(REVIEW ARTICLE)

Check for updates

Legal Technology and Bias: A Threat to Fair Trial Rights?

Chaudhary Hamza Riaz *

Independent Legal Researcher, LLB (Hons) Ulster University, Belfast, Northern Ireland, United Kingdom.

Abstract

This paper examines whether bias in legal technology poses a threat to the right to a fair trial, a cornerstone of democratic justice systems. Drawing on examples from the UK, US, and EU, it critically analyses how algorithmic bias in tools like predictive recidivism algorithms, auto- mated visa processing, and facial recognition systems can perpetuate discrimination, undermine judicial impartiality, and erode procedural fairness. Key arguments highlight the 'black box' nature of AI systems, which obscures decision-making processes, and real-world cases such as the COMPAS algorithm's racial disparities and the UK Home Office's biased visa tool. The findings reveal that while legal technology offers efficiency gains, inherent biases, stemming from flawed training data and opaque algorithms jeopardize Article 6 of the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR) protections in the UK. Existing safeguards, including data protection laws and judicial review, are insufficient due to enforcement gaps and limited transparency. As of 2025, with the EU AI Act partially in force, ongoing developments underscore the need for vigilance. The paper concludes that without robust reforms, such as mandatory bias audits and independent oversight, legal technology risks violating fair trial rights, recommending policy enhancements to ensure equitable integration into justice systems.

Keywords: Legal Technology; AI Bias; Fair Trial; Human Rights; Judicial Impartiality; Algorithmic Discrimination

1. Introduction

The advent of legal technology, encompassing artificial intelligence (AI), predictive algorithms, and automated decision-making systems, has transformed the administration of justice worldwide. In the UK, courts increasingly rely on AI for case management, while policing employs facial recognition for identification, and immigration authorities use algorithms for visa screening. Similarly, in the US, tools like COMPAS assess recidivism risks to inform bail and sentencing decisions, and the EU deploys AI in asylum processing to enhance efficiency. These innovations promise to streamline processes, reduce human error, and improve access to justice amid overburdened systems. For instance, predictive analytics can forecast case outcomes with purported accuracy, aiding lawyers and judges in resource allocation.

However, this technological integration raises profound concerns about bias, transparency, and fairness. Algorithmic bias occurs when systems, trained on historical data reflecting societal inequalities, perpetuate discrimination against marginalized groups. In the UK, the Home Office's visa algorithm was scrapped in 2020 after allegations of racial bias, illustrating how automated tools can embed prejudices (22). In the US, ProPublica's investigation into COMPAS revealed racial disparities, with black defendants falsely flagged as high-risk at nearly twice the rate of white counterparts (16). Such issues extend to the EU, where facial recognition trials have sparked debates on data protection and discrimination.

The central legal question this paper addresses is: Does bias in legal technology threaten the right to a fair trial? Under Article 6 ECHR, incorporated into UK law via the Human Rights Act 1998, individuals are entitled to a fair hearing by an independent and impartial tribunal. Bias in AI could undermine this by introducing discriminatory outcomes, eroding

---

* Corresponding author: Chaudhary Hamza Riaz

trust in judicial processes, and violating procedural safeguards. This analysis argues that while legal technology holds potential, unchecked bias poses a significant threat, needing rigorous scrutiny. By examining legal frameworks, real-world examples, and reform proposals, the paper evaluates the compatibility of these tools with fair trial principles, contributing to ongoing debates on digital justice in a global context, particularly amid 2025 developments like phased EU AI Act implementation.

2. Legal background

The right to a fair trial is a fundamental human right enshrined in international and domestic law, serving as a bulwark against arbitrary state power. In the UK, this right is primarily governed by Article 6 of the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR), which provides: "In the determination of his civil rights and obligations or of any criminal charge against him, everyone is entitled to a fair and public hearing within a reasonable time by an independent and impartial tribunal established by law." Incorporated through the Human Rights Act 1998, Article 6 binds UK public authorities, including courts and administrative bodies, to uphold these standards.

 Central to Article 6 is judicial impartiality, requiring tribunals to be free from bias or prejudice. The European Court of Human Rights (ECtHR) has interpreted this as encompassing both subjective impartiality—absence of personal bias— and objective impartiality, where circumstances might reasonably raise doubts about neutrality. In Porter v Magill [2001] UKHL 67, the House of Lords adopted the test: whether a fair-minded and informed observer would conclude that there was a real possibility of bias. This principle extends to automated systems if they influence judicial decisions, as impartiality demands transparent and accountable processes.

