iapp



AI Legal Ethics and Responsibilities Tracker



Numerous state and national bar associations and other professional bodies have issued guidance, both formal and informal, on the use of artificial intelligence in legal services. These guidelines seek to answer questions such as how AI use should align with the ethical standards of the legal profession, how the risks and benefits of AI use ought to be balanced and what practical steps lawyers and law firms need to take before implementing AI in their daily practices.

Courts and judiciary bodies have been confronted with a similar proliferation of questions, putting forth guidance and orders on implementing AI in their courtrooms, as well as the common pitfalls regarding generative AI use that judges and court personnel should be particularly aware of. They have also issued numerous orders concerning the use of AI-generated material in legal proceedings and court filings. In response to the increasing use of AI-generated evidence in court, these rules and guidelines seek to help judges determine the authenticity, validity and reliability of evidence in the era of AI.

The AI Legal Ethics and Responsibilities Tracker consolidates these emerging guidelines, orders and rules, identifying the risks with AI use as well as documenting key recommendations and emerging legal standards and obligations. This collection of AI guidance is organized jurisdictionally and alphabetically by country.

Overall, this tracker makes clear that AI has both enhanced and complicated the range of duties legal professionals must carry out. As the duty of competence may extend to the use of AI, the professional obligations brought about by AI must be addressed. It is within this current legal environment, increasingly transformed by AI, that legal professionals must grapple with how to incorporate AI into the practice of law in an ethical and beneficial manner.

	Resource	Risks identified	Recommendations
ARGENTINA	Public Bar Association of the Federal Capital Guide to the Use of Artificial Intelligence for Lawyers* July 2025	» Hallucinations » Bias perpetuation » Absence of transparency/trust » Leakage of client or confidential information » Uncertainty caused by rapid technological change	» The legal and factual accuracy of any generative AI output lawyers rely on must always be double-checked. » Lawyers should constantly be wary of hidden biases influencing their generative AI output. » Clients must be informed to what extent generative AI is being used and why it is necessary. Lawyers must also be wary not to create false expectations or guarantee successful outcomes to their clients. » Before inputting client information, lawyers should carefully examine the privacy and data security practices of the providers of the AI tools they use. » Keeping current with both changes to the law and AI tools' capabilities is a professional responsibility. Additionally, law firms should encourage interdisciplinary collaboration and institute practical training and guidelines for AI usage.
	Council of Magistracy of the Nation Presidential Resolution No. 206/2025* Annex 1 26 Feb. 2025	» Diminished human judgment » Leakage of client or confidential information	» Generative AI is primarily intended to assist judicial personnel, not replace them. Human intervention in any generative AI-enhanced judicial process is required. Lawyers must not outsource their legal judgment to generative AI systems. » Lawyers should not input confidential information into generative AI systems.
AUSTRALIA	Federal Court of Australia Use of Generative Artificial Intelligence Practice Note (GPN-AI) 16 April 2026	» Hallucinations » Leakage of client or confidential information	» Any legal professionals using generative AI should be aware of its tendency to hallucinate material and must verify the accuracy of any output. » Lawyers should be mindful of the risk in disclosing confidential information before entering it into an AI tool.

	Resource	Risks identified	Recommendations
AUSTRALIA	High Court of Australia A Guide to the Use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) 20 Feb. 2026	» Hallucinations » Bias perpetuation » AI-fabricated evidence » Absence of transparency/trust » Manipulation	» Any usage of AI in the legal field requires that a human remains in the loop to check the accuracy of output. » Court employees are required to be aware of any potential sources of bias in the AI tools they use. » Practitioners and court employees must remain vigilant for AI-generated or altered content submitted as evidence. Forensic authentication by a third party may be necessary. » Court employees should always directly engage with the underlying source document and check it for hidden prompts.
	Supreme Court of New South Wales Supreme Court Practice Note SC Gen 32 — Use of Generative Artificial Intelligence (Gen AI) 28 Jan. 2025	» Hallucinations » Bias perpetuation » Leakage of client or confidential information » IP infringement	» Legal practitioners should be aware of the limits, risks and shortcomings of any generative AI system they use. • Authors of written submissions, summaries or skeletons of arguments must verify that all citations and references to legal and academic authorities, case law and legislative references are accurate, relevant to the proceedings and genuinely exist. » Legal practitioners should be mindful that data entered into generative AI programs may be used to train large language models, potentially making confidential information available to others. » Information subject to nonpublication or suppression orders must not be entered into any generative AI program. » Generative AI must not be used to generate the contents of — or alter, embellish, strengthen or dilute — affidavits, witness statements, character references or other similar material. These materials must also contain a disclosure stating that generative AI was not used to generate its content.

	Resource	Risks identified	Recommendations
AUSTRALIA	Bar Association of New South Wales Issues Arising from the Use of AI Language Models (including Chat GPT) in Legal Practice 12 July 2023	» Hallucinations » Bias perpetuation » Problematic billing practices » Leakage of client or confidential information » IP infringement	» Lawyers must constantly check the accuracy and timeliness of any generative AI output they rely on. » They should also be wary of using AI tools that lack transparency tools and produce unexplainable output. » Lawyers must ensure their AI tools were not trained on biased data and check any generative AI output they rely on for bias. » Hourly fees billed to clients must reflect the actual time a lawyer spends on a task. » Lawyers should not input confidential client information into an AI system without informed consent from that client. » Lawyers should be wary that AI output that reproduces substantial amounts of copyrighted work may violate IP regulations.
	Bar Association of Queensland Guidelines for the Use of Artificial Intelligence in Legal Practice November 2025	» Hallucinations » AI-fabricated evidence » Lack of data oversight » Bias perpetuation » Leakage of client or confidential information	» Lawyers must always check the accuracy and timeliness of any generative AI output they rely on. » Lawyers should be wary of AI-generated or enhanced evidence given to them by their clients. » Lawyers should consider recording AI prompts and output, as well as any decisions they made using that data. » Lawyers must ensure their AI tools were not trained on biased data and check any generative AI output they rely on for bias. » Lawyers should not include any sensitive information in AI prompts.
BELGIUM	Order of Flemish Bars Guidelines for Lawyers on the Use of Artificial Intelligence* 20 Jan. 2025	N/A	» Lawyers must know the basics of how their AI tools function and are trained, as well as what databases they are trained on. » Lawyers must check the accuracy of any AI output before relying on it. » There is no general affirmative obligation for lawyers to communicate AI usage to their clients. » Lawyers must not enter confidential information into AI tools. If entering confidential information into an AI tool is necessary, they must obtain informed consent from their clients before doing so. » Clients must be informed if they are communicating with chatbots.

	Resource	Risks identified	Recommendations
BELGIUM	Order of French and German-speaking Bars Do ethics and AI go hand in hand?* 2024	» Leakage of client or confidential information » Hallucinations » Absence of transparency/trust	» Lawyers should not enter confidential client information into an AI tool. » Lawyers must check AI output for inaccuracies and ensure they are not letting an AI tool replace their professional judgment. » Lawyers should consider disclosing AI usage based on their client's sophistication, the novelty of the technology or usage, the extent of the representation and the risks associated with generative AI use.
BRAZIL	Brazilian Bar Association Proposal No. 49.0000.2024.007325-9/COP* 11 Nov. 2024	N/A	» Lawyers must carefully examine each AI tool they use and ensure any client information entered into it is adequately protected. They must also ensure that any chatbots they use to interact with clients do not carry out any legal activities. » Lawyers must critically examine AI output for factual or legal errors and should never outsource their legal judgment to an AI system. » The Brazilian bar strongly recommends that lawyers disclose any AI usage to their clients. Clients are entitled to the right to refuse the use of AI and to communicate with a human lawyer.
	National Council of Justice Resolution No. 332 of August 21, 2020* 21 Aug. 2020	N/A	» Pursuant to Article 6, data used to train AI models must be representative. Proper safeguards to protect judicial confidentiality must be adopted. » Judicial decisions supported by AI tools must be fair, nondiscriminatory and seek to eliminate or minimize oppression, human marginalization and errors per Article 7. » Under Article 17, AI systems must enhance user autonomy by allowing users to review their proposed decisions and the data used to make them without binding the users to those decisions.

	Resource	Risks identified	Recommendations
CANADA	Canadian Bar Association Ethics of Artificial Intelligence for the Legal Practitioner — Guidelines for Use 28 Nov. 2024	» Uncertainty caused by rapid technological change » Leakage of client or confidential information » Absence of transparency/trust » Hallucinations and lack of human judgment » Problematic billing practices » Bias perpetuation	» Lawyers must be educated on the risks associated with using a particular AI system. They also must keep abreast of any changes to their AI tools and understand the limitations of AI. » Lawyers must examine the data storage, security and usage practices of their AI systems before they input client information into them. » There is no requirement that lawyers disclose generative AI usage to their clients. They are encouraged to disclose generative AI usage and obtain informed consent when generative AI systems are being used for nonroutine tasks. » Lawyers are required to promptly inform courts and tribunals of any errors they discover in AI-generated output. » Lawyers are explicitly prohibited from billing for time saved thanks to the use of generative AI. They should inform clients of how generative AI usage affects their fees and adjust their billing practices accordingly. » Lawyers must be cognizant that their AI tools may have been trained on biased or discriminatory data and that these biases may skew output.
	Canadian Judicial Council Guidelines for the Use of Artificial Intelligence in Canadian Courts September 2024	N/A	» Judges must be careful to maintain their decision-making independence when using AI tools. » Any AI usage must be consistent with the court's ethical values: independence, integrity, respect, diligence, competence, equality, fairness, impartiality, transparency, accessibility, timeliness and certainty. » Courts using AI must be aware of the legal aspects of AI use, including but not limited to IP law, hate speech law and data protection regulation. » Judges must consider how the information they enter into or generate using AI is stored and protected. » Any AI tools used in court must produce explainable output. » Courts must track the impact of AI deployments and provide training to judges.

