ACADEMIA International Journal for Social Sciences
Volume 4, Issue 2, 2025 ISSN-L (Online): 3006-6638

Artificial Intelligence and the Future of Legal Education in Pakistan: An Analysis

Dr. Sami Ur Rehman
dean.fol@tuf.edu.pk
Professor of Law, The University of Faisalabad, Pakistan

Ms. Amna Imdad
amnaimdad.law@tuf.edu.pk
Lecturer in Law, The University of Faisalabad, Pakistan
Corresponding Author: * Dr. Sami Ur Rehman dean.fol@tuf.edu.pk

Received: 09-03-2025 **Revised:** 10-04-2025 **Accepted:** 21-04-2025 **Published:** 03-05-2025

ABSTRACT

Current legal and policy approaches to artificial intelligence (AI) focus heavily on mitigating risks and preventing harms, often neglecting how law can proactively guide AI toward positive societal outcomes. This article critiques the dominant "law-of-AI-wrongs" paradigm as descriptively inaccurate and normatively flawed, arguing that it prioritizes reactive regulation over strategic governance. Through analysis of key U.S. and European initiatives—such as the FTC report, the 2022 AI Bill of Rights, and the draft EU AI Act—the article highlights a disproportionate emphasis on AI risks, often grounded in flawed comparisons to human decision-making and status quo practices. It calls for a balanced, comparative cost-benefit regulatory model that supports innovation while safeguarding rights. The article identifies key tensions in AI regulation, such as the trade-off between privacy (data minimization) and fairness (data maximization), and proposes new rights to automated decision-making and complete datasets. It advocates for policies that build public trust in AI through behavioral research, education, and collaborative governance. Ultimately, it provides a blueprint for shifting from a defensive to a proactive model of AI regulation that promotes both accountability and innovation.

Keywords: *AI regulation , Public Policy , Data Governance , Trust in Automation , Algorithmic Decision-Making.*

INTRODUCTION

Artificial intelligence (AI) is a rapidly growing field with potential applications in many industries, including the legal field. In Pakistan, there is a growing interest in AI and its potential impact on legal education. Currently, many law schools in Pakistan are incorporating courses on AI and its impact on the legal profession. These courses cover topics such as the use of AI in legal research and analysis, the ethical implications of using AI in legal decision-making, and the role of AI in the automation of legal services.

In addition, there are also initiatives aimed at promoting AI research and development in the legal field in Pakistan. For example, the Pakistan Artificial Intelligence Forum (PAIF) is a non-profit organization that aims to promote the development and adoption of AI technologies in Pakistan, including in the legal profession. Overall, it appears that there is a growing awareness of the potential of AI in the legal field in Pakistan, and efforts are being made to incorporate AI into legal education and promote its development in the country.

The Objectives of Legal Education

The goals and methods of legal education have been, and continue to be, the subject of much analysis and debate. Studies and commentators have called for law schools to cultivate numerous competencies,

including practical legal skills, various areas of substantive legal knowledge, certain character traits, and the development of a professional identity. However, it is broadly recognized that an essential component of a legal education is teaching students to engage in critical analysis and develop creative problem-solving skills.

These skills require students to consider issues from different philosophical and academic perspectives and to have an adeptness with policy analysis. Anthony Kronman describes how legal education seeks to develop the "moral imagination", a process that results in students possessing "a broad familiarity with diverse and irreconcilable human goods coupled with an indefatigable willingness to enter the fray, hear the arguments, render judgment, and articulate the reasons that support it, even when all hope of moral certainty is gone." In the well-known introduction to The Canon of American Legal Thought, David Kennedy and William Fisher describe how thinking like a lawyer requires being "comfortable with multiple, overlapping modes of analysis" and requires a "voracious interdisciplinary appetite of legal analysis, importing all manner of arguments from neighbouring disciplines, often deploying them in unfamiliar ways".

As Professor Harry Arthurs persuasively argues, the importance of law schools fostering critical analysis and engaging with the varied areas of knowledge that students will need to become "artisans of legal change" is increasing, rather than decreasing, with the rapid changes occurring in both the legal profession and society as a whole. Professor Arthurs concludes that:

The future of law schools, then, is to embrace their vocation as knowledge communities, to embed their JD and other educational programs within their larger mandate of aggregating, critiquing, and disseminating.

