Jurnal Hukum dan Keadilan

P-ISSN : 0000-0000
E-ISSN : 3031-6782
Available:https://jurnalhafasy.com/index.php/jhk

Vol.3. No.6, October 2026
DOI : https://doi.org/10.61942/jhk.v3i6.591

Technology-Based Law Enforcement Transformation: An Analysis of Artificial Intelligence Integration in the Justice System

Anis Noviya
Universitas Jambi, Indonesia

Received: September 01, 2026
Revised: September 30, 2026
Accepted: October 22, 2026
Published: October 29, 2026

Corresponding Author:
Author Name*: Anis Noviya
E-mail*:
anisnoviyanoviya@gmail.com

Abstract: *The rapid development of artificial intelligence (AI) technology presents both challenges and opportunities for the law enforcement and judicial system in Indonesia. This article comprehensively analyzes the integration of AI in the Indonesian judicial system, encompassing technical, legal, ethical, and institutional dimensions. Using normative, conceptual, and comparative legal research approaches, the study examines how AI can revolutionize the judicial process—from legal document analysis and verdict prediction to case management and fraud detection—while identifying the accompanying obstacles and risks. The research findings indicate that the implementation of AI in the judiciary in Indonesia is still in its infancy, hampered by regulatory fragmentation, digital infrastructure gaps, human resource capacity deficits, and the lack of a standard AI ethics framework. Comparatively, the experiences of the European Union through its AI Act and several Asia-Pacific countries provide important lessons on responsible AI governance. This article recommends the establishment of a comprehensive national legal framework, the development of an integrated judicial data infrastructure, the strengthening of the digital competence of judicial officials, and the adoption of Explainable AI principles to ensure that technological transformation does not compromise the values of justice, accountability, and legal certainty.*

Keywords: Artificial Intelligence, Judicial System, Law Enforcement, Legal Technology, Digital Transformation.

INTRODUCTION

The fourth industrial revolution, marked by the convergence of digital, physical, and biological technologies, has brought humanity into an era that is fundamentally different from previous eras.[1] In this context, artificial intelligence (AI) appears as the most transformative technology that is not only disrupting the industrial and economic sectors, but also penetrating domains that have previously been considered the exclusive domain of human intelligence, including the fields of law and justice.[2]

The judicial system, as a central pillar of the rule of law and the most fundamental instrument in the realization of justice, faces significant transformative pressures. Richard Susskind, in his landmark work Tomorrow's Lawyers, predicts that the legal profession will experience massive disruption due to technological penetration, with much of the work currently performed by lawyers, judges, and judicial officials being automated or substantially assisted by AI systems.[3]

Indonesia, as a state based on the rule of law, which adheres to the principle of rechtsstaat as mandated in Article 1 paragraph

[1]World Economic Forum, The Future of Jobs Report 2023 (Geneva: WEF, 2023), hlm. 12.

[2]Klaus Schwab, The Fourth Industrial Revolution (Geneva: World Economic Forum, 2016), hlm. 1.

[3]Richard Susskind, Tomorrow's Lawyers: An Introduction to Your Future, 2nd ed. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017), hlm. 22-23.

P-ISSN : 0000-0000
E-ISSN : 3031-6782
Available:https://jurnalhafasy.com/index.php/jhk

Vol.3. No.6, October 2026
DOI : https://doi.org/10.61942/jhk.v3i6.591

(3) of the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia, cannot escape the current of digital transformation. The Indonesian justice system, which is currently grappling with various structural challenges ranging from a massive backlog of cases, limited human resources, inconsistent court decisions, to issues of access to justice, actually has a very large space to utilize AI as an instrument of improvement.[4]

The development of the implementation of artificial intelligence in the justice system is no longer just a conceptual discourse, but has entered the practical stage in various jurisdictions.[5] Several countries have utilized AI to support legal document analysis, predict verdicts, and even data-driven case management. This phenomenon demonstrates that AI is no longer merely an administrative tool but is beginning to transform into a decision-making instrument with direct implications for the rights and obligations of legal subjects. In this context, Richard Susskind's thinking finds empirical relevance, as technology significantly shifts the traditional legal paradigm toward a more data-driven justice model.

The adoption of this technology also raises a conceptual tension between efficiency and substantive fairness. Algorithm-based systems have the potential to reproduce biases inherent in historical data, risking reinforcing pre-existing inequities. Furthermore, the black-box nature of many AI systems raises serious transparency issues, particularly when the resulting decisions or recommendations cannot be rationally explained to the parties.[6] This condition has implications for the erosion of the principle of due process of law and the right to a fair trial, which are the main foundations of the modern legal system.