	Resource	Risks identified	Recommendations
CANADA	The Law Society of Alberta The Generative AI Playbook Last updated February 2026	» Uncertainty caused by rapid technological change » Leakage of client or confidential information » Cybersecurity risks » Hallucinations and lack of human judgment » Bias perpetuation » IP infringement	» The duty of competence requires that lawyers understand how their generative AI tools were trained and the data recency, what their limitations are and what their terms of use say. » Never include confidential information in generative AI prompts. Using proprietary or in-house AI systems may alleviate this danger. » Caution is needed when using or interacting with generative AI systems. » Lawyers should always double-check the accuracy of any generative AI output on which they rely and should never rely on generative AI systems to judge their own accuracy. » All generative AI output should be reviewed to ensure it aligns with their ethical obligations and does not contain biases or stereotypes. » Any use of generative AI should be disclosed.
	The Law Society of British Columbia Guidance on Professional Responsibility and AI October 2023	» Diminished human judgment » Uncertainty caused by rapid technological change » Leakage of client or confidential information » Absence of transparency/trust » Problematic billing practices » AI-fabricated evidence » Bias perpetuation	» The duty of competence requires that lawyers apply their own intellectual judgments to their jobs, communicate with their clients and diligently perform all professional functions. Generative AI tools should be treated as nonlawyers and their output supervised. » The duty of competence requires that lawyers continue to adapt to changing professional standards and practices. » Lawyers should redact any confidential client information from their generative AI input. Where this is impossible, they should obtain informed consent from their clients. They should also examine where and how securely input information is stored. » The duty of candor requires lawyers to disclose to clients the extent to which generative AI is used during the representation. » Lawyers must consider whether and how to adjust their billing practices in light of AI-driven efficiencies. » Lawyers must be careful not to be swayed by AI-enhanced or generated information given to them by their clients. » Lawyers should closely scrutinize generative AI output and ensure they haven't been swayed by any biases.

	Resource	Risks identified	Recommendations
CHILE	Judicial Academy Basic Guide on Generative Artificial Intelligence for the Practice of Judges* April 2026	» Diminished human judgment » Absence of transparency/trust » Bias perpetuation » Leakage of client or confidential information	» Judges must ensure that AI use does not undermine due process, is transparent, does not replace judicial decision-making and remains open to challenge by the parties. » Courts should ensure that individuals affected by AI decisions understand how those decisions were reached. » Judges must actively evaluate AI systems for bias. » Judges must never input personal or confidential information into an AI system.
	Chilean Bar Association Guidelines for the Responsible Use of Artificial Intelligence in Professional Practice* 15 July 2026	» Uncertainty caused by rapid technological change » Hallucinations » Diminished human judgment » Leakage of client or confidential information » Absence of transparency/trust	» The duties of competence and diligence require that lawyers educate themselves about how their AI tools generally function and their limitations. This duty is ongoing as technology changes. » Lawyers are required to double-check AI output for legal and factual accuracy before using it in their filings. Lawyers also may not delegate their professional judgment to AI systems. Lawyers must also supervise their colleagues and subordinates using AI. » Lawyers must examine the privacy and security policies and technical and organizational privacy protections of an AI provider before entering client information into their tools. » Lawyers using AI must inform clients in advance of this use, as well as the risks and benefits associated with it.
CHINA	All-China Patent Attorneys Association Code of Professional Ethics and Practice Discipline for Patent Agents 22 Sept. 2025	» IP infringement » Problematic billing practices	» AI must not be used to directly generate patent application documents or to "maliciously" lower the price of patent agency services.
	The Supreme People's Court of the People's Republic of China Opinions of the Supreme People's Court on the Lawful Adjudication of Cases Involving Artificial Intelligence Disputes* 7 Sept. 2026	N/A	» These guidelines contain disclosure and verification requirements for litigants using AI to prepare their filings.

	Resource	Risks identified	Recommendations
EUROPE	Council of Bars and Law Societies of Europe CCBE Guide on the Use of Generative AI by Lawyers 2 Oct. 2025	» Leakage of client or confidential information » Hallucinations » Bias perpetuation » Absence of transparency/trust » IP infringement » Cybersecurity risks	» Lawyers should refrain from entering any personal, confidential or other data related to the client into the user interface of a generative AI tool. » Lawyers should understand how a generative AI provider processes data, including whether prompts may be used for model training or shared with third parties. » Lawyers should verify the output of a generative AI before it is utilized in their work. » Lawyers using generative AI should maintain their professional objectivity. » Lawyers should be transparent with clients regarding their use of generative AI.
	The European Bars Federation European Lawyers in the Era of ChatGPT September 2024	» Diminished human judgment » Ambiguous regulatory and legal landscape » Leakage of client or confidential information » Absence of transparency/trust	» Lawyers should maintain a thorough understanding of how their AI tools function and their limitations. They should never uncritically rely on AI-generated output and remain responsible for the accuracy of AI-generated output. » Lawyers are required to keep abreast of current AI regulations and changes to them. » Lawyers should carefully examine the data storage, security and usage policies of the AI systems they use before entering confidential information into them. • Lawyers should prepare detailed assessments of compliance with the EU General Data Protection Regulation and conduct data protection impact assessments prior to adopting AI tools. » Lawyers are not affirmatively obliged to inform clients of their AI usage. However, in some situations, such as when AI systems are used to handle substantial or significant parts of the representation, disclosure is strongly recommended.
FRANCE	France Num Generative Artificial Intelligence for Lawyers: A Practical Guide* September 2024	» Hallucinations » Bias perpetuation » Leakage of client or confidential information » IP infringement » Inaccurate or misleading information	» Lawyers must be aware of the risks of AI hallucinations and verify the accuracy of any generative AI output. » Lawyers must never input data covered by professional secrecy into a generative AI.

	Resource	Risks identified	Recommendations
GERMANY	German Bar Association Use of AI in the Legal Profession* July 2025	» Hallucinations » Leakage of client or confidential information	» Lawyers must remain critical of AI output, double-check the accuracy of any AI output on which they rely and retain independent judgment. » Lawyers are prohibited from giving third-party AI providers access to confidential client information without ensuring they are bound by confidentiality obligations.
	Federal Bar Association Notes on the use of artificial intelligence (AI)* December 2024	» Hallucinations » Leakage of client or confidential information » Absence of transparency/trust	» Lawyers are still responsible for independently and responsibly advising their clients, even if AI is used. They must double-check the accuracy of any AI output on which they rely. » Lawyers must take care not to input any client information into an AI tool without anonymizing it. They may only provide client information to third-party IT personnel on a need-to-know basis. » Lawyers are generally not required to disclose the use of AI to clients, although transparency obligations may arise depending on contract and unfair competition law; regardless, disclosure is recommended. In those circumstances, disclosure is required only when an AI system is used directly in connection with a specific client's matter.
ITALY	Italian Senate Italian AI Act 10 July 2024	N/A	» Under Article 13, AI systems must only be used for instrumental support activities in intellectual professions. Professionals must clearly and comprehensively communicate information about AI systems to clients. » When using AI, judges must always retain exclusive authority over the interpretation of the law, interpretation of facts and evidence and ultimate judicial decisions, per Article 15.

	Resource	Risks identified	Recommendations
ITALY	Rome Bar Association A Brief Handbook for Lawyers on the Use of Artificial Intelligence*	N/A	» Technologies used must comply with current EU and Italian regulations. » Lawyers must be aware that AI is meant to support, not displace, their legal judgment. » Lawyers using AI remain subject to the duties established by the Code of Conduct and Professional Law.
	Torre Annunziata Bar Association Guidelines on the Use of Artificial Intelligence by Lawyers* June 2023	» Uncertainty caused by rapid technological change » Hallucinations and lack of human judgment » Diminished human judgment » Leakage of client or confidential information	» Lawyers must keep abreast of any changes to their AI tools and the overall field of AI technology. » Lawyers must always double-check any generative AI output they rely on and must never delegate decision-making authority to AI systems. » Lawyers remain wholly responsible for their activities and filings, regardless of how much AI assists them. » AI usage must comply with professional secrecy and data protection obligations.
JAPAN	Japanese Federation of Bar Associations Notes on the Use of Generative AI in Legal Practice September 2025	» Hallucinations » Leakage of client or confidential information	» Lawyers are required to check the accuracy of any generative AI output they rely on. » Lawyers must protect client information that is input into a generative AI system. » When using generative AI, lawyers should maintain independent legal judgment » Article 72 of the Attorneys Act prohibits the practice of law by nonlawyers, ostensibly including AI.