Procedural fairness under Article 6 includes equality of arms, ensuring parties have equal opportunities to present their case, and the adversarial principle, allowing challenge to evidence. The ECtHR in Rowe and Davis v UK (2000) 30 EHRR 1 emphasized disclosure of material evidence to prevent unfair advantage. In criminal proceedings, Article 6(3) guarantees minimum rights, such as adequate time for defence preparation and legal assistance. Delays or opaque processes can violate the 'reasonable time' requirement, as seen in Darnell v UK (1993) 18 EHRR 205, which addressed excessive delays in civil proceedings.

Access to justice is intertwined with fair trial rights, implying effective remedies without undue barriers. The UK Supreme Court in R (UNISON) v Lord Chancellor [2017] UKSC 51 struck down employment tribunal fees for obstructing access, underscoring that systemic inequalities exacerbate violations. In immigration and policing contexts, where legal technology is prevalent, fair trial rights extend to administrative decisions with quasi-judicial elements, per Golder v UK (1975) 1 EHRR 524.

Common law principles reinforce these protections. The rule against bias, articulated in Dimes v Grand Junction Canal (1852) 3 HL Cas 759, mandates recusal in conflict cases. Procedural fairness, per Ridge v Baldwin [1964] AC 40, requires hearings before decisions affecting rights. These doctrines ensure justice is not only done but seen to be done, fostering public confidence.

Fair trial rights in the UK demand impartial, transparent, and equitable processes. As legal technology integrates into these domains, any bias risks eroding these foundations, potentially leading to discriminatory outcomes and diminished trust in the justice system.

3. Legal Technology and Bias

Legal technology, particularly AI-driven tools, introduces efficiencies but also significant risks of bias that can undermine fair trial rights. Algorithmic bias arises from flawed data inputs, design choices, or deployment, leading to discriminatory outcomes. A key issue is the 'black box' problem: opaque algorithms where decision-making processes are inscrutable, hindering challenges under Article 6 ECHR's equality of arms principle (26). This lack of transparency exacerbates risks, as users cannot verify fairness.

Bias manifests in various forms. Data bias occurs when training datasets reflect historical inequalities, perpetuating discrimination against protected groups. For instance, if algorithms learn from past arrests skewed by racial profiling, they may overpredict risks for minorities. Design bias stems from programmer assumptions, while deployment bias arises from context-insensitive application (21).

Real-world examples illustrate these threats. In the US, the COMPAS recidivism algorithm, used in sentencing and bail, was scrutinized by ProPublica in 2016. Analyzing over 7,000 defendants in Broward County, Florida, the investigation found black defendants were nearly twice as likely to be falsely labelled high-risk for reoffending (44.9% error rate) compared to whites (23.5%). Conversely, whites were more often mislabeled low risk despite reoffending (47.7% vs. 28% for blacks). Overall predictive accuracy was 61%, but only 20% for violent crimes. Northpointe (now Equivant) disputed the methodology, claiming race-neutral accuracy, but withheld proprietary details, highlighting black box issues (16). Recent studies in 2024 confirm persistent biases, though some can be mitigated (20). In Loomis v Wisconsin (2017) 881 NW 2d 749, the court upheld COMPAS use as advisory, but critics argue it injects bias into judicial discretion, violating due process akin to Article 6 impartiality.

In the UK, the Home Office's visa streaming algorithm, discontinued in 2020, faced allegations of racism. It sorted applications by nationality, flagging 'high-risk' countries like Pakistan for

 scrutiny, leading to higher refusal rates for certain ethnic groups. Campaigners, including the Joint Council for the Welfare of Immigrants, claimed it embedded a 'hostile environment'. The Home Office admitted potential bias and committed to redesign, incorporating unconscious bias training (22). By 2025, new concerns have emerged with AI tools in immigration, such as a ChatGPT-style LLM criticized for errors in asylum decisions (21). This case underscores how automated immigration decisions, often unchallenged due to opacity, threaten fair trial rights in appeal processes, where applicants must contest biased outputs without full disclosure.

Facial recognition technology provides another example. In R (Bridges) v Chief Constable of South Wales Police [2020] EWCA Civ 1058, the Court of Appeal ruled the police's AFR Locate system unlawful for breaching Article 8 ECHR privacy rights and the Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) under the Equality Act 2010. Evidence suggested bias against women and BAME individuals due to imbalanced training data, with false positives potentially leading to wrongful stops. The court criticized inadequate equality impact assessments and discretionary deployment, noting risks of indirect discrimination (23). As of 2025, mass facial recognition rollouts remain in a 'legal grey area' due to insufficient regulation, amplifying bias concerns (18). While not directly invoking Article 6, the judgment implies implications for fair trials: biased identifications could taint evidence in criminal proceedings, eroding impartiality and the right to challenge.

