

Constitutional Caution of Prudence on use of Artificial Intelligence by Courts and Tribunals in Pakistan

Muhammad Amir Munir
(Additional District and Sessions Judge)
Director, Federal Judicial Academy, Islamabad

In *Shakir Ullah v. The Secretary E&SE Department Khyber-Pakhtunkhwa Peshawar*¹, a recent judgment by Hon'ble Supreme Court of Pakistan (*hereinafter* SCoP), use of artificial intelligence (*hereinafter* AI) by a service tribunal² in Pakistan came under discussion. We will briefly discuss how the response of judicature,³ both at judicial and administrative sides, is being developed with respect to the emergence of AI in the field of law and judging. This is not the first judgment in Pakistan dealing with the issue of use of AI, as the judgment itself suggests, and hence, little discussion on judicial trail on this topic, as also some key future developments post *Shakir Ullah* will also be touched here in briefly.

AI, as we know, is now everywhere, in every field of knowledge, and in every business, profession or calling. Judiciary is no exception either. It can be managed, but cannot be denied its reasonable role in any such profession or field of knowledge. Judiciary in Pakistan has shown its response, initially through judicial pronouncements and then on administrative side by developing, designing and issuing guidelines for use of AI in judicial institutions of Pakistan for the purpose. Let's have a look at the judicial response first.

¹ CPLA No.4146 of 2025, decided on 23.10.2025. Available online at the official website of the Supreme Court of Pakistan at https://www.supremecourt.gov.pk/downloads_judgements/c.p. 4146_2025.pdf. Last retrieved 29 July 2026.

² "Administrative Courts and Tribunals" are established under Part VII, Ch.4, Article 212 of the Constitution.

³ "The Judicature" is dealt with in Part VII of the Constitution, while its Ch.1 deals with "the Courts". Article 175 of the Constitution provides for "Establishment and Jurisdiction of Courts".

But before we begin, we need to keep in mind that Pakistan is a constitutionally declared federal democratic Islamic republic.⁴ To establish this as an order, people of Pakistan have given to themselves the Constitution of Islamic Republic of Pakistan 1973⁵ through their representatives in National Assembly.⁶ The constitutional values are enshrined in the Preamble. The most prominent amongst them are sovereignty of Allah Almighty, democracy, Islamic order, federalism, rule of law, human dignity, equality, social justice, fundamental rights, minority rights, peace and international cooperation, and an independent judiciary. Judicial dispensation has to protect these values at each step whenever a matter is in the corridors of justice. This is our constitutionalism. It was being done by humans only and initially; but now in this exercise, the AI seems partnering with human judges, knowingly or otherwise. What it has for us and where we have to be more careful in use of AI is a subject of debate and disagreements.

In view of this, in the above titled case, the Hon'ble Supreme Court of Pakistan was dealing with a service matter under its Appellate Jurisdiction. In said case, the impugned judgment of KP Service Tribunal was found having made references 'supposedly'⁷ to judgments of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of Pakistan. The SCoP found these as "hallucinated"⁸. For better understanding about what the SCoP observed, let us reproduce para no.20, as it stands there, from the cited judgment:⁹

⁴ See Preamble, and Articles 2 of the Constitution.

⁵ See Articles 1(1) and 265(1) of the Constitution.

⁶ See Preamble to the Constitution.

⁷ See para 19 of the judgment.

https://www.supremecourt.gov.pk/downloads_judgements/c.p. 4146_2025.pdf. Last retrieved 29 July 2026.

⁸ On a prompt to chatGPT to define 'hallucination', it responded: "The generation by an AI system of information that is false, fabricated, misleading, or unsupported by the underlying data, yet presented in a confident and plausible manner as if it were true." OpenAI. (2026, July 29). *Response generated by ChatGPT (GPT-5.5) to a prompt about AI hallucinations*. <https://chatgpt.com>.

⁹ See para 20 of the judgment.

https://www.supremecourt.gov.pk/downloads_judgements/c.p. 4146_2025.pdf. Last retrieved 29 July 2026.

20. Upon verification and repeated cross-checking, we note with dismay that the citations referred to in paragraph 19 above, on which the KP-ST relied to non-suit the petitioners, do not in fact exist. Our search was conducted both by citation and by case title. We trust that the KP-ST did not rely upon the assistance of artificial intelligence, which may have “hallucinated” in generating the said citations. This presents an appropriate occasion to reiterate the caution earlier expressed by this Court regarding the use of artificial intelligence, as observed in its judgment dated 03.03.2025, passed in C.P.L.A. No.1010-L/2022 titled “Ishfaq Ahmed v. Mushtaq Ahmed¹⁰.”

