УДК 347.9:004.8
DOI: https://doi.org/10.17721/1728-2195/2025/2.130-9

Nataliia MAZARAKI, DSc (Law), Prof.
ORCID ID: 0000-0002-1729-7846
e-mail: n.mazaraki@knute.edu.ua
State University of Trade and Economics, Kyiv, Ukraine

Tamara KORTUKOVA, PhD (Law), Assoc. Prof.
ORCID ID: 0000-0002-3376-0159
e-mail: t.kortukova@knute.edu.ua
State University of Trade and Economics, Kyiv, Ukraine

TOWARDS RESPONSIBLE AI IN LEGAL SERVICES: THE CASE FOR REGULATING CHATBOTS

Background. ***The rapid adoption of chatbots in legal services has created new opportunities for improving access to justice, while simultaneously raising unresolved questions about risks, accountability, and regulatory oversight. Recent initiatives illustrate the potential of these tools to reduce costs, overcome geographical barriers, and provide timely guidance to self-represented litigants. Yet the same features that make chatbots attractive-instant availability, natural language fluency, and apparent expertise-also magnify dangers: misinformation, bias, breaches of confidentiality, and impacts on due process. Against this background, this paper asks what regulatory and self-regulatory measures are necessary to ensure that legal chatbots deliver accurate, fair, and rights-compliant assistance.***

Methods. ***The study employs a structured, multi-stage methodology. It begins by defining "legal chatbot" and classifying them along a functional continuum from informational to advisory and rights-reporting systems. This typology enables a risk-based assessment of harms. Using access to justice as an evaluative lens, the analysis then examines benefits and vulnerabilities through indicators drawn from the WJP Rule of Law Index. Evidence is synthesized from case law, academic studies, and professional reports, and benchmarked against regulatory frameworks such as the EU AI Act, the GDPR, and Council of Europe instruments, supplemented by national guidelines and emerging professional standards.***

Results. ***Findings show that legal chatbots range from low-risk informational assistants to high-risk advisory tools directly affecting fundamental rights. While informational chatbots primarily require transparency and update obligations, advisory and rights-reporting systems demand stronger safeguards, including verification, human oversight, and liability mechanisms. Existing regulation provides partial coverage but remain too general or fragmented, leaving significant governance gaps.***

Conclusions. ***The paper concludes that a hybrid model is required: binding regulatory measures to anchor transparency, accountability, and data protection, coupled with self-regulatory initiatives from bar associations and courts to guide professional responsibility. Collaborative oversight among developers, regulators, and professional bodies is essential to balance innovation with accountability. Ultimately, legal chatbots can enhance access to justice, but only if governed by proportionate frameworks that safeguard fairness, due process, and public trust.***

Keywords: ***Artificial intelligence, legal chatbots, access to justice, tech governance, EU digital law.***

Background

In July 2024, the Supreme Court of Nevada launched the first publicly available generative AI–powered court chatbot in the United States. Within weeks, thousands of self-represented litigants had used it to navigate divorce filings, custody arrangements, and protection orders tasks that previously required hours of research or in-person visits (Team, 2024). The project was hailed as a breakthrough for access to justice, showing how conversational AI could bridge the gap between legal need and available legal aid. But it also sparked a pressing question: how do we ensure that such tools deliver accurate, fair, and rights-compliant assistance when their advice may influence the outcome of life-altering disputes?

Chatbots are no longer limited to customer service or retail. In courts, legal aid organizations, and private practice, they now guide self-represented litigants through procedural steps, draft legal documents, answer rights-related queries, and, in some jurisdictions, even support judicial decision-making. These developments have positioned legal chatbots as potential game-changers for access to justice, especially for vulnerable populations who may otherwise be excluded from timely, affordable legal assistance.

Yet, the very qualities that make legal chatbots attractive instant availability, natural language interaction, and apparent expertise also magnify risks. Errors can cost a litigant their claim; data mishandling can breach attorney–client privilege; opaque algorithms can compromise transparency and due process. Unlike general business chatbots, legal chatbots operate in a domain where misinformation can have irreversible consequences for rights and freedoms.

The literature on AI chatbots reveals a diverse spectrum of concerns and perspectives, ranging from liability and legal ethics to sector-specific risks and broader regulatory frameworks. Herbosch (Herbosch, 2024) analyzes the private law implications of relying on generative chatbots, showing how misleading outputs could trigger fraud annulment regimes while overlapping with public law obligations in the EU AI Act. Hemesath and Tepe (Hemesath, & Tepe, 2024) extend this to e-government, finding that citizens and municipal staff emphasize privacy, accountability, and human fallback mechanisms, highlighting the need to integrate public value theory into regulatory frameworks. Studies in health and social care contexts underscore the heightened risks of chatbot use for vulnerable populations: Nguyen et al. (Nguyen et al., 2025) demonstrate that AI outputs on child abuse education, while generally accurate, lack actionability and readability; Parks et al. (Parks et al., 2025) stress that mental health chatbots are unregulated and propose a standardized framework based on safety, ethics, and evidence. Similarly, Ng, Haller, and Murray (Ng et al., 2022) argue that legal chatbots can positively impact access to justice and mitigate social disconnectedness, but only if they comply with both legal and AI ethics principles.

Against this backdrop of sector-specific caution and calls for oversight, (Zhang, 2024) offers a contrasting macro-level perspective. Rather than assuming that generative AI inevitably requires heavy regulation, Zhang develops a

© Mazaraki Nataliia, Kortukova Tamara, 2025

yardstick based on inter-informational competition. Drawing on decades of communications regulation, he argues that regulators often err on the side of excessive caution when facing new technologies, overlooking the corrective power of market competition among information outlets. His analysis suggests that competition between chatbots and other sources of information can mitigate many content risks without the need for intrusive measures such as prohibitions, licensing, or dataset curation. Overreliance on direct regulatory tools, Zhang warns, risks stifling competition and innovation in the AI sector. Proportionate regulation should instead be reserved for risks that competition cannot resolve–such as privacy, copyright, or certain harms requiring targeted safeguards.

While the literature demonstrates a wide range of concerns–spanning legal liability, public value, ethical safeguards, and sector-specific vulnerabilities–it also reveals diverging views on the necessity and form of regulation. On one hand, scholars underscore the dangers of misinformation, the risks to vulnerable groups, and the ethical obligations of developers, thereby advocating for stronger oversight and formalized standards. On the other hand, perspectives like Zhang's remind us of the potential of informational markets to self-correct, cautioning against overregulation that could stifle innovation and competition. This tension highlights a key unresolved issue: how to balance regulatory intervention with self-regulatory mechanisms in a way that both mitigates risks and preserves the potential benefits of legal chatbots. Against this backdrop, the present study addresses the central research question: what regulatory and self-regulatory measures are needed to mitigate the risks of legal chatbots and ensure they provide accurate, fair, and rights-compliant assistance?

