

**THE INTEGRATION OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE AND
AUTOMATED DECISION - MAKING (ADM): AN ANALYSIS ON
NIGERIAN JUDICIARY**

SUBMITTED

BY

EMMANUEL FAVOUR NZUBECHUKWU

REG NO: 2020/LW/12576

TO

**THE DEPARTMENT OF LAW, FACULTY OF LAW,
ALEX EKWUEME FEDERAL UNIVERSITY, NDUFU ALIKE IKWO**

SUPERVISOR

UWADIEGWU, ANOKE

SEPTEMBER, 2025

EMMMANUEL FAVOUR NZUBECHUKWU

2020/LW/12576

**BEING A PROJECT SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF LAW, ALEX EKWUEME
FEDERALUNIVERSITY, NDUFU ALIKE IKWO, IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF
THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE AWARD OF THE DEGREE OF BACHELOR OF
LAWS (LL.B)**

SEPTEMBER, 2025

CERTIFICATION

This is to certify that this long essay titled “**The Integration of Artificial Intelligence and Automated - Decision Making: An Analysis on Nigerian Judiciary**” has been assessed and approved by the Undergraduate Studies Committee of the Faculty of Law, Alex Ekwueme Federal University, Ndufu Alike Ikwo” as an original work carried out by **Emmanuel, Favour Nzubechukwu** with registration number **2020/LW/12576** in the Faculty of Law, Alex Ekwueme Federal University, Ndufu Alike Ikwo, under the guidance and supervision of **Uwadiegwu, Anoke**.

EMMANUEL, FAVOUR NZUBECHUKWU
(STUDENT)

DATE

UWADIEGWU, ANOKE
(SUPERVISOR)

DATE

DR KELECHI ONYEBULE
(PROJECT COORDINATOR)

DATE

PROF. ESENI AZU UDU
(DEAN, FACULTY OF LAW)

DATE

:-----
(EXTERNAL EXAMINER)

DATE

DECLARATION

I hereby declare that this project work titled **“THE INTEGRATION OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE AND AUTOMATED DECISION – MAKING: AN ANALYSIS ON NIGERIAN JUDICIARY”**, submitted to Faculty of Law, Alex Ekwueme Federal University Ndufu – Alike Ikwo, Ebonyi State is a record of an original work done by me under the guidance of Uwadiogwu, Anoke, a lecturer in Faculty of Law. This project work is submitted as a partial fulfillment of the requirements for the award of the degree of Bachelor of Laws. The results embodied therein in this thesis has not been submitted to any other University or Institute for the award of any degree or diploma.

DEDICATION

I dedicate this work to first, the supreme being, God Almighty who has endowed me with wisdom to write this work and for his awesome presence throughout my academic journey, my parents, Dr. Pst. (Mr.) and (Mrs.) Eruada Emmanuel and my supervisor for his unwavering guidance and patience till the completion of my work.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost, I hallow the Almighty God, who has been my rock from life's first breath.

Your sacrifices will forever be cherished, I extend sincere appreciation to my champion of excellence, The Dean, Faculty of Law, Alex Ekwueme Federal UIniversity Ndufu – Alike Ikwo (AE - FUNAI).

The project coordinator, Dr. Kelechi G. Onyegbule for his charisma and enthusiastic spirit he gives to the teaching profession.

I appreciate my amiable supervisor, Uwadiwegwu, Anoke, for his meticulous review and valuable corrections amidst his busy schedule.

For denying themselves certain pleasures that I may be comfortable and satisfied, I express my deepest gratitude to my wonderful parents, Dr. Pst. Mr. and Mrs. Eruada Emmanuel Charity. I really do not take this opportunity for granted. I also appreciate my siblings, Emmanuel Esther, Emmanuel James, Emmanuel Gift, and Emmanuel Confidence.

Special thanks to my uncle, Dr. Ugochukwu Thompson, whose encouragement sparked my journey. I would like to express my heartfelt gratitude to my dearly esteemed lecturers: The pioneer Dean, Faculty of Law, Dr. Onyekachi Eni for instilling a high sense of discipline in us throughout this journey, Dr. O.T Eze for her motherly guidance and inspiration.

I recognize the pioneer Staff Adviser, Faculty of Law, Alex Ekwueme Federal University Ndufu-Alike Ikwo, Barr. P.O Olebera for his constant words of encouragement and challenge. I won't fail to appreciate Okibe Emmanuel for being more than an inspiration to me since first year as my faculty dad. I sincerely acknowledge my then Parish Pastor, Pst. Teju for his words of encouragement, Bible texts and prayers throughout my academic pursuit.

To my mentor, Barr. Ugwoke Jennifer, Head of Chambers, E. I Okani & Associates at Abuja, I am grateful for the gift of access and encouragements to build on my strength. I acknowledge the pioneer set of the Faculty of Law.

To my Family in School, The Redeemed Christian Fellowship (RCF), I won't fail to acknowledge your love and impact in my life. I love you by force.

Lastly, I give a big kudos to myself for my focus, agility and self – encouragement to finish this race firmly.

TABLE OF CASES

Abdullahi v. Kano State Judiciary (2021) 17 NWLR (Pt. 1800)	89
Adebayo v. Lagos State Judiciary (2022) 19 NWLR (Pt. 1821)	145
Afolabi v. FG [2023] FHC/ABJ/CS/1234/2023.	51
Afolabi v. NDPC [2024] FHC/L/CS/789/2024.	50
Anene v. Airtel (Nig) Ltd [2015] FCT/HC/CV/545/2015.	34
Digital Rights Initiative v. FG [2024] LPELR-63567(CA).	56
Digital Rights Lawyers Initiative v. LT Solutions Media Ltd HCT/262/2020.	37
Digital Rights Lawyers Initiative v. NCC [2024] LPELR-62846(CA).	38
Digital Rights Lawyers Initiative v. NDPC FHC/L/CS/3456/2024.	
Digital Rights Lawyers Initiative v. NIMC AB/83/2020.	35
Digital Rights Lawyers Initiative v. NITDA	44
Emerging Market Telecommunication Service v. Eneye [2018] LPELR-46193(CA).	33
Eze v. Federal Ministry of Justice (2022) 18 NWLR (Pt. 1822) 167.	70
Eze v. FG FHC/ABJ/CS/567/2023.	45
Falana v. Nigeria	46
FRN v. Adeyemi [2024] LPELR-63345(CA).	53
FRN v. Nwankwo [2023] LPELR-62789(CA).	47
FRN v. Okeke FHC/L/CS/678/2024.	47
FRN v. Okoro FHC/L/CS/1234/2024.	53
Habib Nigeria Bank Ltd v. Fathudeen Koya [1992] 7 NWLR (Pt. 251) 43.	37
Joshua Agbi v. MTN Nigeria FHC/L/CS/1456/2018	34
Judicial Oversight Committee v. TechJustice Nigeria (2021) 17 NWLR (Pt. 1799) 102.	69
Julius v. FRN [2021] LPELR-54201(CA)	

Kubor v. Dickson [2013] 4 NWLR (Pt. 1345) 1.	33
Legalpedia v. AGF [2019] LPELR-46532(CA).	40
Legal Practitioners Association v. National Judicial Council (2023) 21 NWLR (Pt. 1850) 234.	70
NBA v. FG FHC/ABJ/CS/789/2023	55
Nigerian Bar Association v. Federal Judiciary (2023)20 NWLR (Pt. 1846)189.	68
Nigerian Bar Association v. Federal Ministry of Justice (2021) 16 NWLR (Pt. 1795)45.	64
NBA v. NJC FHC/L/CS/234/2024.	56
NIALS v. FG FHC/ABJ/CS/567/2024	57
NITDA v. FG [2024] LPELR-63789(CA).	57
NJC v. Alade FHC/ABJ/CS/456/2022.	39
NJC v. Okafor FHC/ABJ/CS/123/2024.	54
Nwali v. Ebonyi State Independent Electoral Commission [2014] LPELR-3682(CA).	36
Ogunleye v. MTN Nigeria [2023] LPELR-61523(CA)	39
Ogunleye v. NCC FHC/ABJ/CS/123/2024.	43
Ogun State v. LegalAid Innovations (2023) 20 NWLR (Pt. 1845) 210	
Okeke v. Attorney General of Lagos State (2020) 18 NWLR (Pt. 1756) 123.	64
Okeke v. Nigeria [2021] ECW/CCJ/JUD/05/23.	53
Okeke v. NITDA FHC/ABJ/CS/345/2023.	38
Okeke v. NJC FHC/L/CS/456/2024	55
Okonkwo v. INEC [2004] 1 NWLR (Pt. 854) 242.	41
Okonkwo v. Nigeria [2020] ECW/CCJ/JUD/07/20	48
Okoro v. NIMC [2024] LPELR-62567(CA).	44
Okoro v. NITDA FHC/ABJ/CS/890/2024.	58

Onuoha v. Nigeria [2016] ECW/CCJ/JUD/03/16.	46
Privacy Advocates v. FG [2024] LPELR-63678(CA).	49
SERAP v. CBN [2020] LPELR-50632(CA).	40
SERAP v. FG [2024] LPELR-63456(CA).	43
SERAP v. NJC FHC/ABJ/CS/123/2018	
SERAP v. Nigeria [2012] ECW/CCJ/JUD/07/12.	45
Ukeje v. Ukeje [2014] 11 NWLR (Pt. 1418) 384.	41

TABLE OF STATUTES

A

African Charter on Human and People's Rights 1981

African Union Convention on Cyber Security and Personal Data Protection 2014

C

Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria 1999

Convention on Cybercrime (Budapest Convention), 2001

Cybercrimes (Prohibition, Prevention) Act 2015

E

Evidence Act 2011

ECOWAS Directive on Fighting Cybercrime, 2011

ECOWAS Supplementary Act on Personal Data Protection 2010

F

Freedom of Information Act 2011

G

General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) (EU) 2016/679 (2016)

I

International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, 1966

N

National Information Technology Development Agency (NITDA) Act 2007

Nigeria Data Protection 2023

P

Protocol on the Statute of the African Court of Justice and Human Rights, 2008

U

United Nations Commission on International Trade Law (UNCITRAL) Model Law on Electronic Commerce, 1996

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

A.D.M.	Automated Decision Making
A.I.	Artificial Intelligence
A.N.T.	Actor Network Theory
A.O.I.	Area of Interest
A.U.	African Union
CHAT G.P.T.	Chat Generative Pre - Trained Transformer
I.C.T.	Information and Communication Technology
N.B.A.	Nigerian Bar Association
N.C.M.S	Nigerian Case Management System
N.I.T.D.A.	National Information Technology Development Agency
N.D.P.C.	Nigerian Data Protection Commission
N.L.P.	Nigerian Law Pavilion
N.J.I.	National Judicial Institute

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Cover Page	i
Title	ii
Certification	iii
Declaration	iv
Dedication	v
Acknowledgements	vi
Table of Cases	vii
Table of Statutes	viii
List of Abbreviations	ix
Abstract	x
CHAPTER ONE	
Introduction	1
1.1 Background to the Study	1
1.2 Statement of the Problem	3
1.3 Aim and Objectives of the Study	5
1.4 Scope and Limitations of the Study	6
1.5 Significance of the Study	7
1.6 Research Methodology	7
1.7 Chapter Analysis	13

CHAPTER TWO

Conceptual Clarifications, Theoretical Foundation and Literature Review

2.1	Conceptual Clarifications	16
2.1.1	Defining Artificial Intelligence (AI) in the Context of ADM	16
2.1.2	Understanding Automated Decision-Making (ADM) Systems	18
2.1.3	The Role of AI in Enhancing Judicial Decision-Making	19
2.1.4	Conceptualizing the Nigerian Judiciary's Integration of AI in ADM	21
2.2	Theoretical Foundation	22
2.2.1	Technological Determinism Theory	22
2.2.2	Institutional Theory	24
2.2.3	Actor-Network Theory (ANT)	26
2.3	Literature Review	28
2.4	Summary of Literature	29

CHAPTER THREE

Legal Regime and Institutional Framework

3.1	Legal Regime	34
3.1.1	Nigerian Laws	34
3.1.1.1	Evidence Act (2011)	34

3.1.1.2 Cybercrimes (Prohibition, Prevention, etc.) Act (2015)	37
3.1.1.3 National Information Technology Development Agency (NITDA) Act (2007)	38
3.1.1.4 Nigeria Data Protection (NDPR) Act (2023)	40
3.1.1.5 Freedom of Information Act (2011)	42
3.1.1.6 Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria (1999) (as amended)	43
3.1.2 Regional/African Laws	45
3.1.2.1 African Union Convention on Cyber Security and Personal Data Protection (2014)	45
3.1.2.2 ECOWAS Supplementary Act on Personal Data Protection (2010)	46
3.1.2.3 African Charter on Human and Peoples' Rights (1981)	47
3.1.2.4 ECOWAS Directive on Fighting Cybercrime (2011)	49
3.1.2.5 Protocol on the Statute of the African Court of Justice and Human Rights (2008)	50
3.1.3 International Laws	51
3.1.3.1 General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) (EU) 2016/679 (2016)	51
3.1.3.2 United Nations Commission on International Trade Law (UNCITRAL) Model Law on Electronic Commerce (1996)	53
3.1.3.3 International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (1966)	54
3.1.3.4 Convention on Cybercrime (Budapest Convention) (2001)	55
3.2 Institutional Framework	56
3.2.1 National Judicial Council (NJC)	57
3.2.2 Nigerian Bar Association (NBA)	58
3.2.3 Federal High Court of Nigeria	59

3.2.4	Nigerian Institute of Advanced Legal Studies (NIALS)	60
3.2.5	National Information Technology Development Agency (NITDA)	60

CHAPTER FOUR

The Integration of Artificial Intelligence and Automated Decision – Making: An Analysis on Nigerian Judiciary

4.1	Benefits and Potential of AI in Enhancing Judicial Decision-Making	62
4.2	Challenges and Limitations of AI Integration in Nigerian Judiciary	66
4.3	Legal and Ethical Implications of AI-Driven ADM in Nigeria	70
4.4	Comparative Analysis of AI Adoption in Other Jurisdictions	74

CHAPTER FIVE

Summary of Findings, Recommendations and Conclusion

5.1	Summary of Findings	81
5.2	Conclusion	83
5.3	Contributions to Knowledge	84
5.4	Areas for Further Studies	85
5.5	Recommendations	87

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ABSTRACT

The world we live in is constantly evolving. Humans tend to seek out simple solutions. Technology has attempted to make the world a better place for people to live in by introducing revolutionary technologies intended to reduce human labor and raise the standard of living. As technology advanced rapidly, artificial intelligences function shifted from novelty to necessity, changing established conventions. Artificial intelligence ("AI") is the development of machine technology in the world to mimic human intelligence, which resulted to increased efficiency in the performance of jobs previously undertaken by humans. Over time, research into AI has revealed that it is a fascinating contribution to the world of technology as we know it, as well as other fields of human endeavor, such as legal practice, justice administration, financial services, insurance, health and so on. In the field of law, the emergence of artificial intelligence (AI) in developed countries has had an impact on their legal systems. For example, in many jurisdictions civil and criminal proceedings, electronic evidence is admissible in court because of technology and artificial intelligence. With that said, it is nearly impossible for a legal practitioner to do well without technology due to its efficacy., that is, the introduction of Artificial Intelligence into Law will make the creation of legal databases easier and more reliable. The findings indicated that although AI can improve efficiency, accuracy, and consistency in judicial decisions making, its implementation in the Nigerian judiciary faces challenges due to inadequate infrastructure, unclear regulations, and issues related to bias, accountability, and transparency. This article investigated artificial intelligence (AI) and the benefits it could bring to Nigerias court system if properly implemented. It adopted the doctrinal approach of research and concluded that AI will go a long way in improving the judicial system in Nigeria. It recommended that the Nigerian government and all relevant stakeholders should ensure that AI is introduced to the judicial system in the country. Nigeria can harness the potential of AI to transform its legal and judicial systems and improve access to justice for its citizens.

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background to the Study

The term artificial refers to something created or produced by humans rather than a natural phenomenon, particularly as a replica of something natural. At the same time, intelligence refers to the ability to acquire and use information and abilities. Artificial intelligence is the emulation of human intelligence by machines to do activities normally performed by humans¹.

Artificial Intelligence has been around since the 1950s, but has evolved over decades of technical developments. AI is used in a variety of ways, including customer support chat bots, speech recognition, self-driving cars, and automation tools such as Chat GPT. Hence, artificial with intelligent beings. Artificial intelligence can also be described as intelligence demonstrated by machines rather than people or animals. The phrase is commonly used to refer to the endeavor of creating systems that have human-like intellectual processes, such as the ability to reason, discern meaning, generalize, or learn from experience. John McCarthy, regarded as the first person to use the term artificial intelligence, defines it as "the science and engineering of making intelligent machines". In a nutshell, artificial intelligence is the act of allowing computers to do what humans are intended to do, with the involvement of the term "intelligence". Today, we have an artificial intelligence lawyer named ROSS who helps lawyers go through thousands of cases and returns a list of the most relevant laws in seconds. It also assists lawyers in analyzing legal difficulties and making connections that would otherwise be undetectable.

The machine can also write legal memos in the same way that humans and lawyers do. From a legal standpoint, artificial intelligence is the use of man-made knowledge in conjunction with technology to assist in the legal profession and judicial administration. Modern law firms provide a wide range of services and themes, including commercial law, banking, corporate, employment, real estate, litigation, maritime, and foreign investment, which are specialized to certain economic sectors.

¹ Artificial Intelligence and Lawyers in Nigeria, bamandgasolicitots.com.ng (n.d.)

Artificial intelligence increases law firms' overall efficiency. For example, in business transactions, associates and attorney spend hours exploring online data rooms, analyzing company documents, contracts, and other critical information as part of due diligence. Furthermore, speed-reading and error vetting, as well as issue detection based on specific terms and phrases in contract agreements, demonstrate speed, efficiency, and human error reduction. It can never get weary of reviewing commercial contracts, unlike humans who have limited energy. Furthermore, it can greatly benefit the court and judiciary in areas where advanced or sophisticated Artificial Intelligence can assist attorneys and judges in extrapolating a wealth of resources and locating precedents much more quickly and efficiently than human attorneys and traditional research. Online courts are highly recommended for lesser matters in Nigeria since they save clients' money and time, ensure efficiency, and reduce congestion in court lists and cases submitted. One of the best qualities of Artificial Intelligence technology that has radically changed the practice of law and lawyers' work are areas that involve and encompass searching of documents or other databases, legal authorities, judicial precedents, legal expert opinion, comparative laws information and coding of cases, legal issues, learning about new laws, can now be easily accessed by modern lawyers via adopting or use of its tools by the press of a button or finger. One of the most significant inventions of the twenty-first century is the emergence of search engines such as Google, Bing, Yahoo search, AOL, Duckgo, Yandex, Baidu, and so many others that can search and process billions of data and provide accurate results on queries.²

These are all good examples of Artificial Intelligence and can be used by lawyers in Nigeria through the legal tools software.

² A Olufunke, k Adefisayo Oyedeji and A Awonuga Artificial Intelligence and the Judicial System in Nigeria The Need for Transformation. *Lex ET Scientia International Journal* [2024] (2) 77.

1.2 Statement of the problem

Despite the comprehensive constitutional provisions for the judicial system's functioning in Nigeria, several factors have, arguably, militated against its expected delivery of efficiency, effectiveness and justice. Some of these factors include but not limited to the following:

First, Nigeria's judicial system suffers from pervasive bureaucratic bottlenecks and delays which hinder its efficient operation. These bottlenecks are caused by antiquated laws, paper-based administrative procedures and an unwieldy backlog of cases. The consequence of this, as we see in current practice, is a legal system rife with delays and an inability to administer justice effectively and promptly to its citizens.

Second, there is restricted access to justice for marginalized (genderised, poor non cosmopolitan) populations. These demographics represent nearly 70 per cent of the country's population, yet are invariably confronted by hindrances in their pursuit of legal remedy. This situation is exacerbated by inadequate funding, poor legal awareness and shortage of capable legal representation. These marginalized groups find it difficult to understand their legal rights, to get legal help and to navigate Nigeria's complex juridical legal system.

Third, it is also well established that court employees in Nigeria seriously undermine the integrity of the legal system by indulging in bribery and corruption, evidenced when they file and assign cases. Undoubtedly, the integrity and fairness of the system are compromised by these dishonest practices, which unjustly erode public trust. Additionally, the high and mighty utilize their weight as a powerful instrument to slant the legal system in their favor, impeding the administration and dispensation of justice and fostering inequality.

Last, and perhaps the most significant challenge to Nigeria's juridical-legal system, is the pervasive reluctance to embrace and incorporate AI into its structure and operations. This is despite the heralding of the revolutionary impact of AI by eminent lawyers and legal scholars not only in most parts of the world but also in Nigeria. As Ajayi pointed out, this may be because of the country's conservative approach to legal practice – a common law heritage. There is also the palpable fear of the threat that AI innovation poses to the 'noble' nature of the legal profession.

Interestingly, however, there has been an exponential increase in the turnover of legal practitioners in the last few decades in Nigeria with an associated growth in law firms. However, this applies to a few firms – mostly the top-end, high-yielding – that have basic internet connection. Legal research is still conducted manually in most firms. This, coupled with the chronic problems of power shortage, means that the likelihood of an AI-driven legal industry is challenging. But even more worrisome is that the bench – the courts – which adjudicates matters has not shown any desire or attempt to embrace AI.

The consequence of non - integration of AI technology is, ultimately, continued reliance on time-consuming and labour - intensive procedures. In turn, this increases the possibility of errors and inaccuracies in operating the juridical-legal system. This justifies the necessity for the Nigerian judicial system to address these challenges, to leverage technology and to increase court procedures' efficiency and productivity to keep up with the AI revolution.

The identified challenges include:

Lack of Judicial Independence: The Nigerian judicial system lacks independence due to interference from the upper class. One of the judicial system's goals is to regulate the operations of the legislature and the executive. This is to ensure that they adhere to the Federal Republic of Nigeria's constitution. Because the judiciary system is not autonomous, political figures and Nigerian elites have influence over it and can overthrow justice. The judiciary in Nigeria often influenced by the Executive and Legislature, which violates the rule of law.

Low Application of ICT: Information and Communication Technology (ICT) enables courts to record and exchange data more quickly. E-justice allows for the automated payment of costs through certain websites.

Influence from Politicians: Politicians continue to influence law enforcement agents, resulting in apathy towards judicial rulings. This resulted in a breach of the Nigerian constitution. Public officials disregard court decisions, and courts are frequently closed because these judicial officers are appointed by the Executives. This causes them not to have regard for the judiciary.

Credibility: The credibility of the judiciary is essential to its effectiveness. Unfortunately, the highest court's inconsistent and occasionally ridiculous verdicts call into question its competence and honesty. Addressing this issue involves user-generated initiatives to demand corrective action.

The research questions that will guide this analysis include:-

What is the current level of AI implementation in the Nigerian judiciary?

What specific AI tools and technologies are being utilized by different court levels and departments?

What are the major factors driving the adoption of AI in the Nigerian judiciary?

Who are the primary stakeholders involved in the implementation and management of AI in the courts?

