

## **Algorithmic Literacy as Access to Justice: Developing Training Frameworks for Defense Lawyers in AI-Augmented Criminal Proceedings**

**Ms. Parul Gupta<sup>1</sup>, Dr. Krishna Mohan Malviya<sup>2</sup>**

<sup>1</sup>*Research Scholar, Teerthanker Mahaveer College of law and legal studies, Teerthanker Mahaveer University, Moradabad, U.P., India. parul11gupta.pg@gmail.com*

<sup>2</sup>*Associate Professor, Teerthanker Mahaveer College of law and legal studies, Teerthanker Mahaveer University, Moradabad, U.P., India. krishna.law@tmu.ac.in*

### **Abstract**

The integration of artificial intelligence into criminal justice systems globally presents unprecedented challenges to fundamental due process rights, particularly for defense attorneys who must contest algorithmic evidence of increasing complexity. This paper examines algorithmic literacy—the capacity to understand, evaluate, and challenge AI systems as a critical access-to-justice issue. Drawing on comparative analysis of developments in India, the European Union, and the United States, this research identifies core competencies required for defense lawyers and proposes a structured training framework grounded in competency-based education theory. The paper argues that algorithmic literacy is a constitutional imperative, necessitating systemic reform in legal education, professional standards, and procedural safeguards. Without equitable training access, the disparity between well-resourced prosecution teams and under-resourced public defense will fundamentally undermine the right to a fair trial.

**Keyword:** Algorithmic Literacy, Access to Justice, Criminal Defense, Due Process, Competency-Based Training

### **1. Introduction**

The criminal justice system faces a technological transformation that occurs faster than legal institutions can accommodate. Artificial intelligence now permeates every stage of criminal proceedings: from predictive policing and facial recognition during investigations, through risk assessment algorithms influencing bail and sentencing, to automated evidence analysis guiding case strategy.<sup>1</sup> This transformation promises efficiency and objectivity but introduces profound risks of bias, opacity, and systemic injustice. Defense attorneys occupy a uniquely vulnerable position within this algorithmic ecosystem. Prosecutors and law enforcement, typically better-funded and technically sophisticated, deploy AI as offensive instruments in case development. Defense counsel, particularly public defenders managing unsustainable caseloads in resource-constrained environments, must simultaneously leverage AI for effective representation while contesting the reliability of algorithmic evidence against their clients.<sup>2</sup> This dual mandate requires algorithmic literacy—a competency extending far beyond basic computational understanding.<sup>3</sup> Algorithmic literacy comprises metacognitive practices enabling legal professionals to understand how AI systems function, evaluate their fairness, identify potential biases, and recognize constitutional vulnerabilities. The absence of such competency creates a two-tiered justice system: defendants represented by technologically sophisticated firms gain advantages from AI-assisted strategy, while those dependent on under-resourced public

defenders face algorithmic evidence they cannot adequately contest. This paper examines algorithmic literacy as both a professional responsibility and an access-to-justice imperative, surveying the current state of AI integration across jurisdictions and proposing a comprehensive training framework grounded in competency-based education principles.

## **2. The Current State of AI in Criminal Justice: A Global Landscape**

India's criminal justice system is undergoing rapid digitalization without comprehensive oversight. The Ministry of Law and Justice confirms that artificial intelligence is deployed across multiple domains: predictive policing uses pattern analysis to identify high-risk areas; the Crime and Criminal Tracking Network and Systems (CCTNS) integrates criminal data for intelligence purposes; facial recognition and automated CCTV analysis accelerate suspect identification; and AI-driven case management systems reduce administrative backlogs.<sup>4</sup> The passage of three new criminal laws in 2023—the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita (BNSS), Bharatiya Sakshya Adhiniyam (BSA), and Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita (BNS) institutionalizes forensic science and digital evidence but lacks comprehensive safeguards for algorithmic systems.<sup>5</sup> This represents a critical governance gap. While India's Constitution guarantees fundamental rights through Articles 20(3) and 21, the evidentiary framework lacks clarity on AI-generated evidence admissibility.<sup>6</sup> Section 65B of the Indian Evidence Act governs electronic records but provides minimal guidance on algorithmic authentication or reliability assessment.<sup>7</sup> Defense lawyers lack established protocols for challenging “black box” AI systems, placing them at significant disadvantage when algorithmic evidence plays a decisive role in investigations or prosecutions. The absence of legislative clarity forces defense counsel to work within procedural frameworks developed before algorithmic technologies existed.