To break-open these observations, it is found that the Hon’ble Supreme Court of Pakistan has highlighted, at this juncture of time, a basic fault-line of AI based LLMs (large language models) where the algorithmic generation of text by a pre-trained transformer may ‘hallucinate’ the same as if it was existing in ‘quoted’ literature. Its ‘beauty’ only becomes ‘ugly’ when the generated text is ‘cross-checked’ by humans (as is done by the SCoP itself) or by a specific explainable AI (or XAI). Here, the Hon’ble Supreme Court has specifically shown that human supervision and control over AI generated text is critically important for courts and tribunals.

Judges and presiding officers of courts including their staff, at this moment of time, are neither trained nor able to see the algorithms, their architecture and the way they work under deep ‘neural networks’ to generate text on ‘prompting’ of any publicly available ‘open access’ or ‘commercial’ LLMs or AI systems. In literature on AI critique, it is called “black-box” where all it happens beyond the eye and mind of humans. This makes any such LLMs as unexplainable AI models for the

¹⁰ This judgment is now reported as *Ishfaq Ahmad v Mushtaq Ahmad*, PLD 2025 SC 582. Its neutral citation at the Supreme Court’s website is 2025 SCP 112. It is also available on the official website of the Hon’ble SCoP at: https://www.supremecourt.gov.pk/downloads_judgements/c.p. 1010 I 20 22.pdf. Last retrieved 30 July 2026.

end users (including those for whom AI is used). Chances of ‘machine bias’, which, in fact, is ‘garbage-in - garbage out’ phenomenon and hence a human frailty, are many. Fair trial and due process may be compromised in this regard. And for accountability purposes, who will be responsible for an illegal decision generated by an AI model, will remain a question of import? Of course, judging or judge-craft in its traditional sense of providing justice through a court presided over by a human being, is necessarily a human brain related function. This, for Pakistan and many other jurisdictions, is to ensure constitutional and legal duty of human judges to ‘judge’ when they are appointed to function as judges in courts or presiding officers of tribunals.¹¹ They take assistance from laws, precedents, books, articles, libraries, law clerks, and lawyers briefs to craft their final opinions or judgments in a matter. It will remain a gigantic task to develop an ‘explainable, responsible and ethical AI’ (xreAI), as a judicial assistant, for Pakistani legal and judicial system that will be constitutional compliant with a human rights-based approach in its outcome. By default, it has to remain human-centric and human-controlled model but it still requires time and effort to make it a human controlled reliable tool .

Now, connecting the dots and taking lead from para 20 of the above cited judgment (*Shakir Ullah case*) under review, we have to go little back into the past where, in an earlier--rather first--judgment of Hon’ble Supreme Court of Pakistan, the subject of use of AI by judges and courts came under discussion.

Reverting to *Ishfaq Ahmed v Mushtaq Ahmad*, PLD 2025 SC 582, we have found some deep principles declared in it about beneficial use of AI by the courts with safeguards to be adopted and used by the judiciary. Primarily, the matter was relating to an ejectment petition wherein the landlord/petitioner could not succeed to recover his rented property from respondent at the forum of Special Judge (Rent).

¹¹ See *Muhammad Iqbal v Zayad*, (Civil Appeal No.11of 2023) decided on 28.03.2023 by an *first* appellate court in Phalia, wherein it has been observed: “Of course, purpose of such assistance is never to let the basic function of judging “rented out” to AI, at least at the moment.” <https://courtingthelaw.com/wp-content/uploads/DOC-20230413-WA0052..pdf>. Last retrieved on 30 July 2026.

However, the first appellate court granted him relief, but said order of the appellate court, on a constitutional petition by respondent before the Hon'ble High Court, was set aside and his ejection petition was again dismissed. He then moved a civil petition for leave to appeal before the Hon'ble Supreme Court of Pakistan. Same was allowed through the cited judgment. The Supreme Court, at this juncture, noting down the delays in justice delivery, took notice of advent of artificial intelligence and explored as to how it can benefit the justice system and ultimately the timely justice delivery by the district judiciary. In the apt words of the Hon'ble Court:¹²

In Pakistan's overburdened courts, the integration of Artificial Intelligence ("AI") presents a promising path to operational reform, provided its adoption remains grounded in principled constitutional limits.