Within Indonesia, these challenges are increasingly complex given the unequal distribution of digital infrastructure, legal data quality, and human resource capacity. Integrating AI into the justice system requires not only technological updates but also regulatory reforms that ensure accountability, transparency, and human rights protection.[7] Therefore, the required approach cannot be partial or sectoral, but rather comprehensive, integrating legal, ethical, and institutional perspectives. Without a mature regulatory framework, the use of AI has the potential to create new problems that are more complex than the ones it aims to solve.

Integrating AI into the judicial system is not a simple proposition. Behind the promise of efficiency and objectivity offered by AI, there are profound questions that touch on the very heart of the philosophy of law and justice: Can machines replace the moral judgment of judges? How can accountability be ensured when algorithms make decisions that impact a person's liberty? Who is responsible when AI systems make fatal errors? These questions are at the heart of this study.

This research aims to: (1) analyze the urgency and opportunities for AI integration in the Indonesian justice system; (2) map various AI applications that have been and have the

[4]Cass R. Sunstein & Adrian Vermeule, "Law and Leviathan: Redeeming the Administrative State" (Harvard University Press, 2020), hlm. 45.

[5] Harahap, Aswindari, et al. "Analisis Diskresi Hakim dalam Mengintegrasikan Rekomendasi Penalaran Hukum Berbasis Kecerdasan Buatan (AI) di Pengadilan Niaga." *Locus Journal of Academic Literature Review* 4.9 (2025): 734-745. https://doi.org/10.56128/ljoalr.v4i9.789

[6] Kamila, Zahra. "Pengaturan Hukum Dan Prospek Penggunaan Artificial Intelligence Dalam Era Digitalisasi Sistem Peradilan Di Indonesia." *Jurnal Riset Multidisiplin Edukasi* 2.3 (2025): 16-36. https://doi.org/10.71282/jurmie.v2i3.172

[7] Aristawati, Rahma Nur, Inggrid Yemima Sihombing, and Rizha Claudilla Putri. "Revolusi Digital dalam Hukum Acara Perdata: Penerapan Kecerdasan Buatan dalam Penyelesaian Sengketa." *Al-Zayn: Jurnal Ilmu Sosial & Hukum* 4.2 (2026): 3982-3990. https://doi.org/10.61104/alz.v4i2.4896

Jurnal Hukum dan Keadilan

P-ISSN : 0000-0000
E-ISSN : 3031-6782
Available:https://jurnalhafasy.com/index.php/jhk

Vol.3. No.6, October 2026
DOI : https://doi.org/10.61942/jhk.v3i6.591

potential to be implemented in the judicial process; (3) identify the legal, ethical, and institutional challenges faced; (4) examine the comparative experiences of several jurisdictions in regulating and implementing AI in the judiciary; and (5) formulate comprehensive policy and regulatory recommendations for Indonesia.

METHODOLOGY

This research uses a normative legal research method (doctrinal legal research) which focuses on the study of legal norms, doctrines and theories.[8] The choice of this method is based on the nature of the problem being studied, namely the analysis of AI integration in the justice system, which requires a deep understanding of existing theoretical and normative constructs. The approach used in this research encompasses three analytical dimensions. First, a conceptual approach is used to analyze the concept of AI and its implications for basic legal principles.[9] Second, a comparative approach is used to compare the experiences of various jurisdictions in integrating AI into their judicial systems, particularly the European Union through the AI Act, China, Singapore, and Estonia.[10] Third, a critical approach is used to critically evaluate various claims and propositions related to the use of AI in the judicial context, particularly regarding the issues of algorithmic bias and accountability of automated systems.

