

# AI FOR SPEEDY JUSTICE IN AMERICA: EVALUATING LEGAL WORLD AS A SCALABLE MODEL TO NARROW THE U.S. CIVIL JUSTICE GAP

Madiha Afzal

Ph.D. Scholar in Shariah & Law, Faculty of Shariah and Law, International Islamic University Islamabad Co-Founder & CEO Legal World (Pakistan's First AI-Powered Legal Operating System)

[madihahamaad143@gmail.com](mailto:madihahamaad143@gmail.com)

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17614962>

## Keywords

Access to Justice; Civil Justice Reform ; Legal World; Artificial Intelligence; Online Dispute Resolution; Self-Represented Litigants; Judicial Innovation; Court Modernization; U.S. Legal System; National Interest Waiver; Justice Technology and Ethics.

## Article History

Received: 11 September 2025

Accepted: 21 October 2025

Published: 04 November 2025

Copyright @Author

Corresponding Author: \*

Madiha Afzal

## Abstract

Across the United States, the civil justice system remains weighed down by escalating backlogs, unaffordable legal services, and an expanding population of self-represented litigants. Millions of citizens, particularly from low- and middle-income groups, continue to experience unresolved civil issues because of structural barriers to timely and affordable legal assistance. These persistent challenges weaken confidence in the justice system and limit the fulfillment of the constitutional right to “speedy and fair” proceedings. This research explores Legal World an artificial-intelligence-based legal operating framework originally developed in Pakistan as a potential model for bridging America’s access-to-justice divide. The platform combines guided case intake, automated document preparation, multilingual legal support tools, online mediation and arbitration, and data-driven case analytics into a seven-layer architecture that supports both litigants and courts. Designed around transparency, human oversight, and “technological due process,” Legal World ensures that AI complements rather than replaces human judgment. Through comparative examination of international initiatives including the United Kingdom’s Online Courts, Canada’s Civil Resolution Tribunal, and China’s Smart Court ecosystem the study identifies adaptable design and policy features suitable for the U.S. environment. It further proposes a court-supervised “judicial sandbox” for controlled deployment, similar to the innovation frameworks pioneered in Utah and Arizona. Locating Legal World in the United States would also deliver national benefits by generating taxable global revenue, creating advanced research and technology jobs, and positioning America as a global leader in ethical, justice-oriented AI. The initiative directly supports the objectives of the EB-2 National Interest Waiver (NIW) by demonstrating substantial merit, nationwide importance, and tangible public benefit. The paper concludes that Legal World offers a practical pathway toward an AI-assisted, rights-preserving system of speedy and equitable justice.

## INTRODUCTION

### Background

The civil justice system in the United States continues to experience significant procedural

congestion and widening inequality in legal representation. Reports by the Legal Services Corporation (2022) and the American Bar Association (2023) indicate that millions of Americans encounter serious civil problems such as housing disputes, consumer debt, or family-law matters without receiving adequate legal support. Limited legal-aid funding, rising litigation costs, and the prevalence of self-represented litigants have intensified court delays and weakened public confidence in judicial institutions. These systemic pressures challenge the nation's long-standing constitutional commitment to speedy and fair adjudication. In an era shaped by digital transformation, modernising procedural frameworks through responsible artificial-intelligence adoption has become both an operational and ethical necessity.

## Purpose of the Study

This paper examines Legal World, an AI-enabled legal-operating system originally conceptualised and implemented in Pakistan, as a practical model for addressing the American civil-justice deficit. Combining guided case intake, automated documentation, legal navigators, online dispute-resolution workflows, and analytics dashboards, Legal World exemplifies an integrated approach to access-to-justice reform. The study assesses its potential to complement U.S. court modernisation initiatives and proposes a policy roadmap for adapting the platform within the American regulatory and constitutional landscape.

## Research Questions

1. In what specific ways can artificial intelligence enhance accessibility, affordability, and timeliness within the United States civil-justice system?
2. Which functional elements of the Legal World architecture most effectively respond to the structural causes of the American justice gap?
3. What legal, ethical, and procedural safeguards are necessary to ensure compliance with U.S. constitutional and due-process standards?
4. How could registering Legal World Inc. in the United States contribute to national economic

growth, technological advancement, and the broader public interest?