Methods

This study uses a structured, multi-stage design to identify proportionate regulatory and self-regulatory measures for legal chatbots, explicitly situating them within the access-to-justice paradigm. First, the research clarifies what counts as a "legal chatbot" and classifies tools along a functional continuum (informational, intake/triage, document-assembly, advisory, rights-reporting). The typology is used to map risk by function and to align regulatory intensity with functionality, consistent with a risk-based approach (e.g., lighter duties for purely informational bots; heightened safeguards for advisory or evidence-collection tools). This responds to your paper's point that "one-size-fits-all" frameworks under- or over-regulate depending on the mix of functions.

Second, the study operationalizes A2J as an evaluative lens. Building on the modern A2J movement (Cappelletti, Garth) and its shift from formal to effective justice, the analysis treats chatbots as potential instruments to reduce "legal poverty" and to make rights practically enforceable. Concretely, it adopts indicators inspired by the WJP Rule of Law Index, Factor 7 (Civil Justice)–awareness of remedies, access to and affordability of legal advice/representation, and barriers to courts–so that chatbot benefits and risks are assessed against measurable justice outcomes rather than abstract efficiency gains. These A2J anchors are applied across jurisdictions and use-cases, allowing comparison of how chatbots advance or hinder practical access to civil justice.

Third, the study derives context-sensitive metrics and evidence sources. On the benefit side, it evaluates whether chatbots lower geographic, financial, and time barriers (24/7 access, low-cost first-line guidance, improved legal awareness) and whether they scale basic support in underserved settings. On the risk side, it examines accuracy/misinformation, bias and discrimination, data protection and confidentiality, due-process and accountability gaps, unauthorized practice of law, and cybersecurity exposure. Where relevant, the assessment incorporates real-world public-interest deployments (e.g., assistance and referral chatbots used by civil society during wartime or for victims of violence) both to capture A2J value and to surface verification and safety constraints that such tools face.

Fourth, a comparative regulatory analysis benchmarks existing instruments that shape the design and deployment of legal chatbots. The review considers EU-level digital-justice policy (including the Commission's push to leverage AI/chatbots in e-Justice and to coordinate chatbot efforts) alongside the EU AI Act's risk-based model, then reads these against national/professional rules to identify coverage and gaps that matter for A2J (e.g., transparency, human fallback, accountability, and proportional safeguards). This positions chatbots not merely as generic digital tools but as A2J infrastructure subject to layered governance.

Finally, the study undertakes a normative synthesis. Using the A2J indicators as constraints, it weighs regulatory and self-regulatory options to propose a balanced governance model: minimum duties for low-risk informational bots; enhanced obligations (e.g., validation, human oversight, clearer liability allocation, elevated privacy/security controls) for higher-risk advisory or rights-reporting systems; and design-level safeguards that embed due process, accountability, and non-discrimination into system architecture. This synthesis treats chatbots as A2J-relevant socio-technical systems and aligns incentives so that innovation serves practical justice outcomes, not just technical performance.

Results

1. What Are Legal Chatbots?

The term chatbot combines "chat", referring to conversational interaction, and "bot", derived from "robot." The word robot originates (Robot – Etymology, Origin & Meaning, n.d.) from the Czech *robota,* meaning "forced labor" or "drudgery," and was popularized in the 1920 play *R.U.R. (Rossum's Universal Robots)* by Karel Čapek (Moravec, & Peter, 2025). By the late 20th century, *bot* had become computing slang for an automated software agent performing repetitive tasks. The term *chatterbot* first appeared in the mid-1990s, coined by Michael Maudlin (Mauldin, 1994) from "chatter" (informal talk) and "robot," later shortened to *chatbot*

Today, the term *chatbot* is commonly understood as a software application designed to engage in conversation with people, whether through text or speech, in a way that mimics human interaction. Merriam-Webster captures this succinctly as "a bot that is designed to converse with human beings (Merriam-Webster, 2025)," while IBM's industry-oriented definition describes it as "a computer program that simulates human conversation with an end user (IBM)," often using natural language processing (NLP) and machine learning to interpret queries and generate responses.

To date, there is no generally applicable legislative definition of "chatbot" in either EU or national law. Regulatory texts such as the EU AI Act (*Regulation EU 2024/1689*) regulate "AI systems intended to interact with natural persons" but do not provide a standalone legal definition of the term. Where definitions do exist, they are confined to specific domains in which regulators identified an urgent need for targeted intervention. For example, Utah's law defines a "mental health chatbot" as AI technology that:

- *uses generative AI to engage in interactive conversations with a user, similar to the confidential communications an individual would have with a licensed mental health therapist; and*

- *is represented, or a reasonable person would believe, to provide mental health therapy or help a user manage or treat mental health conditions.*

The definition expressly excludes AI technology that only provides scripted output – such as guided meditations or mindfulness exercises – or that solely analyzes a user's input for the purpose of connecting the individual with a human therapist (Utah State Legislature, 2024).

1.2. Evolution of Chatbots

The technological development of chatbots can be traced through several generations. The first recognized chatbot, ELIZA (1966), was developed by Joseph Weizenbaum at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT). ELIZA simulated conversation most famously in the role of a Rogerian psychotherapist – by using pattern matching and scripted responses to create the illusion of understanding, despite lacking any real comprehension (Weizenbaum, 1966).

In the 1990s and 2000s, as online services proliferated, menu-driven and domain-specific chatbots emerged in industries such as banking, retail, and telecommunications. These systems guided users through predefined options and followed deterministic logic flows, limiting their adaptability (Abu Shawar, & Atwell, 2007).

The 2010s brought significant advances in natural language processing (NLP), the rise of global messaging platforms, and cloud computing, enabling chatbots to process a wider range of user inputs and infer intent. This period saw the emergence of virtual assistants like Apple's Siri and Amazon's Alexa, which blended voice interaction with service integration (Hoy, 2018).

By the 2020s, the introduction of transformer-based large language models (LLMs) such as BERT and GPT-4 had transformed the field. Chatbots gained the capacity to generate fluent, contextually nuanced responses and to adapt across specialized domains, including legal services, customer support, and healthcare.