The legal materials used consist of primary legal materials in the form of relevant laws and regulations (the ITE Law, the PDP Law, the 1945 Constitution, Supreme Court Regulations), international legal instruments, and relevant court decisions. Secondary legal materials include academic literature in the fields of legal philosophy, legal theory, information technology law, and computer science studies related to AI. Tertiary legal materials in the form of legal dictionaries, encyclopedias, and legal indexes are used to provide context and clarify terminology. The analysis is conducted qualitatively through systematic, teleological, and historical interpretation of the collected legal materials. The reasoning technique used is deductive-inductive reasoning that moves from general principles of the justice system to a concrete analysis of the challenges of AI integration, to then induce relevant principles and policy recommendations.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Integration of Artificial Intelligence in the Judicial System with Application Mapping and Legal and Ethical Challenges in Indonesia

The application of AI in the judicial system can be categorized into several main categories based on their function and level of complexity. The first category includes administrative automation, which is the most basic yet most widely applied AI application today. In this category, AI is used to automate the archiving and indexing of case documents, court schedule management, processing of administrative forms and files, and sending automated notifications to litigants.[11]

The second category is AI-based legal analysis and research. Modern AI systems are capable of processing millions of legal documents, including court decisions, legislation, legal doctrine, and academic literature, in seconds to find relevant precedents, identify patterns in court decisions, and compile comprehensive summaries. In Indonesia, the Supreme Court's SIPP (Case Tracking Information System) is an initial step in this direction, although its analytical capabilities are still very limited compared to current AI systems.[12]

[8]Peter Mahmud Marzuki, Penelitian Hukum (Jakarta: Kencana, 2010), hlm. 35.

[9]Jimly Asshiddiqie & M. Ali Safa'at, Teori Hans Kelsen tentang Hukum (Jakarta: Konstitusi Press, 2006), hlm. 120.

[10]European Commission, Proposal for a Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council Laying Down Harmonised Rules on Artificial Intelligence (Artificial Intelligence Act) (Brussels, 2021), Article 6-7.

[11]Frank Pasquale, The Black Box Society: The Secret Algorithms That Control Money and Information (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2015), hlm. 8.

[12]Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia Nomor 11 Tahun 2008 tentang Informasi dan

Jurnal Hukum dan Keadilan

P-ISSN : 0000-0000
E-ISSN : 3031-6782
Available:https://jurnalhafasy.com/index.php/jhk

Vol.3. No.6, October 2026
DOI : https://doi.org/10.61942/jhk.v3i6.591

The third, and most controversial, category is judicial prediction systems. These systems use machine learning algorithms to predict court outcomes based on factors identified from historical data. The COMPAS (Correctional Offender Management Profiling for Alternative Sanctions) system in the United States is the most frequently cited and most criticized example of this type of application, as it has been shown to contain significant racial bias in its predictions.[13]

The fourth category includes decision support systems that do not directly make decisions but instead provide analysis and recommendations to judges or prosecutors. In this context, AI functions as a "smart assistant" that presents relevant information, identifies inconsistencies in legal arguments, or flags potential conflicts of interest. This model is considered more ethically acceptable because it retains decision-making authority with humans.

The fifth category is fraud and corruption detection systems in the judicial system. AI can be trained to detect anomalous patterns in court decisions that indicate corruption, nepotism, or unexplained inconsistencies. This potential is particularly relevant for Indonesia, which still grapples with serious judicial integrity issues.[14]

Indonesia currently does not have a specific and comprehensive legal framework regulating the use of AI in the justice system.[15] Law Number 11 of 2008 concerning Electronic Information and Transactions (ITE Law), as amended by Law Number 19 of 2016, does provide a general basis for the recognition of electronic documents and electronic signatures, but it does not regulate AI-based decision-making systems. Supreme Court Regulation (PERMA) Number 1 of 2019 concerning Electronic Administration of Cases and Trials in Courts has indeed paved the way for the digitization of the judicial process, but this PERMA only regulates the substitution of physical media with electronic media, not the automation of the decision-making process through AI. This situation creates a serious legal vacuum (rechtsvacuum), where the implementation of AI in the judiciary is moving faster than the regulatory capacity to regulate it.[16]

One of the most fundamental legal issues arising from the use of AI in the judiciary is the question of accountability. When an AI system makes an incorrect recommendation, resulting in an unfair decision, who is responsible? Is it the judge who relied on the recommendation? Or the AI system developer? Or the judicial institution that adopted the technology? These questions cannot be satisfactorily answered by the traditional legal framework of accountability in Indonesia.[17] This accountability problem is exacerbated by the black-box nature of many modern AI systems, particularly those based on deep learning. Frank Pasquale, in his work, The Black Box Society, describes how opaque algorithms create a 'black box society' where vital decision-making processes are completely unauditable or uncritical.[18] In the judicial context, this lack of transparency directly contradicts the principle of audi alteram partem and the defendant's right to know the basis for decisions that affect his or her life.