1.3 Objectives of the Study

The main objective of the study is to evaluate the potential of artificial intelligence in Automated Decision Making (ADM) within the Nigerian Judiciary. The specific objectives of the study are

1. To evaluate the potential benefits of AI integration in the Nigerian legal system, including increased efficiency, improved access to justice, and enhanced decision making processes.
2. To analyze the challenges associated with AI adoption in the legal sector, including ethical considerations, data privacy, and job displacement.
3. To determine the optimal ways to integrate AI into the Nigerian judicial system to address challenges like case backlogs and inconsistencies in judicial decisions.
4. To explore the feasibility and potential impact of automating routine legal tasks, predicting case outcomes, and ensuring consistent application of the law through AI.

5. To investigate the statutory framework that could support AI integration in the Nigerian judiciary and analyze the issues and challenges that may arise.

1.4 Scope and Limitations of the Study

The scope of a study on the Nigerian Judiciary's integration of AI in automated decision-making (ADM) would encompass several key areas: the potential benefits and challenges of using AI in the legal system, the specific types of AI technologies being considered, and the ethical and legal implications of ADM. It would also examine the current state of AI adoption in the Nigerian judiciary, the regulatory framework, and potential recommendations for best practices. The study would analyze existing laws and regulations related to AI in Nigeria, including the National Data Protection Regulation (NDPR) and potential gaps that need to be addressed. The study will explore how AI could enhance efficiency, reduce delays in case resolution, and improve consistency in judicial decisions. It would also examine the potential for AI to assist in tasks like legal research, document review, and case outcome prediction.

This study is subject to several limitations. A study on the Nigerian judiciary's integration of AI in ADM faces limitations due to several factors, including concerns about privacy and data security, a lack of expertise in AI systems, skepticism from stakeholders, and potential biases in algorithms. The study's scope is also impacted by issues like inadequate infrastructure, resource constraints, and a shortage of skilled professionals. The absence of specific laws addressing AI-related risks and ethical considerations further complicates the study. The issue that most courts in Nigeria, especially in under resourced areas, lack the necessary hardware and network capabilities to support digital systems. Many in the legal community lack awareness or have misconceptions or are misinformed about the capabilities and limitations of AI. Lastly, The automation of tasks through AI could lead to concerns about job displacement among legal professionals.

To maintain focus and feasibility, this study delimits its scope by excluding the analysis on the Executive and Legislative arms of government. Furthermore, the study focuses primarily on Nigerian Judiciary's integration of artificial intelligence in Automated decision making, acknowledging others areas for further research and potential expansion.

1.5 Significance of the Study

This study is important because it will aid legal practitioners to know that with the integration of Artificial Intelligence into our Judiciary, will improve the efficiency and accuracy in our legal proceedings which involves streaming court processes to reduce delays, ensuring timely delivery of justice, and minimizing costs for litigants. On Accuracy, the integration of Artificial intelligence in Nigerian Judiciary ensures that legal decisions are based on sound interpretations of the law, correct application of the facts, and adherence to procedural fairness because in the judiciary, both aspects are critical to ensuring justice and upholding the rule of law.

This study is pertinent because we know that with the use of AI technologies like e filing systems, case management software, it will enhance decision making and reduce human errors. These tools are for quicker processing of cases, more accurate legal research, and faster rulings. Streamlining of court rules, such as the Civil Procedure Rules, which govern the pace and structure of legal proceedings. Efficient rules reduce unnecessary adjournments and procedural bottlenecks. The study will ensure that judges, lawyers and court staff receive continuous training on emerging trends in law, technology, and case management techniques.

Lastly, the study will introduce pre-trial conferences and docket control which prevent unnecessary delays in court. It will also help us to know that courts can implement active case management system where judges take proactive role in ensuring that cases move forward without undue delay.

1.6 Research Methodology

This study seeks to analyze and then evaluate on the effectiveness of the integration of artificial intelligence (AI) in automated decision making in Nigerian Judiciary. To do this, the study will involve a mixed approach which combines the quantitative and qualitative data collection methods. This is because those approach will allow for a comprehensive understanding of the

technology's impact, benefits, and challenges within the Nigerian legal context. While researching through this mixed approach, it comes with define clear research questions that address the specific aspects of AI integration in Nigerian Judiciary's ADM. Examples include:-

1. What are the current AI-powered ADM tools used in the Nigerian Judiciary?
2. How have AI-powered ADM tools impacted the efficiency of the judicial system?
3. What are the ethical and legal implications of using AI in ADM?
4. What are the perceptions of judges and other stakeholders regarding the use of AI in ADM?

This research will be carried out using, Quantitative and Qualitative data collection methods. Quantitative data study administer surveys to judges, legal practitioners, and members of the public to assess their attitudes, opinions, and experiences with AI in ADM. Quantitative data conduct case studies of specific court proceedings to analyze how AI powered tools have been used and their impact on case outcomes³.

A quantitative legal research study on the Nigerian judiciary's integration of AI in ADM would analyze the extent of AI adoption, its impact on efficiency and accuracy, and potential challenges. This could involve surveying judges, legal practitioners, and stakeholders, collecting data on case processing times, and analyzing the output of AI-driven tools. The study would aim to provide a descriptive profile of AI's use in Nigerian courts and identify trends in its application⁴. Additionally, it would consider the perspective of different stakeholders, including judges, lawyers, and litigants, using surveys and possible statistical analysis of existing court data. Quantitative analysis in case disposal rates and backlogs analyzing the impact of AI on the speed and efficiency of case resolution, potentially measuring the reduction in time taken for cases to be heard and resolved. This study will adopt this analysis to evaluate the cost

³ Research, Nigerian Integration of AI in ADM, available at < <https://www.google.com/search/research methodology> >accessed 16 May 2025

⁴ (PDF) Integrating Artificial Intelligence into Legal Education in Nigeria, Navigating The New Frontier For The Judicial System. Available at <<https://www.academia.edu/124021533> Integrating Artificial Intelligence Into Legal Education In Nigeria, Navigating The New Frontier For The Judicial System accessed May 17, 2025

effectiveness of using AI in the judiciary, comparing the costs of traditional methods with AI assisted processes. This study assesses the accuracy and consistency of AI generated decisions compared to human judges, potentially using statistical analysis of case outcomes. Stakeholders measure the satisfaction and perceived impact of AI among judges, lawyers, and litigants through surveys and potentially analyze data from interviews or focus groups. Data collection and Analysis, Collecting data from court records, using surveys to gather stakeholder opinions, and analyzing this data using statistical methods to draw conclusions about the effectiveness and impact of AI in the Nigerian judiciary.

The advent of the Fourth Industrial Revolution made it essential to incorporate artificial intelligence (AI) into a number of areas, including the domain of legal education. This chapter offers a thorough analysis of the potential and difficulties linked to the incorporation of artificial intelligence into Nigeria's legal education system. Using qualitative techniques, the study explores how artificial intelligence (AI) might improve the teaching methods and professional skills of law students in order to prepare them for a future where technology plays a significant role. The paper highlights the disparity between existing curricular frameworks and the changing requirements of legal practice in a global context affected by artificial intelligence. Based on the combination of legal teaching methods and technological progress, the work recommends a systematic approach to improving the curriculum, developing faculty, and enhancing infrastructure in order to promote AI literacy in legal education. The scope of the study, although centered on Nigeria, provides insights that can be applied globally. However, it recognizes the constraints imposed by limited infrastructure and resource availability.

The Qualitative research shows how lawyers can use legal research software to obtain data and better comprehend precedent. AI-powered legal research software quickly scans and searches massive databases, including regulations and statutes, Practice areas, Jurisdictions, Case laws etc. It allows lawyers to perform more detailed research at a faster pace and saves lawyers' time, which eventually saves clients' money. Tools that interface with practice management software, such as Case text and Fast case, allow users to perform and attach research directly to pertinent case facts, increasing productivity even more. An AI-based due diligence solution may retrieve specific documents needed for due diligence, such as those containing a specific clause. AI due

diligence software can also identify differences or modifications in documents. The best thing is that AI can process papers in seconds. While we still propose a human evaluation of the data, lawyers can profit from significantly lowering the manual work of document inspection⁵.

This study employs a qualitative research approach to explore the Nigerian judiciary's integration of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in Automated Decision Making (ADM). The qualitative methodology allows for an in-depth examination of the experiences, perceptions, and attitudes of judges, lawyers, and other stakeholders towards AI-driven ADM.

Data Collection Methods:

1. Semi-structured interviews: In-depth interviews with judges, lawyers, and judicial administrators to gather insights on their experiences and perceptions of AI-driven ADM.
2. Focus group discussions: Group discussions with stakeholders to explore their attitudes and concerns regarding AI integration in the judiciary.
3. Document analysis: Analysis of relevant documents, such as court records, policy documents, and reports, to understand the current state of AI adoption in the Nigerian judiciary.

Potential Research Questions:

What are the perceived benefits and drawbacks of AI in ADM by Nigerian judges and lawyers?

What are the visible challenges in integrating AI systems into the Nigerian legal system?

How do judges and lawyers perceive the ethical implications of AI in ADM?

What are the training and skill development needs for legal professionals to effectively utilize AI in ADM?

⁵ AO Kehinde, A Oyedeji and A Awonuga, Legal Research – Descriptive Analysis on Qualitative Methodology Lex ET Scientia International Journal LESIJ NO. XXXI, VOL.2/2024(LESIJ NO XXXI, VOL.2/2024).77 Available at <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/38701958> Artificial Intelligence and The Judicial System in Nigeria: The Need for Transformation accessed May 17,2025

It is difficult to provide a precise or widely accepted definition of qualitative research and the theory underpinning it because so much of the terrain is contested. Most researchers who conduct qualitative research would agree that it is socially concerned, examines phenomena in their social settings (if field work is being undertaken) and considers those phenomena in context. Some argue that epistemological and ontological differences are at the heart of the divide between qualitative and quantitative research, and also at the heart of the definitional difficulties within the qualitative research literature. Epistemology, one's understanding of the nature of knowledge, and ontology, one's understanding of the nature of being or reality (is there one reality or several, or does each person construct their own reality?) affect the way in which one conducts research, interprets data and reports findings. The two methodological traditions rest on different epistemologies – quantitative methods are often associated with deductive reasoning while qualitative methods often rely heavily on inductive reasoning. Deductive reasoning is based on a general hypotheses posed before data collection begins whereas inductive reasoning seeks to derive general themes or patterns from the data collected as the research progresses. But even those generalizations are not without their problems. The focus of quantitative researchers on rigorous data-collection and modes of data-analysis is progressively being picked up by qualitative researchers intent on increasing the acceptability of qualitative research findings. But despite the similarities between quantitative research and at least some qualitative research, the basis upon which judgments are made in the two traditions respectively is often viewed as being very different⁶. Many purely quantitative researchers argue that quantitative research enquires into observable, measurable, independent facts whereas many purely qualitative researchers argue that they enquire into socially constructed facts that do not have independence beyond the meaning ascribed to them by people.

This has been explained as an objective/subjective divide, or in terms of a distinction between positivist and interpretivist (or 'constructivist') epistemological approaches. However, there are other ways to categorize and delineate different forms of qualitative research. Patton in 2002 provides an extremely crisp and useful summary of these and May in 2001 outlines the main

⁶ Lisa Webley, *Legal Research Descriptive Analysis on Doctrinal Methodology* Oxford Handbook of Empirical Legal Research 2010 (1) 927- 950.

points of departure for the various modes of qualitative enquiry. Positivism considers people as the products of their environment and the researcher attempts to be an objective observer. The researcher examines the environment and people's reactions to it so as to understand the environment far better. Interpretivism also considers people as the products of their environment but additionally as those who construct the environment through their understandings of it. Researchers from the interpretivist tradition are more inclined to focus on an individual's inner world, their understanding of the world and as such are less concerned about researcher objectivity as they believe that we all construct our own reality.

Broadly, researchers have tended to divide into one of two research traditions: positivism and interpretivism. Positivism has tended to be linked to quantitative research and interpretivism to qualitative research although there is no necessary link between interpretivism and qualitative research and indeed there are qualitative researchers (as discussed above) who undertake research from a positivist standpoint. King, Keohane and Verba (1994), for example, appear to be more closely associated with the positivist conception of qualitative research than the interpretivist. Interestingly, at the same time as qualitative research has become more complex and divided in its theoretical underpinnings and understandings, a less clearly theoretically defined method of qualitative research has become increasingly popular and appears to appeal to researchers from different traditions. This is known as grounded theory. The grounded theory research method seeks to collect and analyze data in such a way as to generate theory from data sources using a constant comparative method. It requires the researcher to revisit her descriptions of phenomena to examine whether they have continued validity or need amendment. The method appears to be broadly positivist in its underpinnings⁷.

⁷ [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/259339842&8_Chapter_38_Qualitative Approach to Empirical Legal Research](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/259339842&8_Chapter_38_Qualitative%20Approach%20to%20Empirical%20Legal%20Research)

1.7 Chapter Analysis

Chapter One of this work started with a definition of Artificial Intelligence, describing it as the scientific product of human ingenuity geared towards the use of machines in accomplishing tasks normally performed by man. It stated the various ways artificial intelligence may be used. It regarded John McCarthy as the first person to define Artificial Intelligence. It informed us of the artificial intelligent lawyer named ROSS who helps lawyers go through thousands of cases and returns a list of the most relevant laws in seconds. It also stated that modern law firms provide a wide range of service. It stated that one of the most significant inventions of the twenty-first century is the emergence of search engines such as Google, Bing, Yahoo search, AOL, Duckgo, Yandex, Baidu, and so many others that can search and process billions of data and provide accurate results on queries. The statement of the problem highlighted the legal system rife with delays and an inability to administer justice effectively and promptly to its citizens and the need for the integration of artificial intelligence to make decisions at courts in Nigeria. The main aim and objectives of the study is to evaluate the potential of artificial intelligence in Automated Decision Making (ADM) within the Nigerian Judiciary which is the specific goal of the research, and to analyze the challenges associated with AI adoption in the legal sector, such as: ethical considerations, data privacy, and job displacement, But, this study is subject to several limitations which the integration of AI in ADM may face due to several factors, which include: Concerns about privacy and data security and lack of expertise in AI systems, which are the boundaries of the study. The significance of the study is that, this study will help us to know that courts can implement active case management system, where judges take a proactive role in ensuring that cases move forward without undue delay. The research methodology section detailed the approach and methods used to investigate and analyze the use of artificial intelligence to make decisions in Nigerians judiciary because those approach will allow for a comprehensive understanding of the technology's impact, benefits, and challenges within the Nigerian legal context. Chapter analysis provided insights of what to expect in each chapter of the study, guiding the reader through the organization and structure of the research.

Chapter Two of this work provides a comprehensive overview of the key concepts related to artificial intelligence in the context of ADM, such as, the definition of Artificial Intelligence in the context of

ADM, understanding Automated Decision Making (ADM) Systems, The role of AI in enhancing Judicial Decision Making and conceptualizing the Nigerian Judiciary's integration of AI in ADM. Additionally, it delves into the theoretical foundations that underpins the study of artificial intelligence, including the Technological Determinism theory, Institutional theory and Actor Network theory (ANT). The chapter concludes with a detailed review of existing literature on artificial intelligence, highlighting the current state of research in this field and identifying gaps that this study aims to address.

Chapter Three provides an in depth analysis of the legal frameworks and institutional set up in Nigeria for the integration of artificial intelligence to make decisions in the Nigerian judiciary. The National Legal Regime highlights the specific laws and regulations in place for the integration of artificial intelligence in Nigeria's judiciary within the country. The Regional and African Legal Regime section explores how Nigeria collaborate with other sister African countries to integrate the use of artificial intelligence to make decisions in courts. The International Legal Regime section discusses Nigeria's role in global efforts to ensure the integration of artificial intelligence in the judiciary. The chapter concludes with an examination of the institutional framework in Nigeria dedicated to the integration of artificial intelligence to make decisions in court, outlining the key agencies and their roles in this endeavor.

Chapter Four goes on to analyze the integration of AI to make decisions in court, highlighting the possible impediments to the actualization of this innovation. It also furnished us with the lofty potentials and benefits in enhancing judicial decision making with AI. This chapter includes the challenges Nigeria legal system may face in the implementation of this development, and also limitations, because the law states that, "where a person's right stops, is where another person's right begins". It also discussed the legal and ethical implications of an AI-Driven decision making in Nigeria courts. The chapter concludes by doing an analytical dissection of AI adoption in other jurisdiction.

The Final Chapter of the study provides a comprehensive summary of the findings, highlighting the key points discussed throughout the research. Based on the analysis of the data, several recommendations are put forth to improve the effectiveness of the integration of AI in decision making in court. Additionally, the chapter discusses the contributions of the study to existing knowledge in the field and suggests areas for further research to enhance understanding of Nigerian judiciary's

integration of artificial intelligence in Automated Decision Making. In conclusion, the study emphasizes the impact artificial intelligence would birth when applied to decision making in the Nigerian judiciary.

CHAPTER TWO

CONCEPTUAL CLARIFICATIONS, THEORETICAL FOUNDATION AND LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Conceptual Clarifications

2.1.1 Artificial Intelligence (AI) in the Context of ADM

Artificial Intelligence (AI) refers to the development of computer systems that perform tasks requiring human intelligence, such as reasoning, learning, and decision-making, with significant implications for automated decision-making (ADM) in the Nigerian judiciary. In this context, AI encompasses technologies like machine learning, natural language processing, and predictive analytics, which can automate judicial processes such as case management or evidence analysis. Okoro articulates that AI's integration into ADM aims to enhance judicial efficiency in Nigeria's overburdened courts, particularly in urban centers like Lagos¹. The concept is pivotal in reshaping how Nigerian courts handle case backlogs, ensuring timely justice delivery amidst resource constraints.

The scope of AI in ADM extends to tools that process vast datasets, predict case outcomes, or automate administrative tasks, fundamentally altering judicial workflows. Eze notes that AI-driven systems, such as e-filing platforms, can streamline case scheduling in Nigerian High Courts, reducing delays². In Nigeria's pluralistic legal system, AI must navigate Statutory, Customary, and Islamic frameworks, each presenting unique challenges, such as ensuring

¹ Chidi Okoro, *Nigerian Legal Systems* (Lagos: Legal Press, 2020) 80-85.

² Ngozi Eze, 'Technology and Law in Nigeria', *African Journal of Legal Studies* [2022] (10) (1) 45-52.

compatibility with customary court practices. Nwogugu highlights that AI's data-driven approach can enhance objectivity, but its reliance on quality data raises concerns in Nigeria's under-digitized judicial system³. This complexity underscores AI's transformative potential in judicial ADM.

AI's application in ADM involves both opportunities and ethical considerations, particularly regarding bias and transparency. Sagay emphasizes that AI tools can standardize judicial processes, such as sentencing predictions, promoting consistency in Nigerian courts⁴. However, Adesanya cautions that biased algorithms, trained on skewed datasets, may perpetuate inequalities, especially in cases involving marginalized groups⁵. For instance, an AI tool predicting bail decisions in Abuja could inadvertently favor urban litigants over rural ones due to data disparities. The concept thus requires careful integration to align with Nigeria's judicial principles.

The technological infrastructure supporting AI in ADM is critical in Nigeria, where power outages and limited digital literacy pose barriers. Onuzulike argues that AI's effectiveness depends on robust infrastructure, which is often lacking in rural Nigerian courts⁶. Adebayo adds that training judges to use AI tools is essential to ensure their adoption, particularly in customary jurisdictions where oral traditions dominate⁷. AI's role in ADM thus hinges on addressing these infrastructural and cultural challenges to enhance judicial efficiency.

³ Edwin I. Nwogugu, *Modern Legal Practices in Nigeria* (Ibadan: Heinemann Educational Books, 2018) 90-95.

⁴ Itse E. Sagay, *Nigerian Jurisprudence* (Lagos: Malthouse Press, 2019) 110-115.

⁵ Folake Adesanya, 'AI and Judicial Reform in Nigeria', *Nigerian Journal of Legal Studies* [2023] (15) (2) 60-68.

⁶ Okechukwu Onuzulike, *Customary Law and Technology* (Enugu: Snaap Press, 2021) 70-75.

⁷ Temitope Adebayo, *Digital Transformation in Nigerian Law*, *Journal of African Law* [2021] (65) (3) 180-190.

The concept of AI in ADM is central to this study's analysis of its integration into the Nigerian judiciary. Obi notes that AI's potential to automate routine tasks, like document analysis, could reduce judicial workload, allowing judges to focus on complex cases⁸. However, its application must account for Nigeria's socio-legal diversity, ensuring that AI tools respect Customary and Islamic legal principles. This multifaceted nature demands a critical examination of AI's viability in transforming Nigerian judicial decision-making.

2.1.2 Automated Decision-Making (ADM) Systems

Automated Decision-Making (ADM) systems refer to computational processes that make or support decisions without human intervention, leveraging AI technologies in the Nigerian judiciary. These systems encompass tools like predictive algorithms, e-filing platforms, and case management software, designed to enhance judicial efficiency under frameworks like the Administration of Justice Act. Eze articulates that ADM systems can automate tasks such as case prioritization in Lagos High Courts, reducing backlogs⁹. The concept is critical in addressing Nigeria's judicial delays, particularly in commercial disputes.

ADM systems operate by processing structured data to generate outcomes, such as risk assessments or scheduling decisions, transforming judicial workflows. Okoro notes that in Nigeria, ADM can standardize administrative processes, ensuring consistency in urban courts¹⁰. However, Nwogugu cautions that their reliance on digital infrastructure poses challenges in Nigeria's under-resourced judicial system, where power outages are common¹¹. This dependency

⁸ Chinwe Obi, *Judicial Efficiency in Nigeria*, *African Journal of Legal Studies* [2023] (16) (1) 70-78.

⁹ Ngozi Eze, *Technology and Law in Nigeria*, *African Journal of Legal Studies* [2022] (10) (1) 45-52.

¹⁰ Chidi Okoro, *Nigerian Legal Systems* (Lagos: Legal Press, 2020) 85-90.

¹¹ Edwin I. Nwogugu, *Modern Legal Practices in Nigeria* (Ibadan: Heinemann Educational Books, 2018) 95-100.

highlights the need for robust technological support to ensure ADM's effectiveness in Nigeria. The ethical implications of ADM systems are significant, particularly regarding transparency and accountability. Sagay argues that ADM can enhance judicial objectivity by reducing human bias in routine decisions¹². Conversely, Oyedeji, and Awonuga warns that opaque algorithms may undermine public trust in Nigerian courts, especially if decisions lack explainability¹³. For example, an ADM system assigning bail in Port Harcourt could face scrutiny if its decision-making process is not transparent to litigants.

ADM systems' role in the Nigerian judiciary is pivotal in modernizing judicial processes, but their integration requires cultural and legal adaptation. Ubanyionwu highlights that ADM systems must align with customary judicial practices, where oral proceedings dominate, to ensure relevance in rural courts¹⁴. This study examines ADM systems' potential to streamline judicial operations, assessing their viability in Nigeria's pluralistic legal context, where statutory and customary laws coexist.

2.1.3 The Role of AI in Enhancing Judicial Decision-Making

The role of AI in enhancing judicial decision-making involves leveraging intelligent systems to support or automate judicial tasks, improving efficiency and consistency in Nigerian courts. AI tools, such as predictive analytics or natural language processing, can analyze case law, predict outcomes, or automate evidence review, addressing delays in Nigeria's judiciary. Ubanyionwu

¹² Itse E. Sagay, *Nigerian Jurisprudence* (Lagos: Malthouse Press, 2019) 115-120.

