPT. The Court pointed out that a generative system is neither a source of law nor evidence, and that its answers cannot replace the court's own analysis [4; 14].

ISSN 3083-7979

ChatGPT's answers on the interpretation of a contractual provision cannot confirm or refute the facts of a case. Nor do they have any independent legal force, since they are not a legislative act, a court decision, an expert opinion or any other means of proof provided for by law.

In case No. 925/496/24, the Commercial Court of Cassation, in its decision (postanova) of 8 July 2025, likewise emphasised that AI may serve as an auxiliary information tool but cannot replace the court, judicial discretion or the requirements of relevance, admissibility and reliability of evidence [15].

A separate category comprises cases in which a participant in proceedings files documents containing fictitious references. In case No. 240/14153/24, the Administrative Court of Cassation within the Supreme Court drew attention to the presence in a cassation appeal of false case numbers, dates of court decisions and fictitious legal conclusions. The Court linked the nature of these references to the possible use of generative AI without proper professional verification [16].

This example is of fundamental importance because it shows that the use of AI does not relieve a lawyer of the duty to verify every statement and every source. Professional responsibility arises not from the mere fact of using the technology but from submitting inaccurate material as verified legal information.

Another important issue is the evidentiary value of AI output. The output of a generative system may form part of a party's explanations or serve as a tool for preparing a document, but it does not become evidence simply because it was generated with the help of technology. The court must assess evidence under the general rules of procedural law: relevance, admissibility, reliability, sufficiency and its interrelation with other evidence.

Where AI has been used to process a video recording, an audio file, a photograph or a digital document, the subject of assessment should be not an abstract 'algorithmic answer' but the specific digital material, the manner in which it was obtained, its integrity and authenticity, the processing methodology, the margin of error and the possibility of independent verification.

Use of AI in drafting court decisions

Case law on the use of generative AI directly in drafting court decisions deserves particular attention. In case No. 11-kp/824/1818/2025, on 30 July 2025 the Kyiv Court of Appeal set aside a criminal judgment and remitted the case for retrial. One of the circumstances to which the appellate court drew attention was the use in the text of the judgment of theoretical propositions generated by ChatGPT [16].

The problem lay not in the mechanical use of a digital tool as such, but in the fact that the generated text addressed legal issues and was incorporated into the court decision without proper individualisation and verification. A court decision must contain the court's own reasoning, based on the facts of the particular case and the legal rules applied. It cannot be a mechanical compilation of text produced by an external system.

This case illustrates the difference between technical editing and the substantive drafting of a judicial act. Using AI to correct language errors, structure text that has already been written or translate may carry a different level of risk from using a generative system to build legal arguments, establish legally relevant facts or provide the reasoning for a conclusion.

The decisive criterion is therefore neither the name of the technology nor the manner of its use, but the impact of AI output on the content of the judicial decision. If the technology merely eliminates technical shortcomings in a text already written by a human, it performs an auxiliary function. If, however, it shapes a legal position, assesses evidence

ISSN 3083-7979

or determines the outcome of the case, this runs counter to the principle that justice must be administered by the judge personally.

AI in court administration

A separate area is the use of AI in court administration. International and Ukrainian experience demonstrates its potential for workload analysis, forecasting resource needs, automating human resources and organisational processes, compiling statistics, scheduling and communicating with participants in proceedings [17].

Within such functions, AI should not influence the content of a court decision or determine the outcome of a case. However, administrative use also requires safeguards of non-discrimination, explainability and personal data protection. For example, algorithmic allocation of resources or analysis of staff performance may give rise to risks of covert profiling or unjustified appraisal.

Ukrainian experience shows that the organisational processes involved in implementing AI include developing standard operating procedures, designating responsible persons, managing access to data, auditing systems and training staff. Any technological solution should be accompanied by a description of its purpose, dataset, limitations, possible errors and the procedure for challenging or correcting its output.

Promising areas include the development of intelligent systems for searching legal positions, automatic transcription of court hearings, anonymisation of court decisions, translation and information chatbots. Such systems, however, must function as tools supporting the court rather than as autonomous agents of law enforcement.