The use of AI in judicial processes has the potential to cause serious violations of human rights, particularly the right to due

Transaksi Elektronik sebagaimana telah diubah dengan Undang-Undang Nomor 19 Tahun 2016.

[13]Mahkamah Agung Republik Indonesia, Cetak Biru Pembaruan Peradilan 2010-2035 (Jakarta: Mahkamah Agung RI, 2010), hlm. 47.

[14]Sandra Mayson, "Bias In, Bias Out," 128 Yale Law Journal 2218 (2019), hlm. 2220.

[15] Mecca, Anggil Syahra Putri, Wahab Aznul Hidaya, and Hadi Tuasikal. "Pemanfaatan teknologi kecerdasan buatan (artificial intelligence) dalam sistem peradilan pidana di Indonesia." *Jurnal Sosial Teknologi* 5.6 (2025): 1730-1746. https://doi.org/10.59188/jurnalsostech.v5i6.32207

[16]Peraturan Mahkamah Agung Nomor 1 Tahun 2019 tentang Administrasi Perkara dan Persidangan di Pengadilan secara Elektronik.

[17]Virginia Eubanks, Automating Inequality: How High-Tech Tools Profile, Police, and Punish the Poor (New York: St. Martin's Press, 2018), hlm. 31.

[18] Takwim, Ahsani, and Hena Sulaeman. "EXPLAINABLE AI SEBAGAI SOLUSI BLACK BOX EFFECT DALAM KECERDASAN BUATAN." *SEMINAR TEKNOLOGI MAJALENGKA (STIMA)*. Vol. 9. 2025. https://doi.org/10.58812/shh.v4i02.718

Jurnal Hukum dan Keadilan
P-ISSN : 0000-0000
E-ISSN : 3031-6782
Available:https://jurnalhafasy.com/index.php/jhk
Vol.3. No.6, October 2026
DOI : https://doi.org/10.61942/jhk.v3i6.591

process of law.[19] Law No. 39 of 1999 concerning Human Rights and various international instruments, such as Article 14 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, guarantee everyone's right to a fair trial by a competent, independent, and impartial court. When AI systems containing algorithmic bias are integrated into the judicial process, this guarantee can be fundamentally compromised.

The Personal Data Protection Law (PDP Law) Number 27 of 2022 offers some hope by regulating the right of data subjects not to be subjected to automated decisions that significantly impact them. However, this provision remains very general and not specific enough to address the complexities of AI use in judicial processes involving the public interest and citizens' fundamental rights [20]

The issue of algorithmic bias is one of the most serious ethical challenges in the application of AI to the legal field. Sandra Mayson, in her article "Bias In, Bias Out," argues that AI systems trained on historical data will inherently reproduce and even reinforce existing biases within the legal system.[21] If the training data reflects a history of systemic discrimination, for example related to race, gender, or social class, then AI predictions will tend to discriminate against those same groups.

Virginia Eubanks in Automating Inequality documents how automated systems used in the administration of social welfare, health care, and criminal justice in the United States systematically discriminate against the poor and minority groups.[22] This research provides a particularly relevant warning for Indonesia, given its high levels of socio-economic inequality and demographic diversity, which could potentially be sources of bias in the training data for judicial AI systems.

Another ethical challenge is the threat to judicial independence. Judges who use AI systems as decision-making aids are potentially subject to automation bias, a tendency to overly trust the recommendations of automated systems. This phenomenon can erode the culture of deliberation and moral consideration that is at the heart of a quality judicial process. Lon L. Fuller, in The Morality of Law, emphasizes that good law must be communicable and understandable to those subject to it—a principle difficult to achieve when decisions are generated by opaque algorithms.[23]

Development of Artificial Intelligence in the Judicial System in Various Countries and Indonesia

The European Union, through the Artificial Intelligence Act (AI Act) passed in 2024, adopted a risk-based regulatory approach that is highly relevant to study.[24] The AI Act classifies AI systems based on their risk level, explicitly classifying AI systems used in the administration of justice and legal proceedings as "high-risk," subject to stringent requirements. These requirements include: establishing a sustainable risk management system, using high-quality, bias-free training data, comprehensive and auditable technical documentation, real-time monitoring capabilities, transparency to users, measures to ensure system accuracy and robustness, and

[19] Rizana, Rizana, and Andrew Shandy Utama. "Tinjauan Yuridis terhadap Penggunaan Artificial Intelligence dalam Proses Penegakan Hukum." *Sanskara Hukum dan HAM* 4.02 (2025): 134-145.