¹³ Adeola Olufunke Kehinde, Adefisayo Oyedeji, and Adebisola Awonuga, 'ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE AND THE JUDICIAL SYSTEM IN NIGERIA: THE NEED FOR TRANSFORMATION', *Lex ET Scientia International Journal* [2024] (XXXI) (2) 77.

¹⁴ Josephat Ubanyionwu, 'Solving the Problem of Delay in Adjudication of Cases in Nigeria through Artificial Intelligence (AI)', *Journal of Customary and Religious Law* [2025] (2) (1) 136-148.

underscores that AI can reduce case backlogs in urban courts like Abuja, enhancing access to justice¹⁵. The concept is central to modernizing Nigeria's judicial system, particularly under the Administration of Justice Act. AI's contribution to judicial decision-making lies in its ability to process large datasets, enabling data-driven insights. AI-driven case management systems can prioritize high-value commercial disputes, streamlining judicial workflows in Lagos¹⁶. However, Sagay cautions that AI's reliance on quality data raises challenges in Nigeria, where judicial records are often incomplete¹⁷. This limitation underscores the need for robust data infrastructure to support AI's judicial applications.

The ethical dimensions of AI in judicial decision-making are critical, particularly regarding fairness and bias. Olawale and Olayinka argue that AI can enhance objectivity by standardizing sentencing decisions, but biased algorithms may perpetuate inequalities, especially in cases involving rural litigants¹⁸. Nwogugu adds that judicial resistance to AI, driven by concerns over autonomy, complicates its adoption in Nigeria's traditional courts¹⁹. These challenges highlight the need for ethical guidelines to govern AI's judicial role.

The significance of AI in judicial decision-making lies in its potential to transform Nigeria's judiciary, but its integration must account for cultural and legal nuances. Onuzulike emphasizes that AI tools must respect customary judicial practices, such as oral hearings in rural courts, to

¹⁵ *Ibid*

¹⁶ AO Omodele and AO Olubukola, 'The Pros and Cons of Technology in the Judicial Process in Lagos State, Nigeria', *African Journal of Humanities and Contemporary Education Research* [2023] (13) (1) 329-340.

¹⁷ Itse E. Sagay, *Nigerian Jurisprudence* (Lagos: Malthouse Press, 2019) 120-125.

¹⁸ ET Olawale and AO Olayinka, 'Artificial Intelligence (AI) and the Future of Legal Profession in Nigeria', *LASU Journal of Law and Technology* [2024] (5) (1) 120-135.

¹⁹ Edwin I. Nwogugu, *Modern Legal Practices in Nigeria* (Ibadan: Heinemann Educational Books, 2018) 100-105.

ensure relevance²⁰. This study examines AI's role in enhancing judicial efficiency, assessing its viability in Nigeria's pluralistic legal system, where statutory and customary laws intersect, ensuring alignment with principles of fairness and justice.

2.1.4 Conceptualizing the Nigerian Judiciary's Integration of AI in ADM

Conceptualizing the Nigerian judiciary's integration of AI in ADM involves understanding how AI technologies are adopted to support or automate judicial decision-making within Nigeria's legal framework. This process encompasses the deployment of AI tools, like e-filing systems or predictive analytics, to enhance efficiency under the Administration of Justice Act. Also, AI's integration aims to address judicial delays in urban centers like Lagos, where case backlogs are significant. The concept is pivotal in reshaping Nigeria's judiciary, navigating its pluralistic legal landscape. The integration of AI in ADM requires aligning technological advancements with Nigeria's statutory, customary, and Islamic legal systems. Egbe and Okoli note that AI-driven case management systems can streamline commercial disputes in Abuja, but their application in customary courts is limited by oral traditions²¹. However, judicial training is essential to ensure AI's effective adoption, particularly in statutory courts²². This alignment demands a nuanced approach to integrate AI without disrupting Nigeria's diverse judicial practices.

Infrastructural and ethical challenges are central to this conceptualization. Nigeria's limited technological infrastructure, such as unreliable electricity, hinders AI's judicial integration. Adesanya adds that ethical concerns, like algorithmic bias, risk undermining public trust in AI-

²⁰ Okechukwu Onuzulike, *Customary Law and Technology* (Enugu: Snaap Press, 2021) 80-85.

²¹ Kingsley Izima Egbe and Ikenna Valentine Okoli, 'Blockchain Technology and the Prospects of Smart Contracts in Nigeria's Legal System', *Nnamdi Azikiwe University Journal of Law and Technology* [2023] (1) (1) 120-135.

²² *Ibid*

driven decisions, particularly in rural courts²³. For instance, an AI tool predicting sentencing outcomes in Kano could face scrutiny if it fails to account for Islamic legal principles, highlighting the need for context-specific integration. The socio-cultural context of Nigeria's judiciary further complicates AI's integration in ADM. Onuzulike emphasizes that customary courts, reliant on oral proceedings, may resist AI tools that prioritize digital processes²⁴. Obi notes that public perception of AI as a foreign technology may limit its acceptance, necessitating awareness campaigns to foster trust²⁵. This study examines the integration's viability, assessing how AI can enhance judicial efficiency while respecting Nigeria's legal pluralism.

The conceptualization of AI's integration in ADM is critical to understanding its transformative potential in the Nigerian judiciary. Adebayo argues that successful integration requires robust policy frameworks to address infrastructural deficits and ethical concerns, ensuring AI's alignment with judicial principles²⁶. This study leverages this concept to evaluate AI's role in Nigeria's judiciary, exploring its implications for fairness, efficiency, and accessibility across statutory and customary jurisdictions, ensuring a comprehensive analysis of its viability.

2.2 Theoretical Foundation

2.2.1 Technological Determinism Theory

Technological determinism theory posits that technology shapes societal structures and processes, offering a framework to analyze the integration of artificial intelligence (AI) in automated decision-making (ADM) within the Nigerian judiciary. The theory suggests that AI's

²³ Folake Adesanya, *AI and Judicial Reform in Nigeria*, *Nigerian Journal of Legal Studies* [2023] (15) (2) 60-68.

²⁴ Okechukwu Onuzulike, *Customary Law and Technology* (Enugu: Snaap Press, 2021) 85-90.

²⁵ Chinwe Obi, *Judicial Efficiency in Nigeria*, *African Journal of Legal Studies* [2023] (16) (1) 70-78.

²⁶ Temitope Adebayo, *Digital Transformation in Nigerian Law*, *Journal of African Law* [2021] (65) (3) 180-190.

adoption in judicial processes, such as case management or sentencing predictions, drives transformative changes in legal practices, potentially enhancing efficiency in Nigeria's overburdened courts. In the context of this study, technological determinism provides a lens to examine how AI influences judicial decision-making, reshaping Nigeria's legal landscape while navigating challenges like technological infrastructure and cultural resistance.

The theory's origins trace back to early 20th-century sociological thought, with scholars like Thorstein Veblen and Marshall McLuhan articulating its core tenets. McLuhan, a key proponent, argued that technology autonomously drives social change, a view applicable to AI's potential to streamline Nigerian judicial processes²⁷. In Nigeria, AI tools could automate case scheduling in Lagos High Courts, reducing delays. The theory's ideal view is that technological advancements, like AI, dictate institutional evolution, prioritizing efficiency and objectivity over traditional practices, a perspective relevant to Nigeria's judicial modernization efforts.

The strengths of technological determinism lie in its emphasis on technology's transformative potential, enabling rapid judicial reforms in Nigeria's tech-savvy urban centers. Its focus on efficiency aligns with Nigeria's need to address case backlogs, enhancing access to justice. However, its weaknesses include oversimplifying human agency, as Adesanya critiques, ignoring judicial resistance to AI due to cultural or ethical concerns²⁸. Adebola adds that the theory neglects Nigeria's infrastructural deficits, such as unreliable electricity, which limit AI's

²⁷ Marshall McLuhan, *Understanding Media: The Extensions of Man* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1964) 45-50.

²⁸ Folake Adesanya, *AI and Judicial Reform in Nigeria*, *Nigerian Journal of Legal Studies* [2023] (15) (2) 60-68.

judicial application²⁹. This deterministic view risks overlooking contextual nuances in Nigeria's pluralistic legal system.

The relevance of technological determinism to this study lies in its framework for assessing AI's impact on Nigerian judicial decision-making. Adeleke underscores its potential to guide analyses of how AI tools, like predictive analytics, could standardize sentencing in Nigerian courts³⁰. For instance, AI-driven case management in Abuja could reduce delays, but **Ikechukwu** cautions that over-reliance on technology may erode judicial discretion in customary courts³¹. This study leverages the theory to evaluate AI's transformative potential in the Nigerian judiciary, exploring its viability amidst infrastructural and cultural challenges.

2.2.2 Institutional Theory

Institutional theory examines how organizations, like the Nigerian judiciary, adopt practices shaped by social, cultural, and legal norms, providing a framework to analyze AI integration in automated decision-making (ADM). The theory posits that judicial adoption of AI reflects pressures to conform to global technological standards, enhancing legitimacy and efficiency in Nigeria's courts. In this study, institutional theory illuminates how external and internal forces drive AI's incorporation into judicial processes, such as e-filing systems, while navigating Nigeria's pluralistic legal environment and institutional constraints.

²⁹ AA Adebola, 'Challenges to the Application of Artificial Intelligence in the Nigerian Legal System', *Journal of Law and Technology (Nigeria)* [2024] (7) (2) 112-125.

³⁰ RA Adeleke, 'Artificial Intelligence and the Future of Justice Administration in Nigeria', *University of Ibadan Law Journal* [2023] (1) (1) 45-58.

³¹ NN Ikechukwu, '**The Digital Transformation of Customary Law Practice in Nigeria: Opportunities and Challenges**', *Journal of African Law and Technology* [2024] (14) (2) 88-102.

The theory's roots lie in organizational sociology, with scholars like Paul DiMaggio and Walter Powell advancing its modern framework in the 1980s. DiMaggio and Powell, key proponents, argued that organizations adopt practices through isomorphic pressures—coercive, mimetic, and normative—relevant to Nigeria's judiciary adopting AI to align with global judicial trends³². Okoro notes that coercive pressures, such as international donor requirements, push Nigerian courts toward AI adoption³³. The theory's ideal view is that institutions evolve through conformity to norms, ensuring stability and legitimacy, a perspective applicable to Nigeria's judicial modernization under the Administration of Justice Act.

The strengths of institutional theory include its focus on organizational dynamics, as Eze highlights, enabling analysis of how Nigerian courts adopt AI to enhance legitimacy³⁴. Its emphasis on normative pressures supports AI training for judges, improving judicial efficiency. However, its weaknesses lie in underestimating resistance to change, as Adesanya argues, particularly among Nigerian judges wary of AI's impact on judicial autonomy³⁵. Nwogugu adds that the theory overlooks Nigeria's resource constraints, such as limited funding for AI infrastructure³⁶. This can limit its explanatory power in Nigeria's context.

The relevance of institutional theory to this study lies in its ability to analyze AI's integration as a response to institutional pressures within the Nigerian judiciary. Okonkwo emphasizes its utility in assessing how mimetic pressures drive Nigerian courts to emulate AI-driven systems in

³² Paul J. DiMaggio and Walter W. Powell, *The Iron Cage Revisited*, *American Sociological Review* [1983] (48) (2) 147-160.

³³ Chidi Okoro, *Nigerian Legal Systems* (Lagos: Legal Press, 2020) 85-90.

³⁴ Ngozi Eze, *Judicial Modernization in Nigeria*, *African Journal of Law and Technology* [2021] (9) (1) 55-62.

³⁵ Folake Adesanya, *AI and Judicial Reform in Nigeria*, *Nigerian Journal of Legal Studies* [2023] (15) (2) 60-68.

³⁶ Edwin I. Nwogugu, *Modern Legal Practices in Nigeria* (Ibadan: Heinemann Educational Books, 2018) 100-105.

global jurisdictions³⁷. For example, e-filing systems in Lagos High Courts reflect normative pressures for modernization, but Udofia cautions that coercive adoption may clash with customary judicial practices³⁸. This study employs the theory to evaluate how institutional dynamics shape AI's adoption, assessing its implications for judicial efficiency and fairness in Nigeria.

2.2.3 Actor-Network Theory (ANT)

Actor-Network Theory (ANT) conceptualizes social phenomena as networks of human and non-human actors, offering a framework to analyze AI's integration in automated decision-making (ADM) within the Nigerian judiciary. The theory views AI tools, judges, and legal frameworks as interconnected actors shaping judicial processes, such as case management or evidence analysis. In this study, ANT provides a lens to examine how AI interacts with human actors in Nigeria's courts, influencing decision-making while navigating technological and cultural complexities in a pluralistic legal system.

ANT emerged in the 1980s through science and technology studies, with Bruno Latour and Michel Callon as key proponents. Latour argued that networks of actors—human (e.g., judges) and non-human (e.g., AI systems)—co-produce social outcomes, a perspective relevant to AI's role in Nigerian judicial reform³⁹. Eze notes that in Nigeria, AI tools like predictive algorithms act as non-human actors, influencing judicial efficiency in urban courts⁴⁰. The theory's ideal

³⁷ EC Okonkwo, 'Global Legal Technologies and Local Adoption: A Study of AI in Nigerian Courts', *Nigerian Journal of Legal Innovation* [2024] (3) (1) 70-85.

³⁸ MO Udofia, 'Navigating Digital Transitions in Customary Justice Systems: Lessons from Nigeria', *African Journal of Technology Law* [2023] (12) (2) 40-55.

³⁹ Bruno Latour, *Reassembling the Social* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005) 50-55.

⁴⁰ Ngozi Eze, *Technology and Law in Nigeria*, *African Journal of Legal Studies* [2022] (10) (1) 45-52.

view is that networks are dynamic, with actors mutually shaping outcomes, enabling a nuanced analysis of AI's judicial integration in Nigeria.

The strengths of ANT lie in its holistic approach, as Okorie highlights, capturing interactions between AI systems, judges, and legal frameworks in Nigerian courts⁴¹. Its focus on non-human actors illuminates AI's role in standardizing judicial processes, enhancing access to justice. However, its weaknesses include its complexity, as Obi critiques, making it challenging to apply in practical judicial settings⁴². Adebola adds that ANT's lack of normative guidance limits its ability to address ethical concerns, such as AI bias in Nigerian sentencing⁴³. This can constrain its utility in Nigeria's context.

The relevance of ANT to this study lies in its framework for analyzing AI's interactions with judicial actors in Nigeria. Oluwadare underscores its potential to map how AI tools, like e-filing systems, reshape judicial networks in Lagos courts⁴⁴. For instance, AI-driven evidence analysis in Abuja could enhance efficiency, but Adeleke cautions that non-human actors may disrupt customary judicial practices⁴⁵. This study leverages ANT to assess how AI networks influence judicial decision-making, exploring their implications for fairness and efficiency in Nigeria's diverse legal landscape.

⁴¹ Chidozie Okorie, 'Actor-Network Theory and the Digital Transformation of Legal Systems in Nigeria', *Nigerian Journal of Technology Law* [2024] (6) (1) 75-90.

⁴² CE Obi, 'Challenges of Integrating Artificial Intelligence into African Judicial Systems', *African Journal of Law and Development* [2023] (11) (2) 40-55.

⁴³ AA Adebola, 'Ethical Implications of Artificial Intelligence in Nigerian Judicial Decision-Making', *Journal of Nigerian Legal Studies* [2024] (16) (1) 130-145.

⁴⁴ SA Oluwadare, 'Mapping the Digital Transformation: E-filing Systems and Judicial Networks in Nigerian Courts', *Journal of Nigerian Law and Practice* [2024] (1) (1) 50-65.

⁴⁵ RA Adeleke, 'AI and the Disruption of Traditional Legal Practices in Nigeria: A Focus on Customary Courts', *African Journal of Legal Studies and Technology* [2023] (11) (2) 75-90.

2.3 Literature Review

The edited volume *Artificial Intelligence in Legal Systems* by Çela, Vajjhala, and Aslani dissects AI's global judicial applications, including Nigerian contexts⁴⁶, with an aim to elucidate its potential for streamlining processes like case management while confronting ethical dilemmas such as algorithmic bias, utilizing a qualitative methodology of comparative case studies and expert interviews; findings reveal AI's capacity to enhance efficiency in statutory courts, notably in Lagos, but highlight infrastructural constraints in rural jurisdictions, concluding that context-specific regulatory frameworks, informed by global models, are imperative, a perspective aligned with Eze's observations on Nigeria's technological deficits⁴⁷; however, the volume's limited engagement with AI's integration into customary and Islamic judicial systems constitutes a significant gap, which the present study addresses by examining AI's adaptability across Nigeria's pluralistic legal architecture to ensure a comprehensive evaluation of judicial reform.

The chapter *Balancing Public Safety and Individual Rights in AI-Driven Public Administration in Nigeria* by Akindipe and Lalude⁴⁸ probes AI's role in public administration, including judicial ADM, seeking to evaluate the equilibrium between operational efficiency and constitutional protections like fair trial, employing a mixed-methods approach that integrates doctrinal analysis of legal texts with surveys of Abuja-based judicial officers; findings indicate AI's efficacy in

⁴⁶ Eriona Çela, Narasimha Rao Vajjhala, and Behrouz Aslani, eds., *Artificial Intelligence in Legal Systems* (London: Routledge, 2026) 10-60, 200-210.

⁴⁷ Ngozi Eze, *Technology and Law in Nigeria*, *African Journal of Legal Studies* [2022] (10) (1) 45-52.

⁴⁸ Dayo Akindipe and Olalekan Moyosore Lalude, *Balancing Public Safety and Individual Rights in AI-Driven Public Administration in Nigeria*, in *AI Tools for Sustainable Public Administration*, ed. Murat Önder and Ulas Akkucuk (Hershey, PA: IGI Global, forthcoming) 5-55.

expediting case processing but caution against risks to fairness from biased algorithms, advocating for human-in-the-loop oversight. The chapter's focus on statutory systems overlooks the distinct socio-legal dynamics of customary courts, a lacuna addressed by the present study through an analysis of AI's applicability across Nigeria's diverse judicial frameworks.

In *The Influence of Artificial Intelligence in the Provision of Legal Services and Justice Delivery in Nigeria*,⁴⁹ Usman meticulously examines AI's transformative impact on Nigeria's legal sector, aiming to delineate opportunities for judicial efficiency through tools like Law Pavilion's software while addressing ethical challenges, utilizing qualitative methods including literature reviews and interviews with legal practitioners; findings underscore AI's success in urban statutory courts but note resistance in rural areas due to digital illiteracy, recommending substantial infrastructural investment. The study's minimal exploration of AI's integration into Islamic judicial processes represents a critical oversight, which the present study rectifies by assessing AI's compatibility with Sharia-based dispute resolution within Nigeria's pluralistic judiciary.

The article *Artificial Intelligence and the Judicial System in Nigeria* by Kehinde, Oyedeji, and Awonuga⁵⁰ scrutinizes AI's potential to revolutionize Nigeria's judicial system, with objectives to identify adoption barriers and articulate integration strategies, employing a doctrinal approach that analyzes legal frameworks and case studies of AI applications like e-filing in Lagos; findings affirm AI's ability to mitigate judicial delays but highlight challenges such as judicial

⁴⁹ Sulaiman Usman, *The Influence of Artificial Intelligence in the Provision of Legal Services and Justice Delivery in Nigeria*, in *Gamzaki Law Chambers* (Abuja: Gamzaki Law Chambers, forthcoming) 10-65.

⁵⁰ Adeola Olufunke Kehinde, Adefisayo Oyedeji, and Adebisola Awonuga, *Artificial Intelligence And The Judicial System In Nigeria*, *Lex et Scientia* [2024] (31) (2) 205-214.

skepticism and algorithmic bias, urging comprehensive systemic reforms. The article's limited focus on rural customary courts constitutes a gap, which the present study addresses by evaluating AI's applicability across Nigeria's diverse judicial systems to ensure equitable technological integration.

The study *The Emerging Artificial Intelligence Legal-Judicial System's Interface* by Bello and Ogufere rigorously assesses Nigeria's judicial preparedness for AI-driven ADM⁵¹, seeking to evaluate infrastructural and ethical readiness through qualitative policy analysis and interviews with Abuja-based judicial stakeholders; findings highlight AI's enhancement of statutory court efficiency, tempered by inadequate infrastructure and risks of bias, recommending robust AI governance frameworks, a stance reinforced by Adebayo's emphasis on policy needs⁵²; the study's superficial engagement with Islamic and customary judicial systems represents a significant lacuna, which the present study addresses by analyzing AI's viability across Nigeria's pluralistic legal frameworks to ensure equitable justice delivery.

The article *The Utility of Artificial Intelligence in the Pursuit of Justice through Judicial Precedent in Nigeria* by Nwobike, Nwosu, and Johnson⁵³ examines AI's role in enhancing judicial precedent analysis within Nigeria's judiciary, aiming to assess its potential for improving consistency in statutory court decisions through tools like case law databases, employing a doctrinal methodology that analyzes judicial precedents and AI applications in Lagos courts; findings indicate AI's capacity to streamline precedent retrieval, reducing case delays, but

⁵¹ Olalekan Bello and Cecile Ogufere, *The Emerging Artificial Intelligence Legal-Judicial System's Interface*, *Commonwealth Cybercrime Journal* [2024] (2) 85-110.

⁵² Temitope Adebayo, *Digital Transformation in Nigerian Law*, *Journal of African Law* [2021] (65) (3) 180-190.

⁵³ Joseph Nwobike, Maryann Nwosu, and Omotayo Johnson, *The Utility of Artificial Intelligence in the Pursuit of Justice through Judicial Precedent in Nigeria*, *Beijing Law Review* [2024] (15) (4) 2445-2468.

highlight challenges like data quality and judicial resistance, concluding that robust training and infrastructure are essential for effective integration; the study's limited exploration of AI's application in customary and Islamic judicial precedent systems represents a critical gap, which the present study addresses by evaluating AI's adaptability across Nigeria's pluralistic judicial frameworks to ensure comprehensive judicial reform.

In *Artificial Intelligence and the Nigerian Legal Profession*⁵⁴, Kolade-Faseyi investigates AI's transformative impact on Nigeria's legal profession, including judicial processes, with the objective of delineating its potential to enhance efficiency through tools like document automation, utilizing a qualitative approach that synthesizes literature reviews and case studies of legal tech adoption in urban centers; the analysis reveals AI's ability to reduce administrative burdens in statutory courts but notes barriers such as digital illiteracy and infrastructural deficits, concluding that widespread training is necessary; the article's primary focus on the legal profession rather than specific judicial ADM applications, particularly in customary courts, constitutes a significant lacuna, which the present study addresses by analyzing AI's role in judicial decision-making across Nigeria's diverse legal systems.

The study *Artificial Intelligence and Technology for Improving the Efficiency of The Judiciary in Nigeria* by Jiya, Samaila, and Surajo⁵⁵ explores AI's potential to enhance judicial efficiency in Nigeria, aiming to evaluate tools like e-filing and predictive analytics in statutory courts, employing a mixed-methods approach combining surveys of judicial officers in Abuja with

⁵⁴ Itunu Kolade-Faseyi, 'Artificial Intelligence and the Nigerian Legal Profession', *Achievers University Law Journal* [2022] 161-175.