## **3. The European Union: Regulatory Leadership and Emerging Obligations**

The EU Artificial Intelligence Act, effective August 1, 2024, establishes the world's first comprehensive AI governance framework. Article 4 explicitly mandates AI literacy for organizations developing or deploying high-risk AI systems a category specifically including criminal justice applications.<sup>8</sup> This represents a paradigm shift: AI literacy transforms from desirable skill to regulatory obligation. The Act classifies AI systems in criminal proceedings as high-risk, subjecting them to stringent requirements including conformity assessments, technical documentation, human oversight mechanisms, and continuous monitoring.<sup>9</sup> Legal professionals in EU jurisdictions must demonstrate competency in understanding AI Act requirements, conducting impact assessments, and ensuring compliance. Administrative fines reach up to thirty-five million euros or seven percent of worldwide annual revenue, creating powerful incentives for institutional investment in staff AI literacy.<sup>10</sup> The EU regulatory approach has global implications: organizations operating within EU jurisdictions must comply regardless of location, effectively exporting European AI literacy standards internationally. This framework provides a concrete model for jurisdictions developing their own AI governance structures.

## **4. The United States: Widespread Deployment with Limited Accountability**

The United States has permitted proliferation of algorithmic decision-making systems in criminal justice with minimal oversight. Predictive policing tools like PredPol and HunchLab have been deployed despite evidence of racial bias amplification.<sup>11</sup> The COMPAS recidivism risk assessment algorithm influences sentencing decisions across numerous states, despite well-

documented concerns about fairness and proprietary concealment of methodology.<sup>12</sup> Facial recognition systems, gunshot detection algorithms, and probabilistic genotyping tools are routinely used in criminal investigations with inadequate validation.<sup>13</sup> Crucially, U.S. law provides no systematic guarantee that criminal defendants have access to expert assistance when challenging algorithmic evidence. The landmark case *State v. Loomis* (2016) upheld COMPAS use in sentencing while acknowledging racial bias concerns, yet required only vague warnings rather than genuine contestability.<sup>14</sup> This exemplifies structural asymmetry: defendants often lack resources to hire experts, while prosecutors leverage state funding and vendor relationships. Public defender offices are beginning to adopt AI tools Miami-Dade and Los Angeles implementing platforms like CoCounsel and AMPED FIVE but these initiatives exist in patchwork form with significant disparities between well-funded and resource-constrained jurisdictions.<sup>15</sup>

### **5. Algorithmic Literacy: Defining the Competency**

Algorithmic literacy extends far beyond technical competence with software tools.<sup>16</sup> It comprises metacognitive practices enabling legal professionals to understand AI system functioning, evaluate fairness within legal contexts, identify biases arising from training data or algorithmic design, and recognize constitutional vulnerabilities.<sup>17</sup> For defense lawyers, algorithmic literacy encompasses multiple dimensions: technical understanding of how systems are trained and operate; interpretability assessment determining whether systems provide transparent explanations; bias detection recognizing indicators of discriminatory outcomes; constitutional analysis evaluating how algorithmic evidence intersects with due process; strategic application leveraging tools effectively; and professional responsibility understanding confidentiality and ethical obligations.<sup>18</sup> Technical literacy requires defense counsel to comprehend how specific AI systems used in criminal justice are trained, what data sources compose training sets, and how algorithms generate outputs.<sup>19</sup> This includes understanding statistical concepts: sensitivity and specificity, false positive rates, confidence intervals, cross-validation, and bias-variance tradeoffs. Without such understanding, defense attorneys cannot evaluate whether algorithmic predictions are reliable or whether errors are randomly distributed or systematically biased against particular populations. Interpretability assessment requires capacity to determine whether systems provide explanations for outputs or operate as opaque “black boxes.” This distinction is fundamental to criminal defense: algorithms are only contestable if judges and juries can understand their basis and defense can present counterarguments.<sup>20</sup>