Main risks and safeguards

A systematic review of academic sources, international standards and case law makes it possible to identify the following main risks of using AI in judicial proceedings:

1. the risk of error and legal ‘hallucinations’ – the generation of fictitious rules, decisions or facts;
2. the risk of algorithmic bias – the reproduction of discriminatory patterns present in the source data;
3. the risk of opacity – the impossibility of understanding why the system produced a particular output;
4. the risk of breach of confidentiality – the transfer of personal data or case materials to publicly available services;
5. the risk of loss of professional autonomy – excessive reliance on automated recommendations;
6. the risk of inequality of the parties – unequal access of participants in proceedings to high-quality technology;
7. the risk of false standardisation – the substitution of individual analysis with template text;
8. the risk of diffused responsibility – uncertainty as to who is responsible for an erroneous output.

To minimise these risks, the following safeguards are needed: mandatory human oversight; verification of output against primary sources; a prohibition on automated adjudication; restriction of AI access to confidential data; technical documentation and logging of operations; regular testing for accuracy and bias; explainability of algorithmic output; the possibility of independent audit; professional training of judges and court staff; designation of responsible persons; a procedural possibility to challenge results obtained with the help of AI; preservation of a non-technological alternative for participants in proceedings.

ISSN 3083-7979

In our view, national legislation should enshrine at least three levels of AI use:

1. permitted technical and administrative use – translation, transcription, anonymisation, organisational planning, and information retrieval and systematisation;

2. conditionally permitted analytical use – generalisation of case law, preparation of reference notes and searching for legal positions, subject to mandatory human verification;

prohibited use, or use incompatible with judicial proceedings – assessment of evidence, predicting the decision of a particular judge, automated generation of judicial conclusions, determination of guilt, sentencing, or any other delegation of judicial functions to technology.

Conclusions. Artificial intelligence is gradually becoming part of the judicial system of Ukraine. Its use already covers searching for and generalising case law, automating administrative processes, transcription, translation, information services, preparing analytical materials and professional training of judicial system staff.

International standards, in particular CCJE Opinion No. 26 (2023), the CEPEJ European Ethical Charter and the CEPEJ Guidelines on generative AI for courts, proceed from the principle of the supportive use of technology. AI can enhance the efficiency, accuracy and accessibility of justice, but it cannot replace the judge or take over the functions of assessing evidence, applying the law and making decisions.

Ukrainian approaches are developing in the same direction. Article 16 of the Code of Judicial Ethics allows a judge to use AI only on the condition that this does not affect the judge's independence and impartiality and does not concern the assessment of evidence or the decision-making process. The Supreme Court's Regulation on the use of AI by employees of the Office of the Supreme Court further defines prohibited and permitted areas of technology use.

The review of case law points to an emerging consistent position: answers produced by ChatGPT and other generative systems are not sources of law, evidence or a substitute for judicial analysis. The use of AI by a participant in proceedings is not in itself a violation, but the submission of unverified output, fictitious court decisions and false legal references may entail procedural consequences. In such cases, responsibility is linked not to the technology but to a failure to comply with the professional duty of verification and the principle of good faith.

A particular danger lies in the use of generative AI in drafting court decisions. A judicial act must contain the court's own reasoning, individualised to the circumstances of the particular case. AI-generated text cannot replace judicial discretion and must not create the impression that the function of administering justice has been delegated to technology.

The promising model for Ukraine is therefore not one of automated justice but one of human-centred assistive adjudication. Its essence is that artificial intelligence is used to support organisational, information and analytical processes, while judicial independence, the assessment of evidence, legal reasoning and the final decision remain the exclusive sphere of human responsibility.