[20]Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia Nomor 27 Tahun 2022 tentang Perlindungan Data Pribadi.

[21] Ariyadi, Franky. "Algorithmic Bias Dalam Restorative Justice: Ancaman Bagi Marginal." *National Multidisciplinary Sciences* 4.3 (2025): 148-158. https://doi.org/10.32528/nms.v4i3.756

[22] Polii, Valentino, and Dian Julius Polii. "Akses keadilan bagi kelompok rentan: studi empiris mengenai hambatan struktural dalam sistem peradilan." *Perkara: Jurnal Ilmu Hukum Dan Politik* 3.1 (2025): 655-674. https://doi.org/10.51903/perkara.v3i1.2330

[23]Lon L. Fuller, The Morality of Law, Revised Edition (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1969), hlm. 46.

[24] Hasanuddin, Moh, and Ferika Nurfransiska. "Pengaturan Artificial Intelligence (AI) Dalam Perspektif Hukum Indonesia: Analisis Normatif Atas Tntangan, Implikasi, Dan Model Regulasi Ideal." *Judge: Jurnal Hukum* 6.06 (2026): 1890-1897. https://doi.org/10.54209/judge.v6i06.1632

Jurnal Hukum dan Keadilan
P-ISSN : 0000-0000
E-ISSN : 3031-6782
Available:https://jurnalhafasy.com/index.php/jhk
Vol.3. No.6, October 2026
DOI : https://doi.org/10.61942/jhk.v3i6.591

mandatory human oversight. Furthermore, the AI Act explicitly prohibits the use of certain AI systems deemed ethically unacceptable, including social scoring systems by public authorities [25]

China has taken a diametrically different approach from the European Union. The Chinese judicial system has implemented AI extensively and aggressively, with People's Courts at various levels using AI systems for case analysis, verdict prediction, and even to assist judges in writing judgments. The "Smart Court" platform developed by the Supreme People's Court of China has processed hundreds of millions of cases.[26] While the Chinese model has shown impressive results in terms of efficiency, this approach has drawn serious criticism from the perspective of human rights and judicial independence. The integration of AI into China's judicial system is inseparable from a broader social surveillance system, raising deep concerns about the use of technology as an instrument of social control and the enforcement of political hegemony.

Estonia, known as one of the most advanced countries in the digitalization of public services, has developed a limited AI system to assist judges in small claims cases. Meanwhile, Singapore, through its Model AI Governance Framework, establishes principles that balance innovation with accountability, including human-in-the-loop obligations for high-impact decisions.[27] The experiences of Estonia and Singapore provide lessons that responsible integration of AI in the judiciary requires: (a) gradual implementation starting with low-risk cases; (b) full transparency about how the system works to litigants; (c) an opt-out mechanism that allows parties to choose conventional procedures; and (d) regular evaluation of the system's performance and impact.[28]

The Supreme Court of the Republic of Indonesia has taken commendable initial steps in digitizing the judicial system. The 2010-2035 Judicial Reform Blueprint established a vision for a modern, technology-based judiciary.[29] Various innovations have been implemented, including: the Case Tracking Information System (SIPP), which allows for online case status tracking; e-Court, which facilitates electronic case registration, summons, and document delivery; e-Litigation, which enables online trials; and a smart presence system that uses facial recognition for judicial staff attendance.[30] However, existing implementations are still far from truly utilizing AI. SIPP is essentially an information management system, not an AI-based system. e-Court and e-Litigation are procedural digitization, not decision-making automation. The gap between the level of digitalization achieved and the true potential of AI is vast, reflecting limitations in infrastructure, human resource capacity, and the existing regulatory framework.[31]

Indonesia faces several serious structural barriers to implementing AI in its judicial system. First, the digital infrastructure gap between major cities and remote areas remains significant. Courts in remote areas often struggle with unstable internet connections,

[25] Wafi, Muhammad Syafiq, Aloysius Wisnubroto, and Yudi Prayudi. "Artificial Intelligence-Based Deepfake Crimes: A Conception of Culpability Principle as a Criminal Liability Reform." *Reformasi Hukum* 29.2 (2025): 168-183. https://doi.org/10.46257/jrh.v29i2.1304

[26]Bernard Marr, Artificial Intelligence in Practice: How 50 Successful Companies Used AI and Machine Learning to Solve Problems (Hoboken: Wiley, 2019), hlm. 142.

