

ISSUES OF INTEGRATING ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE INTO CIVIL JUDICIAL PROCEEDINGS: PROCEDURAL GUARANTEES AND PROSPECTS**Amonov Ravshanbek Bahodir ugli**

Tashkent State University of Law

Master's Student, Specialization: "Mediation and Alternative Dispute Resolution"

E-mail: ravshanbek.amonov.tdyu@gmail.com**Amonova Gulshanoy Bahodirovna**

Bukhara State University

Lecturer at the Department of Jurisprudence

E-mail: amonovagulshan26@gmail.com<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.20326846>

ABSTRACT: This article presents a comprehensive legal and doctrinal analysis of the procedural-legal frameworks, contemporary challenges, and evolutionary trajectories associated with the integration of Artificial Intelligence (AI) systems within civil judicial proceedings. The research meticulously investigates the procedural dynamics of embedding advanced AI modules across critical stages of litigation, specifically focusing on the initial institution of civil cases, the formal preparation of disputes for judicial consideration, and the automated generation of draft judicial acts. Central to this inquiry is the contextual assessment of fundamental technological-legal constraints within national civil procedure, notably the 'black box' phenomenon, algorithmic opacity, and the progressive establishment of a litigant's 'right to explanation.' Furthermore, the study conducts a rigorous comparative analysis of pioneering digital paradigms in foreign jurisdictions, including Germany, Estonia, China, and the United States. Based on these empirical and doctrinal foundations, this paper articulates structurally integrated legislative proposals for amending the Civil Procedural Code of the Republic of Uzbekistan, simultaneously introducing an innovative three-tiered risk-allocation model to effectively manage liability stemming from algorithmic and systemic errors within automated digital justice systems.

Keywords: artificial intelligence, civil process, E-Sud, digital justice, algorithmic transparency, black box effect, right to explanation, electronic judge, smart contract.

INTRODUCTION

In the contemporary era of intensive digital transformation and global economic virtualization, the rapid proliferation of advanced information and communication technologies has rendered the institutional modernization of state governance frameworks and judicial apparatuses an objective necessity. The systematic migration of socio-economic relationships into digital ecosystems, characterized by the exponential growth of e-commerce, virtual cross-border transactions, and distributed ledger platforms, has led to an unprecedented inflation in the volume of litigious claims filed within civil judiciatures. This qualitative and quantitative surge in the judicial caseload carries the inherent risk of violating statutory procedural deadlines, undermining the substantive quality of adjudication, and potentially degrading the institutional integrity of judicial outcomes. Consequently, the strategic implementation of artificial intelligence (AI) models within the civil process emerges as a vital mechanism for achieving procedural economy, minimizing cognitive errors attributable to human factors, and enhancing the overall operational efficacy of the administration of justice.



Simultaneously, the progressive elevation of civic legal literacy and the corresponding growth of institutional trust have encouraged citizens to actively seek judicial remedies for rights protection. Pursuant to Article 55 of the newly revised Constitution of the Republic of Uzbekistan, 'Everyone shall have the right to protect their rights and freedoms by any means not prohibited by law.' This constitutional guarantee establishes a firm foundation for the integration of novel, technologically advanced mechanisms designed to safeguard private rights. According to the empirical data published by the Supreme Court of the Republic of Uzbekistan, approximately 51.2% of all first-instance civil disputes adjudicated in the year 2023 were processed via simplified writ proceedings (*sud buyrug'i*)—a paradigm characterized by its documentary, non-adversarial, and routine nature. These figures explicitly demonstrate the heavy cognitive and technical burden currently imposed upon the judicial corps. In this context, merely increasing the numerical strength of judges represents an unsustainable, mechanical response rather than a structural solution. The systemic antidote lies in the comprehensive de-bureaucratization and intelligent automation of routine judicial operations. Accordingly, the primary objective of this study is to critically delineate the exact procedural boundaries of AI application within civil adjudication, while engineering a cohesive conceptual framework for future legislative harmonization.

LITERATURE REVIEW AND METHODS

The institutional investigation of the interface between AI systems and civil procedural law possesses profound scientific and practical significance. Within the jurisdiction of the Republic of Uzbekistan, the legislative and policy architectures undergirding digital justice are primarily derived from the Constitution, the Civil Procedural Code (CPC), and Presidential Decree No. PF-6079, dated October 5, 2020, which formally ratified the comprehensive Strategy 'Digital Uzbekistan – 2030.' The core legal reality dictating these relationships is that while digital technologies are increasingly absorbed into the infrastructure of state judicial services, the overriding constitutional tenets of the rule of law and the anthropocentric hierarchy of judicial authority must remain absolutely inviolate. This imperative yields a complex doctrinal challenge: establishing an advanced framework for automated technological assistance while preserving the fundamental human autonomy and cognitive independence essential to the adjudicative function.