	Resource	Risks identified	Recommendations
MEXICO	Mexican Bar Association Guidelines of the Mexican Bar Association (BMA) for the Responsible Use of Artificial Intelligence in the Professional Practice of Law* 2 Dec. 2025	» Hallucinations » Leakage of client or confidential information » Bias perpetuation » Lack of human judgment » Problematic billing practices » Absence of transparency/trust	» Lawyers should double-check the accuracy of any generative AI output on which they rely. They should also ensure their subordinates and colleagues are not using AI in an unauthorized manner. » Lawyers should not enter confidential client information into AI systems that fail to meet information privacy and security standards. » Lawyers must be aware of how their AI systems were trained and of any potential biases that may result from their training data or design. » Lawyers should remember that AI is meant to assist, not replace, critical legal thinking. All information produced by AI must be verified for factual and legal accuracy. » Lawyers cannot bill clients for time spent learning how to use AI tools. » Lawyers should explain what AI is used for and why it is necessary, especially when AI usage is not routine or expected by clients.
NETHERLANDS	Dutch Bar Association Recommendations on AI in the Legal Profession*	N/A	» Lawyers are highly encouraged to become generally knowledgeable of how their AI tools function before using them. » Lawyers must always verify any generative AI output they rely on. » Lawyers must not enter confidential client information into AI tools. Before entering this information, they must know where the data is stored and how it is processed. » Lawyers must retain final legal decision-making authority and consult generative AI output critically. » Lawyers should be wary of biased generative AI output.

	Resource	Risks identified	Recommendations
NETHERLANDS	Dutch Bar Association Recommendations for AI in the legal profession* 16 Dec. 2025	N/A	» Before using AI in legal matters, lawyers must develop basic knowledge of that AI system, gain practical experience, discuss in advance how quality and safeguards are arranged and always verify output. » Lawyers must investigate how each AI provider protects input data and the AI tools' data flows. They should also refrain from entering confidential data into public AI systems. » Lawyers must only use AI as supporting tools and critically investigate AI output they use. They must also ensure adequate oversight of employees and suppliers. » Lawyers must inform clients of their planned AI usage and never uncritically adopt AI output. » Lawyers must ensure their AI systems are not using biased or partisan training data.
	Knowledge Center for Policy and Regulations Generative AI in legal work* 25 Oct. 2025	N/A	» When using public AI models such as ChatGPT and Mistral Vibe, lawyers must only input publicly accessible information, refrain from sharing personal data and critically review all output.
NEW ZEALAND	Courts of New Zealand Guidelines for Use of Generative Artificial Intelligence in Courts and Tribunals 7 Dec. 2023	» Leakage of client or confidential information » Hallucinations » Bias perpetuation » Cybersecurity risks	» Lawyers are required to understand the capabilities and limitations of the AI tools they choose to utilize. They should also understand how to write effective prompts. » Lawyers should be careful not to enter any information into an AI tool that is not already public and disable chat history when using a chatbot. » Lawyers are required to double-check the accuracy and applicability of any AI output they rely on. » Lawyers should examine the data their AI tools were trained on and be aware that they may not account for New Zealand's cultural values.

	Resource	Risks identified	Recommendations
NEW ZEALAND	New Zealand Law Society Generative AI guidance for lawyers Last updated 24 Feb. 2026	» Hallucinations » Leakage of client or confidential information » IP infringement » Problematic billing practices	» Lawyers remain responsible for their work product, regardless of how much AI assisted them. They must fact-check any output they rely on. » Lawyers should avoid inputting confidential client information into generative AI and examine where and how the data they input is treated. » Lawyers should examine any generative AI output they rely on for IP-protected material. They should also examine the terms of use of their AI tools to ensure the data they enter doesn't become the provider's property. » Lawyers can only bill clients for time spent working on a matter and should reconsider their billing practices in light of AI-driven efficiencies.
POLAND	Polish Bar Association AI in the Work of an Attorney-at-Law 2025	» Leakage of client or confidential information » IP infringement » Hallucinations » Bias perpetuation	» Lawyers should carefully review any agreement with an AI provider to determine confidentiality obligations, ownership of input and output, access rights and data-training policies. » Lawyers should examine their contracts with AI providers to assess the extent to which each provider offers defense and indemnification for IP infringement claims related to use of their tools. » Firms should develop rules that require lawyers who use AI tools to verify the accuracy of all AI-generated output. » Lawyers must examine how their AI tools function and what data they were trained on before relying on them.

	Resource	Risks identified	Recommendations
SINGAPORE	Singapore Ministry of Law Guide for Using Generative AI in the Legal Sector 6 March 2026	» Hallucinations » Bias perpetuation » Leakage of client or confidential information » Absence of transparency/trust	» Legal professionals should take responsibility for their entire work product, regardless of how much generative AI was used when preparing it. Legal professionals using generative AI must understand how their tools work, properly oversee generative AI usage and exercise greater scrutiny when using generative AI in areas outside their expertise. » Legal professionals should assess for potential biases by evaluating generative AI output across different case types and client groups and asking their generative AI tools to explain how they formed their output. Additionally, they should choose generative AI vendors who demonstrate bias testing and mitigation efforts. » Legal professionals should avoid entering confidential client information into generative AI systems and disable data retention on their AI tools. They also should carefully examine each AI provider's privacy terms and pick the most secure AI tools to use. » Legal professionals are not obliged to affirmatively disclose generative AI usage to their clients or the court. Disclosure is strongly recommended when generative AI usage could reasonably impact clients' interests, substantially contribute to work product, affect billing or conflict with client preferences.
	Supreme Court of Singapore The Guide on the Use of Generative Artificial Intelligence Tools by Court Users 23 Sept. 2024	N/A	» Lawyers are fully responsible for their work product even if AI assisted in its production. » Lawyers must double-check the accuracy of any generative AI output they rely on. » Lawyers should uphold IP regulations and assure that any references to copyrighted material in their output is properly attributed. » Lawyers should ensure that all confidential information remain secure while using AI tools. » Courts may require lawyers to disclose any generative AI usage, declare compliance with this guide and potentially file an affidavit attesting to such compliance.

	Resource	Risks identified	Recommendations
SPAIN	Ministry of the Presidency, Justice and Relations with the Courts Policy on the use of Artificial Intelligence in the Administration of Justice 21 June 2024	N/A	» Human review is required for all AI-generated output that directly or indirectly affects the rights of subjects before the court or the administration of justice. » Neither AI-generated data nor its sources should be accessible by third parties. » Humans must review AI tools for sources of bias. AI output that discriminates based on protected characteristics should not be used. » All results generated by AI must be flagged as such. » Only approved or authorized tools should be used.
SOUTH KOREA	Court Artificial Intelligence Research Society Guidelines on the Use of Artificial Intelligence in the Judiciary February 2025	N/A	» These guidelines emphasize the importance of guaranteeing fundamental rights and constitutional values, reliability, legality, responsibility and transparency when AI is used in judicial processes.
SWEDEN	Swedish Bar Association Guidance on the Use of Generative AI in Legal Practice* 12 June 2025	» Hallucinations » Leakage of client or confidential information	» Lawyers must critically review the accuracy of generative AI output before incorporating it into their legal advice. » Lawyers must review the privacy and data usage terms of their AI tools before inputting client information into them. When in doubt over an AI tool's safety, they should obtain the client's informed consent before inputting any information.
SWITZERLAND	LexTech Institute Artificial intelligence in the Contract Practice of Swiss Lawyers* 9 July 2025	» Diminished human judgment » Bias perpetuation » Leakage of client or confidential information	» Lawyers must always critically examine all generative AI output they rely on. » Lawyers must carefully examine any generative AI output on which they rely for potential bias and understand the data on which the AI system was trained. » Confidential information should never be input into AI systems unless it is stored locally on the law firm's servers, stored with a compliant third-party provider or the client's informed consent has been obtained. LexTech recommends using anonymization.

	Resource	Risks identified	Recommendations
SWITZERLAND	Swiss Bar Association Guidelines on the Use of Artificial Intelligence* 14 June 2024	» Leakage of client or confidential information » Hallucinations » IP infringement » Absence of transparency/trust	» Lawyers must examine how input data is stored, processed and used. » Lawyers should double-check any AI output before relying on it and be aware of the risks of bias and sycophancy stemming from AI use. » Lawyers should remember that their AI tools may have been trained on copyrighted data and that the output they rely on may be subject to IP law. » Lawyers should always disclose generative AI usage when prompted by their clients. They may also have a duty to disclose their use where disclosure is necessary to fulfill their professional obligations or the client's mandate.
TAIWAN	Judicial Yuan Reference Guidelines for the Use of Artificial Intelligence Systems by the Judicial Yuan and its Subordinate Agencies* 22 April 2026	N/A	» Before using an AI system, lawyers must educate themselves on how that system works, its limitations and its ethical requirements. They must also be aware of their agencies' AI policy before using an AI system. » Lawyers should avoid inputting confidential client and litigation information into AI systems not approved by the Judicial Yuan. » Lawyers must retain final legal judgment in all cases and should double-check AI output for legal and factual errors. » Lawyers must respect IP regulations when using AI. » Lawyers must promptly disclose any discovered errors in AI output submitted to a court.