[27]Ryan Calo, "Artificial Intelligence Policy: A Primer and Roadmap," 51 UC Davis Law Review 399 (2017), hlm. 407.

[28]OECD, Recommendation of the Council on Artificial Intelligence (Paris: OECD, 2019), Principle 1.3.

[29] Liba, Yulita, and Supriyadi A. Arief. "Praktek di Pengadilan Berbasis Elektronik: Bentuk Konkret Mewujudkan Transparansi." *Iuris Studia: Jurnal Kajian Hukum* 6.1 (2025): 89-97. https://jurnal.bundamediagrup.co.id/index.php/iuris/article/view/836

[30]Mahkamah Agung Republik Indonesia, Laporan Tahunan 2023 (Jakarta: Mahkamah Agung RI, 2023), hlm. 88-90.

[31]Peraturan Mahkamah Agung Republik Indonesia Nomor 3 Tahun 2022 tentang Mediasi di Pengadilan.

Jurnal Hukum dan Keadilan

P-ISSN : 0000-0000
E-ISSN : 3031-6782
Available:https://jurnalhafasy.com/index.php/jhk

Vol.3. No.6, October 2026
DOI : https://doi.org/10.61942/jhk.v3i6.591

inadequate electricity supply, and a lack of adequate IT equipment. Second, there is a shortage of competent human resources in the technology field. Most Indonesian judges and judicial officials lack even a basic understanding of AI. Without a sufficient understanding of how AI systems operate, their limitations, and the potential biases of their users, they cannot provide meaningful oversight.[32] Third, data fragmentation and quality. Effective AI implementation requires structured, high-quality, and sufficient data. The Indonesian justice system currently stores data in various non-standardized formats, scattered across different institutions, and often containing inconsistencies. Without good data, AI systems cannot produce reliable output.[33]

Indonesia needs a comprehensive legal instrument specifically regulating the use of AI in the judicial system. This instrument should adopt the risk-based approach of the European Union's AI Act, defining categories of permitted, restricted, and prohibited uses of AI in the judicial context, and establishing the technical and ethical requirements that AI systems must meet.[34] Specifically, the regulation should affirm the human-in-the-loop principle for all judicial decisions, prohibit the use of AI as the sole determinant in decisions affecting a person's liberty, require transparency and explainability of AI systems to litigants, and establish an effective redress mechanism when AI systems are proven to provide erroneous recommendations.[35]

The Supreme Court needs to develop a judicial data infrastructure that is integrated, standardized, and securely accessible by AI systems.[36] This includes the retrospective digitization and standardization of all case archives, the development of a national legal ontology that serves as the basis for representing Indonesian legal knowledge, and the establishment of a judicial data center that meets high security and reliability standards. Investment in this data infrastructure is an absolute prerequisite for meaningful AI implementation.

A systematic and sustainable capacity-building program is essential for all components of the justice system. Curricula for judicial education and judicial officer training need to be revised to include adequate AI competencies, not to transform judges into software engineers, but to ensure they are capable of using, evaluating, and providing meaningful oversight of the AI systems they employ.[37]

AI systems used in the judiciary must meet the Explainable AI (XAI) standard, the ability to provide human-understandable explanations of the basis and process of each recommendation or decision. In her research, Cynthia Rudin argues that for high-stakes decisions, inherently interpretable AI models should be preferred over accurate but opaque black-box models.[38] This XAI principle is in line with the principle of openness in Indonesian procedural law and the defendant's right to receive adequate explanation regarding the basis for the decision.

CONCLUSION

The integration of AI into the Indonesian justice system is not merely an option, but a strategic necessity that requires careful preparation. The demands of efficiency,

[32]Cynthia Rudin, "Stop Explaining Black Box Machine Learning Models for High Stakes Decisions and Use Interpretable Models Instead," Nature Machine Intelligence 1 (2019), hlm. 206-215.

[33]Soerjono Soekanto, Pengantar Penelitian Hukum (Jakarta: UI-Press, 1986), hlm. 9.

[34]Jimly Asshiddiqie, Pengantar Ilmu Hukum Tata Negara, Jilid II (Jakarta: Sekretariat Jenderal dan Kepaniteraan MK RI, 2006), hlm. 215.

[35]John Rawls, A Theory of Justice, Revised Edition (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1999), hlm. 54.