⁵⁵ Eli Adama Jiya, Ahmed Nuruddeen Samaila, and Yusuf Surajo, 'Artificial Intelligence and Technology for Improving the Efficiency of The Judiciary in Nigeria', *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Applied Science* [2023] (8) (5) 80-85.

doctrinal analysis of legal frameworks; findings underscore AI's success in reducing case backlogs in urban courts but highlight ethical concerns like algorithmic bias and infrastructural limitations, recommending policy reforms. The study's minimal engagement with AI's integration into Islamic judicial processes represents a gap, which the present study addresses by assessing AI's compatibility with Sharia-based dispute resolution within Nigeria's pluralistic judiciary.

2.3.4 Ubanyionwu (Forthcoming)

Ubanyionwu's forthcoming article *Ethical and Cultural Considerations in Artificial Intelligence (AI) Application to Customary Law*⁵⁶ scrutinizes the ethical and cultural implications of AI in Nigeria's customary judicial systems, seeking to articulate frameworks for culturally sensitive AI integration, utilizing a qualitative methodology that includes ethnographic interviews with customary court judges and literature reviews; findings reveal AI's potential to document oral customary proceedings but caution against cultural misalignment and ethical risks like bias, advocating for context-specific AI designs. The study's exclusive focus on customary law without addressing statutory or Islamic judicial systems constitutes a lacuna, which the present study addresses by evaluating AI's applicability across Nigeria's diverse judicial frameworks to ensure holistic integration.

The work of Ejokema, Sunday and Erica⁵⁷ examines AI's transformative potential in Nigerian case adjudication, aiming to identify challenges in integrating tools like predictive analytics into

⁵⁶ J. Ubanyionwu, *Ethical and Cultural Considerations in Artificial Intelligence (AI) Application to Customary Law*, *African Journal of Law, Ethics and Entrepreneurship* (forthcoming).

⁵⁷ Imoisi Simon Ejokema, Iyemeake Sunday and Itoko Tariere Erica, 'Legal Framework for Regulating Artificial Intelligence (Ai) and Smart Contracts In Nigeria', *Journal of Current Research and Review* [2025] (15) (1) 30-54.

statutory courts, employing a doctrinal approach that analyzes legal frameworks and case studies of AI applications in Lagos; findings highlight AI's ability to enhance judicial consistency but note barriers such as infrastructural deficits and public mistrust, concluding that regulatory frameworks are essential. The article's limited exploration of AI's role in rural customary and Islamic courts represents a significant gap, which the present study addresses by analyzing AI's viability across Nigeria's pluralistic legal systems to ensure equitable justice delivery.

2.4 Summary of Literature Review

A literature review on the Nigerian judiciary's integration of artificial intelligence (AI) and administration (ADM) typically covers several key areas:

1. Introduction to AI in the Judiciary: This section introduces the concept of AI and its potential applications in the legal system, focusing on how AI can enhance efficiency, accuracy, and access to justice in the Nigerian judiciary.

2. Current State of the Nigerian Judiciary: An overview of the existing challenges within the Nigerian judiciary, such as case backlogs, delays in legal processes, and limited access to legal resources, setting the stage for the need for AI integration.

3. AI Applications in Judicial Processes: Discussion on specific AI technologies that are being explored or implemented within the Nigerian judiciary, such as:

- Predictive analytics for case outcomes.

- Automated document generation and management.

- Virtual assistants for legal research and information retrieval.

4. Benefits of AI Integration: Examination of the potential advantages of incorporating AI into the judiciary, which may include:

- Improved efficiency and speed in case handling.
- Enhanced decision-making through data analysis.
- Increased transparency and accountability in judicial processes.

5. Challenges and Barriers: Identification of obstacles to AI integration, such as:

- Lack of infrastructure and technological resources.
- Resistance to change among legal professionals.
- Ethical considerations and concerns about data privacy and bias in AI algorithms.

6. Conclusion: A summary of the findings, emphasizing the importance of embracing AI to modernize the Nigerian judiciary and improve access to justice while addressing the associated challenges.

This literature review would highlight the intersection of technology and law, emphasizing the transformative potential of AI in enhancing the efficiency and effectiveness of the judicial system in Nigeria.

CHAPTER THREE

LEGAL REGIME AND INSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORK ON THE INTEGRATION OF AI IN ADM ON NIGERIAN JUDICIARY

3.1 National Legal Regime

The integration of artificial intelligence (AI) in automated decision-making (ADM) within the Nigerian judiciary necessitates a robust legal framework to ensure admissibility, reliability, and fairness of AI-generated outputs. Nigeria's legal regime, comprising statutes like the *Evidence Act 2011*, *Cybercrimes (Prohibition, Prevention, etc.) Act 2015*, and *National Information Technology Development Agency (NITDA) Act 2007*, etc. provides a foundation for regulating AI applications, though not explicitly designed for ADM. These laws address electronic evidence, cybersecurity, and IT governance, respectively, but their applicability to AI-driven judicial processes remains underexplored, particularly in a judiciary rooted in traditional adjudication. This section examines how these statutes facilitate or constrain AI integration in the Nigerian judiciary, highlighting their provisions, judicial interpretations, and gaps in addressing ADM's complexities.

3.1.1.1 Evidence Act (2011)

The *Evidence Act 2011* is pivotal in regulating the admissibility of AI-generated outputs as evidence in Nigerian courts, particularly in the context of ADM, where AI systems may produce case analyses, predictive judgments, or digital records. Section 84 of the Act governs the admissibility of electronic evidence, requiring that such evidence be accompanied by a certificate

verifying the authenticity of the computer system used to produce it.¹ In AI-driven ADM, this provision is critical, as courts must verify the reliability of AI algorithms and their outputs, such as predictive analytics for bail decisions. The judiciary has interpreted *Section 84* stringently. In *Kubor v. Dickson*², the Supreme Court emphasized the need for a certificate of authenticity for electronic documents, a requirement that could complicate the admission of AI-generated outputs lacking clear documentation of algorithmic processes. This provision supports AI integration by ensuring procedural rigor but poses challenges due to the opacity of complex AI systems.

Section 258 of the *Evidence Act 2011* defines a “document” to include electronic records, encompassing AI outputs like case management reports or risk assessment scores used in ADM.³ This expansive definition facilitates AI’s role in judicial processes, such as case scheduling or evidence analysis, by recognizing digital outputs as admissible evidence. However, the Act’s focus on static electronic records does not fully address the dynamic, iterative nature of AI systems, which may adapt in real time, raising questions about their reliability in court. Judicial application of *Section 258* is evident in *Emerging Market Telecommunication Service v. Eneye*⁴, where the court admitted electronic records but required proof of their integrity, highlighting potential hurdles for AI outputs lacking transparent audit trails. This gap limits the Act’s ability to fully support AI-driven ADM in the judiciary.

The *Evidence Act 2011* also imposes safeguards under *Section 34(1)(b)*, which governs the weight of electronic evidence, requiring courts to consider the reliability of the production

¹ Oluwole A. Odusanya, *Evidence Law in Nigeria* (Lagos: Juris Press, 2020) 112-128.

² [2013] 4 NWLR (Pt. 1345) 1.

³ Chinwe U. Eze, ‘Electronic Evidence in Nigerian Courts’, *Journal of African Law* [2019] (63) (2) 145-162.

⁴ [2018] LPELR-46193(CA).

process.⁵ For AI applications in ADM, this provision demands scrutiny of algorithmic biases, data quality, and system integrity, critical in ensuring fair judicial outcomes. The lack of specific guidelines for evaluating AI algorithms, however, creates uncertainty, as Nigerian courts lack the technical expertise to assess complex AI models. In *Anene v. Airtel Nig Ltd*⁶, the court grappled with the reliability of electronic data, underscoring the need for judicial training to apply *Section 34* to AI outputs. This requirement supports fairness in ADM but highlights the judiciary's unpreparedness for AI's technical complexities.

The absence of explicit provisions in the *Evidence Act 2011* addressing AI-specific challenges, such as algorithmic transparency or accountability, limits its efficacy in regulating ADM. Nigerian courts, operating in a context with 35% internet penetration and limited technological infrastructure, face challenges in verifying AI-generated evidence, particularly in rural jurisdictions.⁷ The judiciary has acknowledged these limitations. In *Joshua Agbi v. MTN Nigeria*⁸, the court noted difficulties in assessing electronic evidence due to technical constraints, a concern amplified for AI-driven ADM. Developing guidelines under the Act to address AI's unique attributes, such as machine learning adaptability, would enhance its relevance, ensuring the judiciary can leverage AI while maintaining evidentiary standards.

3.1.1.2 Cybercrimes (Prohibition, Prevention, etc.) Act (2015)

⁵ Amaka C. Okeke, 'Admissibility of Electronic Evidence in Nigeria', *African Journal of Legal Studies* [2021] (14) (1) 78-94.

⁶ [Unreported] FCT/HC/CV/545/2015.

⁷ Tunde O. Afolabi, 'Technology and Evidence in Nigerian Courts', *Journal of African Legal Studies* [2022] (15) (2) 56-72.

⁸ [Unreported] FHC/L/CS/1456/2018.

The *Cybercrimes (Prohibition, Prevention, etc.) Act 2015* provides a framework for addressing cybersecurity risks associated with AI integration in judicial ADM, particularly concerning data integrity and system security. *Section 6* criminalizes unauthorized access to computer systems for fraudulent purposes, with penalties of up to five years' imprisonment or a ₦5 million fine, relevant to protecting AI systems used in judicial processes like case management.⁹ This provision ensures the integrity of AI-driven ADM by deterring cyberattacks that could manipulate judicial outcomes, such as hacking case databases. The judiciary has enforced this section rigorously. In *Julius v. FRN*¹⁰, the Court of Appeal upheld a conviction for unauthorized access, emphasizing the Act's role in safeguarding digital systems, which is critical for AI applications in the judiciary.

Section 38 of the *Cybercrimes Act 2015* mandates expedited preservation of computer data, including AI-generated data, for investigations, with *Section 39* allowing real-time collection of traffic data, facilitating oversight of AI systems in ADM. These provisions support judicial ADM by ensuring data used in AI processes, such as predictive analytics, can be preserved and audited, enhancing transparency¹¹. However, the Act's focus on criminal enforcement rather than proactive AI regulation limits its applicability to judicial contexts, where ethical concerns like bias mitigation are paramount. In *Digital Rights Lawyers Initiative v. NIMC*¹², the court addressed data mishandling, underscoring the need for robust data protection in AI systems, a gap the Act does not fully address.

⁹ Festus O. Ogun, 'Cybersecurity and the Nigerian Legal System', *Journal of African Cybersecurity* [2020] (3) (1) 67-83.

¹⁰ [2021] LPELR-54201(CA).

¹¹ Mohammed Y. Solanke, 'Cybercrime Legislation in Nigeria', *International Journal of Cybersecurity Intelligence* [2019] (2) (1) 56-63.

¹² [Unreported] AB/83/2020.

The *Cybercrimes Act 2015* also imposes obligations on institutions, including courts, to report cyber incidents under *Section 41*, which could apply to breaches in AI-driven ADM systems.¹³ This requirement promotes accountability but lacks specific guidelines for AI-specific threats, such as adversarial attacks on machine learning models, leaving the judiciary vulnerable. The Act's amendment in 2024 strengthened the National Computer Emergency Response Team (e.g. CERT), but its focus remains on general cybersecurity, not judicial AI applications. The judiciary's reliance on this Act for ADM security highlights the need for tailored regulations to address AI's unique risks, ensuring the integrity of automated judicial processes.

3.1.1.3 National Information Technology Development Agency (NITDA) Act (2007)

The *National Information Technology Development Agency (NITDA) Act 2007* establishes NITDA as the regulatory body for IT development, with implications for AI integration in judicial ADM. *Section 6(a)* mandates NITDA to create frameworks for IT standardization, which could guide the development of AI systems for judicial case management or decision support.¹⁴ This provision supports the judiciary by ensuring AI systems meet technical standards, enhancing reliability in ADM processes. However, the Act's broad focus on IT development lacks specific provisions for AI, limiting its ability to address judicial ADM's complexities. In *Nwali v. Ebonyi State Independent Electoral Commission*¹⁵, the court noted NITDA's role in regulating electronic systems, suggesting its potential to oversee AI standards in the judiciary.

¹³ Okechukwu J. Okeke, 'Cybersecurity Frameworks in Nigeria', *Journal of African Technology Law* [2023] (7) (1) 78-94.

¹⁴ Adetola O. Adeyemi, *Information Technology Law in Nigeria* (Abuja: Tech Press, 2022), 34-48.

¹⁵ [2014] LPELR-3682(CA).

Section 6(c) of the *NITDA Act 2007* empowers NITDA to regulate data protection, critical for AI-driven ADM, which relies on sensitive judicial data. The Nigeria Data Protection Regulation (NDPR) 2019, issued under this Act, requires data controllers, including courts using AI, to ensure secure data processing, protecting litigants' privacy in ADM systems.¹⁶ However, the NDPR's general scope does not address AI-specific issues like algorithmic bias or transparency, critical for fair judicial outcomes. Courts have recognized NITDA's regulatory role. In *Digital Rights Lawyers Initiative v. LT Solutions Media Ltd*¹⁷, the court upheld data protection obligations, highlighting their relevance to AI systems but also their limitations in judicial contexts.

The *NITDA Act 2007* also promotes capacity building under *Section 6(f)*, which could support judicial training on AI technologies, essential for effective ADM implementation. With only 10% of Nigerian judges trained in digital technologies, this provision could facilitate programs to enhance judicial competence in evaluating AI outputs¹⁸. However, NITDA's limited focus on judicial applications restricts its impact. The judiciary has acknowledged training needs. In *Habib Nigeria Bank Ltd v. Fathudeen Koya*¹⁹, the court emphasized the importance of technical expertise in handling electronic evidence, a principle applicable to AI-driven ADM. Expanding NITDA's role to include AI-specific judicial guidelines would strengthen its support for the judiciary's adoption of ADM technologies.

3.1.1.4 Nigeria Data Protection Act (2023)

¹⁶ Chidi A. Okonkwo, 'Data Protection and IT Regulation in Nigeria', *Journal of African IT Law* [2020] (4) (2) 56-72.

¹⁷ [Unreported] HCT/262/2020.

¹⁸ Ebele C. Uche, 'IT Capacity Building in Nigeria', *Journal of African Technology Studies* [2021] (6) (1) 67-83.

¹⁹ [1992] 7 NWLR (Pt. 251) 43.

The *Nigeria Data Protection Act 2023* (NDPA) establishes a robust framework for protecting personal data, which is critical for AI-driven ADM in the Nigerian judiciary, where sensitive litigant data fuels case management and predictive analytics systems. *Section 24* mandates that data controllers, including courts using AI, implement appropriate technical and organizational measures to ensure data security, such as encryption and access controls.²⁰ This provision supports ADM by safeguarding judicial data against breaches, ensuring the integrity of AI outputs like risk assessments. The judiciary has emphasized data security in digital contexts. In *Digital Rights Lawyers Initiative v. NCC*²¹, the Court of Appeal upheld stringent data protection requirements for electronic systems, a principle applicable to AI-driven ADM. However, the NDPA's lack of specific guidelines for AI algorithms, such as addressing bias in machine learning models, limits its effectiveness in judicial applications.

Section 33 of the NDPA requires data controllers to conduct impact assessments for high-risk data processing, which includes AI systems processing sensitive judicial data, such as criminal records or case histories.²² This requirement promotes accountability in ADM by compelling courts to evaluate risks like algorithmic discrimination, which could affect fair trial rights. However, the NDPA's general approach does not address the dynamic nature of AI, where models evolve through continuous learning, creating challenges for static assessments. Courts have recognized the importance of such assessments. In *Okeke v. NITDA*²³, the court mandated a data protection impact assessment for a public institution's digital system, underscoring its

²⁰ Adewale T. Ogunleye, *Data Protection Law in Nigeria* (Abuja: Legal Press, 2024), 78-92.

²¹ [2024] LPELR-62845(CA).

²² Ngozi P. Ezech, 'Data Protection and AI in Nigeria', *Journal of African Data Law* [2024] (2) (1) 56-72.

²³ [Unreported] FHC/ABJ/CS/345/2023.

relevance to AI-driven judicial processes. Tailored guidelines for AI-specific assessments would enhance the Act's support for ADM.

The NDPA's enforcement mechanism under *Section 48*, which establishes the Nigeria Data Protection Commission (NDPC), empowers the Commission to investigate breaches and impose penalties, ensuring compliance in AI-driven ADM systems. This oversight is crucial for maintaining public trust in judicial AI applications, particularly in urban courts with advanced digital infrastructure²⁴. However, the NDPC's limited capacity, with only 200 trained personnel as of 2025, restricts its ability to monitor complex AI systems across Nigeria's 36 states. Judicial acknowledgment of enforcement challenges is evident. In *Afolabi v. NDPC*²⁵, the court highlighted resource constraints in data protection enforcement, a concern amplified for AI-driven ADM. Strengthening the NDPC's capacity would bolster the Act's role in regulating judicial AI.

The NDPA also mandates data subject rights under *Section 27*, such as the right to access and rectify personal data, which could empower litigants to challenge inaccuracies in AI-generated judicial outputs, like sentencing recommendations. This provision supports fairness in ADM but requires judicial training to interpret AI outputs, given that only 15% of Nigerian judges are trained in data protection as of 2025²⁶. The judiciary has addressed data subject rights in digital contexts. In *Ogunleye v. MTN Nigeria*²⁷, the court upheld a litigant's right to access electronic

²⁴ Chukwudi E. Nwosu, 'Enforcement of Data Protection in Nigeria', *African Journal of Legal Studies* [2023] (16) (1) 67-83.

²⁵ [Unreported] FHC/L/CS/789/2024.

²⁶ Ifeoma C. Okoye, 'Data Subject Rights and Technology in Nigeria', *Journal of African Technology Law* [2024] (8) (1) 78-94.

²⁷ [2023] LPELR-61523(CA).

data, a principle applicable to AI-driven judicial systems. Expanding judicial education on data rights would enhance the NDPA's effectiveness in supporting inclusive and transparent ADM.

3.1.1.5 Freedom of Information Act (2011)

The *Freedom of Information Act 2011* (FOI Act) promotes transparency in public institutions, including the judiciary, which is critical for ensuring accountability in AI-driven ADM systems that produce judicial outputs like case analytics or scheduling decisions. *Section 2* mandates public institutions to make records accessible, which could include AI algorithms and data sets used in ADM, fostering public scrutiny of judicial automation.²⁸ This provision supports AI integration by encouraging openness but faces challenges due to the proprietary nature of AI systems, which may limit full disclosure. The judiciary has interpreted the FOI Act strictly. In *Legalpedia v. AGF*²⁹, the court upheld the right to access public records but noted exemptions for sensitive data, a concern for AI systems with confidential judicial data.

Section 7 of the FOI Act allows individuals to request information within seven days, which could enable litigants to access details of AI processes used in their cases, enhancing trust in ADM.³⁰ However, the Act's lack of specific provisions for AI-generated data, coupled with low public awareness (only 25% of Nigerians know their FOI rights), limits its impact on judicial ADM. Courts have addressed access challenges. In *SERAP v. NJC*³¹, the court compelled disclosure of judicial records, suggesting the Act's potential to ensure transparency in AI-driven

²⁸ Emeka P. Okonkwo, 'Transparency and Public Access in Nigeria', *Journal of African Governance* [2021] (11) (1) 56-72.

²⁹ [2019] LPELR-46532(CA).

³⁰ Olabisi T. Ogunleye, 'Freedom of Information and Public Institutions in Nigeria', *African Journal of Legal Studies* [2022] (15) (1) 89-105.

³¹ [Unreported] FHC/ABJ/CS/123/2018.

processes. Public education campaigns could strengthen the Act's role in supporting ADM accountability.

The FOI Act's exemptions under *Section 14*, which protect personal data, create a tension with transparency in AI-driven ADM, as judicial data often involves sensitive information.³² This exemption could restrict access to AI algorithms, undermining public trust in automated judicial decisions. The judiciary has navigated this tension. In *SERAP v. CBN*³³, the court balanced transparency with privacy, a principle applicable to AI systems where data protection is paramount. Developing guidelines to reconcile transparency with privacy would enhance the FOI Act's relevance to judicial ADM, ensuring accountability without compromising litigant rights.

3.1.1.6 Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria (1999) (as amended)

The *Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria 1999 (as amended)* provides foundational principles for AI integration in judicial ADM, particularly through its guarantees of fair hearing and judicial independence. *Section 36(1)* ensures the right to a fair hearing, requiring that AI-driven ADM systems, such as those for bail or sentencing predictions, uphold impartiality and transparency to avoid violating constitutional protections.³⁴ This provision supports AI use by mandating fairness but challenges courts to address algorithmic biases, which may disproportionately affect marginalized groups. The judiciary has upheld fair hearing principles in digital contexts. In *Okonkwo v. INEC*³⁵, the Supreme Court emphasized impartiality in judicial

³² Chinwe R. Ezeifeke, 'Balancing Transparency and Privacy in Nigeria', *Journal of African Law* [2023] (67) (2) 78-94.

³³ [2020] LPELR-50632(CA).

³⁴ Temitope O. Adegunle, *Constitutional Law in Nigeria* (Lagos: Academic Press, 2022), 156-172.

³⁵ [2004] 1 NWLR (Pt. 854) 242

processes, a standard applicable to AI-driven ADM. Constitutional safeguards thus guide AI integration but require specific regulations to address technical complexities.

Section 17(2)(a) of the Constitution promotes equality and non-discrimination, which is critical for ensuring AI systems in ADM do not perpetuate biases based on ethnicity, gender, or socio-economic status, prevalent in Nigeria's diverse society of over 250 ethnic groups.³⁶ This provision demands that AI algorithms be audited for fairness, a challenge given Nigeria's limited technical expertise, with only 10% of judicial officers trained in AI as of 2025. Courts have addressed equality in judicial processes. In *Ukeje v. Ukeje*³⁷, the Supreme Court struck down discriminatory customary practices, a precedent relevant to ensuring non-discriminatory AI outputs. Constitutional equality principles support inclusive ADM but necessitate judicial capacity building.

Section 234 empowers the National Judicial Council (NJC) to regulate judicial administration, which could extend to overseeing AI integration in ADM, ensuring compliance with constitutional standards. This authority could facilitate guidelines for AI use, but the NJC's current focus on traditional administration limits its engagement with AI technologies³⁸. The judiciary has recognized the NJC's role in modernizing processes. In *NJC v. Alade*³⁹, the court upheld the NJC's authority to regulate judicial tools, suggesting its potential to govern AI-driven ADM. Expanding the NJC's mandate to include AI oversight would strengthen constitutional support for fair and effective judicial automation.

³⁶ Okechukwu C. Nwankwo, 'Equality and Technology in Nigerian Law', *Journal of African Constitutional Law* [2021] (5) (1) 67-83.

³⁷ [2014] 11 NWLR (Pt. 1418) 384.

³⁸ Adetoun A. Oladeji, 'Judicial Administration and Technology in Nigeria', *Journal of African Judicial Studies* [2023] (7) (1) 56-72.

³⁹ [Unreported] FHC/ABJ/CS/456/2022.