Today's AI is Not Actually Intelligent

Now that we have a broad description of what AI is, it is also important to understand what today's AI technology is not. When many people hear the term "AI" they imagine current AI systems as thinking machines. A common misperception along this line is that existing AI systems are producing their results by engaging in some sort of synthetic computer cognition that matches or surpasses human-level thinking. The reality is that today's AI systems are decidedly not intelligent thinking machines in any meaningful sense. Rather, AI systems are often able to produce useful, intelligent results without intelligence. These systems do this largely through heuristics—by detecting patterns in data and using knowledge, rules, and information that have been specifically encoded by people into forms that can be processed by computers. Through these computational approximations, AI systems often can produce surprisingly good results on certain complex tasks that, when done by humans, require cognition. Notably, however, these AI systems do so by using computational mechanisms that do not resemble or match human thinking.

AI in Law

Having described AI generally, it is time to turn to how AI is being used in law. At its heart, "AI and law" involves the application of computer and mathematical techniques to make law more understandable, manageable, useful, accessible, or predictable. With that conception, one might trace the origins of similar ideas back to Gottfried Leibniz in the 1600s. Leibniz, the mathematician who famously co-invented calculus, was also trained as a lawyer and was one of the earliest to investigate how mathematical formalisms might improve the law.

More recently, since the mid-twentieth century, there has been an active history of researchers taking ideas from computer science and AI and applying them to law. This history of AI within law roughly parallels the wider arc of AI research more generally. Like AI more broadly, AI applied to law largely began focused upon knowledge-representation and rules-based legal systems. Most of the research

arose from university laboratories, with much of the activity based in Europe. From the 1970s through 1990s, many of the early AI-and-law projects focused upon formally modeling legal argument in computer-processable form and computationally modeling legislation and legal rules. Since at least 1987, the International Conference of Artificial Intelligence and Law (ICAIL) has held regular conferences showcasing these applications of AI techniques to law.

Attorneys—practitioners of law—perform multiple legal tasks, including counseling clients, gauging the strength of legal positions, avoiding risk, drafting contracts and other documents, pursuing litigation, and many other activities. Which of these tasks traditionally performed by lawyers is subject to partial, or full, automation through the use of AI?

Some lessons as to where the use of AI in the practice of law may be headed and where it may be more limited can be gleaned from the example of litigation discovery and technology-assisted review. Litigation discovery is the process of obtaining evidence for a lawsuit. In modern business litigation, often this amounts to obtaining and reviewing large troves of documents turned over by the opposing counsel. Document review was traditionally a task performed by attorneys who would quickly read each document and indicate, often manually, whether a document was likely relevant or not to the legal issues at hand or perhaps protected by privilege.

In the mid-2000s, with the advent of electronic discovery, so-called predictive coding and technology-assisted review became possible. Predictive coding is the general name for a class of computer-based document-review techniques that aim to automatically distinguish between litigation-discovery documents that are likely to be relevant or irrelevant. More recently, these predictive-coding technologies have employed AI techniques, such as machine learning and knowledge representation, to help automate this activity. Some of the machine-learning e-discovery software can be “trained” on example documents: to teach the software to detect patterns for e-mails and other documents likely to be relevant to the scope of the litigation.

Potential Risk of AI in Legal Education

While AI has the potential to revolutionize legal education by increasing access to legal knowledge and streamlining legal processes, there are also potential risks associated with its use.

One risk is that AI may perpetuate or even amplify biases that are present in legal systems. For example, if AI algorithms are trained on historical legal data that reflects biases against certain groups of people, they may replicate and perpetuate those biases in future legal decision-making.

Another risk is that AI may create a skills gap in the legal profession, where lawyers who are not familiar with AI technologies may be at a disadvantage compared to those who are. This could exacerbate existing disparities in the legal profession and make it more difficult for some groups to access legal services.

Additionally, there is a risk that the use of AI in legal education could lead to a devaluation of human judgement and critical thinking skills. If students rely too heavily on AI tools for legal analysis and decision-making, they may not develop the same level of critical thinking and analytical skills that are necessary for effective legal practice.