## 2. Literature Review

### The U.S. Civil Justice Gap and the Pro Se Crisis

Empirical research consistently highlights the widening gap between citizens' legal needs and the capacity of existing justice institutions to address them. The Legal Services Corporation's 2022 Justice Gap Report revealed that over 90 per cent of low-income Americans receive insufficient or no professional legal assistance for civil disputes. At the same time, most state courts now handle a majority of cases involving self-represented litigants (pro se parties), particularly in housing, family, and consumer matters. The American Bar Association (2023) and the National Center for State Courts (NCSC) warn that this imbalance leads to procedural inefficiency, reduced case quality, and erosion of public trust. The judicial system's limited technological integration further intensifies these structural challenges, creating a cycle of delay, high cost, and unequal outcomes. These findings underscore an urgent need for innovative, technology-enabled solutions capable of providing legal guidance and streamlining case management without compromising fairness.

### AI and Legal Technology in U.S. Courts

Over the last decade, several U.S. jurisdictions have piloted artificial intelligence and digital tools within their judicial frameworks. The Utah State Courts pioneered Online Dispute Resolution (ODR) for small claims and traffic cases, offering a web-based negotiation and settlement pathway accessible to unrepresented parties. Similarly, Arizona's Alternative Business Structure (ABS) model allowed limited non-lawyer ownership in legal-service delivery, encouraging private investment and innovation in justice technology. Reports from the NCSC and the Pew Charitable Trusts demonstrate that well-designed ODR systems reduce default judgments, improve resolution times, and increase user satisfaction. However, these pilots remain fragmented, and few states have implemented a unified national framework. Scholars note that to achieve systemic reform, courts must move from isolated

experiments to integrated, data-driven ecosystems that combine AI-enabled triage, document automation, and analytics with judicial oversight and ethical safeguards.

### **Comparative Global Experience**

Global justice systems provide valuable lessons in how AI can enhance procedural efficiency while preserving due process. In the United Kingdom, the Her Majesty's Courts and Tribunals Service (HMCTS) launched online civil money-claims portals that allow digital filing, negotiation, and settlement. Their "assisted-digital" model ensures access for individuals lacking technological literacy. The Civil Resolution Tribunal (CRT) in British Columbia, Canada, represents another success story, resolving small-value disputes entirely online through guided pathways and integrated ODR. In contrast, China's Smart Courts Initiative incorporates AI in evidence management, judgment drafting, and predictive analytics, demonstrating technological capability but raising legitimate concerns about transparency and accountability. Meanwhile, Pakistan's Legal World platform showcases a balanced approach that prioritises explainable AI, human-in-the-loop review, and procedural fairness. Collectively, these experiences illustrate that AI adoption succeeds when embedded within legal safeguards, accessibility design, and phased implementation.

### **Ethical, Constitutional, and Policy Considerations**

The expansion of AI into judicial functions has prompted significant debate over its constitutional and ethical implications. Danielle Citron's (2008) concept of "technological due process" argues that algorithmic systems affecting rights must provide transparency, explainability, and opportunities for human review. Remus and Levy (2016) caution that while AI can automate repetitive legal tasks, uncritical reliance risks eroding professional judgment and accountability. Richard Susskind (2019) contends that technology, when designed for inclusivity, can extend access to justice rather than diminish it, provided that core human values reasoning, empathy, and fairness remain central. Contemporary policy discussions in the U.S. echo

these principles, calling for ethical AI frameworks, bias testing, and court-supervised innovation sandboxes. Within this context, the Legal World model aligns with emerging best practices: its AI modules are auditable, its decision support remains non-determinative, and its design complies with the due-process obligations enshrined in both American constitutional law and global human-rights standards.

### **3. Methodology**

This study adopts a doctrinal-comparative research approach, integrating legal analysis with a policy-evaluation framework. The doctrinal component examines U.S. constitutional provisions, state-court procedural rules, and judicial innovation policies to determine how artificial intelligence can be responsibly introduced into the American civil-justice system. It also analyses sandbox models particularly those implemented in Utah and Arizona to evaluate how controlled experimentation can balance innovation with procedural safeguards.

The comparative dimension situates the American justice context alongside successful digital reforms in Pakistan, the United Kingdom, Canada, and China, extracting policy lessons on transparency, human oversight, and data governance. This cross-jurisdictional analysis clarifies how Legal World's architecture comprising guided intake, triage automation and analytic dashboards can be adapted to U.S. procedural and regulatory structures.

From a policy-evaluation perspective, the research maps Legal World's seven functional layers onto specific U.S. use-cases including housing disputes, small-claims litigation, and family-law proceedings. These domains were selected because they collectively account for a significant portion of court caseloads and involve a high percentage of self-represented litigants.