	Resource	Risks identified	Recommendations
U.S.	Alabama State Bar Artificial Intelligence Use: Best Practices Under Existing Professional Conduct Rules July 2026	» Uncertainty caused by rapid technological change » Hallucinations » Diminished human judgment » Leakage of client or confidential information » Absence of transparency/trust » Problematic billing practices	» The duty of competency requires that lawyers generally understand how their AI tools function, recognize their limitations and remain current on developments and changes affecting those tools. » The duties of competency and diligence require that lawyers understand the limits of their AI tools and double-check any generative AI output for errors. The duty of candor requires that lawyers promptly disclose and correct any errors discovered in a generative AI's output. » Lawyers are required to examine an AI tool's data handling, privacy and security policies before entering client information into it. When in doubt, they should obtain a client's informed consent before entering their information into an AI tool. » Lawyers must follow any instructions regarding AI use given by clients and disclose AI usage where it affects the fee charged to clients, is used to draft court filings or involves the processing of client information. » Lawyers are explicitly prohibited from billing for time saved due to the use of generative AI. » Lawyers are recommended to use anonymized client identifiers and hypothetical questions when using AI tools and to set up firm-wide retention policies for AI-generated logs and drafts to aid with discovery.
	District Court for the Northern District of Alabama Haikala Chambers Initial Order 29 April 2025	N/A	» Parties using AI are required to review AI-generated content for accuracy and compliance before submitting it to court.

	Resource	Risks identified	Recommendations
U.S.	Alaska Bar Association Ethics Opinion 2025-1 3 April 2025	» Inaccurate or misleading information » Absence of transparency/trust » Problematic billing practices » Leakage of client or confidential information	» The duties to act with competence and diligence require lawyers to critically examine generative AI output for errors. » Lawyers are held responsible for errors in generative AI output filed in court. » Lawyers must also ensure their subordinates and colleagues are not using generative AI in unsanctioned or unethical ways. » If prompted, a lawyer should always inform a client whether and to what extent generative AI was used during the representation. » Lawyers are explicitly prohibited from billing for time saved due to the use of generative AI. They also cannot bill for time spent learning to use generative AI. » The duty of confidentiality requires lawyers to consider the security of a generative AI tool before inputting client information into it. Alternatively, lawyers must get informed consent from clients before doing so.
	American Bar Association, Standing Committee on Ethics and Professional Responsibility Formal Opinion 512 29 July 2024	» Uncertainty caused by rapid technological change » Hallucinations » Leakage of client or confidential information » Absence of transparency/trust » Problematic billing practices	» The duty of competency requires that lawyers keep abreast of any changes to their AI tools and generally understand how the AI tools they use function. » The duty of competency requires that lawyers double-check any generative AI output they rely on for accuracy. » The duty of candor requires lawyers to promptly disclose and correct any errors in generative AI-generated filings to the court. They must also ensure their subordinates and colleagues are not using generative AI in unsanctioned or unethical ways. » Lawyers must determine the risk that client information will be revealed to those inside and outside the firm by a generative AI system. This should be done by reading and understanding the privacy terms of use, related contractual terms and consulting experts. » Lawyers are required to disclose generative AI usage to clients when asked about it, when notification is required to explain the basis for a fee, to get informed consent, or when they has been retained due to their specific knowledge or skill. » Lawyers are explicitly prohibited from billing for time saved thanks to generative AI usage. They also cannot bill for time spent learning to use generative AI.

	Resource	Risks identified	Recommendations
U.S.	American Bar Association, Task Force on Law and Artificial Intelligence AI Task Force Year 2 Report on the Impact of AI on the Practice of Law December 2025	» Inaccurate or misleading information » Leakage of client or confidential information » Diminished human judgment	» When using AI as a thought partner, special attention must be paid to how it collects, processes and stores information. Additionally, users should be aware that generative AI tends to produce an average work product that is not necessarily based on facts or law. » Judicial officials using AI must be careful to maintain their decision-making autonomy and understand how their AI tools work, develop effective prompting practices and avoid confirmation bias. » Access to justice organizations must proactively provide AI training to nonlawyers, promote awareness of legitimate legal AI use cases and develop quality standards for AI tools likely to be used by laypeople.
	Arizona Supreme Court Generative AI: Ethical Best Practices for Lawyers and Judges 14 Nov. 2024	» Hallucinations » Leakage of client or confidential information » Absence of transparency/trust » Problematic billing practices » Bias perpetuation	» The duties of competence and diligence require lawyers to critically examine generative AI output and familiarize themselves with the benefits and risks of generative AI usage. » Lawyers and judges must determine the risks to confidentiality posed by a specific generative AI tool before inputting client information. If in doubt, legal professionals should refrain from entering client information. » Lawyers must preemptively disclose generative AI use if it is clear a client must know of generative AI use to make an informed decision. If generative AI use risks disclosure of client information, informed consent must be obtained prior to using generative AI. Court employees should conform with court policies regarding the use of generative AI. » Lawyers are explicitly prohibited from billing for time saved thanks to generative AI usage. » Legal professionals must be cautious that the generative AI tools they use do not perpetuate bias. » If clients or prospective clients are interacting with an AI chatbot on a law firm's website, this should be disclosed.
	Arkansas Supreme Court In re Creation of Arkansas Supreme Court Administrative Order No. 25. Artificial Intelligence 5 June 2025	N/A	» Any court personnel using generative AI must be aware of the data retention and privacy policies of the AI tools they use.

	Resource	Risks identified	Recommendations
U.S.	California SB 574: Attorneys, arbitrators, judicial officers, and alternative resolution providers Last updated 4 Sept. 2026	N/A	» § 6068.1(a): Nothing in this section shall be construed to abrogate a lawyer's duty to exercise reasonable competence and diligence or to not delegate the practice of law to AI. » § 6068.1(a)(3): Lawyers using AI must: • Not enter confidential, personally identifying, or nonpublic information into AI systems not restricted to that attorney. • Take reasonable steps to verify the accuracy of generative AI outputs and correct hallucinated outputs. • Disclose generative AI usage to the court for all documents submitted to the court. » § 6068.3(b)(2)(A): Lawyers may not submit any paper before a court without verifying that all the contents are accurate.
	California Cal. Civ. Code § 13663 1 Jan. 2026	N/A	» § 13663(a): Any member of a law enforcement agency preparing an official report using AI must include a disclaimer of that AI use and a statement that they verified the accuracy of its contents. » § 13663(b): If a law enforcement officer or a member of a law enforcement agency uses AI to create an official report, the first draft created must be retained for as long as the final report.

	Resource	Risks identified	Recommendations
U.S.	California Bar, Standing Committee on Professional Responsibility and Conduct Practical Guidance for the Use of Generative Artificial Intelligence in the Practice of Law 16 Nov. 2023	» Hallucinations » Leakage of client or confidential information » Ambiguous regulatory and legal landscape » Absence of transparency/trust » Problematic billing practices » Bias perpetuation	» The duties of competency and diligence require that lawyers review generative AI output and attain a baseline technical understanding of an AI system's function and limitations. Regarding agentic AI, lawyers must retain control over all strategic decision making. » Generally, lawyers are prohibited from inputting client information into generative AI without informed consent. They must also evaluate and limit the scope of agentic AI access to internal systems and deploy agentic AI in a manner that prevents data exfiltration » Lawyers are obligated to remain up to date on and continuously analyze laws and regulations relevant to them, their clients and their use of AI. This duty extends to their supervision of subordinate lawyers and requires the updating of firm-wide policies. » Lawyers must follow any instructions regarding AI use given by clients. They must also consider disclosing if and how they intend to use AI and the risks and benefits of doing so. This is especially true if the AI output will significantly affect the lawyer's decision making. » Lawyers are explicitly prohibited from billing for time saved thanks to generative AI usage. Fee agreements should clearly communicate how fees and costs are being calculated. » Lawyers must engage in continuous learning and oversight regarding AI perpetuated bias and create policies and mechanisms to prevent bias in sensitive areas such as hiring.
	Colorado Supreme Court Colorado Rules of Professional Conduct: Rule Change 2026(02) 8 Jan. 2026	N/A	» The duty of competence is defined to include having knowledge of the risks and benefits of any AI system being used.
	District Court for the District of Colorado Guidance on AI & Hallucinations	N/A	» Rules requiring accuracy, candor, integrity and competence still apply to AI-generated output. » When a party discovers an AI hallucination in their opponent's filings, the court suggests holding a conference, informing the court and filing a formal notice if necessary. The court also supplies considerations to take into account when determining the severity of the hallucination.

	Resource	Risks identified	Recommendations
U.S.	The D.C. Bar Ethics Opinion 388: Attorneys' Use of Generative Artificial Intelligence in Client Matters April 2024	» Hallucinations » Leakage of client or confidential information » Problematic billing practices » Lack of data oversight	» The duty of competency requires that lawyers have a current, reasonable understanding of how their AI tools function, their limitations and their cost. • If a lawyer discovers an error or hallucination in generative AI output submitted to a court, they are required to immediately disclose the error to the tribunal to the extent disclosure is permitted by the Rules of Professional conduct. » Lawyers should establish information input into a generative AI system is not visible to third parties and that their interactions with it will not cause confidential information to be leaked in subsequent interactions. If either of these criteria are not met, the information should not be input into the generative AI. » Lawyers are explicitly prohibited from billing for time saved thanks to the use of generative AI. » Lawyers should consider whether specific generative AI chat logs or output should be retained as part of the client file as they are created.
	Delaware Supreme Court In re Interim Police on the Use of Generative AI By Judicial Officers and Court Personnel 21 Oct. 2024	N/A	» The Judicial Branch Operating Procedures are modified to require judicial officers and court personnel to have working knowledge of their AI tools, retain final decision-making power and remain responsible for errors in generative AI output.
	The Florida Bar Ethics Opinion 24-1 19 Jan. 2024	» Leakage of client or confidential information » Hallucinations » Problematic billing practices	» It is highly recommended that lawyers obtain informed consent from their clients before entering their information into a generative AI. Additionally, they must generally understand how the generative AI they are using functions and whether it is "self-learning" prior to inputting information. » The duties of competency and candor require that lawyers review any AI-generated output and promptly inform the court of any errors they discover in submitted filings. • Florida treats generative AI as a nonlawyer assistant and requires lawyers to check generative AI output and avoid assigning nondelegable tasks to generative AI. Nondelegable tasks include providing legal advice, conducting intake interviews without disclosing nonlawyer status and providing unsupervised or unchecked legal commentary. » Lawyers are prohibited from billing for time saved thanks to the use of generative AI; they can only bill AI fees to clients if they notify them and obtain informed consent.

