

Research Article

# Artificial Intelligence in Criminal Investigations: Legal Implications for Evidence Admissibility, Accountability, and Protection of Fundamental Human Rights

Satriya Nugraha<sup>1\*</sup>, Kiki Kristanto<sup>2</sup>, Fahrizal S.Siagian<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1,3</sup>Universitas Palangka Raya, Indonesia; e-mail: [satriya@law.upr.ac.id](mailto:satriya@law.upr.ac.id)

<sup>2</sup> Universitas Palangka Raya, Indonesia; e-mail: [Kokotzha\\_1983@yahoo.com](mailto:Kokotzha_1983@yahoo.com)

\* Corresponding Author: Satriya Nugraha

**Abstract: Background:** The rapid development of Artificial Intelligence (AI) has brought significant changes to the criminal justice system, particularly in criminal investigations and evidentiary processes, while simultaneously raising complex legal and ethical challenges. **Objective:** This study aims to analyze the legal implications of the use of AI in criminal investigations, focusing on its benefits, risks, and challenges related to the admissibility of AI-based evidence, as well as the need for regulatory frameworks that ensure fairness, transparency, and accountability. **Methods:** This research employs a normative qualitative approach through the analysis of legal regulations, a review of legal and technological literature, and a comparative approach across jurisdictions, complemented by case studies of AI applications in law enforcement practices. **Results:** The findings indicate that AI enhances investigative efficiency through data analysis, crime prediction, and digital forensics; however, it also poses risks such as algorithmic bias, human rights violations, and issues concerning the reliability and transparency of evidence. Furthermore, differences across legal systems result in the absence of uniform standards for the admissibility of AI-based evidence. Therefore, adaptive regulatory frameworks grounded in the principles of fairness, transparency, and accountability are required, along with strengthened human oversight to ensure that the use of AI aligns with the principles of justice and human rights protection.

**Keywords:** Accountability; Artificial Intelligence; Criminal Investigation; Evidence Law; Transparency.

Received: June 11, 2025

Revised: Agustus 17, 2025

Accepted: October 21, 2025

Published: December 31, 2025

Curr. Ver.: December 31, 2025



Copyright: © 2025 by the authors.

Submitted for possible open

access publication under the

terms and conditions of the

Creative Commons Attribution

(CC BY SA) license

([https://creativecommons.org/li](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/)

[censes/by-sa/4.0/](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/))

## 1. Introduction

The rapid development of digital technology has driven significant transformation across various sectors, including the criminal justice system. One of the most prominent innovations is the use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in criminal investigations. AI not only changes the working methods of law enforcement agencies but also reconstructs investigative paradigms from conventional approaches toward data-driven and algorithm-based methods (Gupta et al., 2025; Rankin, 2025). In this context, AI enables the rapid and accurate analysis of large-scale data, thereby enhancing the effectiveness and efficiency of law enforcement processes.

The use of AI in criminal investigations provides various strategic benefits. One of its main contributions lies in its ability to analyze complex data to identify crime patterns and perpetrators. Technologies such as facial recognition, biometric analysis, and three-dimensional crime scene reconstruction have significantly improved investigative accuracy (Patel et al., 2025; Singh et al., 2023). In addition, AI is utilized in predictive policing, an approach that uses algorithms to forecast potential criminal activities based on historical data.

This enables law enforcement agencies to allocate resources more effectively and undertake preventive measures (Ersoz et al., 2025; Monika & Rajesh Kumar, 2024). In the field of digital forensics, AI plays a crucial role in analyzing electronic evidence such as metadata, video recordings, and encrypted digital communications, which are increasingly relevant in the era of cybercrime (Bakkannavar et al., 2025; Saini et al., 2024).

Despite its advantages, the use of AI in criminal investigations also presents complex risks and challenges. One of the primary concerns is algorithmic bias, which may arise from the use of non-representative training data. Such bias has the potential to reinforce discrimination against certain groups, particularly minorities, thereby creating injustice within the criminal justice system (Sierocka, 2025; Yadav et al., 2024). Moreover, the use of AI in surveillance and data analysis raises concerns regarding human rights violations, particularly the right to privacy and personal data protection (Kovatcheva, 2024; Rodrigues, 2020). Technology-driven approaches that are not accompanied by adequate legal safeguards may lead to excessive surveillance practices, including mass surveillance.

Another critical challenge relates to the admissibility of AI-generated evidence in judicial proceedings. Evidence produced by AI systems often raises issues concerning algorithmic transparency (the “black box” problem), system reliability, and the integrity of the chain of custody (Sampaio, 2025; Turner, 2025). These issues give rise to fundamental questions regarding the extent to which such evidence can be accepted in court without violating principles of justice and due process of law. In several jurisdictions, including those in Europe, this issue has become a central concern in the development of modern evidentiary law (Riekkinen & Söderholm, 2023).