СПИСОК ВИКОРИСТАНИХ ДЖЕРЕЛ:

1. Бєлов Д. М., Бєлова М. В. Штучний інтелект в судочинстві та судових рішеннях, потенціал та ризики. Науковий вісник Ужгородського національного університету. Серія: Право. 2023. Вип. 78, ч. 2. С. 315–320. DOI: https://doi.org/10.24144/2307-3322.2023.78.2.50
2. Рядінська В. О., Карпушова О. В. Правові та організаційні засади використання штучного інтелекту в діяльності судів в Україні. Юридичний науковий електронний журнал. 2025. № 5. DOI: https://doi.org/10.32782/2524-0374/2025-5/23

3. Крушинський С. Застосування технологій штучного інтелекту в кримінальному провадженні: реалії і перспективи. Актуальні проблеми правознавства. 2025. № 3. С. 117–122. URL: https://appj.wunu.edu.ua/index.php/appj/article/view/2183
4. Тегза О. О. Використання штучного інтелекту при прийнятті судових рішень. Науковий вісник Ужгородського національного університету. Серія: Право. 2026. Т. 4, № 94. DOI: https://doi.org/10.24144/2307-3322.2026.94.4.6
5. Consultative Council of European Judges. Opinion No. 26 (2023): Moving forward: the use of assistive technology in the judiciary. URL: https://rm.coe.int/ccje-opinion-no-26-2023-final/1680adade7
6. European Commission for the Efficiency of Justice. European Ethical Charter on the Use of Artificial Intelligence in Judicial Systems and their Environment. Strasbourg, 2018. URL: https://lnk.ua/R2NlAzDIa
7. European Commission for the Efficiency of Justice. Guidelines on the use of generative artificial intelligence for courts. CEPEJ(2025)18Final. Strasbourg, 2025. URL: https://lnk.ua/K58POVG7q
8. Regulation (EU) 2024/1689 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 13 June 2024 laying down harmonised rules on artificial intelligence (Artificial Intelligence Act). URL: https://eur-lex.europa.eu/eli/reg/2024/1689/oj
9. Кодекс суддівської етики : затверджений рішенням XI чергового з'їзду суддів України від 22 лютого 2013 року. URL: https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/rada/show/n0001415-13#Text
10. Положення про використання технологій штучного інтелекту працівниками Апарату Верховного Суду : затверджене наказом керівника Апарату Верховного Суду від 08.12.2025 № 117. URL: https://court.gov.ua/storage/portal/supreme/rizne/Polozhennya_SHI.pdf
11. Використання штучного інтелекту в судовій системі потребує чітких правил – суддя ВП ВС. Верховний Суд. 06.05.2026. URL: https://supreme.court.gov.ua/supreme/pres-centr/news/2022297/
12. Штучний інтелект вже в судах. Національна школа суддів України. 06.03.2025. URL: https://lnk.ua/Cs0kC9AJc
13. В НШСУ обговорили актуальні питання використання штучного інтелекту в суді. Судова влада України. 28.04.2026. URL: https://court.gov.ua/archive/2017417/
14. Штучний інтелект і судочинство. Юридична Газета. URL: https://lnk.ua/aouwJK1tX
15. ШІ та правнича діяльність: як реагують суди. Національна асоціація адвокатів України. 05.03.2026. URL: https://lnk.ua/hCsWbY309
16. Використання ШІ у судочинстві: Мінцифра готує законодавство, а судді сперечаються. URL: https://lnk.ua/Qe64mhZaQ
17. Штучний інтелект у судовому адмініструванні: міжнародний досвід та українські практики. Проєкт ЄС «Право-Justice». 05.03.2026. URL: https://lnk.ua/LyaHWEhtA

REFERENCES:

1. Bielov, D. M., & Bielova, M. V. (2023). Shtuchnyi intelekt v sudochynstvi ta sudovykh rishenniakh, potentsial ta ryzyky [Artificial intelligence in justice and court decisions: potential and risks]. Naukovyi Visnyk Uzhhorodskoho Natsionalnoho Universytetu. Seriia: Pravo, 78(2), 315–320. https://doi.org/10.24144/2307-3322.2023.78.2.50
2. Riadinska, V. O., & Karpushova, O. V. (2025). Pravovi ta orhanizatsiini zasady vykorystannia shtuchnoho intelektu v diialnosti sudiv v Ukraini [Legal and organisational principles of using artificial intelligence in the activities of courts in Ukraine]. Yurydychnyi Naukovyi Elektronnyi Zhurnal, 5. https://doi.org/10.32782/2524-0374/2025-5/23
3. Krushynskyi, S. (2025). Zastosuvannia tekhnolohii shtuchnoho intelektu v kryminalnomu provadzhenni: realii i perspektyvy [Application of artificial intelligence technologies in criminal proceedings: realities and prospects]. Aktualni Problemy Pravoznavstva, 3, 117–122. https://appj.wunu.edu.ua/index.php/appj/article/view/2183