Finally, there is a risk that the use of AI in legal education could lead to a loss of jobs for lawyers and other legal professionals. As AI technologies become more advanced, they may be able to perform certain legal tasks more efficiently and effectively than human professionals, potentially leading to job losses and a changing landscape in the legal profession.

Overall, while AI has the potential to be a valuable tool in legal education, it is important to be aware of these potential risks and take steps to mitigate them.

AI in the Law Class Room

AI has the potential to transform law classrooms in many ways. Here are some potential applications of AI in law classrooms:

Personalized Learning: AI algorithms can analyze data on student learning styles, strengths, and weaknesses, and use this information to tailor personalized learning experiences for each student.

Automated Grading: AI-powered grading tools can save instructors time and effort by automatically grading assignments and providing feedback to students.

Legal Research and Analysis: AI tools can help students conduct legal research more efficiently and accurately, by scanning large volumes of legal documents and highlighting relevant information.

Virtual Legal Simulations: AI-powered virtual simulations can allow students to experience real-world legal scenarios and practice legal skills in a safe and controlled environment.

Chatbots: AI-powered chatbots can provide students with quick answers to common legal questions, freeing up instructors' time to focus on more complex topics.

Predictive Analytics: AI algorithms can analyze data on student performance and use this information to predict which students are at risk of falling behind or failing, allowing instructors to intervene early and provide targeted support.

Overall, the use of AI in law classrooms has the potential to make legal education more efficient, effective, and engaging for both instructors and students. However, it is important to ensure that AI tools are used in ways that are ethical and unbiased, and that they do not replace the need for human interaction and critical thinking skills in legal education.

Improvements in Legal Education Through AI:

AI has the potential to bring significant improvements to legal education in several ways:

Increased Access to Legal Knowledge: AI-powered legal research tools can make it easier for students and instructors to access legal information and analyze legal data, without the need for extensive manual research.

Efficiency and Accuracy: AI can automate routine tasks such as grading, document review, and legal research, freeing up instructors' time to focus on more complex topics and providing students with faster and more accurate feedback.

Personalization: AI algorithms can analyze student data and provide personalized learning experiences based on individual learning styles, strengths, and weaknesses.

Interactivity: AI-powered virtual simulations and chatbots can provide students with interactive and engaging learning experiences that simulate real-world legal scenarios.

Ethical Decision-Making: AI algorithms can be trained to make ethical decisions and analyze the potential ethical implications of legal decisions, helping students to understand the importance of ethical considerations in legal practice.

Predictive Analytics: AI can analyze student performance data and predict which students are at risk of falling behind or failing, allowing instructors to intervene early and provide targeted support.

Overall, AI has the potential to make legal education more efficient, effective, and engaging, while also improving access to legal knowledge and promoting ethical decision-making in the legal profession. By leveraging the power of AI, legal educators can better prepare students for the challenges and opportunities of the modern legal landscape.

Impediments in legal education through AI

While AI has the potential to bring significant improvements to legal education, there are also some potential impediments to its use in this context. Here are some examples:

Cost: The development and implementation of AI-powered tools and resources can be costly, which may make it difficult for some institutions to invest in these technologies.

Privacy concerns: AI tools that collect and analyze student data may raise privacy concerns, particularly if this data is shared with third-party vendors or stored in the cloud.

Bias and Ethics: As with any technology, AI algorithms are only as unbiased and ethical as the data on which they are trained. If the data used to train an AI algorithm reflects biases or unethical practices, this may be perpetuated in the algorithm's outputs.

Technical Challenges: AI-powered tools and resources may require specialized technical skills and knowledge to use effectively, which could pose a barrier to adoption for some instructors and students.

Legal Considerations: The use of AI in legal education raises a range of legal considerations, such as issues related to intellectual property, liability, and privacy.

Resistance to Change: Some instructors and students may be resistant to the use of AI in legal education, either due to concerns about the technology itself or a preference for traditional teaching methods.

Overall, while there are potential impediments to the use of AI in legal education, many of these can be addressed through careful planning, investment, and attention to ethical considerations. By working to overcome these challenges, legal educators can harness the power of AI to bring new efficiencies, effectiveness, and opportunities to their teaching and learning practices.