On the other hand, the growing use of AI in criminal investigations has not been fully accompanied by adequate regulatory frameworks. Regulatory gaps or limitations create legal uncertainty and open opportunities for the misuse of technology (Gentelet & Mizrahi, 2024). Furthermore, the absence of clear legal standards regarding the use and evaluation of AI-based evidence further complicates its position within the criminal justice system. Therefore, a comprehensive study is needed that addresses not only the technical aspects but also the legal and ethical dimensions of AI utilization.

Based on this background, this study aims to analyze the legal implications of the use of AI in criminal investigations. Specifically, it focuses on identifying the benefits and risks of AI, examining legal challenges related to the admissibility of AI-based evidence, and evaluating the need for regulatory frameworks that ensure the ethical, transparent, and fair use of AI. Accordingly, this study is expected to contribute both academically and practically to the formulation of policies that optimize the benefits of AI while minimizing its associated risks within the criminal justice system.

## 2. Literature Review

### Law of Evidence

The law of evidence constitutes a fundamental branch of legal science that governs the processes through which facts are established, evaluated, and contested in judicial proceedings. It plays a crucial role in ensuring that judicial decisions are based on reliable, relevant, and legally admissible information. Fundamentally, the law of evidence seeks to structure the fact-finding process in a manner that enhances rationality and accuracy in legal decision-making (Allen et al., 2025). By establishing rules on admissibility, relevance, and probative value, this field of law provides a framework that balances the search for truth with the protection of procedural fairness.

From a conceptual perspective, the primary objective of the law of evidence is to ensure that only legally valid and trustworthy evidence is considered in court. This includes regulating the standards for admitting evidence, assessing its reliability, and determining its relevance to the issues in dispute (Paramjeet, 2023). The principle of rational adjudication underlies these rules, emphasizing that legal decisions should be grounded in logical inference and supported by credible evidence rather than speculation or bias (Allen et al., 2025).

Central to the law of evidence are several foundational principles, including relevance, reliability, and fairness. Evidence must be directly related to the legal issues under consideration and possess sufficient probative value to influence the outcome of a case. At the same time, the admissibility of evidence must not violate fundamental rights, such as the right to privacy or the prohibition of unfair prejudice (Paramjeet, 2023; Stoica, 2025). The principle of evidentiary loyalty further emphasizes that evidence should be obtained and

presented in a manner consistent with legal and ethical standards, reinforcing the integrity of the judicial process (Stoica, 2025).

Another essential component of the law of evidence is the concept of the burden and standard of proof. The burden of proof determines which party is responsible for establishing a particular fact, while the standard of proof defines the level of certainty required for a fact to be considered proven. In criminal cases, the standard is typically “beyond a reasonable doubt,” reflecting the high stakes involved in depriving an individual of liberty (Yasnok et al., 2025). Comparative studies indicate that the allocation of the burden of proof differs between legal systems, with Anglo-Saxon systems providing more detailed rules on evidentiary burdens compared to continental systems (Voitovich et al., 2023). Additionally, the interpretation and application of standards of proof may vary depending on the procedural context and jurisdiction.

The admissibility of evidence represents another critical aspect of evidentiary law. Courts generally require that evidence meet specific legal criteria before it can be considered, including relevance, legality, and reliability. Evidence obtained through unlawful means often raises complex legal questions, as some jurisdictions exclude such evidence to protect individual rights, while others may allow it under certain conditions if it contributes significantly to establishing the truth (Karunanithi & Rajamanickam, 2024). This tension reflects the broader challenge of balancing effective law enforcement with the protection of procedural justice.

Different legal traditions adopt varying approaches to the evaluation of evidence. The Anglo-Saxon legal system is characterized by formal rules governing the presentation and admissibility of evidence, as well as a structured approach to the burden of proof (Voitovich et al., 2023). In contrast, the continental legal system adopts a more flexible approach, often referred to as the principle of “free evaluation of evidence,” which allows judges to assess evidence based on their inner conviction without being strictly bound by formal evidentiary rules (Sorvatzioti, 2021). This distinction highlights the diversity of evidentiary frameworks and their underlying philosophical foundations.

In addition to these traditional approaches, hybrid models have emerged in international legal institutions. For example, international courts such as the International Criminal Court (ICC) integrate elements from both Anglo-Saxon and continental systems, creating a unique evidentiary framework that combines procedural safeguards with judicial discretion (Sorvatzioti, 2021). These hybrid approaches reflect ongoing efforts to harmonize evidentiary standards in an increasingly interconnected legal environment.