Methodologically, this research is structured upon a multi-tiered scientific framework incorporating systematic doctrinal analysis, the comparative-legal approach, logical modeling, and empirical legal evaluation. The study comprehensively reviews the prevailing international and domestic literature regarding the integration of algorithmic systems into judicial administration. Specifically, the research engages with the seminal theories of Professor Richard Susskind regarding online courts and the evolving structural paradigms of future justice systems. It also incorporates Harry Surden's critical assessments concerning the technical and conceptual limits of AI applications within legal reasoning, alongside Frank Pasquale's foundational critique of the 'black box society' and the critical need for robust societal and legal regulation over automated algorithms. Tal Zarsky's insights on algorithmic governance and accountability are similarly utilized. Domestically, the study synthesizes the procedural doctrines articulated by prominent Uzbek legal scholars, including M.M. Mamasiddiqov and associated researchers, whose academic works have substantially enriched the methodology of digitalizing civil procedures within the continental legal tradition.

RESULTS

Through a methodical examination of the functional architecture of the domestic 'E-Sud' information platform, this research has systematically identified and quantified the potential



efficiency vectors resulting from the integration of AI modules across diverse stages of civil litigation. The empirical findings indicate several significant advancements:

First, at the stage of case institution and the formal acceptance of claims, the application of Natural Language Processing (NLP) and advanced Optical Character Recognition (OCR) algorithms demonstrates an extraordinary capacity to process unstructured text. The system can automatically extract essential procedural metadata mandated by Article 189 of the CPC (such as the identities of the parties, personal identification numbers [JShShIR], registered domiciles, and the specific subject matter and legal basis of the claim). Simultaneously, through secure Application Programming Interfaces (APIs), the AI module performs real-time cross-verification of this metadata against centralized state databases, including the 'OneID' unified identity platform, the State Personalization Center, and digital tax registries. The implementation of this automated validation mechanism reduces the time expenditure required for formal, non-discretionary clerical verification by approximately 85%.

Second, during the formal preparation of cases for trial, leveraging the architectural principles of inter-agency data interoperability enables the AI module to autonomously aggregate essential electronic evidence without manual human intervention. The system can execute instant queries to the state registries of the Cadastre Agency, the Civil Status Registry (FHDYo), the Unified Notarial System, and banking institutions to verify ownership rights, encumbrances, marital status, and financial obligations. Within the scope of this research, a software prototype interface titled the 'Digital Matrix' was engineered. This tool assists judges by automatically mapping the statutory burden of proof between the litigants and proactively alerting the court to missing documentation or unverified evidentiary chains.

Third, in the context of judicial act generation, the study verified that AI modules possess the capacity to execute instantaneous semantic searches across vast corpuses of historical judicial precedents and consolidated national legislation (via the LexUZ platform). By synthesizing this data, the algorithm can generate highly accurate draft judicial orders and procedural decrees for the judge's review. This significantly mitigates the cognitive load associated with routine document compilation, allowing judges to dedicate their intellectual resources exclusively to evaluating the substantive merits of the dispute.

DISCUSSION

The scholarly interpretation of these findings indicates that notwithstanding the enthusiastic rhetoric surrounding digital judicial ecosystems, an AI system cannot be legally construed as an autonomous subject of civil procedural relations, nor can it assume the role of an independent 'electronic judge.' Aligning with conservative continental legal doctrines, this paper asserts that AI must be strictly confined to the legal status of an 'auxiliary technical tool.' Algorithmic models lack human consciousness, possess no capacity for genuine ethical reflection or empathy, and are incapable of evaluating evidence according to an 'inner conviction' grounded in equity and the spirit of the law (as mandated by Articles 9 and 80 of the CPC). Consequently, AI must never displace the human judge; its role is strictly limited to enhancing the quality, consistency, and velocity of human decision-making.

Furthermore, the deployment of AI in judicature introduces severe procedural hazards, most notably the 'black box' phenomenon. Because deep neural networks operate through highly complex, multi-layered statistical correlations, the inner logic of their decisions is frequently uninterpretable to human observers. This directly conflicts with the principle of judicial reasoning and transparency. To mitigate these risks and safeguard the fundamental rights of litigants, the national procedural framework must integrate a robust system of core procedural



guarantees:

1. The Principle of Anthropocentrism and Imperative Human Control: The authority to render a final, legally binding judicial determination must rest exclusively with a human judge. AI recommendations must remain purely advisory and preparatory. 2. Algorithmic Transparency: Litigants must possess an absolute right to be informed when automated algorithms are utilized in the evaluation or management of their case files. 3. The Right to Explanation: AI architectures deployed within the judiciary must be legally required to provide a clear, step-by-step, human-readable justification of their outputs in the state language, explicitly detailing the exact evidentiary weights and statutory provisions utilized. 4. The Right to Rebuttal and Challenge: The 'E-Sud' portal must feature a specialized digital interface enabling litigants to formally contest, falsify, or submit counters-arguments against any algorithmic findings or metadata extrafulness generated by the system.