4. Tehza, O. O. (2026). Vykorystannia shtuchnoho intelektu pry pryiniatti sudovykh rishen [Use of artificial intelligence in judicial decision-making]. Naukovyi Visnyk Uzhhorodskoho Natsionalnoho Universytetu. Seriia: Pravo, 94(4). https://doi.org/10.24144/2307-3322.2026.94.4.6
5. Consultative Council of European Judges. (2023). Opinion No. 26 (2023): Moving forward: the use of assistive technology in the judiciary. https://rm.coe.int/ccje-opinion-no-26-2023-final/1680adade7
6. European Commission for the Efficiency of Justice. (2018). European Ethical Charter on the Use of Artificial Intelligence in Judicial Systems and their Environment. Council of Europe. https://lnk.ua/R2NlAzDIa
7. European Commission for the Efficiency of Justice. (2025). Guidelines on the use of generative artificial intelligence for courts. CEPEJ(2025)18Final. Council of Europe. https://lnk.ua/K58POVG7q
8. European Parliament and Council of the European Union. (2024). Regulation (EU) 2024/1689 laying down harmonised rules on artificial intelligence (Artificial Intelligence Act). https://eur-lex.europa.eu/eli/reg/2024/1689/oj
9. Sudova Vlada Ukrainy. (2023). Kodeks suddivskoi etyky [Code of Judicial Ethics]. https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/rada/show/n0001415-13#Text
10. Verkhovnyi Sud. (2025). Polozhennia pro vykorystannia tekhnolohii shtuchnoho intelektu pratsivnykamy Aparatu Verkhovnoho Sudu [Regulation on the use of artificial intelligence technologies by employees of the Office of the Supreme Court]. https://court.gov.ua/storage/portal/supreme/rizne/Polozhennya_SHI.pdf
11. Verkhovnyi Sud. (2026, May 6). Vykorystannia shtuchnoho intelektu v sudovii systemi potrebuie chitkykh pravyl – suddia VP VS [The use of artificial intelligence in the judicial system requires clear rules]. https://supreme.court.gov.ua/supreme/pres-centr/news/2022297/
12. Natsionalna Shkola Suddiv Ukrainy. (2025, March 6). Shtuchnyi intelekt vzhe v sudakh [Artificial intelligence is already in courts]. https://lnk.ua/Cs0kC9AJc
13. Sudova Vlada Ukrainy. (2026, April 28). V NShSU obhovoryly aktualni pytannia vykorystannia shtuchnoho intelektu v sudi [Current issues of using artificial intelligence in court discussed at the National School of Judges of Ukraine]. https://court.gov.ua/archive/2017417/
14. Shtuchnyi intelekt i sudochynstvo [Artificial intelligence and judicial proceedings]. (n.d.). Yurydychna Hazeta. https://lnk.ua/aouwJK1tX
15. Ukrainian National Bar Association. (2026, March 5). ShI ta pravnycha diialnist: yak reahuiut sudy [AI and legal practice: how courts respond]. https://lnk.ua/hCsWbY309
16. Vykorystannia ShI u sudochynstvi: Mintsyfra hotuie zakonodavstvo, a suddi sperechaiutsia [Use of AI in judicial proceedings: the Ministry of Digital Transformation prepares legislation while judges debate]. https://lnk.ua/Qe64mhZaQ
17. EU Project "Pravo-Justice". (2026, March 5). Shtuchnyi intelekt u sudovomu administruvanni: mizhnarodnyi dosvid ta ukrainski praktyky [Artificial intelligence in judicial administration: international experience and Ukrainian practices]. https://lnk.ua/LyaHWEhtA

Дата першого надходження/Date of first submission: 15.08.2026
Прийнято до друку/Accepted: 19.09.2026
Опубліковано/Published: 01.11.2026