The Hon'ble Supreme Court has also highlighted the importance of principles of constitutionalism under the Constitution of Pakistan 1973 when it authoritatively observed:¹³

Under Articles 10A and 37(d) of the Constitution of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan, 1973 ("Constitution"), the right to fair and expeditious justice must not be rendered illusory. Within this constitutional framework, the thoughtful adoption of AI can serve as a viable instrument for access to timely justice and alleviating systemic backlogs.¹⁴

The Court has noted that in many jurisdictions, including Pakistan, the courts are employing the potential of AI in their work. From this, the question of looking at developing appropriate constitutional safeguards for the core function of 'judging' arises. The Court thus observed:¹⁵

¹² See Para No.7 of judgment, PLD 2025 SC 582.

¹³ See para No.7, *Ibid*.

¹⁴ Footnotes omitted.

¹⁵ See Para No.8 of *Ishfaq Ahmed* case, PLD 2025 SC 582.

8. We notice that Commercial GenAI platforms like ChatGPT, Copilot, and DeepSeek have drawn increasing interest from judges around the world who seek new ways to conduct legal research, drafting, and decision support. In 2023, a Colombian judge expressly announced that ChatGPT was consulted when drafting a judicial ruling. By 2025, appellate judges in Washington D.C. publicly cited ChatGPT in their official opinions. More recently, a judge in Pakistan revealed using ChatGPT to adjudicate a case both in a civil and a criminal matter, triggering a debate whether commercial AI is appropriate for official judgments. The promise and potential of AI to enhance the efficiency and working of the justice system cannot be ignored any longer. We find this to be a fit case to explore the use of AI by the judiciary in order to actualize the constitutional mandate of Articles 10A and 37(d) of the Constitution.

With this in mind, the Court has then made discussion on various dynamics of use of AI by the courts and justice system with respect to getting benefit out of this new technology with appropriate safeguards and extent of its use. The Court has explained the same under different heads. Under the heading ‘Smart Legal Research’, it has observed:¹⁶

AI tools can rapidly process vast legal databases to extract relevant precedents, statutory provisions, and scholarly commentary, providing judges with timely, contextually rich legal material. Smart Legal Research is an emerging discipline that applies AI technologies to enhance the accuracy and efficiency of judicial research. Courts worldwide have adopted such platforms, recognizing that they uncover additional sources and insights complementing human research efforts.

¹⁶ See Para No.9 of *Ishfaq Ahmed* case, PLD 2025 SC 582.

About an innovative AI tool for Pakistani judges, ie, “Judge-GPT”, the Court has highlighted:¹⁷

Federal Judicial Academy (“FJA”), Islamabad has taken a momentous stride in judicial innovation by introducing Judge-GPT, an LLM-based AI mechanism devised in collaboration with ETH Zurich. Approximately 1500 judges within the District Judiciary currently utilize this technology, which is tailored to conform with Pakistan’s legislative framework, procedural statutes, and domestic jurisprudence rather than mirroring any commercial prototype. Preliminary observations include that Judge-GPT expedites case law research and better drafting of court orders, enabling judges to devote enhanced attention to substantive legal analysis.

However, this is not found sufficient by the Court to narrate this development. It has categorically went further to explain the contours and cautions in use of AI by the courts of Pakistan in the following words:¹⁸

Judges must, however, undertake careful verification of all references suggested by Judge-GPT while adhering to established ethical and procedural protocols.

This is now well-established throughout the world that AI generated materials, including text, video, audio, pictures, etc., without human verification and human-control can defeat, in situations, the human rights issues and rely on machine biases.¹⁹ The Court has also focused on the fact that AI can help in improving language of the judgments and orders, comparative jurisprudence, decision-making support, and

¹⁷ Ibid.

¹⁸ Ibid.