The evolution of the law of evidence is also influenced by contemporary challenges, particularly the growing complexity of technology and digital evidence. The increasing reliance on electronic data, forensic technologies, and digital communications has introduced new difficulties in verifying the authenticity and reliability of evidence (Rohatgi et al., 2022). Furthermore, the global nature of many legal disputes has prompted efforts to harmonize evidentiary standards across jurisdictions, especially in international human rights and criminal law contexts. These developments underscore the need for continuous reform to ensure that evidentiary rules remain effective and relevant in addressing modern legal challenges.

Overall, the law of evidence continues to evolve as it responds to changes in legal practice, technological advancements, and societal expectations. Its core principles relevance, reliability, fairness, and rationality remain essential in ensuring that justice is administered effectively while safeguarding fundamental rights.

### **Artificial Intelligence in the Judicial System**

The integration of Artificial Intelligence (AI) into judicial systems has significantly transformed both civil and criminal justice processes. AI technologies are increasingly utilized to enhance procedural efficiency, including legal document analysis, automated case management, and predictive decision-making (Padilla et al., 2025; Studzińska, 2024). In civil proceedings, AI facilitates the processing of large volumes of legal data, thereby reducing delays and improving access to justice. Similarly, in criminal justice systems, AI supports investigative processes, evidence analysis, and sentencing predictions, contributing to more consistent and data-driven judicial outcomes (Thomas, 2024).

Empirical studies indicate that AI-based tools can reduce human subjectivity and improve decision-making accuracy by relying on statistical models and historical data (Andriati et al., 2024; Nugraha et al., 2025). Notable examples include the development of “Smart Courts” in China, where AI systems assist or partially automate judicial functions, and

the use of algorithmic tools such as COMPAS in the United States to inform parole and sentencing decisions (Thomas, 2024). These innovations demonstrate the growing reliance on AI as a decision-support mechanism within judicial institutions.

However, despite its potential, AI cannot fully replace human judges. The judicial function involves complex considerations, including moral reasoning, empathy, and the interpretation of social values, which remain beyond the capabilities of current AI systems (Silva & Vadillo, 2024; Xu, 2022). Consequently, AI is more appropriately positioned as a supportive tool for routine and data-intensive tasks, while final decision-making authority remains with human judges to ensure legitimacy and fairness (Nugraha et al., 2025; Xu, 2022).

### **Principles of Fairness, Transparency, and Accountability**

The deployment of AI in judicial systems necessitates adherence to fundamental ethical principles, particularly fairness, transparency, and accountability, which are essential to maintaining public trust and ensuring justice.

Fairness is a central principle in AI governance, requiring that algorithmic systems operate without bias or discrimination. Algorithmic bias may arise from unrepresentative or historically biased training data, leading to unfair outcomes that disproportionately affect certain groups (Rama & Prinsloo, 2025). Ensuring fairness requires proactive measures, such as the use of diverse datasets, bias detection mechanisms, and continuous evaluation of AI systems (de Albuquerque et al., 2025). In the judicial context, fairness is particularly critical, as biased AI decisions can undermine the legitimacy of legal outcomes and exacerbate existing social inequalities.

Transparency refers to the ability to understand and explain how AI systems generate their outputs. Transparent AI systems enable stakeholders, including judges, lawyers, and litigants, to scrutinize and interpret algorithmic decisions (Meduri et al., 2024). The lack of transparency, often referred to as the “black box” problem, poses significant challenges in legal settings, where decisions must be justified and subject to review (Rama & Prinsloo, 2025). Enhancing transparency involves the development of explainable AI models and clear documentation of algorithmic processes, which are essential for ensuring accountability and fostering public confidence.

Accountability requires the establishment of clear mechanisms to assign responsibility for decisions made or assisted by AI systems. In high-stakes domains such as the judiciary, accountability ensures that errors or harms caused by AI can be addressed through legal and institutional frameworks (Raja & Zhou, 2023). This includes identifying the roles of developers, operators, and judicial authorities in the deployment of AI technologies. Regulatory frameworks that define liability and oversight mechanisms are therefore essential to ensure the ethical use of AI (Sawalhi et al., 2025). Without accountability, the integration of AI into judicial systems risks creating gaps in legal responsibility and undermining the rule of law.

### **Challenges and Opportunities**

While AI offers significant opportunities to improve efficiency, consistency, and access to justice, its implementation also presents substantial challenges. Key concerns include algorithmic bias, lack of transparency, and potential violations of privacy and fundamental rights (Dhamo et al., 2023; Fardin & Filippi, 2024). These issues highlight the need for robust safeguards to prevent misuse and ensure that AI systems align with legal and ethical standards.

