STUDYING THE IMPACT OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE ON CRITICAL THINKING IN THE LEGAL SPHERE OF THE MODERN WORLD

Thoshanaa*

ABSTRACT

The impact of technology and the advancement of AI has left an impression on everybody's lives in many ways, ranging from minuscule to major changes, but has led to more damage and problems arising from its use than intended. In the field of law, it has become almost imperative to involve the use of Artificial Intelligence, ranging from drafting an agreement to building a case. While it has definitely done lawyers and advocates a favour by removing some weight off their shoulders, it is also critical to analyse the manner in which it is leading to gradual change in mindset and cognitive abilities. For any person practising in the legal field, the skill of critical thinking is something that one should possess in abundance in order to succeed in their work. In this article, we will be looking deeply into and analysing the impact of AI on our ability to think critically and solve problems in the legal world. We will explore how Artificial Intelligence is used in recent times and not go against the usage of these tools entirely, as we do need to grow with the rest of the world.

Keywords: Artificial Intelligence, Human Essence, Modern Times, Hallucination, Cognitive Abilities.

INTRODUCTION

The usage of Artificial Intelligence gained popularity in the year 2024 and has since then been used in a wide range across the globe, with users having access to basic and premium features that the various training models provide them with. Artificial Intelligence has paved its way into the world of Law and is now being used even as you read this article. While using AI to challenge one's ability to argue and think, it is also important to make sure that it doesn't replace the ability of a person to think for themselves, especially in this profession. Critical

*BA LLB, FIRST YEAR, ST. JOSEPH'S COLLEGE OF LAW, BANGALORE.

thinking is something that one should acquire over a period of time, without having to depend on any other source to perform the thinking for them. Our brain is a muscle that should be continuously trained, and if the training comes to an end, it would be difficult for one to survive and thrive without these cognitive abilities. Throughout this research, we shall be answering some of the sub-questions below to get a clearer picture:

1. Does AI improve or reduce our ability to think?
2. Do lawyers benefit from AI or find themselves burdened with more work than before?
3. Can AI replace legal practitioners?

With the help of these questions, we can evaluate the current state of Critical Thinking among lawyers and predict what the future of Law alongside the rise of AI may look like.

AI CHALLENGES OUR ABILITY TO CRITICALLY ANALYSE AND SOLVE PROBLEMS

Lawyers have taken advantage of the availability of AI and have used it in their work in some way or another. However, some hesitate to use AI in their work, with the reason being that it may underestimate human reasoning and comprehensiveness, on which authentic legal practice depends[1]. The problem in focus here is whether our skill to analyse, assess and come to a solution will deteriorate because of improper use of a learning model.

In a study conducted among knowledge workers, it was found that some of the workers observed reduced effort for cognitive activities involving critical thinking when using Generative AI in comparison to not using it[2]. It can even be observed that the misuse of AI can impact not only critical but also basic formulation skills, as we are dependent on our devices that can come up with results in less than a few seconds.

Lawyers who have used AI also claim that it can make up false cases just to prove that the point we have made is correct. This shows that these models are truly not perfect in nature and can make mistakes; hence, one should not rely on them completely to draft or make up arguments on their Behalf. We can clarify and clear certain doubts and use AI in such a way that we do

[1] Artificial Intelligence and Human Legal Reasoning (April 05, 2026), by Bednar, Nicholas and Cleveland, David R. and Erbsen, Allan and Schwarcz, Daniel, 121 Northwestern University Law Review
[2] The Impact of Generative AI on Critical Thinking: Self-Reported Reductions in Cognitive Effort and Confidence Effects From a Survey of Knowledge Workers

not hand over full responsibility to the machine and use our own gift, our brain, to think and come up with decisions for ourselves. When entirely original problems arise, such as the emergence of a novel coronavirus, human ingenuity must be sharp enough to solve them. Suppose an original problem or case arises; human ingenuity must be smart enough to solve it, as AI can only answer with reference to existing cases, facts and arguments and cannot provide a thorough breakthrough.[3]

AI BURDENS PEOPLE WITH MORE WORK THAN BEFORE

When using AI, one can assume that it will do the work a human does, verifying sources, making sure they are authentic, and then producing an output. However, that is not the case. AI is also known to "hallucinate" certain judgements or cases to justify our stance on certain situations. It is due to this reason, one cannot truly depend on the model to give statements factual in nature, leading to time being spent on reviewing and analysing whether or not the facts are true, locating their sources and eradicating errors, which we could have done ourselves in the first place. The most important element in the field of law is time, and that cannot be spent on triple-checking whether the facts generated by an AI model are right or not.

Vladisav Jovanovi, in his article, states that when the volume of material that requires reviewing increases due to AI, human attention becomes a necessity, hence a problem delaying progress. The material will lead to repeated checking, which leads to vigilance problems.[4]

There is also the problem of 'bias' in AI, which causes a bigger obstacle and directly conflicts with the current constitutional frameworks. Despite inputting appropriate data and attempting to make machines capable of mimicking traditional judicial thinking, they would not produce the same output as humans, as supported by Jacopo Martire.[5]

The use of AI is inevitable, as even a simple Google search leads to an AI-generated summary and cannot be eradicated from everybody's lives. However, we can choose the extent to which it is utilised by us. We should ensure that we control the model, not the model controlling us

[3] How AI is reshaping human skills and thinking, by Zara Abrams, Vol. 57, No. 5 <https://www.apa.org/contributor?contributor=%22Abrams,%20Zara%22>
Print version: page 48, American Psychological Association
[4] The AI Oversight Tax, by Vladisav Jovanovi
[5] Easy and hard problems: mapping the challenges of AI in law By Jacopo Martire <https://www.tandfonline.com/author/Martire%2C+Jacopo>

and abide by what it produces for our legal purposes. Human discretion is a very valuable factor when it comes to the practice of law.