1.3. Defining Legal Chatbots

This research focuses on chatbots that operate within jurisprudence. So far, a variety of computer-powered conversational agents have been deployed to provide legal advice, procedural guidance, and other law-related functions. In academic and professional discourse, different terms are used to describe these systems. Variations include *lawbot*, *robot lawyer*, *justicebot*, *legal information chatbot*, and *virtual legal assistant*. Each emphasizes different aspects – *lawbot* often referring to automated tools that handle legal tasks broadly, *justicebot* to decision-support systems for the public in specific case types, and *virtual legal assistant* to AI-powered systems tailored for lawyers' workflows.

In this paper, we use the umbrella term "legal chatbot" and understand it as a conversational software application often AI-powered that provides legal information, guidance, document assistance, or procedural support concerning rights, obligations, or legal processes, to either lay users or legal professionals.

These systems differ from general-purpose chatbots in that they operate within the legal domain, where precision and accuracy are essential, and their errors can lead to serious consequences for rights and procedural fairness. While they are not yet uniformly subject to specific legal services regulation, professional ethics rules, or court integrity requirements, there is a growing discussion and clear reasons why they should be brought within such regulatory frameworks, alongside AI and data protection laws.

1.4. Classification of Legal Chatbots

The existing range of legal chatbots is broad and highly diverse. Some are simple informational assistants providing pre-scripted answers, while others use advanced natural language processing (NLP) and machine learning to interpret facts and generate legal documents or tailored advice. This diversity means that not all legal chatbots present the same regulatory challenges. A chatbot that only provides a user with court office opening hours clearly raises fewer legal risks than one that guides them through preparing a statement of claim or advises them on eligibility for asylum. Thus, classification is a necessary step: it allows policymakers, professional regulators, and the judiciary to distinguish between chatbot types and apply proportionate regulatory or self-regulatory measures. Without such categorization, there is a risk of either overregulating simple tools (thereby stifling innovation and access) or underregulating complex advisory bots that may directly affect fundamental rights.

For the purpose of this research, legal chatbots can be meaningfully classified by the primary function they serve for the user. This functional approach is consistent with both existing academic taxonomies (Craig, & Niyi, 2025; Dahl et al., 2024; Dai, 2024) and the practical needs of regulatory design, as it highlights differences in risk exposure and governance needs.

1.4.1. Informational and Guidance Chatbots

These chatbots are designed to provide users with plain-language explanations of legal rights, duties, and procedures. They often translate complex statutory or procedural rules into accessible Q&A formats, enabling individuals without legal training to navigate institutions. Typically, they rely on a curated knowledge base and retrieval-based algorithms, which reduces the risk of unpredictable outputs but requires constant updating to remain accurate.

The main risks here are accuracy, completeness, and timeliness. If the law changes but the chatbot is not updated, users may be misled. Yet, since these systems generally do not produce binding documents or apply rules to facts, their risks are lower than advisory bots. Proportionate safeguards might include transparency requirements (clear disclaimers that the bot does not replace legal advice), auditing of content updates, and data protection safeguards for user queries.

In Ukraine, Pravoman (https://pravoman.com/stand-with-ukraine/) provides one of the broadest legal information services, covering more than 350 topics ranging from family and housing law to labor disputes. Similarly, the LegalAidUkraineBot on Telegram (https://t.me/LegalAidUkraineBot) acts as the official entry point to the state's free legal aid system, supplying users with basic procedural guidance and links to further assistance. Internationally, the Solution Explorer (https://civilresolutionbc.ca/solution-explorer/) developed by the Civil Resolution Tribunal in British Columbia is widely regarded as a pioneering model, offering step-by-step explanations of rights and obligations in everyday disputes such as small claims and tenancy matters.

1.4.2. Intake, Triage, and Referral Chatbots

These chatbots serve as the "front door" to legal aid or justice institutions. They gather initial information from users such as the nature of their legal problem, income level, or residency status and then direct them to appropriate services, whether online resources, human lawyers, or relevant administrative bodies. The triage function is particularly valuable in high-demand environments where legal aid resources are scarce.

The risks here concern fairness, non-discrimination, and eligibility errors. An overly rigid intake bot could exclude eligible users or fail to recognize vulnerable individuals who

require priority. Moreover, biases in how questions are framed may inadvertently disadvantage certain groups. Regulation may need to require periodic bias audits, appeal mechanisms for rejected users, and minimum standards for referral accuracy.

In Ukraine, LawLink (https://bot.ldn.org.ua/webchat/chat.html) has emerged as a practical tool for citizens affected by the war, guiding them through issues such as property damage, land lease disputes, and social benefits, while directing them to the competent authorities. Pravoman also integrates referral features, helping users move beyond general information by connecting them to public e-services and, where appropriate, legal professionals. Comparable international models include pro bono coordination platforms such as Paladin (https://www.joinpaladin.com), which employ chatbot-style triage to match clients with volunteer lawyers based on their case type and eligibility.

1.4.3. Procedural Assistance and Document-Assembly Chatbots

These chatbots go beyond providing information by actively assisting users in completing legal forms, drafting petitions, or generating ready-to-file documents. They usually employ guided interviews, where the chatbot asks the user structured questions and then populates official templates. Such tools democratize access to procedures, especially for self-represented litigants, by reducing complexity and eliminating technical errors.

Because the output of these systems directly enters judicial or administrative processes, the accuracy and completeness of documents is critical. Risks include defective filings (leading to dismissal of claims), outdated templates, or failure to include necessary facts. Regulators may therefore require certification of document templates, mandatory update schedules, and human oversight for critical filings.

In Ukraine, Pravoman assists users in generating legal documents such as court applications and contracts through guided interviews, ensuring that forms are populated correctly and in compliance with official templates. The R2P "Legal Adviser for IDPs" extends this functionality to displaced persons, offering ready-to-use procedural templates for pensions, residence registration, and humanitarian aid applications. Internationally, courts in Nevada have implemented a self-help platform with an integrated AI assistant that guides litigants step by step through legal forms, reducing the likelihood of technical mistakes and making judicial processes more accessible.

1.4.4. Advisory and Analytical Chatbots

This category represents the most advanced and controversial form of legal chatbot. Such systems attempt to interpret legal norms in light of user-provided facts and generate advice tailored to the individual situation. Powered increasingly by large language models (LLMs), they can draft letters, suggest legal strategies, or even assess likely outcomes.