### **6. Algorithmic Literacy as Access to Justice**

The relationship between algorithmic literacy and access to justice is direct and consequential. When defense attorneys lack competency to understand and challenge algorithmic evidence, their clients face systematic disadvantage regardless of prosecution case strength.<sup>21</sup> This disparity reflects institutional choices about resource allocation and professional development. Consider a concrete scenario: a defendant faces a bail decision influenced by algorithmic risk assessment predicting high reoffending risk. If the defense attorney lacks understanding of the algorithm's training data, methodology, and demonstrated bias patterns, they cannot effectively argue for individualized consideration or contest the system's reliability.<sup>22</sup> Meanwhile, the prosecution may have access to algorithm developers for expert testimony or vendor documentation establishing proprietary methodology. This informational asymmetry translates directly into unequal access to

justice. In India's context, as AI tools proliferate through police investigations without clear evidentiary standards, defense lawyers must develop competency to identify and contest algorithmic evidence under existing constitutional frameworks while advocating for legislative reforms establishing clearer standards. Without such competency, enhanced efficiency promised by digitalization primarily benefits state actors, while further disadvantaging marginalized defendants already facing systemic inequality.

## **7. Barriers to Algorithmic Literacy Development**

Defense lawyers, particularly in public defense systems, face severe structural barriers to developing algorithmic literacy. The most fundamental barrier is overwhelming caseload. The American Bar Association documents that many public defenders carry caseloads making adequate individual client representation impossible, much less sophisticated investigation of algorithmic evidence required for effective contestation.<sup>23</sup> The situation in India is even more severe: public prosecutors manage vastly more cases than capacity permits, and legal aid systems suffer chronic under-funding and insufficient staffing. Adding algorithmic literacy development to already impossible workloads create what scholars identify as a coordination problem: individual attorney efforts yield minimal systemic impact without institutional framework support. Resource constraints amplify this fundamental problem. Genuine algorithmic literacy training requires substantial time investment, access to high-quality educational materials and tools, and collaboration with technical experts. Well-funded private firms and progressive prosecutor offices absorb these costs and view technological sophistication as competitive advantage. Under-resourced public defender agencies cannot. This creates structural inequality: defendants represented by well-funded firms benefit from sophisticated AI-enhanced strategy, while those dependent on public defense systems face algorithmic evidence they cannot adequately contest because counsel lacks time and resources to develop competency.

## **8. Proprietary Algorithms and Trade Secret Protection**

A second critical barrier is the proprietary nature of many algorithmic systems. Developers of systems like COMPAS assert trade secret protection preventing disclosure of underlying methodology, training data composition, and exact variable weighting that determines outcomes.<sup>24</sup> This opacity fundamentally undermines contestability: even highly trained defense attorneys cannot fully evaluate reliability or identify bias without accessing algorithm documentation. Courts have been inconsistent in requiring disclosure, with some jurisdictions prioritizing vendor intellectual property over constitutional protections requiring defendants confront evidence against them.<sup>25</sup> Legal education has been slow integrating algorithmic literacy into curricula. While growing numbers of law schools now require AI training often prompted by ethics rules mandating technology competence these courses typically focus on AI tools enhancing lawyer productivity rather than critical evaluation of algorithmic evidence in adversarial proceedings.<sup>26</sup> Law school criminal procedure courses rarely examine how artificial intelligence transforms evidentiary rules or due process requirements. Clinical programs, which provide the most realistic training in criminal defense, operate with minimal resources and cannot easily layer algorithmic competency onto existing curricula.

## **9. A Competency-Based Training Framework for Defense Lawyers**

An effective algorithmic literacy framework must embody several foundational principles. First,

it should be competency-centered rather than time-centered, identifying observable competencies concrete demonstrations of knowledge, skills, and professional judgment that defense counsel must exhibit.<sup>27</sup> Competencies should be disaggregated and contextualized specifically to criminal defense practice, not generalized to law broadly, and linked directly to concrete activities attorneys perform routinely. Second, competencies should be structured across multiple mastery levels, recognizing that competency development progresses from basic awareness through increasing sophistication. A framework might establish foundational competencies in which attorneys understand algorithmic systems exist and recognize their use in criminal justice, intermediate competencies enabling evaluation and critical analysis of algorithmic evidence, and advanced competencies enabling complex litigation of algorithmic fairness issues.<sup>28</sup> Third, algorithmic literacy should be integrated into existing criminal defense competencies rather than treated as specialized add-on divorced from normal practice. Defense attorneys already understand evidence evaluation, expert witness management, trial strategy, cross-examination, and sentencing arguments. Algorithmic literacy should be integrated into these existing competencies: evidence evaluation now encompasses evaluating algorithmic evidence for reliability and bias; expert witness management includes hiring technical experts; cross-examination must extend to challenging algorithm creators and operators. This integration approach makes competency development feel continuous with existing professional identity rather than imposing entirely new specialized requirements.