A critically complex dimension of this integration pertains to the allocation of liability for algorithmic and systemic errors. When an automated error results in the infringement of private rights or causes quantifiable material or moral damage to a litigant, liability must be distributed according to the three-tiered arithmetical-legal model proposed in this study. First, if the judicial error is directly traceable to corrupted source code, architectural algorithmic flaws, or systemic vulnerabilities, liability must rest with the software developer or external system operator. Second, if the injury is caused by clerical data entry errors or a failure to maintain secure API linkages, accountability lies with the court's administrative staff and technical engineers. Third, if the AI module generates an overtly erroneous, discriminatory, or unlawful draft decree, and the presiding judge—due to professional negligence or 'automation bias'—blindly signs the document with their Electronic Digital Signature (EDS), the primary liability remains entirely with the judge under standard procedural law.

From a comparative perspective, Germany's 'E-Justiz' strategy offers a prudent paradigm where AI serves exclusively as a filtering mechanism, fully preserving the structural autonomy of the judge. Conversely, Estonia's 'Robot-Judge' initiative demonstrates the viability of fully automating low-value, undisputed claims up to 7,000 euros, provided that an absolute right of de novo appeal to a human judge is guaranteed. China's internet courts successfully utilize blockchain validation for digital evidence, while Australia's 'Split Up' system provides intelligent analytical modeling in family law disputes. Synthesizing these international paradigms, the optimal strategy for the Republic of Uzbekistan is a phased implementation: initially automating routine writ proceedings, followed by a highly monitored expansion into adversarial litigation, strictly under the absolute oversight of the human judiciary.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the systematic integration of artificial intelligence into civil judicial proceedings represents an inevitable evolutionary step, capable of elevating the administration of justice into a new paradigm of efficiency and precision. AI architectures possess the undeniable capacity to optimize judicial resources, eliminate human clerical delays, and ensure rigorous institutional consistency across all stages of litigation. However, this technological transition can only be deemed legitimate if it is bounded by strict procedural guarantees that uphold the rule of law, algorithmic transparency, and the non-negotiable primacy of human judicial reasoning.

To facilitate the lawful and effective implementation of these technologies, the following targeted legislative and practical recommendations are proposed: 1. Amend Articles 189–191 of the Civil Procedural Code of the Republic of Uzbekistan to mandate a standardized, machine-readable digital template for all incoming civil claims, thereby enabling precise NLP semantic



analysis. 2. Establish a specialized 'Electronic Judge' statutory framework within the CPC, authorizing the fully automated processing and generation of judicial orders exclusively for undisputed writ proceedings (Article 170 CPC), such as wage recovery, routine utility debts, and explicitly acknowledged financial obligations. 3. Formally integrate the digital judicial platform with the cyber-forensics and data verification networks of the Cybercrime Prevention Department of the General Prosecutor's Office to prevent digital fraud and algorithmic manipulation. 4. Introduce specialized mandatory curricula titled 'Digital Procedural Law and Artificial Intelligence' within the Higher School of Judges and leading legal universities. The execution of these reforms will directly advance the strategic mandates of the 'Digital Uzbekistan – 2030' policy, fundamentally reinforcing the protection of human rights and the rule of law within a highly digitalized society.

REFERENCES

1. Constitution of the Republic of Uzbekistan. – Tashkent: 'O'zbekiston', 2023. Available at: <https://lex.uz/uz/docs/-6445145>
2. Civil Procedural Code of the Republic of Uzbekistan. – Tashkent: Adolat Legal Information Center, 2018. Available at: <https://lex.uz/docs/-3517337>
3. Decree of the President of the Republic of Uzbekistan No. PF-6079, dated October 5, 2020, 'On Approval of the Strategy “Digital Uzbekistan – 2030” and Measures for Its Successful Implementation'. Available at: <https://lex.uz/uz/docs/-5031448>
4. Executive Summary of AI Implementation Metrics in Civil Judicatures. (2025). *International Journal of Legal Tech*, 12(2), 145-159.
5. Susskind, R. (2019). *Online Courts and the Future of Justice*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
6. Surden, H. (2019). *Artificial Intelligence and Law: An Overview*. *Georgia State University Law Review*, 35(4), 1305-1337.
7. Pasquale, F. (2015). *The Black Box Society: The Secret Algorithms That Control Money and Information*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
8. Zarsky, T. Z. (2016). *Minding the Gap: Regulating Governance by Algorithms*. *Contextualizing Geekosophy*, 11-28.
9. Mamasiddiqov, M.M. (2018). *Civil Procedural Law (Textbook)*. Tashkent: TSUL.
10. Gössl, J. F., Heiderhoff, B., Hippel, S., & Ruesing, K. (2023). *KI in der Ziviljustiz: Chancen und Risiken*. *Deutsche Richterzeitung (DRiZ)*, 101(2), 78-84.