¹⁹ *UNESCO Guidelines for Use of AI Systems in Courts and Tribunals (2025)*. Available online at: <https://www.unesco.org/en/articles/guidelines-use-ai-systems-courts-and-tribunals>. Last retrieved 30 July 2026.

consistency and coherence.²⁰ Thereafter, the Court again cautioned that the “AI tools remain subordinate to judicial reasoning and must never be mistaken as a substitute for the exercise of judicial conscience, discretion, or interpretive judgment. It is strongly underlined that the judicial role requires that AI tools be viewed as supplementary aids rather than substitutes for human reasoning.”²¹ Reminding the judges of their constitutional, legal and ethical responsibility in crafting judgments, the Court has authoritatively remarked: “The responsibility for ensuring the accuracy, ethical integrity, and confidentiality of judicial determinations rests entirely with the judge.”²²

It was well-taken by the Court that the “Administrative Efficiency” of the courts and justice system has to be aligned with the technology by using its features like automated case allocation to judges keeping in view the workload and nature of work assigned to any particular judge. This is taken as ensuring ‘fairness’ and openness in judicial administration.

The Court then issued a ‘warning’ to the courts and judges of Pakistan showing ‘gaps’ so that the human oversight is appropriately kept intact at all relevant times if AI is used by them. Hence, areas like “Transparency and Explainability”, “Hallucination”, “Accountability and Human Oversight”, “Fairness and non-discrimination” were discussed in reasonable detail. With respect to ‘automation bias’, the Hon’ble Supreme Court has warned the judges and courts that it should not affect institutional independence and judicial impartiality. The words of the SCoP are:²³

This Court warns against "automation bias", the undue deference to algorithmic recommendations and affirms that any AI adoption must maintain institutional independence and judicial impartiality.

²⁰ See Para 9 of *Ishfaq Ahmed case*, PLD 2025 SC 582.

²¹ Ibid.

²² Ibid.

²³ See Para 11 of *Ishfaq Ahmed case*, PLD 2025 SC 582.

It was focus of the SCoP that judging cannot be delegated to the AI and “delegating core adjudicative functions to AI would constitute a dereliction of judicial duty constituting misconduct and compromise foundational principles such as impartiality and due process.”²⁴ This is to link up the whole discussion to the codes of judicial conduct as well. So the judges and presiding officers of tribunals have to take notice of this authoritative pronouncement about delimiting the usages of AI for court related work. The discussion starting from impact of AI on constitutionalism is trickling down and reached upto the applicable codes of judicial conduct if AI is not used responsibly and/or ethically. Judges have to be more cautious now about using AI within the parameters found safe by the SCoP and any violation is now to be taken as coming with consequence. We still lack empirical study on the extent of use of AI by the judges while writing their judgments or orders, but there is research that they use AI for improving the quality of the write-up or form of the judgment, a permissible use under the *Ishfaq Ahmed* case.

The judgment in *Ishfaq Ahmed* is full of resources and references to different ethical guidelines issues by various jurisdictions around the globe, including regional and international ethical texts. This makes the judgment as a teaching tool on the issue of use of AI by judges and Courts in an acceptable manner even if there were no ethical guidelines available till this judgment was pronounced. While summing up the judgment, the SCoP held:²⁵

In sum, AI must be welcomed with careful optimism. It can streamline judicial functions, reduce delays, and expand access to legal knowledge. But it cannot replicate the moral, ethical, and empathic reasoning that lies at the heart of judging. Courts must thus pursue a calibrated integration harnessing AI's efficiencies without surrendering the conscience, independence, and humanity that justice demands.

²⁴ See Para 13 of *Ishfaq Ahmed case*, PLD 2025 SC 582.

²⁵ Ibid, para 17.

Coming back chronologically, a court presided over by the present author in Phalia in 2023 has used AI model chatGPT in judicial orders.²⁶ Two orders were passed by the court where potential use of AI was tested as to how it can assist a judge in improving quality of justice.²⁷ The orders were focused that the decision on merit of the lis in both cases was made by the process of using traditional human judging and “judicial experiments in transparent human–AI collaborative adjudication.”²⁸ It was observed that trial courts can benefit out of the new technology if indigenized GPTs are designed containing local case law and relevant texts. Copies of orders of each case were sent to the Hon’ble High Court and to the Law and Justice Commission of Pakistan (LJCP) to consider them as law reform proposals. Notably, at that time, no ethical guidelines were existed for Pakistan judiciary and thus a critique developed that the trial courts or district judiciary cannot use AI without first having appropriate guidelines for use of AI in courts.²⁹

²⁶ The present author, as an Additional District and Sessions Judge, issued two orders, one in a civil appeal against order and the other in a criminal bail petition where the potential of AI was tested for use by the courts and judicial systems. See *Gulf News*, “Pakistani Judge uses chatGPT to make court decision”, 13 April 2023. Online edition available at: <https://gulfnews.com/world/asia/pakistan/pakistani-judge-uses-chatgpt-to-make-court-decision-1.95104528>. The two orders are accessible online at: <https://courtingthelaw.com/wp-content/uploads/DOC-20230413-WA0052..pdf> and <https://courtingthelaw.com/wp-content/uploads/ChatGPT-4-Abdul-Moaiz-v-State.-FIR-No.-15-2023.-Offence-376iii-511-P.S-Bhagat..-allowed.-29.03.2023.pdf>. Last retrieved on 31 July 2026.