At the same time, AI presents opportunities for reforming judicial systems through increased efficiency, reduced case backlogs, and improved decision-making consistency. Achieving these benefits requires a multidisciplinary approach that integrates legal, technological, and ethical perspectives (Sawalhi et al., 2025; Thomas, 2024). Such an approach ensures that AI development is guided not only by technical innovation but also by principles of justice and human rights.

In conclusion, the integration of AI into judicial systems represents a transformative development with both significant potential and inherent risks. The principles of fairness, transparency, and accountability serve as essential safeguards to ensure that AI contributes positively to the administration of justice. Ongoing research and regulatory efforts are crucial to addressing the challenges associated with AI and to ensuring its responsible and ethical implementation in the judicial domain.

### **Human Rights in Law Enforcement**

Human rights (HR) are intrinsically linked to law enforcement practices at both national and international levels. They function as normative constraints on the exercise of coercive powers by law enforcement agencies, ensuring that actions taken by institutions such as the

police do not violate individual dignity and fundamental freedoms (Kolthoff & Janssen, 2023). In the context of criminal justice systems, human rights principles influence multiple dimensions, including the definition of criminal offenses, procedural safeguards, and the protection of victims' rights (Eddyono, 2024). As such, a human rights-based approach to law enforcement emphasizes legality, proportionality, and accountability in all state actions.

One of the major challenges in aligning law enforcement with human rights standards is the issue of corruption. Corruption undermines the rule of law and erodes public trust in legal institutions, while also constituting a violation of the right to live in a society governed by fairness and integrity (Kolthoff & Janssen, 2023). It creates systemic barriers to the realization of other fundamental rights, including access to justice and equal protection under the law. Therefore, integrating human rights principles into the daily operations of law enforcement agencies is essential to ensure both justice and societal security (Danišauskas, 2017).

The influence of human rights on legal reforms is evident in various jurisdictions. In Indonesia, human rights norms have significantly shaped the development of criminal law frameworks, although challenges remain in terms of effective implementation and enforcement (Eddyono, 2024). Similarly, in Ukraine, legal reforms have increasingly adopted a human-centered approach, shifting the focus from state-centric authority to the protection of individual rights (Zarosylo et al., 2020). These developments reflect a broader global trend toward embedding human rights standards within the institutional structures and practices of law enforcement.

### **Explainable AI (XAI) in the Legal Context**

Explainable Artificial Intelligence (XAI) has emerged as a critical area of research aimed at enhancing the transparency and interpretability of AI systems, particularly in high-stakes domains such as law. In legal contexts, XAI goes beyond technical transparency to include the ability to explain how legal decisions are derived from algorithmic processes, thereby enabling meaningful human understanding and oversight (Matulionyte & Hanif, 2021). This is especially important in judicial and law enforcement applications, where decisions must be justified, reviewable, and consistent with legal principles.

Various XAI techniques have been developed to improve interpretability, including methods such as Gradient-weighted Class Activation Mapping (Grad-CAM), Local Interpretable Model-agnostic Explanations (LIME), and SHapley Additive exPlanations (SHAP). These methods are applied in tasks such as legal text classification and decision prediction to provide insights into how AI systems reach their conclusions (Górski et al., 2021). Empirical studies suggest that legal professionals evaluate such explanations based on their accuracy, relevance, and usability in legal reasoning (Górski & Ramakrishna, 2021).

Despite its potential, the implementation of XAI faces significant challenges. One key issue is the tension between transparency and the protection of intellectual property, particularly trade secrets embedded within proprietary algorithms. This limitation restricts access to critical components of AI systems, thereby hindering full transparency (Padovan et al., 2023). Additionally, the complexity of AI models often makes it difficult to provide explanations that are both technically accurate and legally meaningful.

Nevertheless, XAI holds considerable promise in supporting legal accountability, particularly in cases involving autonomous AI systems. By providing interpretable explanations of algorithmic behavior, XAI can assist courts in determining liability and responsibility, thereby complementing existing legal frameworks (Padovan et al., 2023). Furthermore, regulatory developments, such as the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) in the European Union, emphasize the importance of explainability as part of the broader right to information and transparency in automated decision-making (State et al., 2025).

## **3. Materials and Method**

### **Research Approach**

This study employs a normative qualitative approach, which emphasizes the analysis of legal norms, doctrines, and principles related to the use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in criminal investigations and evidentiary law. The normative approach is particularly relevant as this research seeks to examine the legal implications and regulatory frameworks governing AI within the justice system. Through a qualitative lens, the study enables in-depth interpretation of legal texts and scholarly discourse, especially in understanding the intersection between law, technology, and ethics.