## **10. Technical Understanding and System Architecture Competency**

AI systems used in criminal justice are trained, what data sources are used, and how algorithms generate outputs and predictions. Attorneys should distinguish between different machine learning methodologies and identify implications for validation and reliability.<sup>29</sup> For example, supervised learning algorithms predicting recidivism require labeled training data; this raises questions about whether training data is representative and whether historical patterns reflect discrimination that algorithms will perpetuate. This competency domain requires defense counsel to identify indicators of algorithmic bias, understand how biased training data leads to biased outputs, recognize proxy variables functioning as surrogate measures of protected characteristics, and identify when error rates differ substantially across demographic groups.<sup>30</sup> The pedagogical approach should employ interactive case studies examining documented algorithmic systems actually used in criminal justice. Rather than abstract instruction, training should use COMPAS, facial recognition systems deployed by police departments, predictive policing algorithms, and other concrete examples. Attorneys should analyze training datasets, examine algorithm behavior across demographic groups, and review validation studies. Guest experts from computer science and statistics can provide technical credibility while translating concepts for legal audiences. Upon completing training, defense counsel should identify constitutional vulnerabilities in algorithmic evidence under right to confrontation guarantees, due process protections, fair trial requirements, and protection against self-incrimination. Attorneys should understand how algorithmic evidence interfaces with established evidentiary rules requiring evidence be reliable, not unduly prejudicial, and subject to adequate explanation.<sup>31</sup> Defense counsel should articulate specific legal arguments for excluding algorithmic evidence as unreliable, unfairly prejudicial, or constitutionally infirm. This competency domain requires attorneys to craft discovery requests specifically targeting algorithmic methodologies, training data, validation studies, bias analyses, and documentation of how algorithms have performed across demographic groups. Attorneys

must understand what information vendors likely possess and what may be obtainable through discovery. They must recognize when vendors or prosecutors overstate capabilities and identify validation gaps. Simulation exercises where defense counsel draft motions suppressing algorithmic evidence, prepare cross-examination of algorithm developers, and construct counter-narratives help develop practical litigation skills.<sup>32</sup>

### **11. Expert Witness Management and Investigation Competency**

Defense counsel must identify and engage qualified experts capable of evaluating algorithmic evidence computer scientists, statisticians, and researchers specializing in algorithmic fairness.<sup>33</sup> This competency includes directing expert investigation to identify algorithmic bias, validation gaps, or methodological flaws in algorithm development or deployment. Attorneys must effectively utilize expert testimony to explain algorithmic limitations to judges and juries in comprehensible, persuasive language. This competency domain requires attorneys to address practical reality of budgetary constraints. Many public defenders cannot afford private experts, and court-appointed expert funds are often inadequate. Training must address how to identify pro bono resources, engage academics providing expert services without compensation, utilize court-appointed expert funds effectively, and work within budget constraints to obtain necessary expertise. Some defense organizations are developing networks of qualified experts willing to provide pro bono assistance for algorithmic evidence cases.

### **12. Strategic Application in Criminal Defense**

Defense counsel must leverage AI tools for legitimate defense purposes while maintaining confidentiality and managing security risks. This includes using advanced legal research platforms to identify precedent establishing algorithmic bias in particular systems, using discovery processing tools to identify exculpatory evidence in massive datasets, and developing predictive models countering prosecution narratives.<sup>34</sup> Attorneys must critically evaluate vendor claims about AI tool accuracy, bias mitigation, and security. This competency domain requires implementing responsible AI use protocols within defense organizations, addressing confidentiality of client information, security of data processed through cloud-based systems, protection against vendor misuse of legal strategy information, and management of conflicts between vendor interests and client representation. Attorneys must understand how to evaluate whether a particular tool is appropriate for a particular case, given confidentiality concerns and risks. Hands-on training in specific AI tools relevant to criminal defense provides practical competency. Vendors prioritizing defense interests and providing transparency about algorithmic methodologies are essential.