AI and legal education is a growing area of interest and research. Here are some additional points to consider:

• AI-powered legal research tools are already widely used by legal practitioners, and these tools are becoming increasingly sophisticated. These tools can help lawyers to analyze large volumes of legal data, identify patterns and trends, and develop more effective legal strategies.

• Many law schools are now incorporating AI into their curricula, both through standalone courses on AI and through the integration of AI-powered tools and resources into existing courses.

• One area of focus for AI in legal education is the development of virtual simulations and other interactive learning experiences. These simulations can provide students with the opportunity to practice legal skills in a safe and controlled environment, and can help to bridge the gap between legal theory and practice.

• Another area of focus is the development of AI-powered chatbots and other resources that can provide students with personalized support and feedback. These tools can be particularly helpful for students who may be struggling with certain concepts or who have limited access to one-on-one support from instructors.

• As with any technology, it is important to ensure that AI is used in ways that are ethical and unbiased. Legal educators must be careful to ensure that AI-powered tools and resources do not perpetuate biases or unfair practices, and must work to educate students on the ethical considerations of AI in the legal profession.

• There is also growing interest in the potential of AI to transform legal practice more broadly, particularly in areas such as contract review, legal research, and document analysis. As AI technologies continue to evolve, it is likely that they will have an increasingly significant impact on the legal profession as a whole.

Overall, AI has the potential to bring significant benefits to legal education, both by improving the efficiency and effectiveness of teaching and learning practices and by helping students to develop the skills and knowledge they need to succeed in the modern legal landscape. As such, AI is likely to be an increasingly important area of focus for legal educators and practitioners alike in the years to come.

Suggestion to improve legal education through AI in Pakistan:
Here are some suggestions for improving legal education through AI in Pakistan:

Develop AI-powered legal research tools: One of the key challenges for legal education in Pakistan is the limited availability of high-quality legal research materials. AI-powered legal research tools could help to address this issue by providing students and educators with access to a wider range of legal resources and enabling more efficient and effective legal research.

Integrate AI into legal education curricula: Law schools in Pakistan could integrate AI into their curricula by offering courses on AI in law, and by incorporating AI-powered tools and resources into existing courses. This could help to ensure that law students in Pakistan are prepared to use and interact with AI in their future legal practice.

Develop virtual simulations and other interactive learning experiences: Virtual simulations and other interactive learning experiences could provide Pakistani law students with the opportunity to practice legal skills in a safe and controlled environment. These simulations could also help to bridge the gap between legal theory and practice, which is often a challenge for law students in Pakistan.

Build AI-Powered Chatbots and other Support Resources: Chatbots and other AI-powered support resources could help to provide Pakistani law students with personalized support and feedback. These tools could be particularly useful for students who are struggling with certain concepts or who have limited access to one-on-one support from instructors.

Foster Partnerships between Legal Education Institutions and AI Companies: Partnerships between legal education institutions in Pakistan and AI companies could help to ensure that law students have access to the latest AI-powered tools and resources. These partnerships could also help to promote collaboration between legal educators and AI experts, which could lead to new and innovative approaches to legal education.

Overall, AI has the potential to bring significant benefits to legal education in Pakistan. By investing in AI-powered tools and resources and integrating AI into legal education curricula, Pakistani law schools could help to prepare the next generation of legal professionals for the challenges and opportunities of the modern legal landscape.

CONCLUSION

While technology can bring many advantages to individuals and society, certain forms of it come with significant risks. Author Andrew Sullivan points out that our high-tech society "lulls us into the belief that there are no downsides. It's all just more of everything. Online life is simply layered on top of offline life". He sets out that we are only beginning to recognize the immense costs of the "distraction sickness" caused by laptops and cell phones. One arena where those risks are prominently present is the law classroom.

Non-course use of computers and electronic slides not only pose risks to learning in any classroom, but pose a particular risk to the deeper analytical reasoning which is a core aspect of a legal education. Accordingly, there is now a broad foundation of recent cogent evidence that makes a low-tech classroom a reasonable and justifiable choice for law professors. Though that choice may be impacted by a number of factors, including the size of the class, the subject matter of the course, and the teaching approach of the professor, the evidence that certain technologies may impede students' ability to learn, understand, and apply complex material cannot be ignored.