### **Regulatory and Doctrinal Analysis**

The research involves a comprehensive analysis of AI regulations and the law of evidence, focusing on how legal systems address the integration of AI into criminal investigations. This includes examining statutory provisions, legal doctrines, and principles governing the admissibility of evidence, particularly AI-generated evidence. Key issues analyzed include reliability, transparency, accountability, and compliance with procedural fairness in judicial proceedings. This step aims to identify the extent to which existing legal frameworks are capable of accommodating emerging technologies.

### **Case Study of AI in Criminal Investigation**

This study adopts a case study approach to analyze the practical implementation of AI technologies in criminal investigations. The cases include the use of predictive policing systems, digital forensic tools, and algorithmic decision-support mechanisms. Through this approach, the research seeks to understand how AI operates in real-world contexts, highlighting both its advantages and limitations. The case study method also enables an examination of the gap between theoretical legal norms and their application in practice.

### **Comparative Legal Analysis**

A comparative analysis across jurisdictions is conducted to explore differences and similarities in the regulation of AI and evidentiary standards. This comparison includes legal systems from both common law and civil law traditions, as well as selected international frameworks. The purpose of this analysis is to identify best practices, evaluate regulatory effectiveness, and detect gaps in legal governance, particularly regarding the admissibility of AI-based evidence and the protection of fundamental rights.

### **Literature Study**

The research is supported by an extensive literature review of legal and technological sources, including academic journals, books, conference proceedings, and policy reports indexed in reputable databases such as Scopus. This literature provides both theoretical and empirical foundations for the study, ensuring that the analysis is grounded in contemporary scholarly debates and technological developments. The literature review also facilitates a multidisciplinary perspective, integrating insights from law, artificial intelligence, and ethics.

## **4. Results and Discussion**

### **The Role of Artificial Intelligence in Criminal Investigations**

This study finds that the integration of Artificial Intelligence (AI) into criminal investigations has fundamentally transformed investigative practices by enhancing data processing capabilities, pattern recognition, and evidentiary analysis. Through a normative and literature-based analysis, it is evident that AI systems enable law enforcement agencies to process vast and complex datasets ranging from biometric information to digital communications with a level of speed and precision unattainable through conventional methods. Technologies such as facial recognition, automated fingerprint identification, and AI-assisted video analytics have significantly improved suspect identification and crime reconstruction processes, thereby increasing investigative efficiency and evidentiary reliability.

Empirical illustrations from comparative jurisdictions further reinforce these findings. For instance, the use of the COMPAS algorithm in the United States demonstrates how AI can assist in risk assessment and decision-making within the criminal justice system, particularly in parole and sentencing contexts. Similarly, the implementation of Smart Courts in China reflects a more advanced integration of AI, where automated systems support judicial processes such as case management, document analysis, and even preliminary adjudication. These examples highlight the growing reliance on AI as a decision-support tool across different legal systems, albeit with varying degrees of autonomy and regulatory oversight.

However, this study also reveals that AI-driven investigative tools are not free from limitations. The reliance on historical data introduces the risk of perpetuating systemic biases embedded within the data, which may disproportionately affect marginalized groups. Moreover, AI systems lack the capacity to interpret nuanced social contexts, moral considerations, and human behavior in a holistic manner. Therefore, the findings suggest that AI should be positioned as a complementary tool rather than a substitute for human judgment, ensuring that technological efficiency does not undermine substantive justice.

### **Legal Implications for the Law of Evidence**

The findings of this study indicate that the incorporation of AI into evidentiary processes presents significant challenges to traditional doctrines of the law of evidence, particularly in relation to admissibility, reliability, and evidentiary integrity. Normative legal analysis reveals that AI-generated evidence often encounters difficulties in satisfying established legal standards due to the opacity of algorithmic processes, commonly referred to as the black box problem. This lack of explainability complicates judicial assessment of evidentiary weight, as courts require transparency and verifiability to ensure fairness in adjudication.

A key issue identified in this study is the preservation of the chain of custody in digital and AI-generated evidence. As AI systems process data through multiple computational stages, the risk of data alteration, misinterpretation, or technical error increases, thereby raising concerns about evidentiary authenticity. Case-based analysis suggests that courts are increasingly confronted with questions regarding the reliability of algorithmic outputs, particularly when the underlying models are proprietary and inaccessible for independent scrutiny. This challenge is evident in jurisdictions where forensic AI tools are used without clear disclosure of their operational mechanisms.