These chatbots blur the line between information provision and the practice of law. Risks include unauthorized practice, erroneous advice, and over-reliance by vulnerable users. Errors here may result not just in procedural inconvenience but in substantive rights violations (e.g., losing asylum claims or custody disputes). Regulation could involve licensing or accreditation schemes, mandatory disclaimers, and professional liability mechanisms similar to those applied to lawyers.

In Ukraine, FrontYurist (https://frontyurist.com) provides tailored guidance on military law and conscription matters, assisting citizens in navigating one of the most complex and sensitive areas of wartime regulation. Beyond Ukraine, experimental initiatives based on large language models sometimes referred to as "LawGPT" are being tested in academic and commercial contexts, where they generate context-specific legal analyses and strategy suggestions, though their reliability and ethical acceptability remain subjects of intense debate.

1.4.5. Rights Reporting and Evidence Collection Chatbots

These chatbots enable users to submit structured reports, often for human rights monitoring or evidence preservation. They may allow users to upload photos, videos, or testimonies, which are then securely stored for potential legal proceedings. In conflict or crisis settings, they serve as crucial channels for documenting abuses.

The stakes here are extremely high, involving privacy, security, chain of custody, and admissibility in court. Mishandled data could endanger victims or witnesses, while inadequate verification may undermine evidentiary value. Strong regulation is necessary, including data encryption, secure servers, independent verification protocols, and judicial admissibility standards.

In Ukraine, Tribunal.ua enables civilians to document and submit evidence of war crimes, creating a structured channel for information that may later support judicial proceedings. Similarly, the La Strada Ukraine chatbot assists victims of domestic violence and human trafficking in recording incidents and accessing relevant support services, thereby combining evidence gathering with referral to protection mechanisms. Another wartime tool, eEnemy, allows users to report sightings of hostile military equipment directly to the Ukrainian authorities through a secure interface. Internationally, projects such as Hala Systems' "Sentry" (https://www.millionlives.co/members/sentryhalasystems) platform have illustrated how conversational and reporting bots can be combined to crowdsource evidence in conflict zones, although such initiatives raise significant questions about verification, admissibility, and user safety.

This classification is not merely descriptive; it is intended to illustrate a continuum of legal chatbots from relatively low-risk informational tools to high-risk advisory or evidence-collection systems. Such a spectrum underscores the need for proportionate regulatory responses. This logic is consistent with the EU AI Act (Regulation (EU) 2024/1689), which adopts a risk-based framework distinguishing minimal-risk, limited-risk, high-risk, and prohibited AI systems. Applying the same rationale, legal chatbots that only disseminate procedural information would fall into a lighter regulatory category, while advisory or rights-reporting bots would require safeguards comparable to high-risk AI.

Where a chatbot performs multiple functions, such as both document assembly and individualized advice two approaches are possible: regulation could be applied according to the highest-risk function, thereby ensuring maximum protection for users, or regulators may adopt a function-specific model, imposing tailored obligations for each operational layer of the chatbot. Both approaches have merit, but what is clear is that a "one-size-fits-all" framework would be insufficient, as it risks under-regulating complex systems while over-burdening simple ones.

1.5. Legal chatbots within access to justice

The concept of access to justice, a cornerstone in scholarly literature, gained prominence in Europe during the 1960s with the emergence of the 'Access to Justice' movement. This shift was profoundly influenced by M. Cappelletti and B. Garth's 1978 work, "Access to Justice: The Newest Wave in the World Movement to Make Rights Effective". Their research marked a crucial paradigm change, moving beyond the initial understanding of court

access as merely a formal, natural right that required no state intervention. Instead, it highlighted the critical need for practical and effective access to justice to overcome "legal poverty" and ensure a genuinely functioning legal system (Cappelletti, & Garth, 1978). Indeed, the right to access justice is now widely recognized as a fundamental right and a paramount constitutional value in most modern nations (Buryi, 2018).

Despite this recognition, the 2024 WJP Rule of Law Index, which evaluates 142 countries and jurisdictions, reveals a worrying trend: for the seventh consecutive year, the rule of law has declined in the majority of countries (World Justice Project, 2024).

A vital component of this assessment is Factor 7: Civil Justice. This factor specifically measures how effectively and peacefully ordinary people can resolve their grievances through the civil justice system. It scrutinizes the accessibility and affordability of civil courts, examining crucial aspects such as: awareness of available remedies; access to and affordability of legal advice and representation; barriers to the court system.

When considering the accessibility and affordability criteria within the Civil Justice factor, striking disparities become apparent. Countries like Sudan, Burkina Faso, Myanmar, Guatemala, and Cambodia received the lowest scores, indicating significant challenges for their citizens in accessing civil justice. Conversely, Uruguay, Sweden, Denmark, Lithuania, and the Netherlands achieved the highest scores, signaling more robust and equitable civil justice systems (World Justice Project, 2024).

Uruguay's impressive ranking in the 2024 WJP Rule of Law Index for civil justice accessibility and affordability underscores its broader commitment to digital governance and AI readiness in Latin America. This proactive stance extends to the integration of technology, including chatbots, within its legal system (World Bank Group, 2024)).

It's noteworthy that Sweden, Denmark, Lithuania, and the Netherlands, all among the highest-ranking countries, are part of the European Union. The European Commission actively champions the digitalization of justice. Its Communication on the further enhancement of digitalization of justice (European Commission, 2020) and the European e-Justice Strategy and Action Plan 2019-2023 (European e-Justice Strategy and Action Plan, 2019) both advocate for leveraging AI, such as chatbots, within the European e-Justice portal. These strategic documents also highlight the importance of better coordination, especially for chatbots that aim to enhance access to justice (Jánoskúti, Kiss, 2024).

The potential of chatbots to significantly enhance access to justice is evident through several key mechanisms, such as overcoming accessibility barriers, enhancing legal awareness and information dissemination, boosting efficiency and scalability of legal support, aligning with digital transformation and policy objectives.

Firstly, chatbots overcome significant geographical, financial, and time-related barriers that traditionally hinder access to justice. They provide instant, 24/7 access to legal information and initial guidance from anywhere with an internet connection. This is crucial for individuals in remote areas or those with limited mobility who cannot easily visit physical legal aid offices. Furthermore, by offering free or low-cost initial assistance, chatbots address "legal poverty", making foundational legal knowledge and basic procedural guidance accessible to those who cannot afford traditional legal counsel (Craig, & Niyi, 2025). This democratizes access to information that was once the exclusive domain of legal professionals.