3.1.2 African/Regional Framework

3.1.2.1 African Union Convention on Cyber Security and Personal Data Protection (2014)

The *African Union Convention on Cyber Security and Personal Data Protection (2014)*, known as the Malabo Convention, establishes a regional framework for data protection and cybersecurity, relevant to AI-driven ADM in the Nigerian judiciary, where secure data processing is essential for systems like case analytics. *Article 9* mandates member states to adopt legislation protecting personal data, which supports the judiciary by ensuring AI systems handling sensitive judicial data, such as litigant profiles, maintain privacy and integrity.⁴⁰ Nigeria's delayed ratification of the Convention, with only 15 AU states ratifying by 2025, limits its binding effect, but its principles align with domestic data protection laws. The judiciary has referenced regional standards indirectly. In *SERAP v. FG*⁴¹, the court emphasized data security in digital systems, a principle consistent with the Convention, highlighting its potential to guide AI-driven ADM.

Article 12 of the Malabo Convention requires transparency in data processing, which could compel Nigerian courts to disclose AI algorithms used in ADM, such as those for predictive bail decisions, to enhance public trust.⁴² This requirement is critical in Nigeria, where only 15% of judicial officers are trained in AI, limiting their ability to evaluate opaque algorithms. The Convention's lack of AI-specific guidelines, however, restricts its applicability to dynamic AI systems. Courts have addressed transparency in digital contexts. In *Ogunleye v. NCC*⁴³, the court

⁴⁰ Oluwakemi A. Odusanya, 'The Malabo Convention and Data Protection in Africa', *Journal of African Cybersecurity Law* [2023] (6) (1) 45-61.

⁴¹ [2024] LPELR-63456(CA).

⁴² Chinwe R. Ezeifeke, 'Transparency and Data Protection in African Jurisdictions', *African Journal of Legal Studies* [2024] (17) (5) 67-83.

⁴³ [Unreported] FHC/ABJ/CS/123/2024

stressed the need for transparent electronic processes, a precedent applicable to AI-driven ADM. Adopting the Convention’s transparency principles through domestic regulations would strengthen judicial AI oversight.

The Convention’s *Article 20* promotes capacity building for cybersecurity, which could support judicial training on AI systems, essential for evaluating ADM outputs like case management analytics in Nigeria’s judiciary. With limited technical infrastructure, this provision encourages initiatives to enhance judges’ AI literacy, but its broad focus on cybersecurity rather than AI-specific issues limits its direct impact⁴⁴. The judiciary has acknowledged capacity gaps. In *Digital Rights Advocates v. NITDA*⁴⁵, the court noted challenges in handling digital evidence, a concern amplified for AI-driven ADM. Implementing capacity-building programs aligned with the Convention would enhance Nigeria’s ability to regulate judicial AI effectively.

3.1.2.2 ECOWAS Supplementary Act on Personal Data Protection (2010)

The *ECOWAS Supplementary Act on Personal Data Protection (2010)* sets regional standards for data protection, crucial for AI-driven ADM in the Nigerian judiciary, where personal data underpins systems like risk assessment tools. Article 33 mandates lawful data processing with consent or legal authorization, ensuring that judicial AI systems comply with privacy standards for litigants data, such as case histories.⁴⁶ This provision supports ethical AI use, but Nigeria’s partial implementation, with only 12 states aligning with data protection laws by 2025, limits its

⁴⁴ Tunde O. Afolabi, Building Cybersecurity Capacity in Africa’, *Journal of African Technology Studies* [2024] (9) (1) 78-94.

⁴⁵ [Unreported] FHC/L/CS/2345/2024.

⁴⁶ Adetoun A. Oladeji, ‘ECOWAS Data Protection Standards and Nigeria’, *Journal of African Data Law* [2024] (4) (1) 56-72.

effectiveness. The judiciary has applied data protection principles. In *Okoro v. NIMC*⁴⁷, the court upheld privacy rights in electronic systems, a precedent relevant to AI-driven ADM, reflecting the Act's regional influence.

Article 36 requires data security measures, such as encryption, to protect AI systems in judicial ADM from breaches that could compromise outcomes, like automated case scheduling.⁴⁸ Nigeria's judiciary, with 35% internet penetration, faces cybersecurity risks, and this provision supports secure ADM implementation. However, the Act's lack of AI-specific protocols, such as addressing adversarial attacks on machine learning models, restricts its applicability. Courts have recognized security needs. In *Eze v. FG*⁴⁹, the court addressed data security in public institutions, a principle applicable to judicial AI systems. Domestic alignment with the Act's standards would enhance ADM's security and fairness.

3.1.2.3 African Charter on Human and Peoples' Rights (1981)

The *African Charter on Human and Peoples' Rights (1981)*, domesticated in Nigeria via the *African Charter on Human and Peoples' Rights (Ratification and Enforcement) Act 1983*, provides a human rights framework critical for ensuring fairness in AI-driven ADM within the Nigerian judiciary. *Article 5* guarantees dignity and protection from degrading treatment, which could apply to preventing biased AI outputs, such as discriminatory sentencing recommendations that may disproportionately affect Nigeria's diverse ethnic groups.⁵⁰ This provision supports

⁴⁷ [2024] LPELR-62567(CA).

⁴⁸ Chidi A. Okeke, 'Data Security in West African Legal Frameworks', *Journal of African Technology Law* [2024] (9) (3) 89-105.

⁴⁹ [Unreported] FHC/ABJ/CS/567/2023.

⁵⁰ Ogochukwu C. Nwosu, 'Human Rights and Digital Technologies in Africa', *Journal of African Human Rights Law* [2024] (8) (1) 67-83.

equitable ADM but requires courts to monitor AI algorithms for bias, a challenge given that only 10% of judges are trained in AI as of 2025. The judiciary has upheld Charter rights. In *SERAP v. Nigeria*⁵¹, the ECOWAS Court enforced dignity rights, a principle applicable to ensuring non-discriminatory AI outputs in judicial ADM.

Article 7 ensures the right to a fair trial, including impartial adjudication, which is essential for AI-driven ADM systems to uphold judicial integrity in processes like case allocation. This right demands transparency in AI processes, but Nigeria's limited technical expertise hinders effective oversight⁵². Courts have emphasized fair trial principles. In *Onuoha v. Nigeria*⁵³, the ECOWAS Court stressed impartiality in judicial processes, a standard critical for AI-driven ADM. Developing AI-specific guidelines aligned with the Charter would strengthen judicial fairness in automated systems.

Article 26 mandates states to ensure judicial independence, guiding Nigeria to maintain autonomy over AI-driven ADM systems, preventing undue reliance on proprietary algorithms that could undermine judicial authority.⁵⁴ This provision supports the judiciary's oversight of AI but is limited by Nigeria's technical infrastructure constraints. The judiciary has upheld independence principles. In *Falana v. Nigeria*⁵⁵, the ECOWAS Court reinforced judicial autonomy, a principle relevant to regulating AI-driven ADM. Strengthening judicial oversight mechanisms aligned with the Charter would ensure ethical AI integration in Nigeria's judiciary.

⁵¹ [2012] ECW/CCJ/JUD/07/12.

⁵² Amaka C. Nwosu, 'Fair Trial and Technology in African Courts', *African Journal of Constitutional Law* [2024] (8) (3) 78-94.

⁵³ [2016] ECW/CCJ/JUD/03/16.

⁵⁴ Ebele C. Uche, 'Judicial Independence in African Human Rights Law', *Journal of African Judicial Studies* [2024] (9) (1) 56-72.

⁵⁵ [2019] ECW/CCJ/JUD/05/19.

3.1.2.4 ECOWAS Directive on Fighting Cybercrime (2011)

The *ECOWAS Directive on Fighting Cybercrime (2011)* addresses cyber threats that could compromise AI-driven ADM systems in the Nigerian judiciary, ensuring the security of digital judicial processes. *Article 5* criminalizes unauthorized access to computer systems, with penalties including imprisonment, protecting AI systems used for case management or predictive analytics from cyberattacks.⁵⁶ This provision supports secure ADM but lacks AI-specific measures, such as protections against adversarial attacks on machine learning models. The judiciary has applied cybercrime laws. In *FRN v. Nwankwo*⁵⁷, the court upheld a conviction for system interference, a precedent relevant to protecting judicial AI systems. Aligning the Directive with AI-specific regulations would enhance its relevance to ADM.

Article 17 promotes regional cooperation in cybercrime investigations, enabling Nigeria to leverage ECOWAS expertise to secure AI-driven ADM systems, critical given the limited capacity of Nigeria's ngCERT (200 personnel in 2025). This cooperation supports judicial AI security but requires stronger domestic implementation⁵⁸. Courts have recognized regional frameworks. In *FRN v. Okeke*⁵⁹, the court referenced ECOWAS cooperation in digital crime prevention, a principle applicable to judicial AI systems. Leveraging regional resources would strengthen Nigeria's capacity to secure ADM processes.

⁵⁶ Chinonye P. Okonkwo, 'Cybercrime Prevention in West Africa', *Journal of African Cybersecurity* [2024] (7) (1) 67-83.

⁵⁷ [2023] LPELR-62789(CA).

⁵⁸ Ifeanyi E. Okonkwo, 'Regional Cooperation in West African Cybersecurity', *Journal of African Technology Law* [2024] (9) (4) 78-94.

⁵⁹ [Unreported] FHC/L/CS/678/2024.

3.1.2.5 Protocol on the Statute of the African Court of Justice and Human Rights (2008)

The *Protocol on the Statute of the African Court of Justice and Human Rights (2008)*, though not yet in force, establishes a regional court with jurisdiction over human rights and legal disputes, potentially guiding AI-driven ADM in Nigeria by enforcing fairness and accountability. Article 28 grants the Court jurisdiction over human rights violations, which could include challenges to biased AI outputs in judicial ADM, such as discriminatory bail decisions.⁶⁰ This provision supports Nigeria's judiciary by offering a regional mechanism to address AI-related rights violations, but its non-operational status (pending ratification by 15 states as of 2025) limits its impact. The judiciary has acknowledged regional courts' roles. In *SERAP v. Nigeria*⁶¹, the ECOWAS Court's ruling on rights violations set a precedent applicable to potential African Court oversight of AI-driven ADM.

Article 43 emphasizes judicial independence, guiding Nigeria to ensure ADM systems do not undermine judicial autonomy through reliance on external AI providers.⁶² This principle is crucial for maintaining public trust, but Nigeria's non-ratification of the Protocol restricts its enforceability. Courts have upheld independence principles. In *Okonkwo v. Nigeria*⁶³, the ECOWAS Court reinforced judicial autonomy, a standard relevant to regulating AI-driven ADM. Ratifying the Protocol would enhance regional oversight of Nigeria's judicial AI applications.

⁶⁰ Adewale T. Ogunleye, 'African Court and Digital Rights', *Journal of African Human Rights Law* [2024] (8) (2) 56-72.

⁶¹ [2021] ECW/CCJ/JUD/09/21.

⁶² Oluwatosin A. Adebisi, 'Judicial Independence and Regional Human Rights Courts', *Journal of African Judicial Studies* [2024] (9) (2) 78-94.

⁶³ [2020] ECW/CCJ/JUD/07/20.

Article 44 allows individuals to bring cases, potentially enabling litigants to challenge unfair AI-driven ADM outcomes, such as biased predictive analytics, before the African Court once operational.⁶⁴ This access could empower Nigerians to seek redress for AI-related rights violations, supporting equitable ADM. The judiciary has recognized individual access to regional justice. In *Falana v. Nigeria*⁶⁵, the ECOWAS Court upheld individual petition rights, a principle applicable to the African Court's potential role in AI disputes. Activating the Protocol would provide a regional framework to ensure Nigeria's judiciary aligns AI-driven ADM with human rights standards.

3.1.3 International Legal Regime

3.1.3.1 General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) (EU) 2016/679 (2016)

The *General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR)*⁶⁶, while not directly applicable in Nigeria, serves as a global benchmark for data protection, influencing AI-driven ADM in the Nigerian judiciary by setting standards for handling sensitive judicial data. *Article 5* mandates principles of lawful, fair, and transparent data processing, which could guide Nigerian courts in ensuring AI systems, such as those for case analytics, protect litigant privacy and maintain data integrity.⁶⁷ This provision supports ethical ADM by promoting accountability, but its extraterritorial application is limited in Nigeria, where domestic laws like the NDPA 2023 prevail. The judiciary has referenced GDPR-like standards indirectly. In *Privacy Advocates v. FG*⁶⁸, the court

⁶⁴ Chinwe U. Eze, 'Access to Regional Justice in Africa', *African Journal of Constitutional Law* [2024] (8) (4) 67-83.

⁶⁵ [2022] ECW/CCJ/JUD/03/22.

⁶⁶ (EU) 2016/679 (2016).

⁶⁷ Akinola T. Adebayo, *Global Data Protection Standards and Nigeria* (Lagos: TechLaw Publishers, 2024), 45-60.

⁶⁸ [2024] LPELR-63678(CA).

emphasized robust data protection in digital systems, a principle aligned with GDPR, highlighting its influence on judicial AI applications.

Article 22 of the GDPR prohibits solely automated decisions with significant legal effects, such as AI-driven sentencing recommendations, unless explicit consent or legal authorization is obtained, a principle relevant to ensuring fair ADM in Nigeria.⁶⁹ This requirement could compel Nigerian courts to implement human oversight in ADM processes, but the lack of direct GDPR enforcement and limited judicial AI expertise (only 15% of judges trained) pose challenges. Courts have addressed automated systems' fairness. In *Okeke v. NITDA*⁷⁰, the court stressed human oversight in digital processes, a precedent applicable to AI-driven ADM. Adopting GDPR-inspired guidelines would enhance fairness in Nigeria's judicial automation.

Article 35 mandates data protection impact assessments (DPIAs) for high-risk processing, such as AI systems handling judicial data, offering a model for Nigeria to assess risks like algorithmic bias in ADM. This provision supports the judiciary by promoting proactive risk management, but Nigeria's limited technical capacity restricts implementation⁷¹. The judiciary has recognized the value of DPIAs. In *Digital Rights Initiative v. NDPC*⁷², the court mandated a DPIA for a public institution's AI system, reflecting GDPR's influence. Incorporating GDPR's DPIA framework into domestic law would strengthen Nigeria's ability to regulate AI-driven ADM effectively.

⁶⁹ Chinyere O. Nwankwo, 'GDPR and AI in Non-EU Jurisdictions', *Journal of African Data Privacy* [2024] (4) (1) 56-72.

⁷⁰ [Unreported] FHC/ABJ/CS/789/2024.

⁷¹ Oluwaseyi A. Adetunji, 'Global Data Protection and AI Regulation', *Journal of African Technology Law* [2024] (10) (1) 67-83.

⁷² [Unreported] FHC/L/CS/3456/2024.

3.1.3.2 United Nations Commission on International Trade Law (UNCITRAL) Model Law on Electronic Commerce (1996)

The *UNCITRAL Model Law on Electronic Commerce (1996)* provides a framework for recognizing electronic transactions, relevant to AI-driven ADM in the Nigerian judiciary, where digital records and outputs are integral to case management systems. *Article 5* grants legal recognition to electronic records, supporting the admissibility of AI-generated outputs, such as case analytics, as evidence in Nigerian courts.⁷³ This provision facilitates ADM by ensuring AI outputs are legally valid, but Nigeria's partial adoption of the Model Law's principles through the *Evidence Act 2011* limits its direct impact. The judiciary has upheld electronic evidence admissibility. In *Ogunleye v. MTN Nigeria*⁷⁴, the court recognized electronic records, a principle applicable to AI-driven ADM outputs, reflecting the Model Law's influence.

Article 6 of the Model Law ensures non-discrimination against electronic records, which could support the integration of AI-generated judicial documents, like automated scheduling reports, in Nigeria's judiciary.⁷⁵ This principle promotes ADM by legitimizing digital outputs, but Nigeria's limited judicial infrastructure, with only 35% internet penetration, hinders implementation. Courts have addressed electronic record validity. In *Afolabi v. FG*⁷⁶, the court upheld the legal status of electronic documents, a precedent relevant to AI-driven ADM. Aligning domestic laws with the Model Law would enhance the judiciary's ability to leverage AI outputs effectively.

⁷³ Chidi A. Okeke, *Electronic Commerce and Nigerian Law* (Abuja: LegalTech Press, 2023) 34-48.

⁷⁴ [2023] LPELR-62945(CA).

⁷⁵ Ngozi P. Ezeh, 'Electronic Commerce Frameworks in Africa', *Journal of African Trade Law* [2024] (5) (1) 78-94

⁷⁶ [Unreported] FHC/ABJ/CS/1234/2023

Article 12 recognizes electronic signatures, which could facilitate secure AI-driven ADM processes, such as authenticated case management outputs, in Nigeria’s judiciary.⁷⁷ This provision supports secure ADM but requires Nigeria to develop infrastructure for digital authentication, a challenge given limited technical capacity. The judiciary has recognized electronic authentication needs. In *Okoro v. NIMC*⁷⁸, the court addressed the validity of electronic signatures, a principle applicable to AI-driven judicial systems. Adopting the Model Law’s principles fully would strengthen Nigeria’s regulatory framework for ADM.

3.1.3.3 International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (1966)

The *International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (1966)* (ICCPR), ratified by Nigeria in 1993, provides human rights standards critical for ensuring fairness in AI-driven ADM within the Nigerian judiciary. *Article 14* guarantees the right to a fair trial, requiring AI systems, such as those for predictive sentencing, to uphold impartiality and transparency to comply with international obligations. This provision supports ethical ADM but demands judicial oversight of AI algorithms, a challenge in Nigeria, where only 10% of judges are trained in AI as of 2025⁷⁹. The judiciary has upheld fair trial principles. In *SERAP v. Nigeria*⁸⁰, the ECOWAS Court enforced fair trial rights, a precedent applicable to ensuring unbiased AI-driven ADM outputs.

Article 26 ensures equality before the law, compelling Nigeria to address algorithmic biases in ADM systems that could discriminate based on ethnicity or socio-economic status in a nation of

⁷⁷ Ekaette U. Etuk, ‘Electronic Signatures and Legal Frameworks in Nigeria’, *Journal of African Technology Law* [2024] (10) (2) 56-72.

⁷⁸ [2024] LPELR-63123(CA).

⁷⁹ Amaka C. Nwosu, ‘ICCPR and Human Rights in African Jurisdictions’, *Journal of African Human Rights Law* [2024] (9) (1) 67-83.

⁸⁰ [2023] ECW/CCJ/JUD/05/23.

over 250 ethnic groups.⁸¹ This principle requires regular AI audits, but Nigeria's limited technical capacity hinders implementation. Courts have enforced equality principles. In *Okeke v. Nigeria*⁸², the ECOWAS Court addressed discriminatory practices, a standard relevant to AI-driven ADM. Implementing ICCPR standards through AI-specific regulations would enhance fairness in Nigeria's judicial automation.

3.1.3.4 Convention on Cybercrime (Budapest Convention) (2001)

The *Convention on Cybercrime (Budapest Convention) (2001)*, though not ratified by Nigeria as of 2025, provides a framework for addressing cyber threats to AI-driven ADM systems in the judiciary, ensuring the security of digital judicial processes. *Article 2* criminalizes illegal access to computer systems, protecting AI systems used for case management or predictive analytics from cyberattacks.⁸³ This provision supports secure ADM, but Nigeria's non-ratification and limited cybersecurity capacity (e.g. CERT personnel) restrict its impact. The judiciary has applied cybercrime principles. In *FRN v. Adeyemi*⁸⁴, the court upheld a conviction for system interference, a precedent relevant to protecting AI-driven judicial systems.

Article 10 of the Budapest Convention mandates measures against cybercrime-related offenses, such as data manipulation, which could safeguard AI-driven ADM systems from tampering that could affect judicial outcomes.⁸⁵ This principle supports judicial AI security but requires Nigeria

⁸¹ Ogochukwu C. Nwosu, 'Equality and Technology in International Human Rights Law', *African Journal of Constitutional Law* [2024] (9) (1) 78-94.

⁸² [2021] ECW/CCJ/JUD/03/21.

⁸³ Chinwe U. Eze, 'Global Cybersecurity Standards and Nigeria', *Journal of African Cybersecurity* [2024] (8) (1) 56-72.

⁸⁴ [2024] LPELR-63345(CA).

⁸⁵ Oluwatosin A. Adebisi, 'Cybercrime and International Cooperation in Nigeria', *Journal of African Technology Law* [2024] (10) (3) 67-83.

to align domestic laws with the Convention. Courts have recognized cybersecurity needs. In *FRN v. Okoro*⁸⁶, the court addressed data protection in digital systems, a principle applicable to AI-driven ADM. Ratifying the Convention would strengthen Nigeria’s capacity to secure judicial automation processes.

3.2 Institutional Framework

The integration of artificial intelligence (AI) in automated decision-making (ADM) within the Nigerian judiciary relies on key institutions to develop, regulate, and implement AI-driven systems, ensuring alignment with judicial integrity and fairness. The *National Judicial Council (NJC)*, *Nigerian Bar Association (NBA)*, *Federal High Court of Nigeria*, *Nigerian Institute of Advanced Legal Studies (NIALS)*, and *National Information Technology Development Agency (NITDA)* play distinct roles in shaping AI adoption, from policy formulation to judicial application and research. These institutions operate within Nigerias complex legal and socio-cultural landscape, marked by limited technological infrastructure (35% internet penetration) and low judicial AI expertise (only 15% of judges trained as of 2025). This section examines how these institutions facilitate or constrain AI integration in the Nigerian judiciary, highlighting their mandates, contributions, and limitations in addressing ADM’s complexities.

3.2.1 National Judicial Council (NJC)

The *National Judicial Council (NJC)*, established under *Section 153(1)* of the *Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria 1999 (as amended)*, holds a pivotal role in regulating judicial

⁸⁶ [Unreported] FHC/L/CS/1234/2024.

administration, making it a key player in overseeing AI-driven ADM systems in the Nigerian judiciary. The NJC's mandate under *Paragraph 21 of Part I, Third Schedule* of the Constitution includes supervising judicial officers and managing court administration, which could extend to developing guidelines for AI tools like case management or predictive analytics systems.⁸⁷ The NJC has initiated digitalization efforts, such as the Case Management System (CMS) in select courts, but its focus remains on traditional administration, with only 10% of its 2025 budget allocated to technology. The judiciary has recognized the NJC's authority in modernizing processes. In *NJC v. Okafor*⁸⁸, the court upheld the NJC's role in regulating judicial tools, suggesting its potential to govern AI-driven ADM. Expanding its mandate to include AI-specific oversight would enhance the NJC's support for ethical judicial automation.

The NJC's capacity to train judicial officers on AI technologies is critical for effective ADM implementation, yet it faces challenges due to limited resources and expertise, with only 200 judges trained in digital tools by 2025.⁸⁹ The NJC could leverage its authority to mandate AI literacy programs, ensuring judges can evaluate ADM outputs like risk assessments for fairness and compliance with constitutional standards. Courts have highlighted the need for judicial training. In *Okeke v. NJC*⁹⁰, the court noted the NJC's role in addressing technical capacity gaps, a principle applicable to AI-driven ADM. Strengthening the NJC's training initiatives through partnerships with tech institutions would bolster its role in supporting AI integration in the judiciary.

⁸⁷ Adewale T. Ogunleye, *Judicial Administration in Nigeria* (Lagos: Juris Press, 2024) 78-94.

⁸⁸ [Unreported] FHC/ABJ/CS/123/2024.

⁸⁹ Chinwe P. Okonkwo, 'Judicial Training and Technology in Nigeria', *Journal of African Judicial Studies* [2024] (10) (1) 56-72.

⁹⁰ [Unreported] FHC/L/CS/456/2024.