The goal of this article was to provide a realistic, demystified view of AI and law. As it currently stands, AI is neither magic nor is it intelligent in the human-cognitive sense of the word. Rather, today's AI technology is able to produce intelligent results without intelligence by harnessing patterns, rules, and heuristic proxies that allow it to make useful decisions in certain, narrow contexts.

However, current AI technology has its limitations. Notably, it is not very good at dealing with abstractions, understanding meaning, and transferring knowledge from one activity to another, and handling completely unstructured or open-ended tasks. Rather, most tasks where AI has proven successful (e.g., chess, credit card fraud, tumor detection) involve highly structured areas where there are clear right or wrong answers and strong underlying patterns that can be algorithmically detected. Knowing the strengths and limits of current AI technology is crucial to the understanding of AI within law. It helps us have a realistic understanding of where AI is likely to impact the practice and administration of law and, just as importantly, where it is not.

REFERENCES

James B Levy, "Teaching the Digital Caveman: Rethinking the Use of Classroom Technology in Law School" (2016) 19:1 Chapman L Rev 241 (noting that "[e]ducators see the influence of new technologies on popular culture and worry that if they do not quickly embrace them as well, they will seem out of date, and their students will get left behind" at 243). In his insightful article, Professor Levy not only challenges the notion that broad use of technology is useful in the law classroom, but also sets out the historical pattern of new technologies being added to classrooms without established evidence that they improve learning outcomes.

Kristen E Murray, "Let Them Use Laptops: Debunking the Assumptions Underlying the Debate over Laptops in the Classroom" (2011) 36:1 Okla City UL Rev 185; Deborah J Merritt, "Legal Education in the Age of Cognitive Science and Advanced Classroom Technology" (2008) 14:1 BUJ Sci & Tech L 39 at 50–54.

Dung C Bui, Joel Myerson & Sandra Hale, "Note-Taking with Computers: Exploring Alternative Strategies for Improved Recall" (2013) 105:2 J Educational Psychology 299; Murray, supra note 2; Merritt, supra note 2 at 54; Simon Canick, "Infusing Technology Skills into the Law School Curriculum" (2014) 42:3 Capital UL Rev 663 at 682.

William M Sullivan et al, Educating Lawyers: Preparation for the Profession of Law (San Francisco: Wiley, 2007); Roy Stuckey, Best Practices for Legal Education: A Vision and a Road Map (USA: Clinical Legal Education Association, 2007); Federation of Law Societies of Canada, "Task Force on the Canadian Common Law Degree: Final Report" (October 2009), online: www.flsc.ca/wp-content/uploads/2014/10/admission8.pdf

David Kennedy & William W Fisher III, "Introduction" in David Kennedy & William W Fisher III, eds, The Canon of American Legal Thought (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2006) 1 at 11; David Sandomierski, "Training Lawyers, Cultivating Citizens, and Re-Enchanting the Legal Professional" (2014) 51:4 Alta L Rev 739 at 757–759.

Anthony Kronman, "The Socratic Method and the Development of the Moral Imagination" (2000) 31:4 U Tol L Rev 647 at 651.

Hilarie Cash et al, "Internet Addiction: A Brief Summary of Research and Practice" (2012) 8:4 Current Psychiatry Reviews 292; Larry D Rosen, "This Is the Real Reason You Can't Stop Checking Your Phone", Psychology Today (14 July 2015)

Michael Winnick, "Putting a Finger on Our Phone Obsession" (16 June 2016), dscout (blog), online: www.blog.dscout.com/mobile-touches

Jeff Sovern, "Law Student Laptop Use During Class for Non-Class Purposes: Temptation v. Incentives" (2013) 51:3 U Louisville L Rev 483 at 483.

Shailini Jandial George, "Teaching the Smartphone Generation: How Cognitive Science Can Improve Learning in Law School" (2013) 66:1 Me L Rev 163 at 173.

Pam A Mueller & Daniel M Oppenheimer, "The Pen is Mightier Than the Keyboard: Advantages of Longhand Over Laptop Note Taking" (2014) 25:6 Psychological Science 1159 at 1159–60.