Secondly, one of the core challenges to access to justice is a lack of awareness about legal rights, available remedies, and the steps required to navigate the justice system. Chatbots excel at providing clear, concise, and easily understandable information on these topics. They can guide users through complex bureaucratic processes, explain legal jargon, and answer frequently asked questions in an interactive format. This proactive dissemination of information empowers individuals to better understand their legal standing and the options available to them, thereby improving their awareness of available remedies – a key criterion in the WJP Rule of Law Index.

Thirdly, traditional legal aid services are often overstretched and underfunded, leading to long wait times and limited capacity. Chatbots offer a scalable and efficient solution to address this gap. They can handle a high volume of inquiries simultaneously, providing immediate responses and freeing up human legal professionals to focus on more complex cases. This "triage" function ensures that basic inquiries are addressed quickly, reducing the burden on existing legal aid services and making initial guidance more readily available to a wider population. The ability to efficiently disseminate information and provide preliminary support significantly enhances the affordability and reach of legal assistance.

Fourthly, the increasing adoption of digital governance and AI readiness across nations, as exemplified by Uruguay's proactive stance and the European Union's robust digital justice strategies, demonstrates a clear policy direction towards leveraging technology for public services. The explicit advocacy by the European Commission for integrating AI, including chatbots, into justice portals underscores their recognition of these tools as beneficial for enhancing access to justice. This strong policy support and the trend towards digital transformation in the legal sector provide a fertile ground for chatbots to play a central role in modernizing and improving justice systems. The emphasis on coordination in these strategies suggests that integrated chatbot solutions will be key to creating a more cohesive and accessible justice landscape.

Finally, AI systems can analyze vast datasets to predict legal outcomes, moving chatbots beyond simple information provision into the domain of actual advice. For example, researchers have demonstrated this capability by predicting the outcomes of European Court of Human Rights cases with a remarkable 79% accuracy (Aletras et al., 2016). This kind of predictive power could be truly disruptive, enabling individuals to not only understand the next procedural steps but also to make well-informed decisions about whether to pursue a legal matter at all, based on likely outcomes (Gilmour, 2025). The chatbots will help close a part of the access-to-justice gap that is often overlooked. And the risks associated with their adoption appear manageable through pragmatic approaches (Dai, 2024).

1.6. Risks of Legal Chatbots

To understand the regulatory and self-regulatory needs of legal chatbots, it is essential first to identify their risks. In this research, we synthesized the risks posed by different categories of legal chatbots into a common framework. This approach highlights both general AI-related concerns (such as bias and security) and domain-specific vulnerabilities tied to the practice of law and access to justice.

1.6.1. Accuracy and Misinformation

Legal chatbots are highly dependent on the quality of their data and programming. Errors in legal reasoning, outdated statutes, or inaccurate templates may mislead users. Inaccuracies are particularly damaging in law

because even small mistakes such as missing a filing deadline or citing the wrong statute can lead to loss of rights or procedural disadvantage.

For example, in a prominent New York federal court case Mata v. Avianca, Inc., 2023, (Mata v. Avianca, 2023) lawyers were sanctioned for submitting a brief that included non-existent legal cases fabricated by ChatGPT. The attorneys admitted they were unaware the AI could produce such "hallucinations" and failed to verify the citations, leading to a fine and significant professional embarrassment. In the British Columbia Supreme Court case Zhang v. Chen, 2024 (*Zhang v. Chen*, 2024), a lawyer cited non-existent cases generated by ChatGPT in an application for parenting time. The opposing counsel's inability to locate these cases exposed the AI's fabrication. While the lawyer was not found to have intended deception, the court ordered personal costs against them due to the time and effort required to address the fabricated information.

Similar incidents have been reported in various jurisdictions, where lawyers faced sanctions or disciplinary actions for relying on AI-generated, fictitious legal authorities. Studies have further quantified this risk, with research indicating that large language models can hallucinate in response to legal queries at alarming rates. A recent study from Stanford RegLab and the Institute for Human-Centered AI revealed a widespread and troubling issue: leading large language models hallucinate in response to legal questions at rates between 69% and 88% (Dahl, et al., 2024).

In a consumer dispute Moffat v. Air Canada, 2024 (Moffatt v. Air Canada, 2024), Air Canada was ordered to compensate a passenger based on an incorrect refund policy provided by its chatbot. The tribunal ruled that the airline was responsible for all information on its website, including chatbot responses, underscoring the liability associated with AI-generated misinformation. Furthermore, the tribunal rejected Air Canada's argument that the AI chatbot was a separate legal entity, echoing the stance taken in many intellectual property cases related to AI-created content. Historical precedent for this type of liability dates back to 1972 (albeit under U.S. law), in State Farm Mutual Automobile Insurance Company v. Bockhorst, where a company was held liable for its computer's errors. These rulings demonstrate a longstanding legal principle that companies are accountable for the actions and errors of their automated systems.

Similarly, the New York City's AI-powered chatbot, intended to assist small business owners, was found to provide illegal advice. This incident was widely criticized as reckless and irresponsible, highlighting the dangers of deploying AI in sensitive public service roles without adequate safeguards. Such instances reveal that even when not fabricating, AI can misinterpret or misapply rules, leading to advice that is not only unhelpful but actively harmful.

1.6.2. Bias and Discrimination

Since chatbots often rely on machine learning models trained on large datasets, they may reproduce or amplify existing social and legal biases. For instance, a chatbot assisting with housing disputes might reflect biased case law or discriminatory assumptions embedded in training data, leading to unequal treatment of vulnerable groups. The increasing use of AI in public services creates risks of algorithmic bias against women, racialized groups, and minorities, often leaving victims with limited options for recourse or accountability. (Fundamental Rights Report, 2024)

1.6.3. Data Protection and Confidentiality

Legal matters frequently involve sensitive personal data. Chatbots that process user input may collect, store, or transmit information without adequate safeguards. This creates risks under data protection frameworks such as the GDPR, as well as heightened concerns about confidentiality, which is central to the attorney–client relationship.

1.6.4. Unauthorized Practice of Law and Professional Ethics

Chatbots that move from providing general information to offering individualized advice may cross the boundary into the unauthorized practice of law. This raises professional liability issues and risks undermining public trust in regulated legal services. It also creates uncertainty for developers, who may inadvertently expose themselves to sanctions.

1.6.5. Procedural Fairness and Due Process

When deployed in courts or administrative bodies, chatbots may impact procedural rights. For instance, if a chatbot misinforms a litigant about appeal deadlines, or if courts rely on automated tools for triage without human oversight, access to justice and due process guarantees could be compromised.