In the EU, similar concerns arise. The EU AI Act, effective from 2024 with phased implementation, classifies high-risk systems, including judicial AI, requiring bias mitigation; bans on unacceptable risks applied from February 2025 (19). However, critics argue it lacks robust enforcement against discrimination, and 2025 discussions include potential pauses on certain provisions (20). Recent US cases, like Mobley v Workday (ongoing in 2025), allege AI hiring tools discriminate on age, race, and disability, with implications for legal evidence admissibility (24).

These cases demonstrate how legal technology can perpetuate systemic inequalities, threatening fair trial rights by introducing biased evidence or decisions. Without transparency, defendants cannot effectively contest outcomes, violating procedural fairness.

4. Critical discussion

Existing legal safeguards against AI bias in courts are fragmented and often inadequate, revealing limitations in protecting fair trial rights. In the UK, the Human Rights Act 1998 and Article 6 ECHR provide a baseline, enabling judicial review of biased decisions. Data protection laws, including the UK GDPR, mandate fairness in automated processing (Article 22), requiring hu- man oversight for significant decisions. The Equality Act 2010's PSED compels public bodies to assess discrimination risks, as enforced in the Bridges case (23). Judicial review allows challenges on grounds of irrationality or unlawfulness, according to Wednesbury principles.

In the US, safeguards include the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment, prohibiting discriminatory state actions. Disparate impact doctrine, per Griggs v Duke Power Co 401 US 424 (1971), enables claims against biased algorithms without proving intent (17). However, proprietary protections limit scrutiny, as seen in COMPAS disputes. The 2025 Workday lawsuit highlights ongoing challenges in holding AI vendors accountable for bias (25).

The EU offers more comprehensive frameworks. The AI Act (2024) adopts a risk-based approach, banning manipulative AI and requiring high-risk systems, like judicial tools, to undergo conformity assessments for bias, with key provisions effective from 2025 (19). GDPR's Article 22 restricts solely automated decisions, demanding transparency. Yet, loopholes persist: the Act permits sensitive data use for bias detection but lacks mandatory audits for all systems, and 2025 amendments are under consideration (20).

These frameworks' limitations are evident. Enforcement relies on post-hoc challenges, burdening individuals amid opacity. Black box algorithms evade scrutiny, as courts defer to proprietary claims. In the UK, judicial review's high threshold often fails marginalized groups. The EU AI Act's self-assessment for providers risks underreporting bias. Globally, inconsistent regulations fragment protections.

To address this, reforms are essential. Mandatory independent bias audits, conducted by oversight bodies like a UK AI Regulator, could ensure pre-deployment checks. Enhanced transparency requirements, such as algorithmic explainability standards, would align with Article 6's adversarial principle. Policy recommendations include integrating human rights impact assessments into tech procurement and training judges on AI literacy. International cooperation, via treaties like the Council of Europe's AI Convention, could harmonize standards. Ultimately, these measures could mitigate threats, fostering fair integration of legal technology.

5. Conclusion and Recommendations

This paper has demonstrated that bias in legal technology indeed threatens fair trial rights, as evidenced by discriminatory outcomes in systems like COMPAS, the UK Home Office visa algorithm, and facial recognition tools. These innovations, while efficient, perpetuate inequalities through opaque processes and flawed data, undermining Article 6 ECHR's guarantees of impartiality and procedural fairness in the UK and beyond. Recent developments, such as the 2025 Workday AI bias lawsuit and phased EU AI Act enforcement, reinforce the urgency of addressing these risks.

Findings reveal that algorithmic bias erodes trust in justice systems, potentially violating equality of arms and access to justice. Existing safeguards judicial review, data protection laws, and emerging regulations like the EU AI Act offer partial protections but falter due to enforcement gaps and limited transparency.

Legal technology can be safely integrated without violating fair trial rights, but only with proactive reforms. Recommendations include

- Establishing independent oversight bodies to conduct mandatory bias audits for high-risk legal AI.
- Legislating for algorithmic transparency, requiring explainable models in judicial con- texts.
- Enhancing judicial training on AI risks to ensure informed oversight.
- Promoting international standards, such as expanding the Council of Europe's AI treaty, o address cross-border biases.
- Policymakers should prioritize human rights in tech deployment, ensuring equitable access to justice in the digital age.

