

# **Generative AI in the Law and in the Courtroom**

# Generative AI

“Foundation Models” are **pre-trained** on a large amount of **text or images** to respond to prompts

- LLMs are programmed to guess the next word
- Trained using supervised and unsupervised learning

**Gibberish** ⇒ **word salad** ⇒ **coherent-but-bad** ⇒ **pretty good** ⇒ **passes as expert**

Early examples: autocomplete, translation

Can be finetuned with additional models and data.

# Predicting court behavior: Google's Bard



Here are predictions on how each of the nine Supreme Court justices is likely to come out in the NetChoice case:

- **Chief Justice John Roberts:** Roberts is generally considered to be a conservative justice, but he has also shown a willingness to protect First Amendment rights. He may be persuaded by NetChoice's argument that the Texas law violates the editorial discretion doctrine. However, he may also be concerned about the power of social media platforms and the potential for them to censor conservative viewpoints.

- **Justice Brett Kavanaugh:** Kavanaugh is a conservative justice who is more difficult to predict. He may be persuaded by NetChoice's argument that the Texas law violates the editorial discretion doctrine. However, he may also be concerned about the power of social media platforms and the potential for them to censor conservative viewpoints.
- **Justice Stephen Breyer:** Breyer is a liberal justice who is likely to vote in favor of NetChoice. He has a history of protecting First Amendment rights, even when it infringes on the government's ability to regulate speech.
- **Justice Sonia Sotomayor:** Sotomayor is another liberal justice who is likely to vote in favor of NetChoice. She has a history of protecting First Amendment rights, even when it infringes on the government's ability to regulate speech.
- **Justice Elena Kagan:** Kagan is a liberal justice who is likely to vote in favor of NetChoice. She has a history of protecting First Amendment rights, even when it infringes on the government's ability to regulate speech.
- **Justice Amy Coney Barrett:** Barrett is a conservative justice who is likely to vote in favor of the Texas law. She has a history of supporting government regulation of speech, even when it infringes on the First Amendment rights of speakers and publishers.

- **Justice Clarence Thomas:** Thomas is one of the most conservative justices on the Court. He is likely to vote in favor of the Texas law, arguing that the government has a compelling interest in protecting the free speech rights of users.
- **Justice Samuel Alito:** Alito is another conservative justice who is likely to vote in favor of the Texas law. He has a history of supporting government regulation of speech, even when it infringes on the First Amendment rights of speakers and publishers.
- **Justice Neil Gorsuch:** Gorsuch is a conservative justice who is known for his strong defense of the First Amendment. He is likely to vote in favor of NetChoice, arguing that the Texas law violates the editorial discretion doctrine.

Based on these predictions, it is likely that the Supreme Court will vote 5-4 in favor of NetChoice and strike down the Texas law. However, it is important to note that this is just a prediction and the Court could ultimately rule in favor of the state.

# Compare to GPT-4

🌟 GPT-4

JA

How will the Supreme Court come out in the Netchoice case?



As of my last update in January 2022, I don't have real-time updates or the ability to access or retrieve personal data unless it has been shared with me in the course of our conversation. I don't have information on specific court case outcomes, including the NetChoice case, beyond that date.



However, I can offer some general insights into how the Supreme Court might approach a case, which might help infer how they would handle a case involving NetChoice, depending on the specifics:

1. **Legal Precedents:** The justices typically rely heavily on precedents, or previous rulings, which establish a legal principle. They often look to these precedents to guide their decision-making process, especially in complex or novel legal territories.
2. **Constitutional Interpretation:** Different justices have different methods for interpreting the Constitution. Some may be originalists, preferring to interpret the law as it was understood when it was written, while others may be textualists, focusing on the ordinary meaning of the legal text, or they may believe in a living constitution, interpreting it within the context of contemporary society.
3. **Composition of the Court:** The ideologies of the justices on the Supreme Court can influence decisions. As of 2022, the court has a conservative majority, which can affect the




# Quality of the Immitation: Google's Bard



Write the introduction to a dissenting opinion authored by Justice Thomas



View other drafts 



Dissenting Opinion by Justice Thomas

I respectfully dissent.

The Court today holds that the Texas law at issue in this case violates the First Amendment. I believe that the Court is wrong.

The First Amendment protects the right of speakers to disseminate their views without government interference. However, the First Amendment does not protect all speech. For example, the government can regulate speech that is harmful or that is necessary to protect a compelling government interest.

In this case, the Texas law regulates speech on social media platforms. Social media platforms have become increasingly powerful and influential. They have the power to reach billions of people around the world. This power gives social media platforms a responsibility to ensure that their platforms are not used to spread harmful or dangerous speech.

# Compare to GPT-4

JA

Write the introduction to a dissenting opinion by Justice Thomas that finds that the Texas Social Media law is consistent with the First Amendment and should have been upheld



[Note: The following is a fictional introduction to a dissenting opinion, crafted based on the stylistic and legal inclinations Justice Clarence Thomas has demonstrated in the past. It should not be considered an actual statement or opinion by Justice Thomas.]



## **Justice Thomas, dissenting.**

At the heart of our great Republic lies a commitment to the principles of freedom and liberty—a dedication enshrined in our Constitution that sets the American experiment apart. Among the foremost of these liberties is the First Amendment's protection of free speech, a right the Framers held dear and believed essential to the health of our democracy. The Texas Social Media law, in its intent and execution, aims not to curtail this freedom, but to ensure its robust exercise in the face of a rapidly evolving digital landscape. While the majority finds that this statute runs afoul of the First Amendment, I respectfully dissent.