[36] Kamila, Zahra. "Pengaturan Hukum Dan Prospek Penggunaan Artificial Intelligence Dalam Era Digitalisasi Sistem Peradilan Di Indonesia." *Jurnal Riset Multidisiplin Edukasi* 2.3 (2025): 16-36. https://doi.org/10.71282/jurmie.v2i3.172

[37]Satjipto Rahardjo, Ilmu Hukum (Bandung: Citra Aditya Bakti, 2000), hlm. 182.

P-ISSN : 0000-0000
E-ISSN : 3031-6782
Available:https://jurnalhafasy.com/index.php/jhk
Vol.3. No.6, October 2026
DOI : https://doi.org/10.61942/jhk.v3i6.591

accessibility, and consistency in the administration of fair justice will be increasingly difficult to meet without the support of AI technology. Indonesia is currently in the early transition phase of judicial digitalization, with various initiatives launched that have yet to substantively utilize the true capabilities of AI. The gap between AI's potential and actual implementation is caused by a combination of regulatory, infrastructure, and human resource capacity factors. The legal, ethical, and institutional challenges of AI integration in the judiciary are complex and multidimensional. Issues of accountability, algorithmic bias, due process protection, and judicial independence require an integrated and comprehensive response that cannot be addressed partially or sectorally.

Comparative experiences across jurisdictions provide valuable lessons: no single model fits all contexts. Indonesia needs to develop a judicial AI integration model tailored to its own legal context, culture, and institutional capacity, while adhering to universal principles such as transparency, accountability, non-discrimination, and the supremacy of human oversight. Successful AI integration into Indonesia's judicial system requires a long-term commitment involving multiple stakeholders: the Supreme Court, the House of Representatives (DPR), relevant ministries, the academic community, civil society, and the technology sector. This transformation is too important and too complex to be left to a single institution or interest group.

REFERENCE

Aristawati, Rahma Nur, Inggrid Yemima Sihombing, and Rizha Claudilla Putri. "Revolusi Digital dalam Hukum Acara Perdata: Penerapan Kecerdasan Buatan dalam Penyelesaian Sengketa." *Al-Zayn: Jurnal Ilmu Sosial & Hukum* 4.2 (2026): 3982-3990. https://doi.org/10.61104/alz.v4i2.4896

Ariyadi, Franky. "Algorithmic Bias Dalam Restorative Justice: Ancaman Bagi Marginal." *National Multidisciplinary Sciences* 4.3 (2025): 148-158. https://doi.org/10.32528/nms.v4i3.756

Asshiddiqie, Jimly & M. Ali Safa'at. Teori Hans Kelsen tentang Hukum. Jakarta: Konstitusi Press, 2006.

Asshiddiqie, Jimly. Pengantar Ilmu Hukum Tata Negara, Jilid II. Jakarta: Sekretariat Jenderal dan Kepaniteraan MK RI, 2006.

Calo, Ryan. "Artificial Intelligence Policy: A Primer and Roadmap." 51 UC Davis Law Review 399 (2017).

Eubanks, Virginia. Automating Inequality: How High-Tech Tools Profile, Police, and Punish the Poor. New York: St. Martin's Press, 2018.

European Commission. Proposal for a Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council Laying Down Harmonised Rules on Artificial Intelligence (Artificial Intelligence Act). Brussels, 2021.

Fuller, Lon L. The Morality of Law, Revised Edition. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1969.

Harahap, Aswindari, et al. "Analisis Diskresi Hakim dalam Mengintegrasikan Rekomendasi Penalaran Hukum Berbasis Kecerdasan Buatan (AI) di Pengadilan Niaga." *Locus Journal of Academic Literature Review* 4.9 (2025): 734-745. https://doi.org/10.56128/ljoalr.v4i9.789

Hasanuddin, Moh, and Ferika Nurfransiska. "Pengaturan Artificial Intelligence (AI) Dalam Perspektif Hukum Indonesia: Analisis Normatif Atas Tntangan, Implikasi, Dan Model Regulasi Ideal." *Judge: Jurnal Hukum* 6.06 (2026): 1890-1897. https://doi.org/10.54209/judge.v6i06.1632

Kamila, Zahra. "Pengaturan Hukum Dan Prospek Penggunaan Artificial Intelligence Dalam Era Digitalisasi Sistem Peradilan Di Indonesia." *Jurnal Riset Multidisiplin Edukasi* 2.3 (2025): 16-36. https://doi.org/10.71282/jurmie.v2i3.172