Methodologically, the paper employs a descriptive-analytical structure rather than empirical fieldwork. It relies on secondary data and verified institutional sources, such as the Legal Services Corporation's 2022 Justice Gap Report, Pew Charitable Trusts' 2021 ODR studies, and National Center for State Courts publications. This evidence base supports

both qualitative reasoning and data-driven argumentation. The approach ensures that the findings remain conceptually rigorous, contextually relevant, and compliant with academic standards for law-and-technology research.

#### 4. The Legal World Model

##### Overview and Architecture

Legal World operates as a comprehensive, AI-enabled legal operating system designed to digitise, simplify, and accelerate core judicial and administrative processes. Its structure integrates multiple intelligent components within a unified platform: Lex AI (the natural-language engine for legal interpretation and drafting), automated document-generation modules, pre-vetted legal templates, and an extensive AI-assisted legal dictionary that contextualises statutory and case-law terminology. Supplementary tools include workflow-based case management, automated invoicing and billing, and performance analytics that track procedural timelines, resolution rates, and system efficiency. Together, these features constitute a modular ecosystem that can be tailored to diverse jurisdictions while maintaining transparency, auditability, and legal compliance. When deployed within a U.S. setting, this architecture can support judicial administrators, legal-aid providers, and self-represented litigants through unified dashboards. The system's adaptability allows it to integrate with state-court case-management software or to operate as an independent service portal under court supervision, promoting procedural uniformity across multiple jurisdictions.

##### Alignment with U.S. Due-Process Principles

The design of Legal World is anchored in constitutional compliance and technological due process, ensuring that automation strengthens rather than diminishes individual rights. Every AI-generated recommendation is accompanied by explainability documentation, detailing data sources and decision logic. Users are notified whenever AI assistance is applied, fulfilling the obligation of informed transparency. Moreover, the system incorporates a mandatory human-in-the-loop review process for all substantive decisions

affecting legal rights, upholding the right to contest and appeal outcomes. Legal World's governance model aligns with Articles guaranteeing fair hearing and equal protection, analogous to the procedural guarantees under the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments of the U.S. Constitution. By embedding audit logs, ethical AI oversight boards, and regular bias-testing protocols, the platform operationalises the principles of accountability and fairness that underlie the American rule of law. Thus, its integration into U.S. courts would expand access to justice while safeguarding the foundational tenets of due process.

#### 5. Analysis and Discussion

##### Mapping Legal World to the U.S. Access-to-Justice Framework

To evaluate Legal World's potential impact in the American context, this study applies the six-dimension A2J framework—availability, accessibility, affordability, timeliness, quality, and enforceability.

**Availability:** Legal World expands the supply of legal resources through cloud-based document automation, guided legal tools, and remote case-management access.

**Accessibility:** Its multilingual interface, available in English and Urdu, combined with adaptive plain-language explanations, reduces procedural barriers for self-represented litigants and low-literacy users. Mobile and web compatibility allow participation from rural or bandwidth-limited communities.

**Affordability:** Automation of repetitive drafting and filing tasks lowers transaction costs for courts and users alike. By decreasing attorney time per matter, the platform can make limited-scope representation economically viable for small-value disputes.

**Timeliness:** Built-in scheduling tools, electronic notifications, and structured online negotiation channels compress procedural timelines and discourage unnecessary adjournments.

**Quality:** AI-assisted document checking, citation verification, and analytics dashboards enhance procedural accuracy while preserving human discretion in adjudication.

**Enforceability:** Automated generation of clear, standardised orders and compliance reminders supports execution of judgments and reduces post-decree confusion. Collectively, these features indicate that Legal World can strengthen all six A2J dimensions when aligned with U.S. procedural safeguards.

### Potential Implementation in the United States

Effective deployment within the U.S. justice ecosystem would require collaborative integration across three institutional tiers: state courts, legal-aid organisations, and community technology partners. State trial courts could utilise Legal World's document-automation and analytics modules within their case-management systems, while legal-aid providers could offer guided intake and triage portals linked to the same data backbone. Such interoperability would minimise duplication of effort and ensure procedural consistency across jurisdictions. For low-income and self-represented users, the system can operate as a digital legal-aid kiosk providing step-by-step filing assistance, case updates by SMS or email, and referrals to pro bono or mediation services. A multilingual interface initially English and Urdu, with expansion to other prevalent U.S. languages would promote inclusivity. Implementation should follow a phased approach: pilot programmes in high-volume civil areas (housing, small claims, family law), evaluation through user-satisfaction and cycle-time metrics, and gradual scaling under court supervision. Partnerships with law schools and bar associations could further support user training, ethical oversight, and academic research.

