

Future of the International Law Courts

Written & Prepared by Millicent Greetham & Elena Beer

30th August 2017. Dubai International Financial Centre Courts, P.O Box: 507048
Dubai, United Arab Emirates

Disclaimer: The views and opinions expressed in this article are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the official policy or position of the DIFC Courts of any other agency.

Looking ahead to the prospects of the commercial courts, it seems most likely that cases will be handled with a heavy use of technology.

Online Legal Advice

Arguably the future of legal advice is online. Despite this, there are various options in which this may manifest itself and it is plausible to believe that people may receive this advice either via an online platform, allowing people to get in touch with legal experts, or a website, in which the platform itself, gives automated answers through algorithms. Currently there are websites which promote an open forum where volunteers may give their opinions on a person's case. Websites offering such advice are those which may inform you of how strong your argument is and communicate advice about the courts, yet, volunteers from these sites may not necessarily come from a legal background. As a result of this lack of reliability many people would still opt for a more traditional way of seeking legal advice and would be more confident and at ease knowing they had accepted advice from a fully practising lawyer as opposed to a volunteer's opinion online. However, disruptor apps such as 'DoNotPay' offer an automated questionnaire whereby the system will provide them with their legal stance and hopefully in the future be able to provide them with much more: Including what further action to take. These websites and apps are made through the workings of the law and can therefore be trusted by clients. This could be suggested to powerful law firms wanting to expand their pro bono work, as it is an easy access to opinions about their case automated or not. If firms feel threatened by the fact that many of their clients may go and visit this website instead of seeking professional advice, they could set up a firewall to secure the visitors to this page would only be clients confirmed by the pro bono department, which will get access to a password or any other form that is seen fit.

Online Court Assistance

Although many speculate the entirety of the court to be online, it can be predicted that the future of the courtroom may not follow this structure completely, but will introduce assistance used from online platforms. To further the efficiencies of the courtroom procedure, a secure online platform could offer people the ability to book court attendances online, via a website which could display a virtual calendar whereby people could see what days the court are busy without the court breaching confidentiality. This would be a less stressful process for the client instead of the modern equivalent of having to move around their whole schedule for a particular date the Court sees fit. Various pre-trial process' could be handled online an example being the pre-trial questionnaires, which could be submitted online and can then be

automatically submitted into their electronic case with ease.

Virtual Courts

Although not migrating online yet, the courtrooms seem ready to adapt to the future, already adopting video evidence and smart video conferencing. These tools allow people to be in Court from wherever they want in the world, allowing those without timetable flexibility to show up to Court appearances. However, looking to the future, if both parties cannot make the date, the Court may choose to take the trial completely through a platform such as 'Skype'. However, group calls may be tedious with so many people and hard to pass documents through to each other throughout the discussions. Yet, it still may be possible that a legal 'Skype' equivalent may surface. This would show complete confidentiality when transferring documents through the platform and will use a setup which can hold many people in one chatroom, an example of this being the first cyber-court set up in Hangzhou thanks to Alibaba (an online marketplace company). The disputes handled in Hangzhou Internet Court are solely based on disputes about the Internet. As well as a platform in which trials can be held, it serves as a platform that can place submitted complaints or evidence into electronic files.

ODR

ODR is already being used widely but with few people knowing of this alternative option it is still in the primary stages of being set up. It is doubtful that every dispute will be handled via ODR as there will always be those who would much prefer to take their case to a physical court and have the ease of knowing their case is being taken seriously. Although ODR isn't currently that popular, mostly because of customers lack of knowledge but also because of the fact that those who have bigger cases will tend to need to go through the original proceedings, unlike smaller cases which are perfect for ODR. ODR is essentially the online equivalent of ADR which the government are trying to encourage the use of ADR as better ADR and easier access to it should be good for all businesses committed to giving their customers the best possible service. While ODR isn't limited to cases arising out of business to consumer online transactions, it seems to be a particularly adapted for these disputes since it is logical to use the same medium (internet) when parties are located far from one another. ODR offered increased access to information and justice, a great value in society and of particular importance in emerging economies, conflict zones and remote places where individuals do not even have the benefit of judiciaries to resolve their disputes.