	Resource	Risks identified	Recommendations
U.S.	State Bar of Georgia Generative AI Toolkit 9 July 2026	» Hallucinations » Absence of transparency/trust » Problematic billing practices » Leakage of client or confidential information » Cybersecurity risks	» The duties of competency and diligence require that lawyers supervise and check any work done by generative AI systems and stay informed about the systems they use and their limitations. » The duty of candor requires lawyers to disclose any errors discovered in AI-generated output. » Lawyers are required to disclose the use of any AI tools to clients over the course of representation. » Lawyers are explicitly prohibited from billing for time saved thanks to generative AI usage. Before implementing AI tools that may affect billing hours, they must get informed consent from clients and communicate how AI is affecting the fee structure. » Lawyers should carefully examine whether a generative AI gathers entered information for training purposes and whether the provider's security practices are adequate. To be safe, they should obtain informed consent from their clients before entering any information into generative AI.
	District Court for the Northern District of Georgia, Atlanta Division Guidelines to Parties and Counsel in Civil Cases Proceeding Before the Honorable Tiffany R. Johnson 31 March 2025	N/A	» Parties using AI to prepare documents submitted to a court must sign and file a Disclosure of Use of Artificial Intelligence.
	District Court for the District of Hawaii Disclosure and Certification Requirements — Generative Artificial Intelligence 18 March 2024	N/A	» When a party utilizes generative AI to partially or entirely generate their filings, they must notify the court of the tool used and verify that the material in the filing is accurate. » Parties using generative AI will be held liable for the contents of their filings.
	District Court for the District of Hawaii In re Use of Unverified Sources 14 Nov. 2023	N/A	» When submitting material entirely or partly generated using generative AI, that party must notify the court and verify the material in the filing is accurate.

	Resource	Risks identified	Recommendations
U.S.	Hawaii Supreme Court Committee on Artificial Intelligence and the Courts' Final Report to the Hawai'i Supreme Court 15 Dec. 2025	» Hallucinations » Leakage of client or confidential information » Absence of transparency/trust » Problematic billing practices » AI-fabricated evidence	» The duties of competency and diligence require that lawyers keep abreast of both changes to the law and their AI tools and carefully examine generative AI output for errors. Additionally, lawyers must examine whether generative AI should be used for critical issues at all. • The duty of candor also requires that lawyers promptly disclose any errors discovered in any AI-generated court filings. This duty also applies to court filings not made by that party. » Hawaii's Rule 1.6 confidentiality requirements cover data entered into a generative AI. To be sure of compliance, lawyers should secure the informed consent of their clients before entering client data into a generative AI. » Lawyers must follow any instructions regarding AI use given by their clients. They should also discuss potential AI use with and obtain informed consent from clients before using generative AI. » Lawyers are prohibited from billing for time saved thanks to generative AI usage. » Judges and lawyers must carefully assess whether AI-generated or derived insights advance relevant factual determinations. To support the admissibility of such evidence, lawyers should be prepared to submit records pertaining to the algorithms, data inputs and training methodologies that created the evidence.
	Illinois Supreme Court Illinois Supreme Court Policy on Artificial Intelligence 1 Jan. 2025	N/A	» Parties using AI are responsible for the contents of their filings. » Parties using AI are required to review AI-generated content for accuracy and compliance before submitting it to court. » Parties using AI must understand both the capabilities and limits of their systems before using them. » AI applications themselves must not compromise sensitive information.

	Resource	Risks identified	Recommendations
U.S.	Illinois Supreme Court The Illinois Attorney's Guide to Implementing AI 1 Oct. 2025	» Cybersecurity risks » Leakage of client or confidential information » Lack of data oversight and cybersecurity risks	» Risks of leaks and the use of inputs as training data are greater when using free public generative AI models. To minimize these risks, lawyers should consider using paid business or legally oriented models. » Lawyers seeking to employ generative AI must take extra care to research the provider's risk management practices and ensure they are sufficient to protect client data. • Related issues include risks associated with data isolation. As the importance of data increases, additional care should be taken to ensure it is kept secluded from other information. » Documentation concerning the provider's compliance with industry standards related to supply chain and security risks should also be requested and examined.
	Indiana Supreme Court AI Governance Committee AI Starter Pack for Indiana Judges September 2025	» Uncertainty caused by rapid technological change » Lack of human judgment » Bias perpetuation » Leakage of client or confidential information	» Judges must keep abreast of any changes to the AI tools they allow in their courtrooms and must understand the function and logic of those AI tools. » Judges may use AI in an advisory fashion but must retain independent decision-making authority. » Judges must be aware of how biased data can influence AI systems to generate biased output. They must also examine which data was used to generate specific output or train specific models. » Judges must examine which types of data will be used with their AI tools and the level of confidentiality and security each tool can provide before using them.
	Iowa Supreme Court In re Matter of Adopting Chapter 27 of the Iowa Court Rules Chapter 27 Effective Jan. 1, 2027	N/A	» Rule 27.104(1) requires that judicial officers using generative AI must retain decision-making autonomy. » Rule 27.104(2) requires that judicial officers or their assistants must verify the accuracy of generative AI output. » Rule 27.104(3) requires that judicial officers oversee the work an adjudicative assistant performs for the judicial officer to ensure compliance with the rule.

	Resource	Risks identified	Recommendations
U.S.	Kentucky Bar Association Ethics Opinion KBA E-457 The Ethical Use of Artificial Intelligence ("AI") in the Practice of Law 15 March 2024	» Uncertainty caused by rapid technological change » Absence of transparency/trust » Problematic billing practices » Leakage of client or confidential information » Hallucinations	» The duty of competency requires lawyers to remain abreast of both changes in the law and the AI tools being used to navigate it. » Lawyers are required to consult with the client about how their objectives are to be met, including if the client is being charged for generative AI use or if a third party is providing AI services. » Lawyers are prohibited from billing hours saved by using generative AI and hours spent learning about or maintaining AI systems. » Lawyers should closely review terms of use to ensure client data will not be used to train AI models or sent to third parties. To be completely safe lawyers should attempt to get the informed consent of their clients before entering data into a generative AI. » The duties of competency and diligence require that lawyers review generative AI output before filing with a court. Additionally, the duty of candor requires lawyers to promptly disclose any errors in filings made to a court.
	Louisiana Supreme Court Re: The Emergence of Artificial Intelligence 22 Jan. 2024	N/A	» Previous Rules of Professional Conduct still apply to lawyers using AI assistance. » Lawyers are still responsible for their own work-product and filings, regardless of whether AI was used to prepare them; maintaining competence in technology; and protecting confidential client information.
	Maryland District Court In re Use of Generative Artificial Intelligence in Court Filings 5 Aug. 2026	N/A	» Parties filing documents created partially or entirely using generative AI must double-check the accuracy of their content prior to submission.

	Resource	Risks identified	Recommendations
U.S.	Massachusetts Board of Bar Overseers The Wild West of Artificial Intelligence: Ethical Considerations for the Use of A.I. in the Practice of Law 2 May 2023	» Uncertainty caused by rapid technological change » Bias perpetuation » Problematic billing practices » Leakage of client or confidential information	» The duties of competency and diligence require lawyers to remain abreast of both changes in the law and changes in the AI tools they use. They are expected to know how their AI tools function on a general level and what information they collect and store. » Lawyers are prohibited from disclosing client information to generative AI unless they have informed consent, authority to disclose is implied by their position, or an exception to confidentiality rules exists. They should be careful to only enter potentially sensitive client information into systems with adequate security and confidentiality protections. » Lawyers must adequately communicate how AI will be used during their representation of a client and the reasonable costs of doing so. AI fees must always reasonably reflect the cost of the services rendered. » Lawyers should take extra care to ensure the AI systems they use have not been trained on or influenced by biased data.
U.S.	District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan Notice of Proposed Amendments to Local Rules 8 Dec. 2023	N/A	» Parties using generative AI in a court filing must disclose its use and attest that a human verified the accuracy of the filing.
U.S.	State Bar of Michigan Artificial Intelligence for Attorneys — Frequently Asked Questions Last updated November 2024	» Hallucinations » Leakage of client or confidential information » Absence of transparency/trust » Problematic billing practices	» The duties of competency and diligence require that lawyers review generative AI output for any errors before filing with a court. Lawyers must also keep up to date with changes to their AI tools and how they function. » Generally, lawyers should not input client information or attorney-client privileged material into a generative AI system without the client's informed consent. » Under Michigan's rules, lawyers do not have a general obligation to inform clients of their AI use, unless AI use implicates a Rule of Professional Conduct. » Lawyers are prohibited from billing hours saved by using generative AI.