### Risk Mitigation and Ethical Safeguards

Integrating AI into judicial workflows carries identifiable risks bias, opacity, digital exclusion, and procedural over-automation. To address these, the U.S. rollout of Legal World should be governed by a robust risk-management protocol:

**Bias Audits:** Pre-deployment and periodic testing of algorithms for disparate impact across demographic categories, with transparent publication of results.

**Sandbox Testing:** Controlled pilot environments under court and regulatory supervision, modelled on Utah's and Arizona's innovation sandboxes, allowing incremental evaluation before statewide use.

**Assisted-Digital Services:** Physical help-desks and telephone support for individuals lacking digital access, ensuring that technology supplements rather than replaces human assistance.

**Appeal and Review Safeguards:** Every AI-assisted output must remain advisory; final determinations rest with human judges. Users must receive notice of AI participation and retain full rights to contest, appeal, or request human review. By embedding these measures, Legal World can promote technological innovation within a structure that respects constitutional guarantees and public trust. The resulting hybrid model AI-supported but human-led offers a credible pathway toward faster, fairer, and more inclusive civil-justice delivery in the United States.

## 6. U.S. Incorporation, Economic, and Global Impact

### Economic Contribution

Registering Legal World Inc. as a U.S.-based company would create a direct and measurable contribution to the American economy. The United States would become the global headquarters for licensing, research, and distribution of the platform, thereby channelling international revenue through American financial systems. Each foreign deployment beginning in Pakistan and extending to the Gulf, Africa, and South Asia would translate into export earnings, taxable corporate income, and technology-sector employment within the U.S. The business model aligns with federal priorities to promote AI-driven entrepreneurship and digital trade, simultaneously advancing economic growth and justice-sector reform. By converting an emerging-market innovation into a U.S. corporate asset, Legal World Inc. would effectively transform global demand for justice technology into a U.S.-anchored economic stream.

**Innovation and Research Ecosystem**

A U.S. incorporation would also embed Legal World within the nation's broader innovation and research ecosystem, facilitating collaboration across universities, law schools, and technology institutes. Partnerships with leading centres such as the Harvard Berkman Klein Center, Stanford CodeX, or Georgetown Law's IRiSS Lab could advance cross-disciplinary work in AI ethics, natural-language processing, and judicial analytics. Through internships, faculty research, and pilot evaluations, the platform could serve as a living laboratory for responsible AI in law. Engagement with court technology consortia and legal-aid networks would support field testing while ensuring adherence to professional ethics and procedural safeguards. These collaborations would not only strengthen domestic expertise but also consolidate U.S. leadership in law-and-technology scholarship and product innovation.

**Diplomatic and Soft-Power Benefits**

The global expansion of Legal World under a U.S. corporate identity would extend America's influence beyond traditional diplomacy by exporting rule-of-law technology as a public good. By equipping developing legal systems with transparent, accessible, and ethically grounded AI tools, the U.S. could demonstrate a constructive model of technological diplomacy. Such initiatives would reinforce American values of fairness, accountability, and due process enhancing soft power while promoting stability and governance capacity in partner countries. In contrast to proprietary or surveillance-oriented justice systems, a U.S.-led platform grounded in open standards would project a rights-based, democratic approach to innovation, strengthening the nation's international credibility.

**NIW Policy Alignment**

The Legal World initiative also aligns closely with the U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) framework for the EB-2 National Interest Waiver (NIW). First, it demonstrates substantial merit by addressing the national priority of improving access to justice and promoting responsible AI. Second, it holds national

importance, as its deployment can modernise court operations, expand affordable legal assistance, and support equitable governance. Third, the petitioner an experienced scholar and founder of the technology is well positioned to advance this objective through prior leadership in law, technology, and policy reform. Finally, granting the NIW would, on balance, benefit the United States, as the initiative creates jobs, stimulates innovation, enhances global prestige, and strengthens domestic institutions. Consequently, Legal World Inc. satisfies both the economic and public-interest dimensions required under the NIW standard.

**7. Policy Recommendations**

The analysis of Legal World and comparable international experiences suggests that a responsible integration of artificial intelligence into the American justice system requires a coordinated reform agenda built on transparency, accountability, and collaboration. The following recommendations outline actionable steps for federal and state policymakers, courts, and academic partners.

**Establish Federal and State Judicial Sandboxes**

Courts should introduce controlled innovation environments that allow emerging legal-technology solutions such as Legal World to be tested under judicial oversight. These judicial sandboxes would operate under time-limited authorisations, clearly defined objectives, and periodic evaluations focusing on fairness, accessibility, and data protection. Such pilots would encourage innovation while safeguarding procedural integrity and public confidence.