Furthermore, the comparative analysis demonstrates that legal systems have yet to establish uniform standards for the admissibility of AI-based evidence. While some jurisdictions apply existing evidentiary rules to AI outputs, others struggle with conceptual gaps that render such evidence legally ambiguous. This study therefore finds an urgent need for the development of specific legal frameworks governing AI-generated evidence, including requirements for algorithmic transparency, independent auditing, and procedural safeguards to ensure compliance with due process.

### **Fairness, Transparency, and Accountability in AI-Driven Justice Systems**

This study finds that the principles of fairness, transparency, and accountability constitute the normative foundation for the legitimate use of AI in the justice system. From a fairness perspective, the analysis reveals that algorithmic bias remains one of the most critical risks associated with AI deployment. Bias may arise from skewed training datasets, flawed model design, or systemic inequalities embedded in historical data. As a result, AI systems may produce discriminatory outcomes, particularly in predictive policing and risk assessment tools, thereby undermining the principle of equality before the law.

Transparency emerges as another essential requirement, particularly in the context of judicial decision-making. The findings indicate that many AI systems operate with limited explainability, making it difficult for judges, lawyers, and defendants to understand how decisions are generated. This lack of transparency not only challenges evidentiary evaluation but also weakens public trust in AI-assisted justice systems. In response, the development of Explainable AI (XAI) has been identified as a critical advancement, enabling stakeholders to interpret algorithmic decisions and assess their legal validity.

In terms of accountability, this study highlights a persistent “accountability gap” in AI governance. When errors or injustices arise from AI-generated decisions, it remains unclear whether responsibility lies with developers, deployers, or institutional users. Comparative insights suggest that existing legal frameworks are not adequately equipped to address such distributed responsibility. Therefore, this study emphasizes the need for clearly defined accountability structures, supported by regulatory mechanisms that assign legal liability and ensure institutional oversight.

### **Human Rights Implications of AI in Law Enforcement**

The findings demonstrate that the use of AI in law enforcement has profound implications for the protection of human rights. On one hand, AI has the potential to enhance procedural efficiency, reduce human error, and improve access to justice, thereby contributing positively to the realization of fundamental rights. For example, AI-assisted systems can expedite case processing and improve the accuracy of evidence analysis, which may strengthen the right to a fair trial.

On the other hand, the study identifies significant risks associated with the misuse of AI, particularly in relation to privacy rights and non-discrimination. Surveillance technologies such as facial recognition systems have raised concerns regarding mass monitoring and the erosion of individual privacy. In addition, algorithmic bias may reinforce structural discrimination, disproportionately impacting vulnerable populations. These risks highlight the tension between technological advancement and the protection of fundamental rights.

From a normative perspective, this study finds that a human rights-based approach is essential for regulating AI in law enforcement. This approach requires the integration of ethical principles, legal safeguards, and institutional oversight mechanisms to ensure that AI systems operate within the boundaries of human dignity and justice. The findings further suggest that public participation and transparency in AI governance are critical to maintaining democratic accountability.

### **Comparative Analysis Across Jurisdictions**

The comparative analysis conducted in this study reveals significant differences in how legal systems regulate AI in criminal investigations and evidentiary processes. Common law jurisdictions tend to adopt a rule-based approach, emphasizing strict admissibility standards and procedural safeguards. This approach provides a higher degree of legal certainty but may slow the adoption of emerging technologies due to its rigidity. In contrast, civil law systems rely on judicial discretion through the principle of free evaluation of evidence, allowing for greater flexibility in incorporating AI-generated evidence.

However, this flexibility also introduces potential inconsistencies in judicial decision-making, particularly in the absence of standardized guidelines for evaluating AI outputs. The study finds that neither system is fully equipped to address the complexities introduced by AI, highlighting the need for a hybrid approach that combines procedural rigor with adaptive flexibility. Such an approach would enable legal systems to respond effectively to technological advancements while preserving fundamental legal principles.

Additionally, the analysis shows that regulatory development varies significantly across regions. European jurisdictions have taken a more proactive stance in regulating AI, emphasizing data protection, transparency, and ethical governance. In contrast, many developing countries are still in the early stages of regulatory development, resulting in fragmented and inconsistent legal frameworks. This disparity underscores the importance of international harmonization efforts to establish common standards for AI governance in the justice system.

## **5. Comparison**

This study demonstrates that the regulation and implementation of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in criminal investigations and evidentiary processes vary significantly across legal systems, particularly between common law and civil law traditions. In common law jurisdictions, the law of evidence is characterized by a rule-based and procedural approach, where strict admissibility standards govern the introduction of evidence. This includes rigorous scrutiny of reliability, relevance, and methodological validity, especially in the context of scientific and expert evidence. Consequently, AI-generated evidence in these jurisdictions is subjected to higher thresholds of validation, often requiring explainability, transparency, and demonstrable accuracy before being accepted in court.