Kamila, Zahra. "Pengaturan Hukum Dan Prospek Penggunaan Artificial Intelligence Dalam Era Digitalisasi Sistem Peradilan Di Indonesia." *Jurnal*

P-ISSN : 0000-0000
E-ISSN : 3031-6782
Available:https://jurnalhafasy.com/index.php/jhk

Vol.3. No.6, October 2026
DOI : https://doi.org/10.61942/jhk.v3i6.591

Riset Multidisiplin Edukasi 2.3 (2025): 16-36. https://doi.org/10.71282/jurmie.v2i3.172

Liba, Yulita, and Supriyadi A. Arief. "Praktek di Pengadilan Berbasis Elektronik: Bentuk Konkret Mewujudkan Transparansi." *Iuris Studia: Jurnal Kajian Hukum* 6.1 (2025): 89-97. https://jurnal.bundamediagrup.co.id/index.php/iuris/article/view/836

Mahkamah Agung Republik Indonesia. Cetak Biru Pembaruan Peradilan 2010-2035. Jakarta: Mahkamah Agung RI, 2010.

Mahkamah Agung Republik Indonesia. Laporan Tahunan 2023. Jakarta: Mahkamah Agung RI, 2023.

Marr, Bernard. Artificial Intelligence in Practice: How 50 Successful Companies Used AI and Machine Learning to Solve Problems. Hoboken: Wiley, 2019.

Marzuki, Peter Mahmud. Penelitian Hukum. Jakarta: Kencana, 2010.

Mayson, Sandra. "Bias In, Bias Out." 128 Yale Law Journal 2218 (2019).

Mecca, Anggil Syahra Putri, Wahab Aznul Hidaya, and Hadi Tuasikal. "Pemanfaatan teknologi kecerdasan buatan (artificial intelligence) dalam sistem peradilan pidana di Indonesia." *Jurnal Sosial Teknologi* 5.6 (2025): 1730-1746. https://doi.org/10.59188/jurnalsostech.v5i6.32207

OECD. Recommendation of the Council on Artificial Intelligence. Paris: OECD, 2019.

Pasquale, Frank. The Black Box Society: The Secret Algorithms That Control Money and Information. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2015.

Polii, Valentino, and Dian Julius Polii. "Akses keadilan bagi kelompok rentan: studi empiris mengenai hambatan struktural dalam sistem peradilan." *Perkara: Jurnal Ilmu Hukum Dan Politik* 3.1 (2025): 655-674. https://doi.org/10.51903/perkara.v3i1.2330

Rahardjo, Satjipto. Ilmu Hukum. Bandung: Citra Aditya Bakti, 2000.

Rawls, John. A Theory of Justice, Revised Edition. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1999.

Rudin, Cynthia. "Stop Explaining Black Box Machine Learning Models for High Stakes Decisions and Use Interpretable Models Instead." Nature Machine Intelligence 1 (2019): 206-215.

Schwab, Klaus. The Fourth Industrial Revolution. Geneva: World Economic Forum, 2016.

Soekanto, Soerjono. Pengantar Penelitian Hukum. Jakarta: UI-Press, 1986.

Sunstein, Cass R. & Adrian Vermeule. Law and Leviathan: Redeeming the Administrative State. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2020.

Susskind, Richard. Tomorrow's Lawyers: An Introduction to Your Future, 2nd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017.

Takwim, Ahsani, and Hena Sulaeman. "EXPLAINABLE AI SEBAGAI SOLUSI BLACK BOX EFFECT DALAM KECERDASAN BUATAN." *SEMINAR TEKNOLOGI MAJALENGKA (STIMA)*. Vol. 9. 2025.

Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia Nomor 11 Tahun 2008 tentang Informasi dan Transaksi Elektronik sebagaimana telah diubah dengan Undang-Undang Nomor 19 Tahun 2016.

Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia Nomor 27 Tahun 2022 tentang Perlindungan Data Pribadi.

Wafi, Muhammad Syafiq, Aloysius Wisnubroto, and Yudi Prayudi. "Artificial Intelligence-Based Deepfake Crimes: A Conception of Culpability Principle as a Criminal Liability Reform." *Reformasi Hukum* 29.2 (2025): 168-183. https://doi.org/10.46257/jrh.v29i2.1304

World Economic Forum. The Future of Jobs Report 2023. Geneva: WEF, 2023.