	Resource	Risks identified	Recommendations
U.S.	Minnesota Office of Lawyers Professional Responsibility Ethics Guidance for Generative AI Use 28 Sept. 2024	» Uncertainty caused by rapid technological change » Leakage of client or confidential information » Absence of transparency/trust » Hallucinations » Problematic billing practices	» The duties of competency and diligence require lawyers to remain abreast of changes in the law and in the AI tools they use. Lawyers are expected to know how their AI tools function on a general level and what information they collect and store. » Lawyers should get informed consent from their clients before inputting confidential information into AI tools. » Lawyers must respond to client inquiries about AI usage; they must affirmatively disclose AI usage when the client would reasonably expect to be advised as to how much the lawyer defers to AI. » The duties of competency, diligence and candor require lawyers to double-check AI output they rely on for errors and promptly disclose errors in AI generating filings to the court. • The duty of supervision also requires lawyers to ensure that their coworkers and subordinates comply with firm AI policy and responsibly use AI tools. » Lawyers are prohibited from billing hours saved by using generative AI. They also cannot bill for time spent learning about generative AI tools.
	Mississippi Bar Ethics Opinion No. 267 14 Nov. 2024	» Leakage of client or confidential information » Hallucinations » Problematic billing practices » Absence of transparency/trust	» Lawyers should carefully review generative AI terms of use and determine what information is shared with other users. If possible, they should also refrain from entering any personally identifiable information into a generative AI tool. If this isn't possible, then lawyers should obtain informed client consent before entering any information. » The duties of competency and diligence require lawyers to keep abreast of any changes to the law and the AI tools they use. Additionally, they are also required to double-check any output they receive from a generative AI tool for errors. » Lawyers are prohibited from billing hours saved by using generative AI or time spent learning about generative AI. Any costs associated with AI use must be communicated with the client in writing before or shortly after the representation begins. » Lawyers must inform clients of generative AI usage when they provide client information to an AI, pass AI expenses onto clients or are unsure of the privacy and security practices of an AI provider.

	Resource	Risks identified	Recommendations
U.S.	Missouri HB 2032 Introduced 7 Jan. 2026; Died in chamber 2 April 2026	N/A	» § 1.2058(5)(3)(b): AI chatbots shall not directly or indirectly represent themselves as being licensed lawyers or another licensed professional.
	Office of Legal Ethics & Advisory Committee of the Supreme Court of Missouri Informal Opinion No. 2024-11 25 April 2024	» Uncertainty caused by rapid technological change » Leakage of client or confidential information » Hallucinations	» The duty of competency requires that lawyers keep abreast of any changes to the AI tools they use and the field of AI technology in general. » The duty of confidentiality requires that lawyers carefully assess the terms and conditions of AI tools and security practices of providers before entering client information. » The duties of diligence and candor require that lawyers double-check any generative AI-generated output before it is filed to a court and promptly disclose and correct any errors they find.
	Montana's Thirteenth Judicial District Local Rules of Practice of the District Court of the Thirteenth Judicial District of Montana 1 Jan. 2026	N/A	» Rule 35 requires lawyers that have used AI in a filing to identify the type of AI used and certify that every citation to the law and record is verified as accurate.
	District Court for the District of Nebraska Nebraska Civil Rules 1 Dec. 2024	N/A	» All parties using generative AI are responsible for the accuracy and reliability of their filings. All parties are also expected to verify the contents of their filings.
	New Hampshire Bar Association Understanding Generative Artificial Intelligence and the Potential for Discrimination and Bias 30 Oct. 2024	» Bias perpetuation	» The duties of competency and diligence require lawyers to be knowledgeable of how the AI systems they use function and are changing — at least on a general level. » Lawyers are required to be knowledgeable of how algorithms become biased and how that bias can skew output.

	Resource	Risks identified	Recommendations
U.S.	New Jersey Supreme Court Legal Practice: Preliminary Guidelines on the Use of Artificial Intelligence by New Jersey Lawyers 24 Jan. 2024	» Hallucinations » Absence of transparency/trust » Leakage of client or confidential information	» The duties of competency and diligence require that lawyers double-check and verify the legal and factual accuracy of any generative AI output they rely on or submit. » The duty of candor requires lawyers to promptly disclose and correct any errors discovered in AI-generated filings to court. Lawyers must also ensure their colleagues and subordinates, including nonlawyers, are not inappropriately using AI. • While New Jersey does not impose an affirmative duty of disclosure, lawyers should disclose AI usage if asked by a client. Additionally, if a client cannot make an informed decision without knowing their lawyer has been using AI, the lawyer must also disclose AI usage. » Lawyers are responsible for ensuring the security of an AI system and the data input into it before entering nonpublic client information.
	State Bar of New Mexico Ethics Advisory Committee Formal Opinion 2024-004 24 Sept. 2024	» Uncertainty caused by rapid technological change » Leakage of client or confidential information » Hallucinations » Problematic billing practices	» The duties of competency and diligence require that lawyers keep abreast of changes to the law and the AI tools they use. They are required to have general knowledge of how the AI tools they use function. » Lawyers should carefully study both the privacy and security policies of the providers of the AI tools they are using. They should also anonymize any client data input into a generative AI tool to the greatest extent possible. To be absolutely safe, lawyers should get informed consent from their clients before inputting data into a generative AI tool. » The duty of diligence requires that lawyers double-check any AI-generated output they rely on or file before a court. Additionally, the duty of candor requires lawyers to promptly disclose any errors discovered in an AI-generated filing. • Lawyers should supervise their colleagues and subordinates and ensure they are not improperly using or relying on AI. » Lawyers are prohibited from billing hours saved by the use of generative AI. Any AI-related costs must be disclosed and agreed to by the client before the representation to be passed on to them. Alternatively, AI-related costs must accurately reflect actual costs incurred.

	Resource	Risks identified	Recommendations
U.S.	New York State Bar Association Report and Recommendations of the New York State Bar Association Task Force on Artificial Intelligence April 2024	» Hallucinations » Leakage of client or confidential information	» The duty of competency requires that lawyers understand how their AI tools function and their limitations and keep abreast of any changes to them. » The duty of diligence requires that lawyers double-check any AI-generated output they rely on or file with a court. » The duty of candor requires that lawyers promptly disclose any errors in AI-generated filings they discover. » Lawyers should be cautious when inputting confidential client information into generative AI.
	New York AB A8546 In committee assembly 20 May 2026; Died in committee 7 Jan. 2026	N/A	» Rule 2107(a): Any paper served or filed that has been drafted using generative AI must include a separate affidavit disclosing generative AI use and certifying that a human double-checked the accuracy of its contents.
	New York AB A9097 In committee assembly 12 Sept. 2025; Died in committee 7 Jan. 2026	N/A	» Rule 2107(b): Each court must inform all counsel and pro se litigants before it of the dangers of using generative AI. » Rule 2107(c): No paper drafted using generative AI can be filed before any court without the informed consent of the client. » Rule 2107(d): Any paper drafted using generative AI must be filed with a separate affidavit disclosing that generative AI was used and that a human verified the accuracy of its contents.
	New York AB A11723 In committee assembly 16 Sept. 2026	N/A	» § 4552(a): Communications or attorney work products ordinarily protected by the attorney-client privilege or otherwise not obtainable by another party do not lose their privileged or unobtainable character solely because they were entered into an AI tool. » (b): Prior to using AI, lawyers should provide and receive a signed form from their clients, authorizing them to use AI. » (d): The AI use form must explain the risks of using AI, including: • Hallucinated content • Inaccurate content • Unthorough review of case law • Poor or ill-advised legal strategy and arguments » (g): The AI use form does not free lawyers from the obligation to double-check AI output; this verification must be done by a human.

	Resource	Risks identified	Recommendations
U.S.	New York AB A06545 / SB 07263 Committed to rules 5 June 2026	N/A	» § 390-f(2)(a)(ii): Chatbot operators are prohibited from permitting chatbots to impersonate lawyers in such a way that would violate the rules against unlicensed practice of law if done by a natural person. » § 390-f(3): Chatbot operators must provide clear, conspicuous and explicit notice to users that they are interacting with an AI system.
	New York 2025-S10675 Referred to rules 5 Aug. 2026	N/A	» § 390-f(2)(a)(iii): Chatbot operators are prohibited from permitting chatbots to impersonate lawyers in such a way that would violate the rules against unlicensed practice of law if done by a natural person. » § 390-f(3): Chatbot operators must provide clear, conspicuous and explicit notice to users that they are interacting with an AI system.
	District Court for the Southern District of New York Bankruptcy Court Local Rules Effective 30 Sept. 2024	N/A	» Rule 9011-1(d): Litigants remain responsible for legal filings created using generative AI and for any inaccuracies therein.
	New York State Unified Court System Part 161. Use of Artificial Intelligence Technology Effective 1 June 2026	N/A	» Lawyers may use generative AI to create court filings provided that current court rules are being followed.
	North Carolina HB 1161 Last updated 4 May 2026	N/A	» § 7A-811: If any party to a case uses any form of generative AI in a court filing or appearance, the trial judge may dismiss the case without prejudice — regardless of if any errors, deepfakes or hallucinations are present. » § 7A-812: A party whose case has been dismissed under § 7A-811 may either remove all portions created using generative AI and resubmit it to the judge or make an appeal to the Court of Appeals if they believe the denial was erroneous. » § 7A-813: A party permitted to bring a new action to continue an initial case pursuant to § 7A-812 may not use any form of generative AI.