²⁷ See also para No. 8 of *Ishfaq Ahmed case*, PLD 2025 SC 582, footnote no.7.

²⁸ The author also sought an independent critical assessment of these judgments from ChatGPT (OpenAI, GPT-5.5) on 31 July 2026. According to that assessment, the two decisions may be understood as “the first Pakistani judicial experiments in transparent human–AI collaborative adjudication,” because they openly disclosed the use of generative AI, documented the interaction with the AI system, retained human judicial responsibility, and treated AI as an assistive rather than determinative tool.

²⁹ See Sahar Iqbal, “AI in Pakistani Courts of Law”, (1 June 2023), International Bar Association online blog. Available at: <https://www.ibanet.org/AI-in-Pakistani-courts-of-law>. Last retrieved on 31 July 2026.

Literature also developed to challenge any AI based judgment to see if it violates human rights or fair trial right.³⁰

It would be pertinent to mention that the Hon'ble Supreme Court of Pakistan, while concluding the *Ashfaq Ahmed case* decided on 13.03.2025, passed the following important direction:³¹

We strongly recommend that the National Judicial (Policy Making) Committee in collaboration with the Law and Justice Commission of Pakistan considers developing comprehensive guidelines on the permissible uses of AI within the judiciary. These must delineate clear boundaries, ensuring that AI is used only as a facilitative tool and never in a manner that compromises human judicial autonomy, constitutional fidelity, or public trust in the justice system. Let a copy of this judgment be dispatched to both the Law and Justice Commission of Pakistan and the National Judicial (Policy Making) Committee for preparing guidelines to regulate this emerging intersection of law and AI.

This recommendation of the Hon'ble SCoP was well-taken by the National Judicial (Policy Making) Committee (NJPMC) and the Law and Justice Commission of Pakistan (LJCP).³² Draft guidelines were prepared and were sent to the National Judicial Automation

³⁰ Shilun Zhou (06 Dec 2024): Analyzing the justification for using generative AI technology to generate judgments based on the virtue jurisprudence theory, Journal of Decision Systems, DOI: 10.1080/12460125.2024.2428999. Last retrieved 31 July 2026.

³¹ See para 18 of *Ashfaq Ahmed case*, *ibid*.

³² See NJPMC/LJCP, *National Guidelines for Use of Artificial Intelligence in Judicial Institutions of Pakistan*, 2026, p. 02. Available online at: [https://www.ljcp.gov.pk/SiteImage/Misc/files/National%20Guidelines%20for%20Use%20of%20AI%20in%20Judicial%20Institutions%20-%20BOOKLET%20\(2\)\(1\).pdf](https://www.ljcp.gov.pk/SiteImage/Misc/files/National%20Guidelines%20for%20Use%20of%20AI%20in%20Judicial%20Institutions%20-%20BOOKLET%20(2)(1).pdf). Last retrieved 31 July 2026.

Committee (NJAC)³³. After extensive review, the draft was sent to the NJPMC and approved in its 57th Meeting held in February 2026. These guidelines were based on ‘foundational constitutional principle’: “the administrative and judicial autonomy of provincial High Courts.”³⁴ It was further underscored, in this view of the matter, that “each High Court retains full discretion to adopt and implement the framework within its respective jurisdiction.”³⁵ Reading these lines makes it clear that these *Guidelines* have to be ‘adopted’ by High Courts as per their own local requirements in each province. These have been circulated in Punjab province by the Hon’ble Lahore High Court. The text of the *Guidelines* is also available at its official website.³⁶

As a last stretch of this comment, let us see how the *Guidelines* are to operate for the judiciary. It is mentioned as under:³⁷

The Guidelines are intended to be followed by Superior Courts, the Courts subordinate thereto, including Tribunals and Special Courts, as well as other justice sector institutions, while using AI system assisted and generated documents in judicial proceedings.