### **13. Professional Responsibility and Systemic Advocacy**

Defense counsel must understand confidentiality implications of cloud-based legal tools and establish protocols ensuring client information protection when using digital tools. This includes understanding what happens to data after cases conclude, whether vendors have access to attorney work product, and what contractual protections against misuse are necessary. Attorneys must advise clients candidly about algorithmic evidence's role and AI-assisted analysis limitations. This competency domain requires attorneys to develop awareness of regulatory developments affecting algorithmic systems, including the EU AI Act, state algorithmic fairness legislation, and case law establishing algorithmic rights.<sup>35</sup> This domain encompasses capacity to advocate for systemic reforms: developing litigation strategies establishing precedent regarding algorithmic evidence,

working with legislative advocates on bills strengthening procedural protections, and participating in regulatory processes as affected stakeholder groups. Defense counsel must understand when regulatory changes create new litigation opportunities or require institutional changes to comply with evolving law.

#### **14. Implementation Models for Different Jurisdictional Contexts**

For India, a phased implementation framework should begin with foundational awareness training for all defense practitioners through bar associations, legal aid organizations, and law schools. Foundational training would establish that algorithmic systems exist, are being used in Indian criminal investigations and prosecutions, and that defense lawyers will increasingly encounter algorithmic evidence. Intermediate training for defense counsel in high-capacity jurisdictions would develop deeper understanding of specific algorithmic systems likely to be encountered, how to identify and challenge them procedurally, and how to develop litigation strategy.<sup>36</sup> Advanced training for appellate specialists and organizations litigating algorithmic fairness issues would develop capacity for sophisticated constitutional litigation and impact work. The framework should explicitly address how existing Indian constitutional and evidentiary law applies to algorithmic evidence, pending eventual legislative clarification. Critically, implementation in India should not wait for legislative reform constitutional protections are already robust enough to support defense challenges. Partnerships with law schools, the National Legal Services Authority, state legal services authorities, and NGOs focused on access to justice are essential.

#### **15. The European Union and United States Implementation**

For the European Union, the AI Act's mandatory AI literacy requirement creates regulatory leverage for professional development. Bar associations and law schools should develop curriculum explicitly addressing high-risk AI systems used in criminal justice contexts, compliance obligations for practitioners and organizations, and effective litigation strategies for contesting algorithmic evidence.<sup>37</sup> The framework should address both EU-specific AI Act requirements and comparative approaches to algorithmic governance in different member states, recognizing diversity in legal systems and procedural approaches. For the United States, given its federal system and substantial state variation, training should be developed at both national and state/local levels. National organizations including the American Bar Association, public defender associations, and criminal law bar sections can establish core competencies and develop model curricula. State and local bar associations, public defender offices, and law school clinics should develop jurisdiction-specific training addressing particular algorithmic systems and evidentiary frameworks relevant in their regions.<sup>38</sup> The fundamental challenge is reaching under-resourced public defender offices; this likely requires grants from foundations and government sources, pro bono expertise networks, and integration of algorithmic literacy into mandatory continuing legal education.

#### **16. Global Lessons and What Works**

The most successful algorithmic literacy initiatives share common features. First, successful programs are integrated into existing professional responsibilities and core competencies rather than treated as specialized technical knowledge. When training explicitly connects to how evidence evaluation works, how expert witnesses are managed, and how trial strategy is developed, it resonates with practitioners' existing professional identity and urgency about client

representation. Second, effective programs deliberately combine technical education with legal and ethical analysis. Technical experts including computer scientists and statisticians provide necessary credibility and depth, but legal experts must contextualize how algorithmic systems intersect with due process and evidence law.<sup>39</sup> Third, successful initiatives have built networks connecting defense practitioners with academic expertise and research resources. The Berkeley Law School project on “AI for Defense Lawyers” benefits substantially from university research capacity and brings rigorous academic analysis to practice-focused problems.<sup>40</sup> Fourth, competency-based approaches that specify observable demonstrations of learning outperform generic “awareness” training. Defense counsel are extremely busy; they invest effort when training yields demonstrable professional advantage the capacity to draft better motions, cross-examine more effectively, or provide better counsel to clients.