1.6.6. Cybersecurity and Malicious Use

Chatbots can be exploited by malicious actors–for instance, through impersonation, injection of harmful code, or phishing. Legal chatbots are particularly attractive targets because they deal with sensitive data and often act as entry points into justice systems.

1.6.7. Accountability and Liability Gaps

When harm occurs due to chatbot use – such as wrongful advice or data breaches it is often unclear who bears responsibility: the developer, the platform provider, or the public authority using the tool. This accountability gap complicates both litigation and regulatory enforcement, leaving users unprotected.

1.7. Existing Regulatory and Self-Regulatory Responses

Artificial intelligence in legal practice and within the judiciary has already been the subject of regulatory debate, with some attempts at governance emerging at both national and international levels. In certain jurisdictions, such as the European Union, legal chatbots are indirectly covered by general regulatory interventions, most notably the AI Act and the GDPR, while in others the approach remains fragmented and largely self-regulatory.

1.7.1. European Union: AI Act and GDPR

The EU AI Act (Regulation (EU) 2024/1689) is the first comprehensive legal framework for artificial intelligence. Although it does not provide a specific definition of "chatbot" or "legal chatbot", it introduces obligations for AI systems with varying levels of risk. Legal chatbots would generally fall under the "high-risk" category if used in areas affecting fundamental rights, such as access to justice, or under the "limited-risk" category when used for informational purposes only. The Act also includes a transparency requirement for all conversational AI systems, mandating that users must be informed that they are interacting with a machine.

In parallel, the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) continues to apply to all chatbots processing personal data. For legal chatbots, GDPR safeguards are particularly relevant given the sensitive nature of legal communications, including the requirements of purpose limitation, data minimization, and heightened protection for special categories of data.

1.7.2. Council of Europe Standards

The Council of Europe (CoE) has not yet defined "legal chatbots" explicitly but has produced several soft-law instruments addressing AI in justice. The European Ethical Charter on the Use of Artificial Intelligence in Judicial Systems (2018) emphasizes principles of transparency, accountability, non-discrimination, and respect for human

rights when deploying AI in courts. More recently, the Framework Convention on Artificial Intelligence, Human Rights, Democracy and the Rule of Law (2024) established binding standards for member states, requiring human oversight and proportionality in AI deployment. While not specific to chatbots, these documents are directly relevant, as legal chatbots deployed in courts or by legal aid bodies must respect fair trial rights and access to justice guarantees.

1.7.3. National Bar Associations and Legal Societies

Bar associations across Europe and beyond have begun issuing guidelines and ethical opinions on the use of AI and chatbots in legal services. For example, the American Bar Association (ABA) has warned about unauthorized practice of law risks in connection with tools like DoNotPay, which claims to provide legal representation via chatbots. The Law Society of England and Wales has published discussion papers on AI in the legal sector, underlining that lawyers remain accountable for advice even if generated with the assistance of AI tools. Although Ukrainian professional associations have not yet issued chatbot-specific guidance, discussions around digital transformation and e-justice are ongoing.

1.7.4. Ukraine

In Ukraine, the Ministry of Digital Transformation has issued Guidelines for the Responsible Use of Artificial Intelligence in Public Service (Ministry of Digital Transformation of Ukraine, n.d.), which, while not legally binding, set important benchmarks for AI applications, including chatbots. They emphasize that civil servants must remain accountable for AI-assisted decisions, that AI outputs must always be verified by a human, and that sensitive data such as state or personal information must not be exposed to AI systems. These principles align with international standards of legality, privacy, and non-discrimination, and could be directly adapted for legal chatbot deployment in courts and public legal aid.

The Ukrainian National Bar Association (UNBA) has likewise taken first steps toward self-regulation by entering into a memorandum with the AI Ethics and Integrity International Association (AIEI) (Ukrainian National Bar Association, 2025). Although still at an early stage, the initiative reflects growing awareness within the legal profession that AI-chatbots in particular must be guided by professional responsibility and client protection principles.

Discussion and conclusions

This paper set out to explore what regulatory and self-regulatory measures are needed to mitigate the risks associated with legal chatbots. By defining the term, tracing its etymology and evolution, classifying existing types of legal chatbots, and synthesizing the risks they pose, we demonstrated that legal chatbots are distinct from general-purpose conversational agents. Their deployment in matters of rights, obligations, and access to justice introduces heightened stakes that demand a tailored governance response.

Our classification illustrated a spectrum ranging from low-risk informational bots to high-risk advisory or quasi-judicial bots. This typology not only helps to understand the landscape but also clarifies why different levels of regulation are warranted: simple informational systems may require light-touch transparency rules, while advisory or decision-support bots implicate professional ethics, judicial integrity, and fundamental rights safeguards. Importantly, some chatbots combine functions across categories, meaning that either the highest applicable risk standard should apply, or the regulation should be adjusted to each function.

The comparative review showed that existing instruments, such as the EU AI Act, the GDPR, the Council of Europe AI Convention, and guidelines by bar associations already provide a partial framework. Yet they remain either too general (not tailored to the legal services context) or too soft (non-binding). Ukrainian initiatives, including the Ministry of Digital Transformation's guidelines and the UNBA-AIEI memorandum, are promising but at an early stage.

Therefore, future governance should pursue a hybrid approach:

Regulatory measures at the supranational and national levels should clarify the application of AI risk-based regulation to legal services, ensuring consistency with data protection, fair trial guarantees, and professional regulation.

Self-regulatory measures by bar associations and courts should establish codes of conduct, red lines for chatbot use, and training for legal professionals.

Collaborative mechanisms between developers, the judiciary, data protection authorities, and professional bodies should be institutionalized to ensure continuous oversight and adaptability.

Ultimately, legal chatbots hold potential to enhance access to justice, particularly for self-represented litigants and underserved communities. But without a clear framework balancing innovation with accountability, they risk undermining the very values of fairness and trust on which legal systems rest. The path forward lies in coupling innovation with regulation – both binding and self-regulatory – anchored in human rights and professional ethics.