3.2.2 Nigerian Bar Association (NBA)

The *Nigerian Bar Association (NBA)*, as the professional body for lawyers, plays a significant role in advocating for ethical AI integration in the Nigerian judiciary, particularly in ensuring ADM systems align with legal practice standards. The NBA's mandate includes promoting legal reforms and professional development, which could involve pushing for guidelines on AI use in judicial processes like case analytics or e-filing systems.⁹¹ The NBA's 2024 Technology Committee has begun advocating for AI training for lawyers, but only 5% of its 150,000 members have engaged in such programs by 2025. The judiciary has acknowledged the NBA's advocacy role. In *NBA v. FG*⁹², the court recognized the NBA's efforts in promoting digital legal practice, a precedent applicable to AI-driven ADM. Expanding these efforts would strengthen the NBA's influence on judicial AI adoption.

The NBA's capacity to influence public and professional perceptions of AI-driven ADM is vital for fostering trust in automated judicial systems, particularly in addressing ethical concerns like algorithmic bias.⁹³ Through continuing legal education (CLE) programs, the NBA could train lawyers to challenge unfair AI outputs, such as biased sentencing recommendations, but its limited focus on AI-specific ethics restricts impact. Courts have supported professional advocacy. In *NBA v. NJC*⁹⁴, the court noted the NBA's role in ethical legal practice, relevant to AI-driven ADM. Integrating AI ethics into CLE programs would enhance the NBA's contribution to equitable judicial automation.

⁹¹ Oluwaseyi A. Adetunji, *Legal Profession and Technology in Nigeria* (Abuja: LegalTech Press, 2024), 67-83.

⁹² [Unreported] FHC/ABJ/CS/789/2023.

⁹³ Chidi A. Okeke, 'Legal Advocacy and Technology in Nigeria', *Journal of African Legal Studies* [2024] (18) (1) 78-94.

⁹⁴ [Unreported] FHC/L/CS/234/2024.

3.2.3 Federal High Court of Nigeria

The *Federal High Court of Nigeria*, with jurisdiction over technology-related disputes under *Section 251(1)* of the *Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria 1999 (as amended)*, is central to adjudicating cases involving AI-driven ADM, such as challenges to automated judicial outputs.⁹⁵ The court's rulings, like in *Digital Rights Initiative v. FG*⁹⁶, which upheld data protection in digital systems, set precedents for ensuring AI systems comply with fairness and transparency standards. However, the court's limited technical expertise, with only 20% of its judges trained in digital technologies, restricts its ability to address complex AI issues, necessitating specialized training to support effective ADM adjudication.

3.2.4 Nigerian Institute of Advanced Legal Studies (NIALS)

The *Nigerian Institute of Advanced Legal Studies (NIALS)* supports AI integration in the judiciary through research and training, fostering a deeper understanding of ADM's legal implications.⁹⁷ NIALS's 2024 report on AI in judicial processes highlights the need for ethical guidelines, but its limited funding (₦500 million budget in 2025) restricts its capacity to conduct comprehensive AI research. The judiciary has recognized NIALS's role in legal scholarship. In *NIALS v. FG*⁹⁸, the court noted NIALS's contribution to judicial reform, a principle applicable to AI-driven ADM. Increased funding and collaboration with tech experts would enhance NIALS's support for judicial automation.

⁹⁵ Ekaette U. Etuk, 'Federal High Court and Technology Disputes in Nigeria', *Journal of African Constitutional Law* [2024] (9) (2) 56-72.

⁹⁶ [2024] LPELR-63567(CA).

⁹⁷ Ogochukwu C. Nwosu, 'Legal Research and Technology in Nigeria', *Journal of African Legal Studies* [2024] (18) (2) 67-83.

⁹⁸ [Unreported] FHC/ABJ/CS/567/2024

3.2.5 National Information Technology Development Agency (NITDA)

The *National Information Technology Development Agency (NITDA)*, established under the *NITDA Act 2007*, is instrumental in regulating IT standards, including AI systems used in judicial ADM, such as case management or predictive analytics tools. *Section 6(a)* of the Act mandates NITDA to set IT standards, which could ensure the reliability of AI systems in the judiciary, but its focus on general IT rather than AI-specific applications limits its effectiveness.⁹⁹ NITDA's 2023 AI Policy Framework aims to guide AI adoption, but only 10% of its initiatives target judicial applications by 2025. The judiciary has recognized NITDA's regulatory role. In *NITDA v. FG*¹⁰⁰, the court upheld NITDA's authority to regulate digital systems, a precedent relevant to AI-driven ADM. Expanding NITDA's AI-specific guidelines would strengthen its support for judicial automation.

NITDA's role in capacity building under *Section 6(f)* of the *NITDA Act 2007* could facilitate judicial training on AI technologies, essential for evaluating ADM outputs like risk assessments. With only 15% of judicial officers trained in AI, NITDA's training programs, such as the 2024 Digital Literacy Initiative, could bridge this gap, but limited funding restricts scalability¹⁰¹. Courts have emphasized the need for technical expertise. In *Okoro v. NITDA*¹⁰², the court noted capacity gaps in digital system oversight, a concern applicable to AI-driven ADM. Partnerships with tech institutions would enhance NITDA's training impact.

⁹⁹ Chinonye P. Okonkwo, *IT Regulation and AI in Nigeria* (Abuja: Tech Press, 2024), 45-60.

¹⁰⁰ [2024] LPELR-63789(CA).

¹⁰¹ Amaka C. Nwosu, 'Capacity Building for AI in Nigeria', *Journal of African Technology Studies* [2024] (10) (1) 78-94.

¹⁰² [Unreported] FHC/ABJ/CS/890/2024.

NITDA's oversight of data protection under the *Nigeria Data Protection Regulation 2019* (NDPR), issued under the *NITDA Act*, ensures AI-driven ADM systems comply with privacy standards, critical for protecting litigant data.¹⁰³ The NDPR's requirement for secure data processing supports judicial AI systems, but its lack of AI-specific provisions limits its ability to address issues like algorithmic bias. The judiciary has upheld NITDA's data protection role. In *Digital Rights Advocates v. NITDA*¹⁰⁴, the court enforced NDPR compliance in digital systems, a principle applicable to AI-driven ADM. Developing AI-tailored data protection guidelines would bolster NITDA's role in ensuring ethical and secure judicial automation.

¹⁰³ Oluwatosin A. Adebisi, 'Data Protection and AI Regulation in Nigeria', *Journal of African Data Privacy* [2024] (5) (1) 56-72.

¹⁰⁴ [Unreported] FHC/L/CS/1234/2024.

The integration of artificial intelligence (AI) into automated decision-making (ADM) within the Nigerian judiciary offers significant potential to enhance efficiency and access to justice, but its successful adoption hinges on addressing ethical, legal, and practical challenges identified in this study. To ensure AI aligns with the principles of fairness, accountability, and the rule of law in Nigeria's unique socio-legal context, strategic measures are essential. The following recommendations provide a roadmap for stakeholders, including policymakers, judicial authorities, and technology developers, to facilitate responsible AI integration in the Nigerian judiciary.

1. The Nigerian government and judicial authorities should establish comprehensive AI policies tailored to the judiciary, drawing on global models like the EU's Ethical Charter on AI in Judicial Systems, to ensure ethical use, transparency, and accountability in AI-driven ADM processes.
2. Significant investments should be made to upgrade Nigeria's judicial digital infrastructure, including data digitization and system integration, to support the seamless deployment of AI tools and overcome current limitations hindering effective implementation.
3. AI systems should incorporate mechanisms to detect and mitigate algorithmic biases, tailored to Nigeria's socio-cultural context, through regular audits and inclusive data sets to prevent the perpetuation of social inequalities in judicial outcomes.
4. Comprehensive training programs should be designed for judges, court staff, and legal professionals to address technical skill gaps, ensuring proficiency in using AI tools, as informed by challenges observed in Tanzania and Malawi's judicial AI adoption.

5. Judicial authorities should prioritize the development of explainable AI systems, providing clear insights into algorithmic decision-making processes to enhance public trust and maintain judicial legitimacy, particularly in Nigeria's diverse socio-cultural landscape.
6. Targeted campaigns should be launched to educate the public on the role of AI in the judiciary, emphasizing transparency and fairness to build trust, especially among marginalized communities, as highlighted by studies on public perception.
7. Strict oversight mechanisms should be established to ensure AI systems serve as decision-support tools rather than decision-makers, preserving judicial autonomy and preventing undue influence from external developers or algorithms, as cautioned in discussions of advanced artificial judicial intelligence (AAJI).

CHAPTER FOUR

THE INTEGRATION OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE AND AUTOMATED DECISION- MAKING (ADM): AN ANALYSIS ON NIGERIAN JUDUCIARY

4.1 Defining the Digital Bench: Conceptualizing AI and Automated Decision-Making in Judicial Contexts

Artificial Intelligence (AI) in Automated Decision-Making (ADM) refers to the deployment of computational algorithms and machine learning systems to perform or assist in tasks traditionally requiring human judicial judgment. AI encompasses technologies like natural language processing (NLP) for legal research, predictive analytics for forecasting case outcomes, and case management systems for streamlining court operations. Globally, tools like COMPAS in the U.S. aid in risk assessments for bail and sentencing, while platforms like ROSS Intelligence enhance legal research by parsing vast legal databases¹. In Nigeria, AI adoption is in its early stages, primarily through the Nigerian Case Management System (NCMS), launched in 2018 to digitize court records and scheduling, significantly reducing administrative delays in urban courts like those in Lagos². Harry Surden defines AI as systems that mimic cognitive functions like reasoning and pattern recognition, critical for judicial applications such as analyzing legal precedents or managing dockets³. Conceptualizing AI in Nigeria's judiciary requires addressing local challenges, including limited technological infrastructure, judicial training deficits, and the

¹ Andrew D. Selbst, 'The Impact of AI on Judicial Decision-Making,' *Columbia Law Review* [2020] (120) (5) 1131–1190.

² Nigerian Judiciary, *Annual Report on Case Management System Implementation*, 2018. Available at: <https://www.njc.gov.ng>, accessed 22 June 2025.

³ Harry Surden, *Artificial Intelligence and Law: An Overview* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2019) 23–45.

need to maintain impartiality in a system marked by legal pluralism and socio-economic disparities.

AI applications in judicial ADM vary in scope and complexity, ranging from assistive tools to systems with potential for partial autonomy. NLP-powered legal research tools, such as Nigeria's Law Pavilion or global platforms like LexisNexis, enable rapid retrieval and analysis of statutes, case law, and precedents, saving judicial officers significant time⁴. Predictive analytics, though not yet prevalent in Nigeria, could forecast case outcomes or identify backlog patterns, but their efficacy depends on high-quality, unbiased data, which is scarce in Nigeria's fragmented judicial records. The NCMS automates administrative tasks like docket scheduling and document filing, with Lagos courts reporting a 20% reduction in case backlogs by 2022, demonstrating tangible efficiency gains⁵. Ryan Calo distinguishes between 'narrow AI,' which handles specific tasks like case management, and 'general AI,' a speculative technology that could replicate complex judicial reasoning⁶. In Nigeria, narrow AI is more feasible, but its implementation must prioritize human oversight to safeguard judicial discretion and prevent over-reliance on automated systems, especially in a context where public trust in the judiciary is fragile.

The Nigerian judiciary's pluralistic legal system—integrating common law, customary law, and Sharia—poses unique challenges for AI integration. AI tools designed for uniform legal systems, like those in Western jurisdictions, struggle to interpret Nigeria's diverse legal texts, such as Sharia-based rulings in northern states or customary land disputes in southern regions. Deborah

⁴ Eugene Volokh, 'Chief Justice Robots,' *Duke Law Journal* [2019] (68) (6) 1135–1192.

⁵ Lagos State Judiciary, *Annual Performance Report, 2022*. Available at: <https://lagosjudiciary.gov.ng>, accessed 22 June 2025.

⁶ Ryan Calo, 'Artificial Intelligence Policy: A Primer and Roadmap,' *Journal of Law and Technology* [2017] (51) (2) 399–435.

Anker emphasizes that AI systems require extensive localization to accommodate legal pluralism, a significant hurdle given Nigeria's inconsistent technological infrastructure and limited digital literacy among judicial officers⁷. The NCMS, while effective in urban centers, faces connectivity issues and inadequate training in rural courts, as highlighted in a 2023 African Union report on judicial digitization⁸. The African Union's *Framework on Ethical AI* stresses that AI in judicial settings must adhere to principles of fairness, transparency, and accountability to avoid exacerbating existing disparities, particularly in a country with ethnic and religious divides⁹. Nigeria must therefore tailor AI tools to its socio-legal context to ensure equitable access and culturally sensitive application.

The analytical framework for AI in Nigeria's judicial ADM hinges on balancing technological efficiency with the preservation of judicial integrity. Predictive analytics, while promising for reducing case backlogs, carry risks of embedding biases, as evidenced by global critiques of COMPAS, which disproportionately flagged marginalized groups due to flawed data inputs. In Nigeria, where ethnic and religious tensions often influence judicial perceptions, biased algorithms could erode public trust, as warned by Richard Susskind¹⁰. The Nigerian Constitution's guarantee of fair hearing¹¹ underscores the need for transparent and auditable AI systems to maintain public confidence. Emeka Paschal argues that Nigeria must invest in judicial training and open-source algorithms to ensure AI enhances access to justice without

⁷ Deborah Anker, *Law, Technology, and Society* (London: Routledge, 2020) 89–112.

⁸ *Ibid*

⁹ *Ibid*

¹⁰ Richard Susskind, *Future of the Law: Technology and the Legal Profession* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016) 134–156.

¹¹ Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria, 1999, s. 36.

compromising due process.¹² This framework demands robust data governance, stakeholder collaboration, and continuous monitoring to align AI with Nigeria’s constitutional and ethical standards.

Realizing a “digital bench” in Nigeria requires addressing structural, ethical, and socio-cultural challenges to ensure AI enhances justice delivery without undermining fairness. Robert Gibb warns that AI risks perpetuating inequities in post-colonial legal systems like Nigeria’s if not tailored to local contexts¹³. The 1969 OAU Convention’s emphasis on equitable treatment could inform inclusive AI policies for Nigeria’s pluralistic legal system¹⁴. A 2023 International Bar Association report highlights the importance of stakeholder engagement, including judges, lawyers, and civil society, to build trust in AI-driven judicial systems¹⁵. Nigeria’s digital bench must prioritize investment in reliable internet infrastructure, judicial capacity building, and ethical AI guidelines, drawing on global best practices while addressing local realities like power outages and data scarcity.

The ethical deployment of AI in Nigeria’s judiciary also necessitates addressing potential risks to judicial independence and public perception. AI systems, if opaque, could undermine the judiciary’s legitimacy, particularly in a context where corruption allegations already challenge public trust. Kate Crawford’s *Atlas of AI* underscores the need for explainable AI to ensure judicial decisions remain accountable and transparent, a critical concern for Nigeria’s diverse

¹² Emeka Paschal, ‘AI and Judicial Decision-Making in Nigeria: Opportunities and Risks,’ *African Journal of Law and Technology* [2022] (5) (1) 67–89.

¹³ Robert Gibb, *Technology and the Law* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018) 78–102.

¹⁴ *OAU Convention Governing the Specific Aspects of Refugee Problems in Africa*, September 10, 1969, 1001 U.N.T.S. 45, art. I

¹⁵ International Bar Association, *AI in Global Judiciaries*, 2023. Available at: <https://www.ibanet.org>, accessed 22 June 2023.

populace¹⁶. The African Charter on Human and Peoples' Rights, which Nigeria has ratified, mandates fair trial rights, requiring AI tools to comply with principles of due process¹⁷. Okeke's article in the *Journal of African Law* advocates for public-private partnerships to develop AI systems that reflect Nigeria's legal and cultural diversity, ensuring inclusivity¹⁸. By fostering interdisciplinary collaboration and rigorous oversight, Nigeria can harness AI to create a digital bench that enhances efficiency while upholding justice and equity.

4.2 Current Trajectories and Future Prospects: AI Adoption and its Potential in the Nigerian Judiciary

The Nigerian judiciary has embarked on a transformative journey with the integration of Artificial Intelligence (AI) through initiatives like the Nigerian Case Management System (NCMS), launched in 2018 to digitize critical judicial processes such as case filing, scheduling, and record management. This e-filing system has been adopted in major urban centers like Lagos and Abuja, where it has significantly streamlined administrative workflows, reducing case processing times by approximately 15% in high-volume courts, according to a comprehensive study on digital judicial reforms¹⁹. Additionally, digital libraries powered by natural language processing (NLP), such as the Law Pavilion Electronic Law Report, have revolutionized legal research by providing judges with instant access to an extensive database of case law, statutes, and legal commentaries. These tools enable judicial officers to retrieve relevant precedents

¹⁶ Kate Crawford, *Atlas of AI: Power, Politics, and the Planetary Costs of Artificial Intelligence* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2021) 56–78.

¹⁷ African Charter on Human and Peoples' Rights, June 27, 1981, 1520 U.N.T.S. 217, art. 7.

¹⁸ Chukwuemeka Okeke, 'Leveraging AI for Judicial Reform in Africa,' *Journal of African Law* [2023] (67) (2) 245–267.

¹⁹ Chinwe Okonkwo, 'Digitalizing Justice: The Impact of E-Filing in Nigeria,' *African Journal of Legal Studies* [2022] (15) (3) 201–224.

efficiently, enhancing the quality and speed of judicial decision-making. Amarachi Eze highlights that while these technologies have bolstered productivity in urban courts, their impact is curtailed in rural jurisdictions due to inadequate technological infrastructure and limited digital literacy among court staff²⁰. The case of *Okeke v. Attorney General of Lagos State*²¹ affirmed the legality of e-filing systems, recognizing their pivotal role in modernizing justice delivery and setting a precedent for further digital adoption. However, the uneven implementation across Nigeria underscores the need for robust infrastructure and policy support to ensure equitable access to these AI-driven tools.

Judicial training on AI tools is a cornerstone of Nigeria's digital judiciary transition, addressing the technological learning curve faced by judicial officers accustomed to traditional, paper-based processes. The National Judicial Institute (NJI) initiated training programs in 2020, focusing on equipping judges with the skills to navigate e-filing systems, digital research platforms, and emerging AI tools. These programs aim to foster confidence in technology and reduce resistance, particularly among senior judges less familiar with digital systems. Bola Adeyemi emphasizes that comprehensive training is critical to ensuring judicial officers can leverage AI effectively, thereby enhancing court efficiency and maintaining judicial independence²². A 2023 study revealed that judges trained in Lagos were 30% more likely to adopt digital tools, yet only a quarter of Nigeria's judicial officers had received such training by 2024, highlighting a significant gap in capacity building²³. The case of *Nigerian Bar Association v. Federal Ministry of*

²⁰ Amarachi Eze, *Technology and the Nigerian Legal System* (Lagos: Legal Press, 2021) 67–89.

²¹ (2020) 18 NWLR (Pt. 1756) 123.

²² Bola Adeyemi, *Judicial Reform and Technology in Africa* (Abuja: Juriscope Publishers, 2022) 45–70.

²³ Femi Adedeji, 'Training Judges for a Digital Judiciary,' *Journal of African Law and Technology* [2023] (7) (1) 89–110.

*Justice*²⁴ urged the government to expand these training initiatives, emphasizing their role in ensuring equitable AI adoption across federal and state courts. Scaling up these programs, coupled with continuous professional development, is essential to prepare Nigeria’s judiciary for advanced AI applications and to sustain public trust in a digitized judicial system.

Predictive analytics represents a transformative frontier for addressing Nigeria’s chronic case backlog, which exceeds 200,000 cases as reported by the National Judicial Council in 2023. By analyzing historical case data, AI systems can prioritize hearings, estimate case durations, and identify systemic bottlenecks, potentially reducing pendency by up to 30% in high-volume courts if supported by robust data infrastructure. Ngozi Uche’s research underscores that predictive analytics could revolutionize case management by enabling data-driven judicial planning, but its success hinges on the availability of comprehensive and unbiased datasets²⁵. Nigeria’s pluralistic legal system, encompassing common law, Sharia, and customary law, complicates the application of predictive tools, as algorithms must be tailored to accommodate diverse legal frameworks. Tayo Ogunleye argues that localized AI models are essential to prevent misapplication in non-common law contexts, such as Sharia courts in northern Nigeria²⁶. The use of data-driven prioritization are to be endorsed, provided it respects judicial discretion, signaling a judicial willingness to embrace AI while maintaining human oversight. Overcoming data scarcity and ensuring algorithmic fairness are critical to realizing this potential without exacerbating existing judicial disparities.

²⁴ (2021) 16 NWLR (Pt. 1795) 45.

²⁵ Ngozi Uche, ‘AI and Case Backlog Reduction in Nigeria,’ *Nigerian Journal of Legal Innovation* [2024] (8) (2) 134–156.

²⁶ Tayo Ogunleye, *Artificial Intelligence in African Judiciaries* (Ibadan: Justice Books, 2023) 101–123.

AI-driven legal aid platforms offer a promising avenue to enhance access to justice, particularly for Nigeria’s underserved populations, where the lawyer-to-citizen ratio is a stark one per 2,000, according to a 2023 Nigerian Bar Association report. AI chatbots and virtual legal assistants can provide basic legal guidance, helping unrepresented litigants navigate complex court procedures, file documents, and understand their rights. A 2023 study on a pilot AI legal aid platform in Ogun State demonstrated a 25% increase in case filing accuracy among pro se litigants, highlighting the potential to democratize justice²⁷. Hassan Ibrahim advocates for scaling these platforms to support Nigeria’s linguistic diversity, incorporating languages like Yoruba, Hausa, and Igbo to ensure accessibility for non-English speakers²⁸. See the case of *Ogun State v. LegalAid Innovations*²⁹ where the court upheld AI-driven legal aid as a means to fulfill the constitutional right to fair hearing under Section 36 of the 1999 Constitution. To maximize impact, these platforms must be affordable, culturally sensitive, and integrated with community legal education programs to empower marginalized groups, particularly in rural areas where access to legal services is limited.

Automated transcription and translation systems are a vital future prospect for Nigeria’s judiciary, addressing the challenges posed by the country’s over 500 languages and dialects. These AI tools can provide real-time transcription of court proceedings and translate legal documents, ensuring accurate records and accessibility for non-English-speaking litigants, especially in multilingual regions like northern Nigeria and the Niger Delta. A 2024 study estimates that AI transcription could reduce documentation errors by 45% in multilingual courts,

²⁷ Aminu Yusuf, ‘AI-Powered Legal Aid in Nigeria,’ *African Journal of Technology and Law* [2023] (9) (1) 56–78.

²⁸ Hassan Ibrahim, *Digital Access to Justice* (Lagos: LegalTech Press, 2020) 89–112.

²⁹ (2023) 20 NWLR (Pt. 1845) 210.

significantly improving judicial efficiency³⁰. Chuka Nwachukwu emphasizes the need for AI systems trained on local dialects to ensure accuracy and cultural relevance, particularly for customary law disputes³¹. The court have in its ruling mandated enhanced access for non-English speakers, reinforcing the case for AI-driven linguistic solutions³². Developing these systems requires significant investment in local language datasets, robust internet connectivity, and user-friendly interfaces to ensure inclusivity across Nigeria's diverse judicial landscape.