### **17. Cautionary Lessons: What Fails**

Several approaches have proven counterproductive and should be avoided. Treating algorithmic literacy as purely technical training requiring attorneys to take computer science courses or learn programming fails to engage legal professionals. Conversely, treating artificial intelligence as merely a “legal issue” without sufficient technical depth permits lawyers to maintain comfortable misconceptions about algorithmic systems. Genuine competency requires meaningful technical literacy; abbreviating this requirement leaves attorneys vulnerable to vendor manipulation or overconfidence. Initiatives that privilege prosecution interests or well-resourced organizations worsen existing inequality. When AI literacy training flows primarily through prosecutor offices, law enforcement agencies, or large law firms, it magnifies existing disparities. Public defense organizations must be primary targets of training investment if algorithmic literacy is to serve access-to-justice purposes. Approaches treating artificial intelligence as primarily an efficiency tool “using AI to handle more cases” miss the contestability dimension. The framing must be: “understanding algorithmic evidence to protect constitutional rights.”

### **18. India-Specific Challenges and Opportunities**

India's path to developing algorithmic literacy among defense practitioners faces distinct challenges rooted in resource constraints of India's criminal justice system. The system already suffers from chronic under-resourcing, enormous case backlogs, inadequate investigation resources, and insufficient judicial capacity. Many defendants lack adequate legal representation because legal aid systems lack sufficient funding and personnel. If algorithmic literacy training is imposed without corresponding resources and support, it may simply create a professional obligation practitioners cannot realistically meet. However, India possesses substantial advantages creating genuine opportunities. India's constitutional tradition, deeply grounded in dignity, fairness, and procedural justice, provides exceptionally strong doctrinal resources for contesting algorithmic evidence. Articles 20(3) and 21 have been interpreted generously by Indian courts to protect procedural rights and the right to know the basis for decisions affecting liberty. Defense counsel should frame algorithmic literacy development as expression and implementation of constitutional guarantees rather than technical distraction. India's legal aid infrastructure, while under-resourced, provides organizational pathways through which training can be delivered. The National Legal Services Authority, state legal services authorities, and bar associations have capacity to coordinate training.<sup>41</sup>

## **19. Legislative Reform and Institutional Change**

India's higher education system, particularly law schools, possesses capacity to lead in developing contextually appropriate curriculum. Law schools can conduct research on specific algorithms deployed by Indian police and prosecution agencies, develop case studies based on Indian legal decisions, and integrate algorithmic literacy into criminal procedure courses reflecting Indian law and constitutional framework. This represents opportunity for Indian legal scholarship to contribute to global understanding of algorithmic justice. Pending legislative reform to clarify admissibility and reliability standards for algorithmic evidence under the Indian Evidence Act provides a window of opportunity. Rather than leaving burden entirely on individual attorneys to contest algorithmic evidence under ambiguous standards, legislative reforms should establish clear procedures by which prosecutors must prove algorithmic reliability and guarantee defense counsel access to expert assistance when challenging algorithmic evidence. This would establish algorithmic literacy requirements at the systemic level through procedure rather than relying solely on individual professional development.

## **20. Conclusion and Recommendations**

The Bar Council of India should formally establish algorithmic literacy as a professional competency requirement for defense practitioners and develop model curriculum addressing how Indian constitutional law and evidence law apply to algorithmic evidence. Law schools should integrate algorithmic evidence analysis into criminal procedure courses, addressing how Articles 20(3) and 21 protect against secret or unexplained algorithmic decision-making. The National Legal Services Authority and state legal services authorities should develop and fund training programs specifically targeting legal aid practitioners, recognizing that algorithmic literacy is essential infrastructure for effective access to justice.<sup>42</sup> Pending legislative reform should establish clear evidentiary standards for algorithmic evidence, require prosecutors to prove algorithmic reliability through defined procedures, and guarantee defense counsel access to expert assistance when contesting algorithmic evidence. Bar associations should facilitate development of pro bono expert networks connecting defense practitioners with qualified computer scientists and statisticians. Organizations working on algorithmic justice should prioritize India, given the scale of India's criminal justice system and current absence of clear standards.