	Resource	Risks identified	Recommendations
U.S.	District Court for the Western District of North Carolina In re Use of Artificial Intelligence 18 June 2024	N/A	» All attorneys must file a certification with the court when filing a document that no AI was used in the drafting of that document — aside from AI tools integrated with common legal research engines — and that the filing's contents were verified by a human.
	North Carolina State Bar 2024 Ethics Opinion 1: Use of Artificial Intelligence in a Law Practice 1 Nov. 2024	» Hallucinations » Leakage of client or confidential information » Absence of transparency/trust » Problematic billing practices	» The duty of competency requires that lawyers generally educate themselves on how their AI tools function and the risks of using them. » The duty of diligence requires that lawyers double-check any generative AI output they rely on or file before a court. » Lawyers are required to exercise reasonable care and research the security and privacy practices of the vendor providing their generative AI tools before entering information into them. » North Carolina recommends against using public models. Lawyers are still held liable for content generated using in-house models. » Generally, lawyers are under no obligation to inform clients of routine uses of AI; they are obliged to inform clients of substantive uses of AI. » Lawyers are prohibited from billing hours saved by using generative AI.
	North Carolina Bar Association Beyond the Ban: Why Your Law Firm Needs a Realistic AI Policy in 2026 13 Jan. 2026	» Cybersecurity risks » Hallucinations » Absence of transparency/trust	» It is imperative that law firms implement at least a somewhat permissive AI policy, so that lawyers aren't encouraged to use unapproved and unsurveilled AI tools. » Firms must employ a human-in-the-loop structure for their AI usage, as the rules of competency, diligence and candor require that lawyers verify AI output. » Firms should update their engagement letters to ensure that clients are aware of AI usage related to their matter.
	North Dakota Court System Public Notice on the Use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) 1 June 2026	» Hallucinations » Leakage of client or confidential information	» Lawyers remain fully responsible for the accuracy of their work product. The duty of competency requires that they understand how the AI systems they use function, as well as their general limits. The duty of diligence requires lawyers to double-check AI-generated output for errors. The duty of candor requires that lawyers promptly disclose and correct any errors they discover in AI-generated output. » Lawyers remain responsible for the confidentiality of information entered into AI systems.

	Resource	Risks identified	Recommendations
U.S.	Ohio Board of Professional Conduct Artificial Intelligence for Lawyers and Judicial Officers April 2026	» Uncertainty caused by rapid technological change » Hallucinations » Leakage of client or confidential information » Absence of transparency/trust » Problematic billing practices	» The duty of competency requires that lawyers keep abreast of changes to the AI tools they use and the AI landscape in general. They also must continuously weigh the benefits and risks of using particular tools. » Both the duties of competency and diligence require that lawyers double-check any AI-generated output for errors before relying on or filing it. The duty of candor requires that lawyers promptly disclose and correct any errors detected in their filings. » Lawyers are required to exercise reasonable care when entering client information into AI systems. They are required to assess each AI tool they use to ensure the tools don't train models on or share the information they receive. » Lawyers are required to answer client questions about their AI usage. They are not required to automatically disclose routine AI usage but must disclose substantial AI usage. » Lawyers are prohibited from billing for hours saved by generative AI usage. If a lawyer uses a flat fee for their services, it must be reasonable in light of their generative AI usage.
	Oklahoma HB 2016 Introduced 3 Feb. 2025; Died in committee 12 Feb. 2025	N/A	» § 1(B): Where AI output is admitted as expert testimony, a human witness must testify that the output will help the trier of fact make their decision, was based on sufficient and pertinent data, is the product of reliable methods, and reflects a reliable application of the methods to the facts of the case. » § 2(B): Where AI output is admitted into evidence and would be considered hearsay if introduced by a human, the output's accuracy may be attacked and supported as if it was offered by a human.
	Oklahoma HB 4348 Introduced 2 Feb. 2026; Died in committee 3 Feb. 2026	N/A	» § 1: Lawyers and legal advisors are prohibited from knowingly introducing or encouraging AI manipulated evidence — including information generated or altered to be false or misleading. They must also exercise due diligence in verifying the accuracy of any generative AI output they rely on. » § 2: If a party suspects their opponent has falsified evidence or information submitted, including through the use of AI, the party must raise these concerns at a pretrial hearing. If an attorney knows or has reason to know that any information they submitted is false, they must disclose this fact or face disciplinary action.

	Resource	Risks identified	Recommendations
U.S.	United States Bankruptcy Court Western District of Oklahoma In re Pleadings Using Artificial Intelligence 25 July 2023	N/A	» Parties submitting filings partially or entirely created using generative AI must notify the court, certify that they verified the accuracy of the filing and confirm that no confidential information was disclosed.
	Oklahoma Court of Criminal Appeals Order Adopting New Procedural Rule in the Court of Criminal Appeals 18 Feb. 2026	N/A	» Rule 1.17(a) requires lawyers using generative AI to draft documents filed to the Court of Criminal Appeals to verify the accuracy of the filing's contents.
	Oregon State Bar Formal Opinion No. 2025-205 Artificial Intelligence Tools February 2025	» Uncertainty caused by rapid technological change » Hallucinations » Leakage of client or confidential information » Absence of transparency/trust » Problematic billing practices	» The duty of competency requires that lawyers understand how the AI systems they use function and their limitations. They must also keep up to date with any changes to the AI system they use. » The duties of competency and diligence require that lawyers check generative AI output they rely on or file are legally and factually accurate. The duty of candor requires they promptly disclose and correct any errors they find in generative AI output. » Lawyers are required to confirm that any AI tools they use do not communicate confidential client information to third parties. » Lawyers should consider disclosing and discussing AI usage with their clients. » Lawyers are prohibited from billing for hours saved by generative AI usage. They are also prohibited from passing on AI costs accounted as overhead, unless clients are informed of and consent to such fees.

	Resource	Risks identified	Recommendations
U.S.	Pennsylvania HR 331 Last updated 29 Sept. 2025	N/A	» The House of Representatives urged the Pennsylvania Supreme Court to adopt rules, procedures and educational guidelines that: • Require all legal findings to include a signed affidavit certifying all citations have been reviewed for accuracy. • Classify the citation of false authorities as malpractice or professional misconduct. • Direct licensing authorities and bar associations incorporate training on AI risks and ethical usage into continuing legal education requirements. • Require judges to receive specialized training and education on the limitations, risks and ethical implications of using AI. • Encourage courts to adopt rules that prohibit the use of unverified AI systems. • Direct bar associations and licensing boards to update continuing legal education and ethics requirements to include instruction on risks and acceptable AI uses. • Provide ethical guidance for judges regarding the use of AI-generated content in decision-making, legal reasoning or opinion drafting. • Empower disciplinary boards to impose escalating penalties on attorneys and judges who improperly use AI.
	Pennsylvania Bar Association and Philadelphia Bar Association Ethical Issues Regarding the Use of Artificial Intelligence August 2024	» Hallucinations » Absence of transparency/trust » Leakage of client or confidential information	» The duty of competency requires that lawyers understand how the AI tools they use generally work and to stay abreast of any changes to them. » The duty of diligence requires lawyers to double-check any AI output they rely on or file before a court for errors. » The duty of candor requires that lawyers promptly disclose and correct any errors discovered in generative AI output filed in court. » Lawyers must inform their clients of the benefits, risks and limits of the generative AI they plan to use over the course of representation. Both the lawyer and client must decide if generative AI is necessary for the representation. » Lawyers must carefully check whether the AI systems they use adequately protect and keep confidential information private before entering any into them.

	Resource	Risks identified	Recommendations
U.S.	Rhode Island Supreme Court In re Amendments to Article V, Rule 1.1 of the Supreme Court Rules (Professional Conduct) and Adoption of Interim Generative AI Guidelines 17 June 2026	» Uncertainty caused by rapid technological change » Hallucinations » Absence of transparency/trust » Problematic billing practices » Leakage of client or confidential information » Bias perpetuation	» The duty of competency requires that lawyers keep abreast of any changes with the AI tools they use and continuously weigh the benefits and risks of using these technologies. » The duty of competency requires lawyers to ensure the generative AI tools they use assist them in providing competent representation. The duty of diligence requires that lawyers double-check generative AI output they rely on and make any final legal judgments. Judges also must be wary of errors in filed documents. » Lawyers are not affirmatively required to disclose all generative AI use. They are only required to affirmatively disclose significant generative AI uses and must disclose generative AI usage when prompted by a client. » Lawyers are prohibited from billing clients for time saved through the use of and/or for the time spent learning about generative AI. Generative AI operating expenses are treated as overhead and cannot be passed on to the client. » Prior to using a generative AI model, lawyers are required to examine the model's terms of use and ensure they contain enforceable data privacy and data security measures. Consultation with experts is also encouraged. » Lawyers and judges must be aware of the material used to train the generative AI tools that they use and be vigilant for biased output. Judges should also generally avoid receiving ex parte communications and external influence through generative AI output.
	South Carolina HB 5138 Introduced 10 Feb. 2026	N/A	» § 39-80-30(A)(1)(b): Chatbot providers may not state or imply that their chatbots are endorsed by or equivalent to a licensed legal professional.
	Supreme Court of South Carolina Re: Interim Policy on the Use of Generative Artificial Intelligence 25 March 2025	N/A	» Judges and court officials may only use generative AI tools approved by the South Carolina Supreme Court or South Carolina Court Administration. All memos, orders, opinions and other documents created using generative AI must be overseen and verified by human personnel. » Generative AI tools cannot process confidential information without express authorization under applicable rules or policies. » Lawyers must certify that their use of generative AI does not impact the confidentiality of client data and any AI-generated filings they submit are accurate.