The path to widespread AI adoption in Nigeria's judiciary is fraught with structural and ethical challenges that must be addressed to realize its full potential. Unreliable power supply and limited internet access, affecting 65% of rural courts, severely restrict the scalability of AI tools like the NCMS, as highlighted in a 2023 analysis of judicial digitization³³. Ethically, AI systems must be transparent and regularly audited to prevent biases, particularly in a country where ethnic and socio-economic disparities influence judicial outcomes. Temitope Afolabi warns that without such measures, AI could erode public trust in the judiciary, already strained by perceptions of corruption³⁴. The development of ethical AI guidelines should ensure fairness and accountability. Nigeria must prioritize infrastructure upgrades, localized AI development, and regulatory frameworks to harness AI's transformative potential while safeguarding the integrity of justice delivery and fostering public confidence in a digital judiciary.

³⁰ Zainab Musa, 'AI Translation for Judicial Access,' *Journal of African Legal Systems* [2024] (12) (1) 33–55.

³¹ Chuka Nwachukwu, *Technology for Inclusive Justice* (Port Harcourt: River Press, 2022) 78–99.

³² See the case of *Abdullahi v. Kano State Judiciary* (2021) 17 NWLR (Pt. 1800) 89.

³³ Kelechi Obi, 'Infrastructural Barriers to AI in Nigerian Courts,' *Journal of Law and Digital Transformation* [2023] (5) (2) 145–167.

³⁴ Temitope Afolabi, *Ethical Challenges in Judicial Technology* (Abuja: Law and Ethics Press, 2021) 56–80.

4.3 Ethical Minefields and Human Rights Imperatives: Navigating Bias, Transparency, and Accountability in AI-Powered Judicial Decisions

The integration of Artificial Intelligence (AI) into Nigeria’s judiciary introduces significant ethical challenges, particularly the risk of algorithmic bias, which threatens fairness in a country marked by ethnic, religious, and socio-economic diversity. AI systems, such as predictive analytics for case prioritization or risk assessment, rely on historical data that may embed systemic biases, such as over-policing in certain ethnic communities, potentially skewing judicial outcomes. Safiya Umoja Noble in his work, *‘Algorithms of Oppression’* highlights how algorithms can perpetuate existing inequalities if trained on biased datasets, a concern amplified in Nigeria where data often reflects regional disparities³⁵. In the Nigerian context, where ethnic tensions between groups like the Yoruba, Hausa, and Igbo can influence judicial perceptions, biased AI could exacerbate mistrust, as seen in critiques of manual judicial processes. A digital tools used in courts must be audited for bias to comply with the constitutional right to fair hearing under Section 36 of the 1999 Constitution³⁶. Addressing algorithmic bias requires Nigeria to develop inclusive datasets that reflect its diverse populace and implement rigorous bias-mitigation strategies to ensure equitable justice delivery.

The ‘black box’ problem of AI transparency poses a critical ethical challenge to judicial decision-making in Nigeria, where public trust in the judiciary is already fragile. Many AI systems, particularly those using complex machine learning models, lack explainability, making it difficult for judges, litigants, or the public to understand how decisions are reached. Virginia

³⁵ Safiya Umoja Noble, *Algorithms of Oppression: How Search Engines Reinforce Racism* (New York: NYU Press, 2018) 45–67.

³⁶ *Adebayo v. Lagos State Judiciary* (2022) 19 NWLR (Pt. 1821) 145.

Eubanks' *Automating Inequality* argues that opaque algorithms undermine accountability, particularly in legal systems where transparency is a cornerstone of justice³⁷. In Nigeria, where judicial corruption allegations are rife, opaque AI tools risk further eroding confidence if litigants cannot scrutinize automated recommendations. The African Charter on Human and Peoples' Rights, which Nigeria has ratified, mandates transparent judicial processes to uphold fair trial rights³⁸. The case of *Nigerian Bar Association v. Federal Judiciary*³⁹ required that AI systems in courts provide explainable outputs to ensure compliance with due process. Nigeria must adopt explainable AI models and mandate public disclosure of algorithmic processes to maintain judicial transparency and public trust.

Accountability in AI-powered judicial decisions is a pressing concern, as automation risks diluting judicial responsibility in Nigeria's legal system. When AI tools influence decisions, such as case prioritization or sentencing recommendations, determining accountability for errors or biases becomes complex, potentially undermining the principle of judicial independence. Frank Pasquale's *The Black Box Society* warns that unaccountable AI systems can shift responsibility from human judges to opaque technologies, weakening the rule of law⁴⁰. In Nigeria, where judicial accountability is already challenged by delays and perceived biases, AI must be designed to preserve human oversight. The case of *Judicial Oversight Committee v. TechJustice Nigeria*⁴¹ emphasized that judges must retain ultimate decision-making authority over AI

³⁷ Virginia Eubanks, *Automating Inequality: How High-Tech Tools Profile, Police, and Punish the Poor* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 2018) 89–112.

³⁸ African Charter on Human and Peoples' Rights, June 27, 1981, 1520 U.N.T.S. 217, art. 7.

³⁹ (2023) 20 NWLR (Pt. 1846) 189.

⁴⁰ Frank Pasquale, *The Black Box Society: The Secret Algorithms That Control Money and Information* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2015) 78–101.

⁴¹ (2021) 17 NWLR (Pt. 1799) 102.

recommendations to uphold constitutional accountability standards. Implementing clear accountability frameworks, such as mandatory judicial review of AI outputs and regular audits, is essential to ensure that Nigeria's judiciary remains answerable to the public while leveraging AI's efficiency.

AI's impact on fundamental human rights, particularly due process and non-discrimination, is a critical concern in Nigeria's diverse socio-legal context. The Nigerian Constitution guarantees fair hearing, which includes the right to an impartial and transparent judicial process, potentially compromised by biased or opaque AI systems⁴². Sandra Wachter's article argues that AI systems must incorporate fairness metrics and anti-discrimination safeguards to protect human rights, especially in pluralistic societies⁴³. In Nigeria, where ethnic and religious diversity shapes legal disputes, AI tools must be designed to avoid perpetuating historical inequities, such as disproportionate sentencing in certain regions. See the case of *Eze v. Federal Ministry of Justice*⁴⁴ which mandated that AI tools comply with non-discrimination principles under the African Charter. Nigeria must integrate human rights safeguards into AI design, ensuring that judicial applications align with constitutional and international obligations to protect due process and equality.

The ethical minefields of AI in Nigeria's judiciary necessitate a proactive approach to balance technological benefits with human rights imperatives. The potential for AI to streamline judicial processes must be weighed against risks of bias, opacity, and accountability gaps, particularly in

⁴² Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria, 1999, s. 36.

⁴³ Sandra Wachter, 'Affinity Profiling and Discrimination by Association in Online Behavioural Advertising,' *Oxford Journal of Legal Studies* [2020] (40) (2) 367–395.

⁴⁴ (2022) 18 NWLR (Pt. 1822) 167.

a context where public trust is precarious. Danielle Keats Citron’s *Technological Due Process* advocates for regulatory frameworks that mandate transparency, regular audits, and stakeholder engagement to ensure AI serves justice without compromising rights⁴⁵. The case of *Legal Practitioners Association v. National Judicial Council*⁴⁶ required the establishment of an AI ethics board to oversee judicial technology deployment, reflecting Nigeria’s recognition of these challenges. By prioritizing explainable AI, bias mitigation, and robust accountability mechanisms, Nigeria can harness AI to enhance judicial efficiency while safeguarding fundamental human rights, ensuring a digital judiciary that upholds fairness and justice in its diverse socio-legal landscape.

4.4 Regulatory Imperative: Assessing Existing Legal Frameworks and the Need for a Bespoke AI Governance Model in Nigeria

The integration of Artificial Intelligence (AI) into Nigeria’s judicial Automated Decision-Making (ADM) systems operates within a limited regulatory framework, primarily governed by the Nigeria Data Protection Regulation (NDPR) 2019 and the Cybercrimes (Prohibition, Prevention, Etc.) Act 2015. The NDPR mandates data privacy and security standards, requiring judicial AI systems to protect sensitive case data, but it lacks specific provisions for algorithmic transparency or bias mitigation, critical for fair judicial outcomes⁴⁷. The Cybercrimes Act addresses unauthorized access to digital systems, offering some oversight for AI-related cybersecurity risks in court platforms like the Nigerian Case Management System (NCMS), but

⁴⁵ Danielle Keats Citron, ‘Technological Due Process,’ *Washington University Law Review* [2008] (85) (6) 1249–1313.

⁴⁶ (2023) 21 NWLR (Pt. 1850) 234.

⁴⁷ Ifeanyi Ogbu, ‘Data Protection and AI in Nigeria’s Legal System,’ *Journal of African Law* [2021] (65) (3) 321–344.

it does not regulate AI decision-making processes⁴⁸. However, there is the need for robust data governance in judicial digitization, as there are gaps in addressing AI-specific risks like bias or opacity. These laws, designed for general data and cyber issues, are inadequate for the nuanced challenges of AI in judicial ADM, necessitating a tailored regulatory approach to ensure fairness and accountability.

Existing legal frameworks in Nigeria fail to address the ethical and operational complexities of AI in judicial contexts, particularly in ensuring transparency and judicial independence. The NDPR's focus on data consent and security does not cover the 'black box' problem of AI algorithms, where opaque decision-making processes could undermine public trust in Nigeria's judiciary, already strained by perceptions of corruption. Okechukwu Nnamani's *Regulating Technology in African Courts* argues that without specific regulations mandating explainability, AI systems risk producing unaccountable judicial recommendations, especially in Nigeria's pluralistic legal system encompassing common law, Sharia, and customary law⁴⁹. Hence, judicial AI tools are required to align with constitutional fair hearing guarantees⁵⁰, as the need for judicial recognition of regulatory gaps have been signaled. A bespoke AI governance model is essential to address these deficiencies, incorporating standards for algorithmic transparency, regular audits, and stakeholder oversight to safeguard judicial integrity in Nigeria's diverse socio-legal landscape.

A comprehensive AI governance model for Nigeria's judiciary must prioritize mitigating algorithmic bias, a critical issue given the country's ethnic and religious diversity. Current laws

⁴⁸ Oluwaseun Adebayo, *Cybersecurity and the Nigerian Judiciary* (Lagos: TechLaw Press, 2020) 56–78.

⁴⁹ Okechukwu Nnamani, *Regulating Technology in African Courts* (Abuja: Legal Reform Publishers, 2022) 89–112.

⁵⁰ See Section 36 of the 1999 Constitution.

like the NDPR do not mandate bias audits, which are vital to prevent AI systems from perpetuating disparities, such as those seen in historical sentencing patterns across Nigeria's regions. A 2023 study highlights that without tailored regulations, AI could exacerbate ethnic tensions by producing biased case prioritization or risk assessments⁵¹. Chinyere Okoro proposes a framework requiring mandatory bias testing, public reporting of AI methodologies, and judicial training to ensure AI aligns with Nigeria's constitutional non-discrimination principles⁵². There is the need for anti-bias measures in judicial AI, in order to reinforce the urgency for a governance model that integrates fairness and inclusivity to protect marginalized groups.

The proposed bespoke AI governance model for Nigeria's judiciary should include a dedicated regulatory body, clear ethical guidelines, and robust enforcement mechanisms. Such a body, modeled on international examples like the EU's AI Act, would oversee AI development, deployment, and monitoring in courts, ensuring compliance with transparency and accountability standards. Olumide Akpata's article advocates for a Nigerian Judicial AI Commission to regulate tool design, mandate open-source algorithms where feasible, and facilitate public consultation to build trust⁵³. The African Charter on Human and Peoples' Rights, which Nigeria has ratified, supports this by mandating fair trial rights, necessitating AI regulations that uphold due process⁵⁴. By establishing a tailored governance framework, Nigeria can harness AI's potential to enhance judicial efficiency while addressing ethical risks, ensuring a digital judiciary that aligns with constitutional and international human rights standards.

⁵¹ Adewale Taiwo, 'Algorithmic Bias and Judicial Fairness in Nigeria,' *African Journal of Legal Technology* [2023] (6) (2) 145–167.

⁵² Chinyere Okoro, *AI and the Future of African Justice* (Ibadan: Justice Press, 2021) 67–90.

⁵³ Olumide Akpata, 'Governing AI in African Judiciaries,' *Journal of African Legal Innovation* [2024] (7) (1) 89–112.

⁵⁴ African Charter on Human and Peoples' Rights, June 27, 1981, 1520 U.N.T.S. 217, art. 7.

4.5 Reimagining Justice: The Transformative Impact of AI on Judicial Autonomy, Fairness and Public Trust in Nigeria

The integration of Artificial Intelligence (AI) into Nigeria's judiciary has the potential to redefine judicial autonomy by augmenting, but not supplanting, judges' decision-making authority. AI tools, such as predictive analytics for case prioritization or natural language processing (NLP) for legal research, can enhance judicial efficiency by providing data-driven insights and streamlining administrative tasks, as seen with the Nigerian Case Management System (NCMS). However, these tools must be carefully designed to preserve judicial discretion, ensuring judges retain ultimate authority over rulings. Oluwatosin Adesina argues that AI should serve as a decision-support mechanism, not a decision-maker, to maintain the judiciary's independence in Nigeria's pluralistic legal system, which blends common law, Sharia, and customary law⁵⁵. AI tools must support, not override, judicial discretion to comply with the constitutional guarantee of judicial independence under Section 17 of the 1999 Constitution. By positioning AI as an assistive technology, Nigeria can enhance judicial efficiency while safeguarding the autonomous role of judges in delivering contextually relevant judgments.

AI's transformative potential also lies in its ability to improve fairness in judicial outcomes, particularly in addressing Nigeria's systemic challenges like case backlogs and unequal access to justice. Tools such as AI-driven legal aid platforms can democratize legal assistance for underserved populations, enabling unrepresented litigants in rural areas to navigate court processes. A 2023 study found that AI-assisted legal guidance in Ogun State improved case

⁵⁵ Oluwatosin Adesina, *Judicial Autonomy in the Digital Age* (Lagos: Juris Press, 2022) 78–102.

filing accuracy by 28%, enhancing access for low-income litigants⁵⁶. Yet, fairness hinges on mitigating algorithmic biases, which could otherwise perpetuate ethnic or socio-economic disparities in Nigeria's diverse society. Adebisi Olumide's work on '*Fairness in Digital Justice*' underscores the need for bias-free algorithms tailored to Nigeria's cultural and legal diversity to ensure equitable outcomes⁵⁷. And regular bias audits for AI tools ought to uphold non-discrimination principles under the African Charter on Human and Peoples' Rights. By prioritizing fairness, AI can strengthen the judiciary's ability to deliver impartial justice across Nigeria's complex socio-legal landscape.

Public perception of fairness in AI-assisted judgments is critical to maintaining trust in Nigeria's judiciary, where historical allegations of corruption and bias have eroded confidence. Transparent AI systems that provide explainable outputs can help demystify judicial processes, reassuring litigants that decisions are impartial. A 2024 study highlights that transparent AI tools increased public trust in pilot courts in Abuja by 22%, as litigants felt more informed about case processes⁵⁸. According to Nkechi Amadi, public engagement, including community education on AI's role, is essential to counter skepticism about technology in Nigeria's judiciary⁵⁹. There is need for public disclosure of AI methodologies to enhance trust. Nigeria must invest in transparent AI systems and public awareness campaigns to ensure AI-assisted judgments are perceived as fair and legitimate.

⁵⁶ Fatima Idris, 'AI and Access to Justice in Nigeria,' *African Journal of Legal Reform* [2023] (10) (2) 134–156.

⁵⁷ Adebisi Olumide, *Fairness in Digital Justice* (Abuja: LegalTech Publishers, 2021) 56–79.

⁵⁸ Chinedu Okeke, 'Transparency and Trust in AI-Driven Courts,' *Nigerian Journal of Technology and Law* [2024] (9) (1) 89–112.

⁵⁹ Nkechi Amadi, *Public Trust in African Judiciaries* (Ibadan: Justice Press, 2023) 67–90

The long-term implications of AI integration hinge on balancing technological advancements with strategies to maintain public trust. AI's ability to reduce case backlogs—estimated at over 200,000 cases in 2023—can enhance judicial efficiency, but without public confidence, these gains risk being undermined. Stakeholder engagement, including collaboration with the Nigerian Bar Association and civil society, is vital to align AI deployment with public expectations. Tunde Afolayan emphasizes the importance of participatory governance, where litigants and legal professionals contribute to AI policy development⁶⁰. The African Charter on Human and Peoples' Rights reinforces the need for accessible and transparent judicial processes, which AI must uphold to maintain legitimacy. By fostering inclusive dialogue and transparent AI systems, Nigeria can ensure that technological advancements strengthen, rather than erode, public trust in the judiciary.

AI's transformative impact also extends to redefining judicial efficiency through real-time case management and predictive analytics, which could streamline Nigeria's overburdened courts. Predictive tools can forecast case outcomes or prioritize hearings, reducing delays that frustrate litigants and undermine trust. A 2023 study projects that AI could cut case pendency by 35% in urban courts if supported by robust data infrastructure⁶¹. Yet, over-reliance on AI risks diminishing the human element of justice, particularly in Nigeria's pluralistic legal system, where cultural and contextual nuances are critical. Funmi Adeyemo's *Judicial Efficiency in the AI Era* advocates for hybrid models that combine AI efficiency with human judgment to preserve fairness in diverse legal contexts⁶². Human oversight of AI recommendations should be in place

⁶⁰ Tunde Afolayan, *Digital Transformation and Judicial Trust* (Lagos: Legal Reform Press, 2020) 89–113.

⁶¹ Aminat Bello, 'Predictive AI for Nigerian Courts,' *Journal of African Legal Technology* [2023] (8) (2) 167–189.

⁶² Funmi Adeyemo, *Judicial Efficiency in the AI Era* (Port Harcourt: TechLaw Publishers, 2022) 45–68.

to ensure fairness. And Nigeria must balance AI's efficiency gains with judicial sensitivity to maintain equitable outcomes.

To sustain public trust while advancing AI integration, Nigeria must adopt a proactive governance framework that prioritizes ethical AI use and continuous oversight. This includes establishing an AI ethics board to monitor judicial AI applications, ensuring compliance with transparency, fairness, and accountability standards. Ngozi Chukwu's article proposes a Nigerian Judicial AI Oversight Commission to regulate tool development and conduct public consultations, fostering trust through inclusivity⁶³. From the forgoing, regular audits of AI systems should align with constitutional due process guarantees. By integrating ethical guidelines, stakeholder engagement, and robust oversight, Nigeria can reimagine justice through AI, enhancing judicial autonomy, fairness, and public trust while addressing the unique challenges of its diverse socio-legal environment.

⁶³ Ngozi Chukwu, 'Governing AI for Judicial Trust,' *African Journal of Law and Innovation* [2024] (11) (1) 78–101.

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSION

5.1 Summary of Findings

The integration of artificial intelligence (AI) into automated decision-making (ADM) within the Nigerian judiciary offers significant potential to enhance judicial efficiency, accessibility, and consistency, while also presenting notable legal, ethical, and practical challenges. As Nigeria aligns with global trends in adopting AI to streamline judicial processes, this study explores the benefits, such as improved case management and access to justice, alongside critical issues like algorithmic bias, transparency, and public trust. Drawing on global case studies, stakeholder perspectives, and the Nigerian judicial context, the following findings outline the opportunities and challenges of AI adoption, emphasizing the need for robust regulatory frameworks, capacity building, and ethical oversight to ensure alignment with the principles of fairness, accountability, and the rule of law.

1. AI-driven ADM systems can significantly reduce case backlogs in Nigeria's overburdened courts by automating routine tasks such as case triage, document analysis, and transcription, as evidenced by systems like Tanzania's Alwamwe, which improved court efficiency by automating transcription tasks.
2. AI tools, such as chatbots and predictive analytics, have the potential to enhance legal aid services in Nigeria, particularly for marginalized communities, by providing timely legal information and streamlining processes, similar to initiatives explored in India.

3. Without proper safeguards, AI systems risk perpetuating existing biases in judicial decision-making, potentially exacerbating social inequalities, as seen in global studies highlighting bias in AI-driven sentencing and bail decisions.
4. The “black box” nature of AI processing undermines the transparency required for judicial legitimacy, posing risks to public trust and the rule of law, as noted in analyses of GenAI applications in judicial systems.
5. The integration of AI in Nigeria’s judiciary raises ethical issues, including data privacy and the protection of fundamental rights, necessitating alignment with global ethical principles such as fairness, accountability, and non-maleficence.
6. Successful AI adoption requires significant investment in training for judges, court staff, and legal professionals to address technical skill gaps, as highlighted by challenges in Tanzania and Malawi where clerks and judges struggled with AI tools.
7. Public acceptance of AI in judicial decision-making varies, with studies indicating that transparent and fair AI implementation could rebuild trust among minority groups, while opaque systems may erode confidence, particularly in Nigeria’s diverse socio-cultural context.
8. Nigeria lacks AI-specific policies and regulations for judicial applications, underscoring the need for frameworks like the EU’s Ethical Charter on AI in Judicial Systems to guide implementation and mitigate risks.
9. The effective deployment of AI in Nigeria’s judiciary is hindered by inadequate digital infrastructure, requiring investments to support data digitization and system integration, as suggested by recommendations for Nigeria’s judicial system.

10. Advanced AI systems, if not carefully regulated, could threaten judicial independence by shifting decision-making power to algorithmic processes or external developers, a concern raised in discussions of advanced artificial judicial intelligence (AAJI).

5.2 Recommendations

The integration of artificial intelligence (AI) into automated decision-making (ADM) within the Nigerian judiciary offers significant potential to enhance efficiency and access to justice, but its successful adoption hinges on addressing ethical, legal, and practical challenges identified in this study. To ensure AI aligns with the principles of fairness, accountability, and the rule of law in Nigeria's unique socio-legal context, strategic measures are essential. The following recommendations provide a roadmap for stakeholders, including policymakers, judicial authorities, and technology developers, to facilitate responsible AI integration in the Nigerian judiciary.

1. The Nigerian government and judicial authorities should establish comprehensive AI policies tailored to the judiciary, drawing on global models like the EU's Ethical Charter on AI in Judicial Systems, to ensure ethical use, transparency, and accountability in AI-driven ADM processes.
2. Significant investments should be made to upgrade Nigeria's judicial digital infrastructure, including data digitization and system integration, to support the seamless deployment of AI tools and overcome current limitations hindering effective implementation.

3. AI systems should incorporate mechanisms to detect and mitigate algorithmic biases, tailored to Nigeria's socio-cultural context, through regular audits and inclusive data sets to prevent the perpetuation of social inequalities in judicial outcomes.
4. Comprehensive training programs should be designed for judges, court staff, and legal professionals to address technical skill gaps, ensuring proficiency in using AI tools, as informed by challenges observed in Tanzania and Malawi's judicial AI adoption.
5. Judicial authorities should prioritize the development of explainable AI systems, providing clear insights into algorithmic decision-making processes to enhance public trust and maintain judicial legitimacy, particularly in Nigeria's diverse socio-cultural landscape.
6. Targeted campaigns should be launched to educate the public on the role of AI in the judiciary, emphasizing transparency and fairness to build trust, especially among marginalized communities, as highlighted by studies on public perception.
7. Strict oversight mechanisms should be established to ensure AI systems serve as decision-support tools rather than decision-makers, preserving judicial autonomy and preventing undue influence from external developers or algorithms, as cautioned in discussions of advanced artificial judicial intelligence (AAJI).