Today's digital platforms hold unprecedented power over the public square. They are the gatekeepers of discourse, shaping and often controlling the narrative, and, in some instances, determining who gets to speak and who remains silent. In recognizing the central role these platforms play in modern discourse, the Texas Legislature sought to prevent these entities from arbitrarily silencing voices based on their viewpoints. In my estimation, the statute does not violate the First Amendment; rather, it seeks to buttress it by preserving the diversity of thought, which is fundamental to our democracy.

The majority's decision to strike down the Texas law rests on a view of the First Amendment that, while well-intentioned, may inadvertently embolden these platforms to exert even more control over our national conversation. I fear that today's decision may further endanger the very essence of free discourse the First Amendment was crafted to protect.


---

Again, this is a fictional representation and is not an actual statement or opinion by Justice Thomas.

# Use of Gen-AI in the Legal Profession

- Legal research
- Summary of documents/transcripts
- Discovery responses
- Memo and brief writing
- Crafting arguments and style to the assigned judge
- Jury simulations
- Diagrams / visual aids
- Substitute for a lawyer for pro se litigants

## These 20 jobs are the most "exposed" to AI, ChatGPT, researchers say

1. Telemarketers
  2. English language and literature teachers
  3. Foreign language and literature teachers
  4. History teachers
  5. Law teachers
  6. Philosophy and religion teachers
  7. Sociology teachers
  8. Political science teachers
  9. Criminal justice and law enforcement teachers
- 

# AI COMPETENCIES

- **Descriptive summary and synthesis**
  - Summarizing precedent and rules
  - Describing standard treatment options
- **Matching new facts to previous literature**
  - diagnosis
  - Issue-spotting
- **Communicating clearly**
  - Pitched to a particular audience
  - Can meet high standards (e.g. other professionals)
- **Discovery and argument construction**
  - With prompting, identifying research questions and hypotheses
  - With prompting, crafting new policy arguments



# AI COMPETENCIES

- **Descriptive summary and synthesis**
  - Summarizing precedent and rules
  - Describing standard treatment options
- **Matching new facts to previous literature**
  - diagnosis
  - Issue-spotting
- **Communicating clearly**
  - Pitched to a particular audience
  - Can meet high standards (e.g. other professionals)
- **Discovery and argument construction**
  - With prompting, identifying research questions and hypotheses
  - With prompting, crafting new policy arguments

This improves the productivity and quality of the entire spectrum of professionals

Creativity still matters

# AI INCOMPETENCIES

- **Immodest gap-filling**
  - Hallucinated citations, false statements
- **Goal-setting and societal priorities**
  - A client's goals have to be incorporated into prompts
  - Meta-goals (societal priorities) also have to be incorporated for long-term success
- **Understanding, relatability, and trust**
  - Explainability\*
  - Robophobia

# AI INCOMPETENCIES

- **Immodest gap-filling**

- Hallucinated citations, false statements

Paranoia still matters

- **Goal-setting and societal priorities**

- A client's goals have to be incorporated into prompts
- Meta-goals (societal priorities) also have to be incorporated for long-term success

Facility with philosophy, economics, and politics still matters

- **Understanding, relatability, and trust**

- Explainability\*
- Robophobia

Being a human still confers some advantages

# WINNERS AND LOSERS

- The quality of services will go up while costs go down (Clients and patients are winners)
- The quantity of doctors and lawyers may go up or down
- The distribution of value (and also earnings) of the professionals will shift and have more skew





My ex-spouse is requesting a change in our parenting plan so that she can take our children to church every Sunday. However, Sunday is the only day that I have off every week, and I don't want to lose the only day that I can take the kids on a day trip or hang out with them for the whole day. Under our original plan, we took turns having the kids for the weekend, and I want to keep it that way. Write a brief for a Texas ...



View other drafts 





## Brief for Texas Family Court Opposing Motion to Change Parenting Plan

Case Name: [Your Name] v. [Ex-Wife's Name]

Case Number: [Case Number]

### Introduction

[Ex-Wife's Name] has filed a motion to change the parenting plan to allow her to take the children to church every Sunday. [Your Name] opposes this motion.

### Background

---

## Background

The current parenting plan provides that [Your Name] and [Ex-Wife's Name] have joint custody of the children, with [Your Name] having primary custody. Under the current plan, the children spend every Sunday with [Your Name].

[Ex-Wife's Name] now wants to change the parenting plan so that she can take the children to church every Sunday. She argues that it is important for the children to attend church and that [Your Name] should be willing to sacrifice his time with the children so that they can go to church.



My ex-spouse is requesting a change in our parenting plan so that she can take our children to church every Sunday. However, Sunday is the only day that I have off every week, and I don't want to lose the only day that I can take the kids on a day trip or hang out with them for the whole day. Under our original plan, we took turns having the kids for the weekend, and I want to keep it that way. Write a brief for a Texas ...



View other drafts 







## Brief in Opposition to Motion to Change Parenting Plan

**Case Name:** [Your Name] v. [Ex-spouse's Name]

**Case Number:** [Case number]

### Introduction

The Respondent, [Your Name], respectfully opposes the Motion to Change Parenting Plan filed by the Petitioner, [Ex-spouse's name]. The Petitioner requests that the Parenting Plan be modified to allow her to take the minor children to church every Sunday. The Respondent opposes this modification for the following reasons:

- **It would interfere with the Respondent's parenting time.** The Respondent currently has the minor children on Sundays, which is his only day off every week. If the Petitioner is allowed to take the children to church every Sunday, the Respondent will lose the only day that he has to spend time with his