AI CANNOT REPLACE LEGAL PRACTITIONERS

We have heard of trends for various commodities such as fashion, jewellery, food and the list go on. Artificial Intelligence is one such trend that has gained popularity, and you can come across any person, even on the road, using ChatGPT to recommend some restaurants near them, for example. In the field of law, it almost feels like one has to use Artificial Intelligence so that they do not stay behind, but the question here is: Does AI have the capability to replace lawyers?

It is not unknown that in recent times, people have been using AI, the language learning models, as their lawyers; however, it cannot replace lawyers in any manner. There is no rule or article under the Constitution of India, or in fact any constitution, that the use of AI is mandatory for lawyers. In contradiction to the belief that AI can work as one's lawyer, more petitions and lawsuits are being filed against it for a list of reasons, such as copyright infringement, mostly for pieces of artwork. Work produced by the language learning model cannot be credited as original, and it also lacks the human essence which is imperative in the legal field.

AI still stands as a threat to legal practitioners, and while some may argue that it can be used as a corruption-free tool for justice, it is simply impractical and impossible to even contemplate such an idea. Humans have existed without technology and have evolved since then, making use of the resources around them. Lawyers have to be wise and be aware of what is going on around this tool and must use it judiciously, and not in an inappropriate manner such that it can cost them their career. There are regulations surrounding AI, discrediting it as it can hallucinate and produce false cases without verifying sources. This serves as another reason why the deterioration of critical thinking in the field of law is a great concern, as the future is in our hands, and we cannot let language learning models take up our cases for us in the upcoming years.

CASE REVIEWS - AI USAGE PAVING ITS WAY INTO JUDGMENTS

In the case of Smt. Gayathri vs Guru Reddy Raju S N[6], in the City Civil Judge Court of Bengaluru, the dispute was surrounding a suit for partition and separate possession. The

[6] Indian Kanoon, KABC010168152011

judgment in the suit consists of an AI-generated prompt from ChatGPT, directly copied and pasted without any editing or attempt to hide the AI-generated judgment itself. The case, however, was resolved; an order was passed stating that 1/5th of the property was divided among the defendants No. 1,2,3 and 4.

In another case, Vijay Ghanshyam Gadiya v. Union of India[7], the case revolved around the issue of mis-declaring a consignment of natural diamonds as lab-grown in order to pay a lower tariff. The second respondent in this case appeared to have generated several judgments and articles using Artificial Intelligence, which, in reality, did not exist and had fake citations, appearing to be a hallucination of AI. This judgment by the Supreme Court stated that it is necessary for courts not to accept precedents generated by artificial intelligence without verifying them first.

In the case of Pooja Ramesh Singh vs Jammu and Kashmir Kank Ltd. & Another[8], revolving around bankruptcy, AI-generated material was used as a precedent in support of the judgment of Respondent 2, where the material generated was false and hallucinated.

These cases show that Artificial Intelligence is being used by lawyers; while it is progressive in nature and lawyers are adapting to its use, they are unaware of how to use it efficiently. It is assumed that Artificial Intelligence is perfect and cannot make mistakes; however, especially in the legal field, where fact-checking every small detail is crucial, that assumption is entirely false. These cases also show the slow reduction in critical thinking, as there was no attempt made to even verify and check the material generated by the AI mechanism and reveal that, gradually, people are trusting the language learning models to be of authentic nature and believing that they cannot make any mistakes.

CONCLUSION

The use of language learning models happens intentionally and unintentionally, be it through our prompts or by using any search engine on the internet. In the legal sphere, the ability to use our cognitive capabilities and efficiently solve problems in our society is incredibly important and should not vanish because of the progressing nature of technology. The human essence required to pass legal judgments and bring about change in the world, be it socially, economically or politically, whether on a small scale or a large scale, can never be replaced by

[7] Lexis Advance, Vijay Ghanshyam Gadiya Vs Union Of India & Another Lnind 2026 Sc 858
[8] Lexis Advance, Pooja Ramesh Singh Vs Jammu And Kashmir Bank Ltd. & Another Lnind 2026 Sc 918

machines and robots. Our brain can only function to its fullest if trained regularly and thinks beyond what meets the eye, which is a very important aspect when it comes to practising law. In order to do this, it needs to think critically in different situations and not just depend on a language learning model to solve the problem for humans. Regulations around the use of Artificial Intelligence must be made more binding in nature and restrictive as well so that humans do not forget that they too can think and function as their own person, so that lawyers do not forget what they studied and worked so hard for in the first place.

We can learn to embrace the usage and development in the field of technology and the enhancement of the language learning models it has birthed as well. However, we can also curb our usage of it; embracing it does not necessarily mean letting it take control over our lives in a complete sense. We can use Artificial Intelligence to answer and resolve the doubts of lawyers, but we should make sure that it does not take away either the job or the true essence of a lawyer; instead of performing the task it was meant for, that is, assisting humans.