In contrast, civil law systems adopt a more flexible framework through the principle of free evaluation of evidence, which grants judges broader discretion in assessing evidentiary value. This flexibility allows courts to incorporate AI-generated outputs more readily, even in the absence of rigid admissibility rules. However, this approach may also result in inconsistencies, as judicial interpretations of AI reliability and probative value can vary significantly. The absence of standardized criteria for evaluating algorithmic evidence raises concerns regarding legal certainty and equal treatment before the law.

Furthermore, the study finds that hybrid legal systems and international judicial bodies tend to combine elements of both traditions, seeking a balance between procedural safeguards and practical adaptability. For example, international tribunals increasingly rely on flexible evidentiary standards while maintaining a commitment to due process and fairness. In terms of regulatory development, European jurisdictions appear more advanced in establishing AI governance frameworks, emphasizing data protection, human rights, and algorithmic accountability. Meanwhile, other jurisdictions, including developing legal systems, often face regulatory gaps that create uncertainty in the application of AI within criminal justice processes.

Overall, this comparative analysis highlights that no single legal system has fully resolved the challenges posed by AI. Instead, it underscores the need for a harmonized and adaptive legal approach that integrates the strengths of both common law and civil law traditions while addressing the unique risks associated with AI technologies.

## 6. Conclusion

This study concludes that the integration of Artificial Intelligence (AI) into criminal investigations and the law of evidence represents a transformative development with profound implications for modern legal systems. AI has demonstrated significant potential in enhancing investigative efficiency, improving evidentiary analysis, and supporting judicial decision-making. Technologies such as predictive analytics, forensic AI, and automated data processing enable law enforcement agencies to handle complex cases with greater speed and precision, thereby contributing to more effective crime control and adjudication.

However, these benefits are accompanied by substantial legal and ethical challenges. The findings reveal that AI systems introduce risks related to algorithmic bias, lack of transparency, and accountability gaps, all of which may undermine fundamental legal principles such as fairness, due process, and equality before the law. In the context of evidentiary law, AI-generated evidence raises critical questions regarding admissibility, reliability, and the preservation of the chain of custody. The “black box” nature of many AI systems further complicates judicial evaluation, as courts require clear and verifiable explanations to ensure the legitimacy of legal outcomes.

From a human rights perspective, the use of AI in law enforcement must be carefully regulated to prevent violations of privacy, discrimination, and abuse of power. The study emphasizes that a human rights-based approach is essential to ensure that technological innovation aligns with the protection of individual dignity and fundamental freedoms. In this regard, the principles of fairness, transparency, and accountability should serve as the normative foundation for the development and deployment of AI in the justice system.

Based on these findings, this study recommends the development of comprehensive and adaptive regulatory frameworks that specifically address the use of AI in criminal investigations and evidentiary processes. Such frameworks should include clear standards for algorithmic transparency, mechanisms for independent auditing, and well-defined accountability structures. Additionally, human oversight must remain central to all AI-assisted processes to ensure that final decision-making authority rests with accountable legal actors.

In conclusion, the future of AI in the justice system depends not only on technological advancement but also on the ability of legal institutions to adapt and evolve. A balanced approach that integrates innovation with robust legal safeguards is essential to ensure that AI serves as a tool for enhancing justice rather than compromising it.

## References

- Allen, R. J., Pardo, M. S., Lawrence, W. J., & Smiciklas, C. K. (2025). Minimal rationality and the law of evidence. *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, 115(2), 269–315.
- Andriati, S. L., Rizki, I. K., & Malian, A. N. B. M. (2024). Justice on trial: How artificial intelligence is reshaping judicial decision-making. *Journal of Indonesian Legal Studies*, 9(2), 909–942. <https://doi.org/10.15294/jils.v9i2.13683>
- Bakkannavar, S., Parekh, U., & Gupta, S. (2025). Unveiling truth of artificial intelligence in forensic medicine and education: Better late than never. *Journal of Forensic Medicine and Toxicology*, 42(1), 127–132. <https://doi.org/10.48165/jfmt.2025.42.1.19>
- Danišauskas, G. (2017). Towards safety of society: Rethinking principles of police financing. *Journal of Security and Sustainability Issues*, 7(2), 23–30. [https://doi.org/10.9770/jssi.2017.7.2\(3\)](https://doi.org/10.9770/jssi.2017.7.2(3))
- de Albuquerque, V. H. C., Kumar, B., Ghosh, M., Barman, S., & Jha, A. (2025). A primer on responsible AI. In *A compendium of responsible artificial intelligence* (pp. 1–27). <https://doi.org/10.1201/9781003514497-1>
- Dhamo, A., Dhamo, I., & Manastirliu, I. (2023). Fundamental rights and new technologies. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Research and Development*, 10(3), 121–125. <https://doi.org/10.56345/ijrdv10n319>
- Eddyono, S. W. (2024). The relationship between human rights and criminal law: A human rights-based criminal justice system. In *International human rights and local courts: Human rights interpretation in Indonesia* (pp. 114–135). <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003431350-7>