Artificial Intelligence

Although far in the future, AI is a possibility in which a software program will be able to analyse legal evidence and weigh up moral questions of right and wrong. However, if AI is to be taken seriously there will need to be a change within the government. Currently, AI is in place in Wisconsin. A past example showcasing an AI rule would be Wisconsin vs. Loomis. Here Loomis argued that the government buys algorithms from private business' rather than creating their own, therefore have limited knowledge as to how the machine makes decisions, this could mean that it may show racism or sexism etc as the algorithm would be set up from a private company's perspective on right and wrong and the law. As well as this, there has been no federal law set in place which states the need to evaluate these algorithms. However, it can be argued that in this case, the 'COMPAS' (an AI device) was only to aid the judge in his final decision and to weigh up Loomis' risk factor. In the future, to

allow those in the Court to feel as though they are being treated fairly, AI will need to be heavily inspected by the government and all algorithms to be explained and made transparent before the case. This may mean that how the legal system is taught will differ as lawyers may need to learn to understand software code to refer this back to their client.

Further in the future, there is speculation AI could take over the whole judicial system altogether, if programmed by the government, as it will give an impartial view on the case based on statistics and algorithms without the prejudice that some feel when in Court, and may prefer AI as everybody will be treated like equals. However, some believe that some cases are heavily based on context and human emotion which people believe will be doubtful to find in such machines. If AI was made recognised by the courts globally, they would want to give people an option as to what judge they would want: AI or Human? Yet, those with cases with the need for sympathising as there is less hard evidence, will lean towards a human judge and those who are statistically sure of their stance will go to an AI Judge. Therefore people will go the judge which they think will help their case the most, making it less fair as the other party will obviously feel they have a harder time making their case, this in itself may start more disputes that the court will have to handle. As well as this, there may be a subconscious prejudice when going to a human judge as they may think that if the party were sure of their case, they would go to an AI Judge. Furthermore, the AI Judge software needs to be prepared for irregularities in cases and to be prepared for cases that it has not yet seen before and although the AI Judges will have been programmed to understand context, those in Court may not feel as comfortable in trusting their case with such a machine.

Disruptors

From chatbots to tech-powered legal advice, startup transforming legal services are looking to provide an alternative to the legal help we would turn to at this current point due to our dependence on all things technology based. LawBot being an example of offering out free advice to victims of crime. It only covers 26 criminal offences and isn't necessarily looking to replace lawyers or take a case forward, rather the idea is to help people find out how to law applies to their situation, for example whether they have been the victim of a crime. Like another example of a disruptor, DoNotPay, LawBot takes the user through a series of questions and, if it finds a match for an offence it creates a draft letter.

However legal disruption is having some positive impacts. It wasn't too long ago that time consuming groundwork and necessary research for cases was completed offline with the use of filing cabinets and libraries. Today with files and libraries bring online, lawyers can now complete the tedious work of preparing for a case in the comforts of their own home. Disruptors are good from a customer's perspective as lawyers are easy to access, information is readily available and costs are substantially reduced. There is most likely to be a big push towards virtual law offices that offer clients the convenience of conducting business online, such as a 'legal pay-pal' to handle money for lawsuits and disputes. The race to win clients will likely be conquered by those with the most tech-savvy legal procedures.

Adapting to Big and Small Businesses

Depending on what route the Court decides to take to adapt to the future, they will have many options to adapt to big and small businesses as well. Through electronic filing it is

made much easier to split cases, since someone can decide whether to enter their claim to a Small or Large claims section and it will be sent to the according department. In the small claims department there is much more regularity in the claims made and usually have been seen many times before, therefore there may be more flexibility in how the claim may be handled. Because of this regularity, it is easy to setup algorithms online or through AI which can handle these smaller cases. However, when entering your claim to the large claim section it may give a link where you would enter the website from a different perspective. This may include: replacing the settings of the online calendar to allow you to pick a week instead of a day that both parties are free to set up a trial schedule (in accordance to the courts availability made clear on the virtual calendar) . There may also be places on the large claims version of the website where one can send the other party interrogatories as well as get in contact with them to discuss a stipulation.

To view the supporting video visit : <https://vimeo.com/247469612>

ENDS 30.08.17