For the European Union, bar associations and law schools should develop curriculum implementing Article 4 AI Act literacy requirements in criminal law contexts. For the United States, professional organizations should establish algorithmic literacy as a core competency in the ABA Model Rules. Law schools should integrate algorithmic evidence analysis into criminal procedure curriculum. Federal and state funding should support pro bono expert networks assisting public defenders. Internationally, organizations should work to develop comparative standards for algorithmic literacy competency in criminal defense, recognizing that algorithmic systems affect justice systems globally.<sup>43</sup> The choice before jurisdictions is stark. Without systematic investment in algorithmic literacy among defense practitioners, AI integration will create a two-tiered justice system: wealthy defendants represented by technologically sophisticated firms gain advantages while poor and marginalized defendants face algorithmic evidence they cannot contest. Algorithmic literacy for defense lawyers is not luxury or optional enhancement it is essential infrastructure for meaningful equal protection and rule of law in the

21st century. The development of such literacy requires coordinated investment in education, professional standards, support systems, and regulatory frameworks. The stakes nothing less than the legitimacy and fairness of criminal justice itself justify such commitment.

## **Reference**

1. Council on Criminal Justice. (2024). The Implications of AI for Criminal Justice. Retrieved from <https://counciloncj.org/the-implications-of-ai-for-criminal-justice/>
2. Council on Criminal Justice. (2025). Law Enforcement and Legal Professionals' Trust in Algorithms. SAGE Publications. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2755323X251325594>
3. Garingan, D., & Pickard, A. J. (2021). Artificial Intelligence in Legal Practice: Exploring Theoretical Frameworks for Algorithmic Literacy in the Legal Information Profession. *Legal Information Management*, 21(2), 97-117.
4. Tech and Justice at Oxford. (2025). India: Increasing use of AI across the justice system. Retrieved from <https://www.techandjustice.bsg.ox.ac.uk/research/india>
5. Journal of Integrated Research in Law. (2025). Balancing Technology and Liberty: Forensic Science in the Age of Constitutional Rights and New Criminal Laws in India.
6. Ibid.
7. The Amicus Curiae. (2025). AI-Generated Evidence and Its Admissibility in Indian Courts: A Legal Vacuum. Retrieved from <https://theamikuscuriae.com/ai-generated-evidence-and-its-admissibility-in-indian-courts-a-legal-vacuum/>
8. Gultekin-Varkonyi, G. (2025). AI Literacy for Legal AI Systems: A practical approach. ArXiv.
9. CBIZ. (2025). Understanding the EU's Artificial Intelligence Act: Key Points for Legal and Compliance Professionals. Retrieved from <https://www.cbiz.com/insights/article/understanding-the-eus-artificial-intelligence-act-key-points-for-legal-and-compliance-prof>
10. Ibid.
11. ArXiv. (2024). Predictive Policing and Racial Bias in Criminal Justice Systems. <http://arxiv.org/pdf/2208.03209.pdf>
12. Harvard Law Review. (2017). State v. Loomis. *Harvard Law Review*, 130.
13. Forensic Statistics. (2021). Algorithmic Evidence in Criminal Trials. Retrieved from <https://forensicstats.org/blog/2021/02/10/algorithmic-evidence-in-criminal-trials/>
14. Harvard Law Review. (2017). State v. Loomis. *Harvard Law Review*, 130.
15. AI Certs. (2025). Public Defenders Showcase Legal Innovation With AI. Retrieved from <https://www.aicerts.ai/news/public-defenders-showcase-legal-innovation-with-ai/>
16. Garingan, D., & Pickard, A. J. (2021). Artificial Intelligence in Legal Practice: Exploring Theoretical Frameworks for Algorithmic Literacy in the Legal Information Profession. *Legal Information Management*, 21(2), 97-117.
17. ACM. (2024). Generative AI Literacy: Twelve Defining Competencies. <https://dl.acm.org/doi/10.1145/3685680>
18. Ibid.
19. Shope, M. L. (2017). Lawyer and Judicial Competency in the Era of Artificial Intelligence. *Georgetown Legal Ethics Journal*. Retrieved from <https://www.law.georgetown.edu/legal-ethics-journal/wp-content/uploads/sites/24/2022/08/GT-GJLE210005.pdf>
20. PMC National Center for Biotechnology Information. (2023). Interpretable Algorithmic

Forensics. PMC10576126.