References

[1] Dimes v Grand Junction Canal (1852) 3 HL Cas 759

Available from: https://doi.org/10.1093/he/9780191995729.003.0014

[2] Golder v United Kingdom (1975) 1 EHRR 524

Available from: https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/eng#{%22itemid%22:[%22001-57496%22]}

[3] Griggs v Duke Power Co 401 US 424 (1971)

Available from: https://supreme.justia.com/cases/federal/us/401/424/

[4] Loomis v Wisconsin 881 NW 2d 749 (2017)

Available from: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Loomis_v._Wisconsin

[5] Porter v Magill [2001] UKHL 67

Available from: https://publications.parliament.uk/pa/ld200102/ldjudgmt/jd011213/magill-1.htm

[6] R (Bridges) v Chief Constable of South Wales Police [2020] EWCA Civ 1058

Available from: https://www.libertyhumanrights.org.uk/issue/legal-challenge-ed-bridges-v-south-wales-police/

[7] Ridge v Baldwin [1964] AC 40

Available from: https://www.oxfordlawtrove.com/display/10.1093/he/9780191995729.001.0001/he-9780191995729-chapter-65

[8] Rowe and Davis v United Kingdom (2000) 30 EHRR 1

Available from: https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/eng?i=001-58556

[9] R (UNISON) v Lord Chancellor [2017] UKSC 51

Available from: https://www.supremecourt.uk/cases/uksc-2015-0233.html

[10] Data Protection Act 2018

Available from: https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2018/12/contents/enacted

[11] Equality Act 2010

Available from: https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2010/15/contents

[12] European Convention on Human Rights, Article 6

Available from: https://www.echr.coe.int/documents/convention_eng.pdf

[13] Human Rights Act 1998

Available from: https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1998/42/contents

[14] Regulation (EU) 2016/679 (General Data Protection Regulation)

Available from: https://eur-lex.europa.eu/eli/reg/2016/679/oj

[15] Regulation (EU) 2024/1689 (EU Artificial Intelligence Act)

Available from: https://eur-lex.europa.eu/eli/reg/2024/1689/oj/eng

[16] Angwin J, Larson J, Mattu S and Kirchner L, 'Machine Bias' (ProPublica, 23 May 2016) https://www.propublica.org/article/machine-bias-risk-assessments-in-criminal-sentencing accessed 17 July 2025.

[17] Barocas S and Selbst AD, 'Big Data's Disparate Impact' (2016) 104 California Law Review 671 https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2477899 accessed 14 July 2025.

[18] Council of Europe, 'European Ethical Charter on the Use of AI in Judicial Systems' (2018) https://www.europarl.europa.eu/cmsdata/196205/COUNCIL%20OF%20EUROPE%20-%20European%20Ethical%20Charter%20on%20the%20use%20of%20AI%20in%20judicial%20systems.pdf accessed 19 July 2025.

[19] European Commission, 'Artificial Intelligence Act' (2024) https://artificialintelligenceact.eu accessed 18 July 2025.

[20] Falletti E, 'Algorithmic Discrimination and Privacy Protection' (2024) 1 Law Journal Digital 1 https://www.lawjournal.digital/jour/article/view/185 accessed 17 July 2025.

[21] Foxglove, 'The Home Office's New ChatGPT-style LLM Tool is Riddled with Mistakes' (19 May 2025) https://www.foxglove.org.uk/2025/05/19/home-office-chatgpt-llm-life-or-death-people-seeking-asylum/ accessed 19 July 2025.

[22] Guardian, 'Home Office Drops 'Racist' Algorithm from Visa Decisions' (4 August 2020) https://www.theguardian.com/uk-news/2020/aug/04/home-office-to-scrap-racist-algorithm-for-uk-visa-applicants accessed 18 July 2025.

[23] Judiciary of England and Wales, 'R (Bridges) v Chief Constable of South Wales Police Judgment' (11 August 2020) https://www.judiciary.uk/wp-content/uploads/2020/08/R-Bridges-v-CC-South-Wales-ors-Judgment.pdf accessed 19 July 2025.

[24] Law and the Workplace, 'AI Bias Lawsuit Against Workday Reaches Next Stage' (11 June 2025) https://www.lawandtheworkplace.com/2025/06/ai-bias-lawsuit-against-workday-reaches-next-stage-as-court-grants-co accessed 17 July 2025.

[25] Proskauer, 'Workday Lawsuit Over AI Hiring Bias (As of May 16, 2025)' (27 May 2025) https://fairnow.ai/workday-lawsuit-resume-screening/ accessed 19 July 2025.

[26]   Selbst AD and others, 'Fairness and Abstraction in Sociotechnical Systems' (2019) Proceedings of the Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency 59.

[27]   Xiang A and Raji ID, 'On the Legal Compatibility of Fairness Definitions' (2019) https://arxiv.org/abs/1912.00761 accessed 16 July 2025.