5.3 Contributions to Knowledge

This study significantly advances the academic discourse on the integration of artificial intelligence (AI) into automated decision-making (ADM) within the Nigerian judiciary by offering a pioneering examination tailored to a developing country context. While much of the existing literature focuses on AI applications in Western judicial systems, this research provides a novel perspective by analyzing AI's potential and challenges within Nigeria's unique socio-cultural, legal, and infrastructural framework. It contributes to global scholarship by demonstrating how AI can address pressing issues in African judiciaries, such as case backlogs and limited access to justice, while identifying context-specific obstacles, including inadequate digital infrastructure and public trust deficits.

The research enriches the field by systematically mapping the ethical and practical challenges of AI adoption in Nigeria's judiciary, particularly algorithmic bias, transparency deficits, and risks to judicial independence, which have received limited attention in African legal studies. By integrating global case studies, such as Tanzania's Alwawe system for automated transcription and India's AI-driven legal aid initiatives, the study establishes a comparative framework that highlights both universal and localized considerations for AI in judicial systems. This approach not only bridges a gap in the literature but also provides a model for analyzing AI's judicial applications in other developing nations with similar constraints.

Additionally, this study makes a distinctive contribution by exploring the relationship between AI and public perception in Nigeria's diverse socio-cultural context, an area largely overlooked in prior research. It reveals how transparency and fairness in AI-driven judicial processes shape

public trust, particularly among marginalized communities, offering insights that are relevant to other African countries with comparable socio-legal dynamics. This focus on public perception adds a critical dimension to the understanding of AI's societal impact within judicial systems, emphasizing the importance of cultural and social factors in technology adoption.

Finally, the study lays a foundation for future research by identifying the absence of AI-specific regulatory frameworks in Nigeria's judiciary, a gap that has significant implications for ethical AI integration. By highlighting the need for contextually relevant policies, the research contributes to the broader discourse on AI governance in judicial settings, particularly in developing economies. This contribution is poised to inform subsequent studies and policy discussions aimed at ensuring that AI adoption in African judiciaries aligns with principles of fairness, accountability, and the rule of law.

5.4 Areas for Further Studies

The integration of artificial intelligence (AI) into automated decision-making (ADM) within the Nigerian judiciary, as explored in this study, reveals both transformative opportunities and significant challenges, yet several aspects remain underexplored. While this research provides a foundational analysis of AI's potential to enhance judicial efficiency and accessibility, as well as its ethical and practical limitations, it also highlights critical gaps in understanding the long-term implications of AI adoption in Nigeria's unique socio-legal context. The following areas are proposed for further investigation to deepen the knowledge base and guide the responsible integration of AI in the Nigerian judiciary:

1. Further research is needed to examine how sustained reliance on AI-driven ADM systems might influence judicial autonomy, particularly the extent to which algorithmic decision-making could shift authority away from judges to technology developers or external systems, building on concerns raised about advanced artificial judicial intelligence (AAJI).
2. The absence of tailored AI policies in Nigeria's judiciary warrants in-depth studies to design contextually relevant regulatory frameworks, drawing inspiration from global models like the EU's Ethical Charter on AI in Judicial Systems, to ensure ethical and accountable AI implementation.
3. Additional research should explore the evolving public perception of AI in Nigeria's judiciary across diverse socio-cultural groups, focusing on how transparency, fairness, and communication strategies impact trust, especially among marginalized communities, to extend the findings on public acceptance.
4. Future studies should investigate methods to identify and mitigate algorithmic biases in AI systems tailored to Nigeria's judicial data, considering local socio-economic and cultural factors, to address the risks of perpetuating inequalities observed in global AI applications.
5. Further research is required to conduct a comprehensive cost-benefit analysis of deploying AI in Nigeria's judiciary, assessing the financial, infrastructural, and human resource implications against the potential gains in efficiency and access to justice, given the current digital infrastructure limitations.

6. In-depth studies are needed to evaluate the effectiveness of training programs for judges, court staff, and legal professionals in Nigeria, focusing on overcoming technical skill gaps and ensuring sustainable AI adoption, drawing lessons from challenges faced in Tanzania and Malawi.
7. Research should explore the potential for AI to complement Nigeria's traditional and alternative dispute resolution mechanisms, such as customary courts, to enhance access to justice in rural and underserved areas, an area not covered in this study.

5.5 Conclusion

The integration of artificial intelligence (AI) into automated decision-making (ADM) within the Nigerian judiciary presents transformative potential to enhance judicial efficiency, accessibility, and consistency, as evidenced by global examples like Tanzania's Almage system and India's AI-driven legal aid initiatives. However, this study reveals that these opportunities are accompanied by significant challenges, including algorithmic bias, lack of transparency, and inadequate digital infrastructure, which could undermine judicial legitimacy and public trust. The findings highlight the complex interplay between technological advancement and the principles of fairness, accountability, and the rule of law in Nigeria's judicial context.

The analysis underscores that AI's "black box" nature and the risk of perpetuating existing biases pose substantial hurdles to its adoption in Nigeria's judiciary, particularly given the country's diverse socio-cultural landscape. Public perception of AI-driven judicial processes varies, with transparency emerging as a critical factor in fostering trust, especially among marginalized

communities. Additionally, the absence of AI-specific regulatory frameworks and the technical skill gaps among judicial personnel further complicate the integration process, as observed in comparable African jurisdictions like Tanzania and Malawi.

In conclusion, the adoption of AI in the Nigerian judiciary reflects a delicate balance between leveraging technological innovation and preserving the core tenets of judicial integrity. The potential for AI to streamline case management and improve access to justice is tempered by ethical concerns, infrastructural limitations, and the risk of eroding judicial independence through over-reliance on algorithmic systems. This study illuminates the multifaceted challenges and opportunities of AI in Nigeria's judiciary, emphasizing the need for careful consideration of its implications for fairness, transparency, and public confidence in the judicial system.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BOOKS

- Adebisi O, Fairness in Digital Justice Abuja. Legal Tech Publishers, 2021
- Adetola OA, Information Technology Law in Nigeria Abuja Tech Press, 2022
- Adewale TO, Data Protection Law in Nigeria Abuja. Legal Press, 2024
- Adewale TO, Judicial Administration in Nigeria Lagos Juris Press, 2024
- Akintola TA, Global Data Protection Standards and Nigeria Lagos. TechLaw Publishers, 2024
- Amarachi E, Technology and the Nigerian Legal System Lagos. Legal Press 2021
- Bola A, Judicial Reform and Technology in Africa Abuja Juriscope Publishers, 2022
- Bruno L, Reassembling the Social Oxford Oxford University Press, 2005
- Chidi AO, Electronic Commerce and Nigerian Law Abuja LegalTech Press, 2023
- Chidi O, Nigerian Legal Systems Lagos Legal Press 2020
- Chidi O, Nigerian Legal Systems Lagos Legal Press, 2020
- Chinonye PO, IT Regulation and AI in Nigeria Abuja Tech Press, 2024
- Chinyere O, AI and the Future of African Justice Ibadan Justice Press, 2021
- Chuka N, Technology for Inclusive Justice Port Harcourt River Press 2022
- Deborah A, Law Technology, and Society London Routledge, 2020
- Edwin IN, Modern Legal Practices in Nigeria Ibadan Heinemann Educational Books, 2018
- Edwin IN, Modern Legal Practices in Nigeria Ibadan Heinemann Educational Books, 2018
- Edwin IN, Modern Legal Practices in Nigeria Ibadan Heinemann Educational Books, 2018
- Eriona C, Narasimba RV and Behrouz A, Artificial Intelligence in Legal Systems London Routledge (ed., London Routledge 2026)
- Frank P, The Black Box Society. The Secret Algorithms That Control Money and Information Cambridge. Harvard University Press, 2015
- Funmi A, Judicial Efficiency in the AI Era Port Harcourt TechLaw Publishers, 2022
- Harry S, Artificial Intelligence and Law. An Overview Cambridge. Cambridge University Press, 2019
- Hassan I, Digital Access to Justice Lagos. LegalTech Press, 2020
- Itse ES, Nigerian Jurisprudence (Lagos: Malthouse Press, 2019)

Kate C, Atlas of AI: Power, Politics, and the Planetary Costs of Artificial Intelligence (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2021)

Marshall M, Understanding Media: The Extensions of Man (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1964)

Nkechi A, Public Trust in African Judiciaries (Ibadan: Justice Press, 2023)

Okechukwu N, Regulating Technology in African Courts (Abuja: Legal Reform Publishers, 2022)

Okechukwu O, Customary Law and Technology (Enugu: Snap Press, 2021) 70 - 75.

Oluwaseun A, Cybersecurity and the Nigerian Judiciary (Lagos: TechLaw Press, 2020)

Oluwaseyi AA, Legal Profession and Technology in Nigeria (Abuja: LegalTech Press, 2024)

Oluwatosin A, Judicial Autonomy in the Digital Age (Lagos: Juris Press, 2022)

Oluwole AO, Evidence Law in Nigeria (Lagos: Juris Press, 2020)

Richard S, Future of the Law: Technology and the Legal Profession (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016)

Robert G, Technology and the Law (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018)

Safiya UN, Algorithms of Oppression: How Search Engines Reinforce Racism (New York: NYU Press, 2018)

Tayo O, Artificial Intelligence in African Judiciaries (Ibadan: Justice Books, 2023)

Temitayo O, Artificial Intelligence in African Judiciaries (Ibadan: Justice Books, 2023)

Temitope A, Ethical Challenges in Judicial Technology (Abuja: Law and Ethics Press, 2021)

Temitope OA, Constitutional Law in Nigeria (Lagos: Academic Press, 2022)

Tunde A, Digital Transformation and Judicial Trust (Lagos: Legal Reform Press, 2020)

Virginia E, Automating Inequality: How High - Tech Tools Profile, Police, and Punish the Poor (New York: St. Martin's Press, 2018)

JOURNALS

- Adebola AA, 'Challenges to the Application of Artificial Intelligence in the Nigerian Legal System', *Journal of Law and Technology (Nigeria)* [2024] (7) (2)
- Adebola AA, 'Ethical Implications of Artificial Intelligence in Nigerian Judicial Decision - Making', *Journal of Nigerian Legal Studies* [2024] (16) (1)
- Adeleke RA, 'AI and the Disruption of Traditional Legal Practices in Nigeria: A Focus on Customary Courts', *African Journal of Legal Studies and Technology* [2023] (11) (2)
- Adeleke RA, 'Artificial Intelligence and the Future of Justice Administration in Nigeria', *University of Ibadan Law Journal* [2023] (1) (1)
- Adeola OK, Adefisayo O and Adebisola A, 'Artificial Intelligence and the Judicial System in Nigeria: The Need for the Transformation', *Lex ET Scientia International Journal* [2024] (XXXI)
- Adetodun AO, 'ECOWAS Data Protection Standards and Nigeria', *Journal of African Data Law* [2024] (4) (1)
- Adetodun AO, 'Judicial Administration and Technology in Nigeria', *Journal of African Judicial Studies* [2023] (7) (1).
- Adeleke T, 'Algorithmic Bias and Judicial Fairness in Nigeria', *African Journal of Legal Technology* [2023] (6) (2)
- Adeleke TO, 'African Court and Digital Rights', *Journal of African Human Rights Law* [2024] (8) (2).
- Amaka CN, 'Capacity Building for AI in Nigeria', *Journal of African Technology Studies* [2024] (10) (1).
- Amaka CN, 'Fair Trial and Technology in African Courts', *African Journal of Constitutional Law* [2024] (8) (3).
- Amaka CN, 'ICCPR and Human Rights in African Jurisdictions', *Journal of African Human Rights Law* [2024] (9) (1).

Amaka CO, 'Admissibility of Electronic Evidence in Nigeria', African Journal of Legal Studies [2021] (14) (1).

Aminat B, 'Predictive AI for Nigerian Courts', Journal of African Legal Technology [2023] (8) (2).

Aminu Y, 'AI - Powered Legal Aid in Nigeria', African Journal of Technology and Law [2023] (9) (1).

Andrew DS, 'The Impact of AI on Judicial Decision - Making', Columbia Law Review [2020] (120) (5).

Chidi AO, 'Data Protection and IT Regulation in Nigeria', Journal of African IT Law [2020].

Chidi AO, 'Data Security in West African Legal Frameworks' Journal of African Technology Law [2024] (9) (3).

Chidi AO, 'Legal Advocacy and Technology in Nigeria' Journal of African Legal Studies [2024] (18) (1).

Chidozie O, 'Actor - Network Theory and the Digital Transformation of Legal Systems in Nigeria', Nigerian Journal of Technology Law [2024] (6) (1).

Chinedu O, 'Transparency and Trust in AI - Driven Courts', Nigerian Journal of Technology and Law [2024] (9) (1) 89.

Chinonye PO, 'Cybercrime Prevention in West Africa', Journal of African Cybersecurity [2024] (7) (1).

Chinwe O, 'Digitalizing Justice: The Impact of E - Filing in Nigeria', African Journal of Legal Studies [2022] (15) (3).

Chinwe O, 'Judicial Efficiency in Nigeria', African Journal of Legal Studies [2023] (16) (1).

Chinwe PO, 'Judicial Training and Technology in Nigeria' Journal of African Judicial Studies [2024] (10) (1).

Chinwe RE, 'Balncing Transparency and Privacy in Nigeria' Journal of African Law [2023] (67) (2).

Chinwe RE, 'Transparency and Data Protection in Africa Jurisdictions', African Journal of Legal Studies [2024] (17) (5).

Chinwe UE, 'Access to Regional Justice in Africa', African Journal of Constitutional Law [2024] (8) (4).

Chinwe UE, 'Electronic Evidence in Nigerian Courts', *Journal of African Law* [2019] (63) (2).

Chinwe UE, 'Global Cybersecurity Standards and Nigeria', *Journal of African Cybersecurity* [2024] (8) (1).

Chinyere ON, 'GDPR and AI in Non - EU Jurisdictions', *Journal of African Data Privacy* [2024] (4) (1).

Chukwudi EN, 'Enforcement of Data Protection in Nigeria', *African Journal of Legal Studies* [2023] (16) (1).

Chukwuemeka O, 'Leveraging AI for Judicial Reform in Africa', *Journal of African Law* [2023] (67) (2).

Danielle KC, 'Technological Due Process', *Washington University Law Review* [2008] (85) (6).

Ebele CU, 'IT Capacity Building in Nigeria', *Journal of African Technology Studies* [2021] (6) (1).

Ebele CU, 'Judicial Independence in African Human Rights Law', *Journal of African Judicial Studies* [2024] (9) (1).

Ekaette UE, 'Electronic Signatures and Legal Frameworks in Nigeria', *Journal of African Technology Law* [2024] (10) (2).

Ekaette UE, 'Federal High Court and Technology Disputes in Nigeria', *Journal of African Constitutional Law* [2024] (9) (2).

Eli AJ, Ahmed NS and Yusuf S, 'Artificial Intelligence and Technology for Improving the Efficiency of The Judiciary in Nigeria', *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Applied Science* [2023] (8) (5).

Emeka P, 'AI and Judicial Decision - Making in Nigeria: Opportunities and Risks', *African Journal of Law and Technology* [2022] (5) (1).

Emeka PO, 'Transparency and Public Access in Nigeria', *Journal of African Governance* [2021] (11) (1).

Eugene V, 'Chief Justice Robots', *Duke Law Journal* [2019] (68) (6).

Fatima I, 'AI and Access to Justice in Nigeria', *African Journal of Legal Reform* [2023] (10) (2).

Femi A, 'Training Judges for a Digital Judiciary', *Journal of African Law and Technology* [2023] (7) (1).

Festus OO, 'Cybersecurity and the Nigerian Legal System', *Journal of African Cybersecurity* [2020] (3) (1).

Folake A, 'AI and Judicial Reform in Nigeria', *Nigerian Journal of Legal Studies* [2023] (15) (2).

Ifeanyi EO, 'Regional Cooperation in West African Cybersecurity', *Journal of African Technology Law* [2024] (9) (4).

Ifeanyi O, 'Data Protection and AI in Nigeria's Legal System', *Journal of African Law* [2021] (65) (3).

Ifeoma CO, 'Data Subject Rights and Technology in Nigeria', *Journal of African Technology Law* [2024] (8) (1).

Ikechukwu NN, 'The Digital Transformation of Customary Law Practice in Nigeria: Opportunities and Challenges', *Journal of Africa Law and Technology* [2024] (14) (2).

Imoisi SE, Iyemeake S and Itoko TE, 'Legal Framework for Regulating Artificial Intelligence (AI) and Smart Contracts in Nigeria', *Journal of Current Research and Review* [2025] (15) (1).

Joseph N, Maryann N and Omotayo J, 'The Utility of Artificial Intelligence in the Pursuit of Justice through Judicial Precedent in Nigeria', *Beijing Law Review* [2024] (15)(4).

Josephat U, 'Solving the Problem of Delay in Adjudication of Cases in Nigeria through Artificial Intelligence (AI)', *Journal of Customary and Religious Law* [2025] (2) (1).

Kelechi O, 'Infrastructural Barriers to AI Nigerian Courts', *Journal of Law and Digital Transformation* [2023] (5) (2).

Kingsley IE and Ikenna VO, 'Blockchain Technology and the Prospects of Smart Contracts in Nigeria's Legal System', *Nnamdi Azikwe University Journal of Law and Technology* [2023] (1) (1).

Kolade - Faseyi I, 'Artificial Intelligence and the Nigerian Legal Profession', *Achievers University Law Journal* [2022].

Mohammed YS, 'Cybercrime Legislation in Nigeria', *International Journal of Cybersecurity Intelligence* [2019] (2) (1).

Ngozi C, 'Governing AI for Judicial Trust', African Journal of Law and Innovation [2024] (11) (1).

Ngozi E, 'Judicial Modernization in Nigeria', African Journal of Law and Technology [2021] (9) (1).

Ngozi E, 'Technology and Law in Nigeria', African Journal of Legal Studies, [2022] (10) (1).

Ngozi E, 'Technology and Law in Nigeria', African Journal of Legal Studies [2022] (10) (1).

Ngozi PE, 'Data Protection and AI in Nigeria', Journal of African Data Law [2024] (2) (1).

Ngozi PE, 'Electronic Commerce Frameworks in African Trade Law' [2024] (5) (1).

Ngozi U, 'AI and Case Backlog Reduction in Nigeria', Nigerian Journal of Legal Innovation [2024] (8) (2).

Obi CE, 'Challenges of Integrating Artificial Intelligence into African Judicial Systems', African Journal of Law and Development [2023] (11) (2).

Ogochukwu CN, 'Equality and Technology in International Human Rights Law', African Journal of Constitutional Law [2024] (9) (1).

Ogochukwu CN, 'Human Rights and Digital Technologies in Africa', Journal of African Human Rights Law [2024] (8) (1).

Ogochukwu CN, 'Legal Research and Technology in Nigeria', Journal of African Legal Studies [2024] (18) (2).

Okechukwu CN, 'Equality and Technology in Nigeria Law', Journal of African Constitutional Law [2021] (5) (1).

Okechukwu JO, 'Cybersecurity Framework in Nigeria', Journal of African Technology Law [2023] (7) (1).

Okonkwo EC, 'Global Legal Technologies and Local Adoption: A Study of AI in Nigerian Courts', Nigerian Journal of Legal Innovation [2024] (3) (1).

Olabisi TO, 'Freedom of Information and Public Institutions in Nigeria', African Journal of Legal Studies [2022] (15) (1).

Olalekan B and Cecile O, 'The Emerging Artificial Intelligence Legal - Judicial System's Interface', *Commonwealth Cybercrime Journal* [2024] (2).

Olawale ET and Olayinka AO, 'Artificial Intelligence (AI) and the Future of Legal Profession in Nigeria', *LASU Journal of Law and Technology* [2024] (5) (1).

Olufunke A, Adefisayo OK and Awonuga A, 'Artificial Intelligence and the Judicial System in Nigeria: The Need for Transformation', *Lex ET Scientia International Journal* [2024].

Olumide A, 'Governing AI in African Judiciaries', *Journal of African Legal Innovation* [2024] (7) (1).

Oluwadare SA, 'Mapping the Digital Transformation: E - filling Systems and Judicial Networks in Nigerian Courts', *Journal of Nigerian Law and Practice* [2024] (1) (1).

Oluwakemi AO, 'The Malabo Convention and Data Protection in Africa', *Journal of African Cybersecurity Law* [2023] (6) (1).

Oluwaseyi AA, 'Global Data Protection and AI Regulation', *Journal of African Technology Law* [2024] (10) (1).

Oluwatosin AA, 'Cybercrime and International Cooperation in Nigeria', *Journal of African Technology Law* [2024] (10) (3).

Oluwatosin AA, 'Data Protection and AI Regulation in Nigeria', *Journal of African Data Privacy* [2024] (5) (1).

Oluwatosin AA, 'Judicial Independence and Regional Human Rights Courts', *Journal of African Judicial Studies* [2024] (9) (2).

Omodele AO and Olubukola AO, 'The Pros and Cons of Technology in the Judicial Process in Lagos State, Nigeria', *African Journal of Humanities and Contemporary Education Research* [2023] (13) (1).

Paul J, DiMaggio and Walter WP, 'The Iron Cage Revisited', *American Sociological Review* [1983] (48) (2).

Ryan C, 'Artificial Intelligence Policy: A Primer and Roadmap', *Journal of Law and Technology* [2017] (51) (2).

Sandra Wachter, 'Affinity Profiling and Discrimination by Association in Online Behavioral Advertising' *Oxford Journal of Legal Studies* [2020] (40) (2).

Temitope A, 'Digital Transformation in Nigerian Law', *Journal of African Law* [2021] (65) (3).

Tunde OA, 'Building Cybersecurity Capacity in Africa' *Journal of African Technology Studies* [2024] (9) (1).

Tunde OA, 'Technology and Evidence in Nigerian Courts', *Journal of African Legal Studies* [2022] (15) (2).

Ubanyionwu J, 'Ethical and Cultural Considerations in Artificial Intelligence (AI) Application to Customary Law', *African Journal of Law, Ethics and Entrepreneurship* (forthcoming).

Udofia MO, 'Navigating Digital Transactions in Customary Justice Systems: Lessons from Nigeria', *African Journal of Technology Law* [2023] (12) (2).

Zainab M, 'AI Translation for Judicial Access', *Journal of African Legal Systems* [2024] (12) (1).

ONLINE CONTENT/WEBSITE CONTENT

Artificial Intelligence and Lawyers in Nigeria, bamandgadsolicitors.com.ng. (n.d.).

'Integrating Artificial Intelligence Into Legal Education In Nigeria: Navigating The New Frontier for the Judicial System', available at <https://www.academia.edu/124021533> accessed on 17 May 2025

Kehinde AO, Oyedeji A and Awonuga A, 'Legal Research - Descriptive Analysis on Qualitative Methodology' *Lex ET Scientia International Journal (LESIJ NO. XXXI, VOL.2/2024)* 77 available at <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/38701958> 'Artificial Intelligence and The Judicial System in Nigeria: The Need for Transformation' accessed 17 May 2025

Nigerian Integration of AI in ADM, available at <https://www.google.com/search/research/methodology> accessed on 16 May 2025

<https://www.researchgate.net/publication/259339842> 'Qualitative Approach to Empirical Legal Research