21. ACM. (2024). (Beyond) Reasonable Doubt: Challenges that Public Defenders Face in Scrutinizing AI in Court. <https://dl.acm.org/doi/pdf/10.1145/3649217.3653637>
22. Duke Law Journal Online. (2024). Access to Algorithmic Justice: Defending a Right to Expert Assistance. [Scholarship.law.duke.edu](http://scholarship.law.duke.edu).
23. National Association of Criminal Defense Lawyers. (2025). Competency in Criminal Cases: Using AI for Trial Preparation. Retrieved from <https://www.nacdl.org/Content/CompetencyinCriminalCases>
24. Forensic Statistics. (2021). Algorithmic Evidence in Criminal Trials. Retrieved from <https://forensicstats.org/blog/2021/02/10/algorithmic-evidence-in-criminal-trials/>
25. Harvard Law Review. (2017). State v. Loomis. *Harvard Law Review*, 130.
26. Attorney at Work. (2025). Lawyer AI Competence: Training Is Becoming Mandatory. Retrieved from <https://www.attorneyatwork.com/courtroom-to-classroom-lawyer-ai-competence-training-is-becoming-mandatory/>
27. Christensen Institute. (2016). Competency-based Legal Education. Retrieved from <https://www.christenseninstitute.org/blog/competency-based-legal-education/>
28. Sciedupress. (2020). The Use of a Competency-based Approach to Forming Professional Culture in Pre-service Lawyers. *Journal of Higher Education*, 18656, 11443.
29. ArXiv. (2024). Generative AI Literacy: Twelve Defining Competencies (ArXiv version). <http://arxiv.org/pdf/2412.12107.pdf>
30. Research Outreach. (2023). Justice Served? Discrimination in Algorithmic Risk Assessment. Retrieved from <https://researchoutreach.org/articles/justice-served-discrimination-in-algorithmic-risk-assessment/>
31. Anuarupa. (2025). Artificial Intelligence and the Right to a Fair Trial in the Context of Evidence Administration. Anuarupa, 52.
32. NexLaw. (2025). AI for Defense Attorneys: How Artificial Intelligence Strengthens Case Strategy, Evidence Review, and Courtroom Preparation. Retrieved from <https://www.nexlaw.ai/blog/ai-for-defense-attorneys/>
33. Sonix. (2025). 5 Powerful AI for Criminal Defense Lawyers: Build Stronger Cases. Retrieved from <https://sonix.ai/ai/ai-for-criminal-defense-lawyers/>
34. Ibid.
35. Women in AI. (2025). Navigating the EU AI Act: A Strategic Guide for Legal Professionals. Retrieved from <https://www.womeninai.co/post/navigating-the-eu-ai-act-a-strategic-guide-for-legal-professionals>
36. Ministry of Law and Justice, Government of India. (2025). Integrating AI in India's Judiciary and Law Enforcement. Press Information Bureau.
37. Stanford Legal Design Lab. (2025). AI & Access to Justice Initiative. Retrieved from <https://justiceinnovation.law.stanford.edu/projects/ai-access-to-justice/>
38. UC Berkeley Law. (2025). AI for Defense Lawyers. Criminal Law and Justice Center. Retrieved from <https://www.law.berkeley.edu/research/criminal-law-and-justice-center/our-work/ai-for-public-defenders/>
39. Woxsen University. (2021). AI in Legal Decision Making - Benefits and Ethical Implications. Retrieved from <https://woxsen.edu.in/research/white-papers/exploring-the-use-of-ai-in-legal-decision-making-benefits-and-ethical-implications/>
40. UC Berkeley Law. (2025). AI for Defense Lawyers. Criminal Law and Justice Center.

Retrieved from <https://www.law.berkeley.edu/research/criminal-law-and-justice-center/our-work/ai-for-public-defenders/>

41. India AI. (2024). How Artificial Intelligence is Democratizing Legal Services. Retrieved from <https://indiaai.gov.in/article/enhancing-access-to-justice-how-artificial-intelligence-is-democratizing-legal-services>
42. Ibid.
43. NYU Criminal Justice Center. (2025). Why Access to Justice Enables Better AI Governance: AI for Justice and Justice for AI. Retrieved from <https://cic.nyu.edu/resources/ai-for-justice-and-justice-for-ai-why-access-to-justice-enables-better-ai-governance/>