

Summary of 4 French institutional reports on the use of artificial intelligence in the field of justice

The **Senate report** focuses on the legal professions (lawyers, judges, notaries, in-house counsel). It puts forward twenty recommendations to help these professions adapt to generative AI. Key priorities include protecting the monopoly of legal advice, ensuring transparency towards litigants, and regulating legaltech companies through public certification labels. It also stresses the need for training at all levels, upgrading court IT infrastructure, and appointing AI officers within professional orders. The overarching goal is to safeguard litigants and strengthen public service in justice.

The **Ministry of Justice** report advocates a pragmatic and results-driven approach. It recommends equipping all judges and court clerks with AI assistants by 2025, developing targeted use cases (mass litigation management, automated drafting of simple decisions, hearing transcription), and creating a “Digital Campus” for training. The ministry emphasizes technological sovereignty, with secure national hosting of judicial data, and strong ethical safeguards (codes of conduct, a “trustworthy AI” certification). The focus is on rapid deployment and tangible outcomes.

The **Court of Cassation report** draws on its pioneering experience with AI tools (pseudonymization, automatic allocation of appeals, divergence detection). It proposes a rigorous evaluation framework (ethical, legal, technical, economic) for new AI use cases: enhanced legal research, identification of mass disputes, drafting assistance, and administrative support. The Court insists on two principles: judicial independence and continuous human oversight. AI is viewed as an internal support tool to improve consistency and efficiency, never as a substitute for judges’ decision-making.

Finally, the **report on open data of court decisions** (the Ludet report) raises concerns about the risks of re-identifying individuals, threats against judges, and disclosure of sensitive business information. It recommends expanding anonymization (covering judges, lawyers, and companies), introducing differentiated access levels (general public vs. professional users), and possibly charging major reusers. The aim is to balance transparency, privacy protection, and financial sustainability.

Taken together, these reports converge on key themes:

- **Opportunities:** AI can enhance productivity, access to law, and predictability of decisions.
- **Risks:** generative AI’s unreliability, algorithmic bias, confidentiality breaches, and the danger of over-standardized justice.
- **Conditions for success:** clear ethical and legal safeguards, strong governance (with dedicated oversight bodies), continuous training of professionals, and technological sovereignty.

The reports outline a specifically French vision of AI in justice: an assistance tool, never a substitute, designed to serve litigants while protecting fundamental rights. France thus positions itself as a European leader in carefully managed AI integration in justice, combining innovation with human-centered safeguards.