Although this study has outlined the risks, regulatory gaps, and governance options for legal chatbots, further research is needed to refine both theoretical understanding and practical implementation. A first priority lies in the empirical evaluation of chatbot accuracy and its impact on users, since systematic studies testing outputs against benchmark legal scenarios remain scarce. Such assessments would not only help to identify error rates but also reveal the concrete consequences of misinformation on litigants' rights and procedural outcomes. Closely linked to this is the question of user trust and access to justice, as the effectiveness of legal chatbots depends on whether different groups of self-represented litigants, vulnerable populations, and even legal professionals perceive them as reliable and fair tools. Another important avenue of inquiry concerns cross-border regulatory convergence, given that supranational frameworks such as the EU AI Act, the Council of Europe's work, and national guidelines, including those emerging in Ukraine, may evolve in parallel but diverge in scope and enforcement. Comparative analysis could illuminate both inconsistencies and opportunities for harmonization. Beyond regulation, more attention must also be paid to the integration of chatbots with professional ethics, particularly how codes of conduct for lawyers and judges should adapt to AI-supported practice and whether certification or oversight mechanisms are required. Finally, interdisciplinary work on socio-technical design approaches is essential to embed legal principles, such as due process, accountability, and non-discrimination directly into chatbot architectures, ensuring that technological innovation advances in step with fundamental rights and professional standards.

Author contributions: Mazaraki Nataliia: conceptualization, methodology, literature review, supervision; Kortukova Tamara: writing, review and editing, case law analysis, writing – original draft. Both authors approved the final version of the manuscript.

Acknowledgements. This research is part of the project Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are,

however, those of the authors only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or EACEA. Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them.

Sources of funding. This studi did not receive any grant from a funding institution in the public, commercial, or noncommercial sectors.

References

Abu Shawar, B., & Atwell, E. (2007). Chatbots: Are they Really Useful? *Journal for Language Technology and Computational Linguistics*, 22(1), 29–49. https://doi.org/10.21248/jlcl.22.2007.88

Aletras, N., Tsarapatsanis, D., Preoţiuc-Pietro, D., & Lampos, V. (2016). Predicting judicial decisions of the European Court of Human Rights: A natural language processing perspective. *PeerJ Computer Science*, 2.

Buryi, V. O. (2018). Right to access to justice as one of the prerequisites for ensuring other human rights and freedoms. NaUKMA Research Papers. Law, 1, 25–28 [in Ukrainian]. [Бурій, В. О. (2018). Право на доступ до правосуддя як одна з передумов забезпечення інших прав і свобод людини. Наукові записки НаУКМА. Юридичні науки, 1, 25–28]. https://nrplaw.ukma.edu.ua/article/view/153081/152279

Cappelletti, M., & Garth, B. G. (1978). *Access to justice: The newest wave in the worldwide movement to make rights effective*.

Craig, K., & Niyi, J. (2025). *The use of chatbots in providing free legal guidance: Benefits and limitations*.

Dahl, M., Magesh, V., Suzgun, M., & Ho, D. E. (2024). Large legal fictions: Profiling legal hallucinations in large language models. *Journal of Legal Analysis*, 16(1), 64–93.

Dai, X. (2024). Who wants a robo-lawyer now?: On AI chatbots in China's public legal services sector. *Yale Journal of Law & Technology*, 26(3), 527–559.

European Commission. (2020). Communication on the further enhancement of digitalisation of justice. https://commission.europa.eu/strategy-and-policy/policies/justice-and-fundamental-rights/digitalisation-justice/communication-digitalisation-justice-european-union-and-proposal-e-codex/-regulation_en

European e-Justice Strategy and Action Plan 2019–2023. (2019). https://eur-lex.europa.eu/EN/legal-content/summary/european-e-justice-strategy-/and-action-plan-2019-2023.html

Fundamental Rights Report. (2024). European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights. https://fra.europa.eu/sites/default/files/fra_uploads/fra-2024-fundamental-rights-report-2024_en.pdf

Gilmour, B. (2025). *The ability of AI to increase access to justice*. Society for Computers and Law. https://www.scl.org/the-ability-of-ai-to-increase-/access-to-justice/

Hemesath, S., & Tepe, M. (2024). Public value positions and design preferences toward AI-based chatbots in e-government: Evidence from a conjoint experiment with citizens and municipal front desk officers. *Government Information Quarterly*, 41(4), 101985. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.giq.2024.101985

Herbosch, M. (2024). Fraud by generative AI chatbots: On the thin line between deception and negligence. *Computer Law & Security Review*, 52, 105049. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clsr.2024.105049

Hoy, M. B. (2018). Alexa, Siri, Cortana, and More: An Introduction to Voice Assistants. *Medical Reference Services Quarterly*, 37(1), 81–88. https://doi.org/10.1080/02763869.2018.1404391

IBM. (n.d.). What is a chatbot? IBM. https://www.ibm.com/topics/chatbots

Jánoskúti, B., & Kiss, D. (2024, July). *The potential and limitations of artificial intelligence chatbots to improve children's access to child friendly justice – legal analytical study*. Terre des hommes Foundation. https://justicewithchildren.org/sites/default/files/library/attachments/legal%/20study.pdf

Mata v. Avianca, Inc., No. 1:2022cv01461 (S.D.N.Y. 2023). https://law.justia.com/cases/federal/district-courts/new-york/nysdce/1:2022cv01461/575368/55/

Mauldin, M. L. (1994, January). ChatterBots, TinyMuds, and the Turing Test: Entering the Loebner Prize Competition. Proceedings of the Twelfth National Conference on Artificial Intelligence (AAAI-94), 16–21. AAAI Press/MIT Press

Merriam-Webster. (2025). *Chatbot. In Merriam-Webster.com dictionary*. Retrieved August 15, 2025. https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/chatbot

Ministry of Digital Transformation of Ukraine. (n.d.). Guidelines for the use of artificial intelligence in public service [in Ukrainian]. [Міністерство цифрової трансформації України. (б.д.). Поради з використання штучного інтелекту в публічній службі]. https://cms.thedigital.gov.ua/storage/uploads/files/page/community/docs/Porady_z_vykorystannya_AI.pdf

Moffatt v. Air Canada. (2024). BCCRT 149. https://www.canlii.org/en/bc/bccrt/doc/2024/2024bccrt149/2024bccrt149.html

Moravec, & Peter, H. (2025, August 14). Robot | Definition, History, Uses, Types, & Facts. *Encyclopedia Britannica*. https://www.britannica.com/technology/robot-technology

Ng, J., Haller, E., & Murray, A. (2022). The ethical chatbot: A viable solution to socio-legal issues. *Alternative Law Journal*, 47(4), 308–313. https://doi.org/10.1177/1037969X221113598

Nguyen, L., Tran, V., Li, J., Baughn, D., Shotwell, J., Gushanas, K., Hasan, S., Falls, L., & Zhong, R. (2025). Artificial intelligence chatbots as sources for patient education material on child abuse. *Child Protection and Practice*, 5, 100167. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chipro.2025.100167