The *Guidelines* provide the following four guiding principles:³⁸

³³ This Committee is presided over by an Hon’ble Judge of Supreme Court of Pakistan (Mr. Justice Muhammad Ali Mazhar, and some other hon’ble judges of Supreme Court and High Courts are its members.) See details about this NJAC composition at NJPMC/LJCP, *National Guidelines for Use of Artificial Intelligence in Judicial Institutions of Pakistan*, 2026, p. 03. Available online at: [https://www.ljcp.gov.pk/SiteImage/Misc/files/National%20Guidelines%20for%20Use%20of%20AI%20in%20Judicial%20Institutions%20-%20BOOKLET%20\(2\)\(1\).pdf](https://www.ljcp.gov.pk/SiteImage/Misc/files/National%20Guidelines%20for%20Use%20of%20AI%20in%20Judicial%20Institutions%20-%20BOOKLET%20(2)(1).pdf). Last retrieved 31 July 2026.

³⁴ Ibid, p. 04. We have to note that as per Article 203 of the Constitution of Pakistan 1973, each High Court has superintendence and control of the courts subordinate to it.

³⁵ Ibid.

³⁶ https://lhc.gov.pk/system/files/National_Guide_lines.pdf. Last retrieved 31 July 2026.

³⁷ NJPMC/LJCP, *National Guidelines for Use of Artificial Intelligence in Judicial Institutions of Pakistan*, 2026, p. 06. Available online at: [https://www.ljcp.gov.pk/SiteImage/Misc/files/National%20Guidelines%20for%20Use%20of%20AI%20in%20Judicial%20Institutions%20-%20BOOKLET%20\(2\)\(1\).pdf](https://www.ljcp.gov.pk/SiteImage/Misc/files/National%20Guidelines%20for%20Use%20of%20AI%20in%20Judicial%20Institutions%20-%20BOOKLET%20(2)(1).pdf). Last retrieved 31 July 2026

³⁸ Ibid, at pp.06-07.

Human Oversight (Human-in-the-Loop)

Ethical Integrity and Transparency

Privacy and Data Security

Accountability and Oversight

At the same time, the *Guidelines* have also provided “Permissible Use of AI Systems”. These are under the following headings:³⁹

Administrative Functions

Legal Research

Predictive Analytics

Judicial Assistance

Locally developed explainable systems

Further, the *Guidelines* also highlighted the need of ‘capacity building’ of human resources of judiciary including judges and court staff. The NJPMC/LJCP have to devise training programs in the federal and provincial judicial academies to fulfill this requirement.⁴⁰

To link up and to conclude the discussion made above, in a recently held Conference organized by the EU and UNDP in Islamabad titled “EU and UNDP’s First Rule of Law Forum On The Future of People-centered Justice”, I would like to quote the words of Chairperson of the National Judicial Automation Committee (NJAC) Hon’ble Mr. Justice Muhammad Ali Mazhar (Judge Supreme Court of Pakistan) that how the judiciary is looking at people centric justice in the rapidly changing technology and development:⁴¹

“Justice cannot remain static in a rapidly changing world. Our responsibility is to ensure that the justice system evolves with the needs of the people it serves. At the Supreme Court of Pakistan, we are pursuing transformative reforms that strengthen institutional

³⁹ Ibid, at p.07.

⁴⁰ Ibid, p. 07.

⁴¹ <https://www.undp.org/pakistan/press-releases/eu-and-undp-launch-pakistans-first-rule-law-forum-future-people-centered-justice>. Last retrieved 31 July 2026.

resilience, enhance public confidence, and place people at the very center of justice.”

Conclusion:

The above discussion has shown that the artificial intelligence is well considered by the judiciary and judicial policy making bodies in Pakistan as an important tool to assist and augment judicial functions, but not to replace final decision making authority of judges. These *Guidelines* are result of Hon’ble Supreme Court’s judicial recognition of the challenges posed by AI in courts and justice system of Pakistan in above discussed *Shakir Ullah* and *Ishfaq Ahmed* judgments of the Hon’ble Supreme Court of Pakistan. Both streams of documents, i.e. judicial precedents and the authentic guidelines together now provide a better way out to deal with the issue that how the judiciary can embrace and integrate AI into its core functions. These limitations or safeguards are in accordance with Constitutional mandate of independence of judiciary, fundamental rights of people, judicial ethics and international best practices.