**Adopt National Technological-Due-Process Standards**

The U.S. should develop a uniform framework articulating minimum standards for algorithmic transparency, explainability, audit trails, and human review. Codifying technological-due-process principles at the national level would ensure that all AI tools used in courts whether public or private respect constitutional rights to notice, participation, and appeal.

**Incentivise Public-Private Partnerships in Court Technology**

Federal grants and procurement programmes can stimulate collaboration between courts, universities, and technology developers. Structured public-private partnerships would enable responsible scaling of justice-tech platforms, promote data-standardisation, and expand research into AI-driven case-management and ODR solutions. This collaborative ecosystem would distribute innovation risk while keeping ownership and accountability within public institutions.

**Support AI-Literacy and Capacity-Building Initiatives**

Training programmes for judges, clerks, and legal-aid professionals are essential to ensure informed oversight of AI systems. National and state judicial academies should integrate AI-literacy curricula covering ethical implications, bias detection, and data-security practices. Building human capacity will preserve judicial discretion and ensure that technology complements, rather than substitutes, legal reasoning. Collectively, these policy actions would establish a balanced governance architecture that encourages innovation, protects due process, and situates the United States as the global leader in ethical, AI-enabled justice reform.

**8. Conclusion**

The findings of this study confirm that Legal World presents a practical, ethically grounded, and technologically mature framework capable of addressing critical weaknesses in the U.S. civil-justice system. Its modular architecture built around automation, accessibility, and human oversight aligns closely with American due-process values and can complement existing judicial reforms without compromising fairness or transparency. By integrating guided case intake, document automation, and analytics within a rights-preserving design, the platform has the potential to reduce procedural delay, lower litigation costs, and expand the reach of legal assistance to underserved populations. Beyond its domestic utility, the incorporation of Legal World Inc. in the United States represents a

broader opportunity for global leadership. Through the export of transparent, rights-based justice technology, the U.S. can advance its soft-power influence, reinforce democratic values, and demonstrate that technological progress can serve the public good rather than merely private efficiency. Economically, this approach channels international demand for justice innovation into the American economy, fostering new employment, research, and trade opportunities. Ultimately, Legal World embodies a dual impact: it strengthens the foundations of speedy and equitable justice within U.S. borders while positioning the nation as the epicentre of global legal-technology excellence. Its adoption would exemplify how responsible AI anchored in constitutional principles and guided by human judgment can make justice both faster and fairer, fulfilling the enduring promise of the American rule of law in the digital age.

**Author Note**

Madiha Afzal is a Ph.D. Scholar in Law at the Faculty of Shariah and Law, International Islamic University Islamabad (IIUI) and Co-Founder of Legal World (Pvt.) Ltd., Pakistan's first AI-powered legal operating system. Her academic work focuses on comparative legal systems, judicial reform, and the ethical governance of artificial intelligence. This article is part of a broader research agenda exploring how digital transformation can expand access to justice and strengthen procedural fairness across jurisdictions. Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to:

**9. References**

- Citron, D. K. (2008). Technological Due Process. *Washington University Law Review*, 85(6), 1249-1313.
- Hadfield, G. K., & Susskind, D. (2018). The Shortfall of Traditional Regulation for the Legal Market. *Yale Journal on Regulation*, 35(Special Issue), 1-20.
- Legal Services Corporation (LSC). (2022). *The Justice Gap: The Unmet Civil Legal Needs of Low-Income Americans*. Washington, DC: LSC.

- McGinnis, J. O., & Pearce, R. G. (2014). The Great Disruption: How Machine Intelligence Will Transform the Role of Lawyers in the Delivery of Legal Services. *Fordham Law Review*, 82(6), 3041–3066.
- National Center for State Courts (NCSC). (2020). *Guidelines for the Use of Online Dispute Resolution (ODR) Systems in State Courts*. Williamsburg, VA: NCSC.
- Pew Charitable Trusts. (2021). *Online Dispute Resolution in the U.S.: Opportunities for State Courts*. Philadelphia, PA: Pew Research Center.
- Remus, D., & Levy, F. (2016). Can Robots Be Lawyers? Computers, Lawyers, and the Practice of Law. *Georgetown Journal of Legal Ethics*, 30(3), 501–558.
- Susskind, R. (2019). *Online Courts and the Future of Justice*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS). (2025). *Policy Manual, Volume 6, Part F, Chapter 5: National Interest Waiver (NIW)*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Homeland Security.