Parks, A., Travers, E., Perera-Delcourt, R., Major, M., Economides, M., & Mullan, P. (2025). Is this chatbot safe and evidence-based? A call for the critical evaluation of generative AI mental health chatbots. *Journal of Participatory Medicine*, 17. https://doi.org/10.2196/69534

Regulation (EU) 2024/1689 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 13 June 2024 laying down harmonised rules on artificial intelligence and amending certain Union legislative acts (Artificial Intelligence Act). (2024). *Official Journal of the European Union*, L, 202, 1–110. https://eur-lex.europa.eu/eli/reg/2024/1689/oj

Robot – Etymology, Origin & Meaning. (n.d.). Etymonline. https://www.etymonline.com/word/robot

Team, C. (2024, September 15). *First publicly available Court-Supported generative AI chatbot in the nation. CiviLaw.Tech – We Build Self-Help Portals*. https://civilaw.tech/index.php/our-work/10-releases/13-first-publicly/-available-court-supported-generative-ai-chatbot-in-the-nation

Ukrainian National Bar Association. (2025, June 16). *Ukrainian advocates join efforts to develop AI ethics standards*. https://en.unba.org.ua/activity/news/10435-ukrainian-advocates-join-efforts-to-develop-ai-ethics-standards.html

Utah State Legislature. (2024). Artificial Intelligence Applications Relating to Mental Health, Utah Code Ann. § 13-72a-101. https://le.utah.gov/xcode/Title13/Chapter72A/13-72a-S101.html

Weizenbaum, J. (1966). ELIZA a computer program for the study of natural language communication between man and machine. *Communications of the ACM*, 9(1), 36–45. https://doi.org/10.1145/365153.365168

World Justice Project. (2024). WJP Rule of Law Index 2024. https://worldjusticeproject.org/rule-of-law-index/global

Zhang v. Chen. (2024). BCSC 285. https://www.canlii.org/en/bc/bcsc/doc/2024/2024bcsc285/2024bcsc285.html

Zhang, J. (2024). Regulating chatbot output via inter-informational competition. *Northwestern Journal of Technology and Intellectual Property*, 22(1), 109–156.

Отримано редакцією журналу / Received: 30.08.25
Прорецензовано / Revised: 13.09.25
Схвалено до друку / Accepted: 25.09.25

МАЗАРАКІ Наталія, д-р юрид. наук, проф.
ORCID ID: 0000-0002-1729-7846
e-mail: n.mazaraki@knute.edu.ua
Державний торговельно-економічний університет, Київ, Україна

КОРТУКОВА Тамара, д-р філософії (міжнародне право), доц.
ORCID ID: 0000-0002-3376-0159
e-mail: t.kortukova@knute.edu.ua
Державний торговельно-економічний університет, Київ, Україна

ДО ВІДПОВІДАЛЬНОГО ШТУЧНОГО ІНТЕЛЕКТУАЛЬНОГО СТВОРЕННЯ В ЮРИДИЧНИХ ПОСЛУГАХ: АРГУМЕНТИ РЕГУЛЮВАННЯ ЧАТБОТІВ

В с т у п . ***Швидке впровадження чатботів у сфері надання правових послуг створює нові можливості для поліпшення доступу до правосуддя, водночас піднімаючи невирішені питання щодо ризиків, підзвітності та регуляторного нагляду. Останні ініціативи демонструють потенціал цих інструментів у зниженні витрат, подоланні географічних бар'єрів і наданні своєчасних консультацій особам, які представляють себе в суді самостійно. Проте ті самі характеристики, що роблять чатботи привабливими, – миттєва доступність, природна мовна плавність і видима експертність – також підсилюють небезпеки: дезінформацію, упередженість, порушення конфіденційності та вплив на належну правову процедуру. На цьому тлі стаття ставить питання: які регуляторні та саморегуляторні заходи необхідні, аби забезпечити надання чатботами точних, справедливих і таких, що відповідають правам, консультацій?***

М е т о д и . ***Дослідження спирається на структуровану багатоступеневу методологію. Спочатку визначається поняття "юридичний чатбот" і класифікуються його види за функціональним континуумом – від інформаційних до консультативних і таких, що повідомляють про права. Ця типологія дає змогу проводити оцінювання ризиків за функціональним підходом. Використовуючи доступ до правосуддя як оціночну призму, аналіз розглядає переваги та вразливості через індикатори, запозичені з Індексу верховенства права WJP. Дані синтезуються із судової практики, академічних досліджень і професійних звітів та співвідносяться з такими регуляторними рамками, як Акт ЄС про штучний інтелект, GDPR і документи Ради Європи, доповнені національними настановами й новими професійними стандартами.***

Р е з у л ь т а т и ***показують, що юридичні чатботи варіюються від малоризикових інформаційних асистентів до високоризикових консультативних систем, що безпосередньо впливають на фундаментальні права. Якщо для інформаційних чатботів головними вимогами є прозорість і регулярне оновлення, то консультативні та rights-reporting-системи потребують більш суворих гарантій, включно з перевіркою достовірності, людським наглядом та чіткими механізмами відповідальності. Існуюче регулювання забезпечує лише часткове охоплення і залишається надто загальним або фрагментованим, залишаючи значні прогалини.***

В и с н о в к и . ***У підсумку доходимо висновку, що потрібна гібридна модель: обов'язкові регуляторні заходи для забезпечення прозорості, підзвітності та захисту даних у поєднанні із саморегуляторними ініціативами адвокатських асоціацій і судів для підтримки професійної відповідальності. Спільний нагляд з боку розробників, регуляторів і професійних інституцій є необхідним для збереження балансу між інноваціями та підзвітністю. Зрештою, правові чатботи здатні посилити доступ до правосуддя, але лише за умови, що вони регулюватимуться пропорційними рамками, які гарантують справедливість, дотримання процесуальних прав і суспільну довіру.***

К л ю ч о в і с л о в а : ***доступ до правосуддя, штучний інтелект, цифрове право ЄС, юридичні чатботи, регулювання технологій.***

Автори заявляють про відсутність конфлікту інтересів. Спонсори не брали участі в розробленні дослідження; у зборі, аналізі чи інтерпретації даних; у написанні рукопису; в рішенні про публікацію результатів.

The authors declare no conflicts of interest. The funders had no role in the design of the study; in the collection, analyses or interpretation of data; in the writing of the manuscript; in the decision to publish the results.