	Resource	Risks identified	Recommendations
U.S.	Utah State Bar Using ChatGPT in Our Practices: Ethical Considerations 2023	» Absence of transparency/trust » Leakage of client or confidential information » Problematic billing practices » Hallucinations	» Lawyers should discuss generative AI usage with their clients, covering both the benefits and risks involved. They should also refrain from using generative AI unless they receive informed consent to do so. » Lawyers should refrain from sharing confidential information with any AI system, especially those that collect and train on data they receive. » Lawyers are prohibited from billing for hours saved by generative AI usage. » The duty of competence requires that lawyers remain knowledgeable of the limitations of their AI tools and that they check their generative AI output for errors.
	Vermont Judiciary Committee on Artificial Intelligence and the Courts First Annual Report 1 March 2025	» AI-fabricated evidence » Uncertainty caused by rapid technological change » Absence of transparency/trust » Leakage of client or confidential information » Problematic billing practices	» Judges must separately weigh whether evidence produced by AI is relevant and reliable and if explaining the concept to a jury would waste time and resources. » The duty of competency requires that lawyers keep abreast of changes in the AI tools they use and to continuously weigh the risks and benefits of using them. » Lawyers are highly recommended to disclose their intent to use generative AI and the nature and extent of the use. » Lawyers should carefully examine a generative AI model's terms of service and understand how and whether that model stores or uses data before entering client information. » Lawyers are prohibited from billing for hours saved by generative AI usage. Any extra costs associated with AI must be communicated with the client beforehand.
	Virginia State Bar Legal Ethics — Guidance on Generative Artificial Intelligence	» Leakage of client or confidential information » Absence of transparency/trust » Hallucinations » Problematic billing practices	» Lawyers should carefully review the terms of service of any generative AI tools they use and ensure that their security and privacy policies properly protect entered information. » There is no per se requirement to inform a client about the use of generative AI during their representation. » The duty of competency requires that lawyers understand how their AI tools function and keep abreast of any changes to them. The duty of diligence requires that lawyers double-check any generative AI output they rely on for errors. » Lawyers are prohibited from billing for hours saved by generative AI usage. They may bill for costs associated with generative AI if permitted by the fee agreement.

	Resource	Risks identified	Recommendations
U.S.	Virginia Supreme Court Legal Ethics Opinion 1901: Reasonable Fees and the Use of Generative Artificial Intelligence 24 Nov. 2025	» Problematic billing practices	» Lawyers are prohibited from billing for hours saved using generative AI.
	Washington State Bar Association Artificial Intelligence-Enabled Tools in Law Practice 20 Nov. 2025	» Uncertainty caused by rapid technological change » Hallucinations » Leakage of client or confidential information » Absence of transparency/trust » Problematic billing practices	» The duty of competency requires that lawyers keep abreast of any changes in the AI tools they use and their terms of service. AI tools must be continuously reevaluated to make sure they comply with ethical rules. » The duty of competency requires that lawyers know how their AI tools function and their limitations. The duty of diligence requires that lawyers double-check the accuracy of any generative AI output on which they rely. The duty of candor requires that lawyers promptly disclose and correct any errors they discover in AI-generated output. » Lawyers should carefully evaluate an AI provider's data security and data privacy assurances before entering client information. Entering sensitive information may require obtaining client informed consent. » Lawyers are required to respond to client questions and follow client requests regarding AI usage. Affirmative disclosure of AI usage is unnecessary where AI tools are tailored for and used in routine legal practice and contain adequate confidentiality protections. » Lawyers are prohibited from billing for hours saved through the use of generative AI.
	Office of Disciplinary Counsel West Virginia Judicial Tower Legal Ethics Opinion 24-01— Artificial Intelligence 14 June 2024	» Hallucinations » Absence of transparency/trust » Leakage of client or confidential information	» The duty of competency requires that lawyers have a basic understanding of how their AI systems work. The duty of diligence requires that lawyers carefully double-check any AI-generated output they rely on for errors. The duty of candor requires that lawyers promptly disclose and correct any errors they find in AI output. » A lawyer's duty to communicate with their client includes their decisions to use generative AI over the course of the representation. A lawyer should obtain consent from the client before relying on generative AI. » Lawyers should carefully examine their AI provider's information collection, use and security policies before entering client information into an AI model.

	Resource	Risks identified	Recommendations
U.S.	Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit Circuit Rule Revisions 2025 1 Dec. 2025	N/A	» Committee Note to Rule 32-1 allows filings to the court to be created using generative AI, provided that they include the standard signed attestation that the filer has reviewed and takes responsibility for the contents.
	Patent and Trademark Office Guidance on the Use of Artificial Intelligence-Based Tools in Practice Before the United States Patent and Trademark Office 11 April 2024	N/A	» AI often produces inaccurate or incomplete statements or outright hallucinates information. Independent human verification of any AI output is required. » AI systems may use confidential information as training data and risk leaking that confidential information in future output. » The USPTO's existing rules and policies surrounding practice still apply when AI is used: • The duty of candor and good faith require good faith when dealing with the USPTO and the duty of disclosure. • The signature requirement: Patent lawyers are required to apply their own signature to any filings, asserting that everything in them has been verified by them as true. • The confidentiality of information: Practitioners should not reveal confidential client information except in highly specific circumstances. • Foreign filing and export restrictions • The USPTO electronic systems policies • Duties owed to clients — these namely include the American Bar Association's Model Rules of Professional Conduct
U.K.	Courts and Tribunals Judiciary Artificial Intelligence, Guidance for Judicial Office Holders 31 Oct. 2025	» Lack of human judgment » Leakage of client or confidential information » Hallucinations » Bias perpetuation	» Lawyers should understand how their AI tools function, which databases they were trained on and how to write effective prompts. As a baseline, they should never uncritically trust AI output. » Lawyers should not enter any information that is not already public knowledge into a public AI system. » Lawyers should double-check the accuracy of any AI-generated output before relying on it. » Lawyers should be aware of which data their AI tools were trained on and how they might introduce bias into their output.

	Resource	Risks identified	Recommendations
U.K.	International Bar Association and the Center for AI and Digital Policy The Future is Now: Artificial Intelligence and the Legal Profession September 2024	» Leakage of client or confidential information » Uncertainty caused by rapid technological change » Absence of transparency/trust » Hallucinations » Problematic billing practices » Diminished human judgment	» Lawyers must stay informed about the data retention, usage and security practices of the AI tools they use. » Lawyers must keep abreast of changes in the law and the technology they use. » Lawyers must diligently honor any professional commitments made during representation. » Lawyers must maintain full control over their submissions to court. In some cases, this could impose an obligation to be fully responsible for generative AI output. » Lawyers should not bill clients for time saved through generative AI usage and should avoid generating unnecessary work. » Law firms must be careful to ensure humans remain in the loop regarding their legal responsibilities. They should also ensure AI systems that violate human rights, such as through the use of social scoring or mass surveillance, are not used.
	Solicitors Regulation Authority Effective Supervision Last updated 12 June 2026	N/A	» Firms should adequately supervise the use of AI by their attorneys. AI output must be subject to human review, scrutiny and professional judgment.
	The Law Society Generative AI – the essentials 1 Oct. 2025	» Hallucinations » IP infringement » Leakage of client or confidential information » Cybersecurity risks	» Lawyers should carefully fact-check any AI output before relying on them, carry out due diligence on the AI tools they use and ensure appropriate staff protocols and guidance are provided around employees' use of such tools. » They should be aware of any IP conflicts rising from their use of AI output. • Lawyers should also consider contacting their web service providers about rate limiting website requests to prevent scraping on their firm's webpages. » Lawyers should not enter any information that is not already public knowledge into a public AI system. They should also scrub any documents of metadata before entering them into an AI tool. » Lawyers should check any documents they want to use AI on for any hidden or malicious prompts.

	Resource	Risks identified	Recommendations
U.K.	The Law Society of Scotland Guide to Generative AI October 2024	» Hallucinations » Leakage of client or confidential information » IP infringement » Absence of transparency » Diminished human judgment » Environmental degradation	» Lawyers should double-check any generative AI output they rely on for accuracy and timeliness. This task should not be outsourced to another AI system. Lawyers are ultimately responsible for overseeing their AI systems. » Lawyers should avoid inputting confidential information into public AI tools. They also should examine the risks of disclosure before inputting any information into any AI system. Anonymization may provide some protection, but it isn't foolproof. » Firms should examine how IP-protected information input into AI systems will be processed. » Lawyers should have a basic understanding of how an AI system functions before its adoption. » Lawyers should always maintain decision-making independence and be aware of the societal impact of widespread AI usage. » Firms adopting AI tools should consider the environmental implications of these systems.

*Denotes that the document was translated to English using Microsoft 365 Copilot or another automated translation tool.

Contact

Vasilios Antonopoulos
Westin Research Fellow, IAPP
vantonopoulos@iapp.org

Müge Fazlioglu
Principal Researcher, Privacy Law and Policy, IAPP
muge@iapp.org

Joe Jones
Research and Insights Director, IAPP
jjones@iapp.org

For further inquiries, please reach out to research@iapp.org.

Follow the IAPP on social media

Updated October 2026.

The IAPP disclaims all warranties, expressed or implied, with respect to the contents of this material, including any warranties of accuracy, merchantability or fitness for a particular purpose. Nothing herein should be construed as legal advice.

© 2026 IAPP. All rights reserved.