- Ersoz, F., Ersoz, T., Marcelloni, F., & Ruffini, F. (2025). Artificial intelligence in crime prediction: A survey with a focus on explainability. *IEEE Access*, 13, 59646–59674. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ACCESS.2025.3553934>
- Fardin, S. J., & Filippi, C. G. (2024). Societal view. In *Impact of artificial intelligence in radiology* (pp. 199–203). <https://doi.org/10.1201/9781003095279-39>
- Gentelet, K., & Mizrahi, S. K. (2024). A human-centered approach to AI governance. In *Human-centered AI* (pp. 215–230). <https://doi.org/10.1201/9781003320791-24>
- Górski, Ł., & Ramakrishna, S. (2021). Explainable artificial intelligence: Lawyer's perspective. In *Proceedings of ICAIL* (pp. 60–68). <https://doi.org/10.1145/3462757.3466145>
- Górski, Ł., Ramakrishna, S., & Nowosielski, J. M. (2021). Towards Grad-CAM based explainability. In *Lecture Notes in Computer Science* (Vol. 13048, pp. 154–168). [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-89811-3\\_11](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-89811-3_11)
- Gupta, M., Sood, R. P., & Singh, R. (2025). AI in criminal investigation. In *Rethinking the police* (pp. 311–323). [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-83173-7\\_21](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-83173-7_21)
- Karunanithi, K., & Rajamanickam, R. (2024). Admissibility of illegally obtained evidence. *International Journal of Public Law and Policy*, 10(2), 116–144. <https://doi.org/10.1504/IJPLAP.2024.137775>
- Kolthoff, E., & Janssen, J. (2023). Police corruption and human rights. In *Applied human rights* (pp. 299–321). [https://doi.org/10.3920/978-90-8686-943-5\\_17](https://doi.org/10.3920/978-90-8686-943-5_17)
- Kovatcheva, D. (2024). AI and human rights protection. *Economic Alternatives*, 30(2), 439–468. <https://doi.org/10.37075/EA.2024.2.12>
- Matulionyte, R., & Hanif, A. (2021). Explainable AI in law enforcement. In *IEEE EDOC Workshop* (pp. 75–80). <https://doi.org/10.1109/EDOCW52865.2021.00035>
- Meduri, K., Podicheti, S., Satish, S., & Whig, P. (2024). Accountability in AI. In *Ethical dimensions of AI* (pp. 83–102). <https://doi.org/10.4018/979-8-3693-4147-6.ch004>
- Monika, E., & Rajesh Kumar, T. (2024). AI-based crime detection. In *ICECA 2024 Proceedings* (pp. 1557–1562). <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICECA63461.2024.10800911>
- Nugraha, Z. A. D., Marisa, D., Ayunisia, S., & Baan, B. B. (2025). AI in judicial decision-making. *Engineering Proceedings*, 107(1), 103. <https://doi.org/10.3390/engproc2025107103>
- Padilla, S. D. F., Andrade, A. R. R., Cajo, F. R. H., Silva, R. D. B., & Ashqui, A. L. M. (2025). AI in judicial decision-making: A systematic review. *Anales de la Academia de Ciencias de Cuba*, 15(3), e3138.
- Padovan, P. H., Martins, C. M., & Reed, C. (2023). AI liability. *Artificial Intelligence and Law*, 31(1), 133–167. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10506-022-09308-9>
- Paramjeet. (2023). Evidence laws analysis. *MSW Management*, 33(1), 187–193. <https://doi.org/10.7492/keabsn38>
- Patel, K., Parikh, H., Dodiya, K. R., Patel, D., & Patel, A. (2025). AI in forensic science. In *Combating cyberbullying with generative AI* (pp. 365–388). <https://doi.org/10.4018/9798337305431.ch013>
- Raja, A. K., & Zhou, J. (2023). AI accountability. *Computer*, 56(4), 61–70. <https://doi.org/10.1109/MC.2023.3238390>
- Rama, T., & Prinsloo, T. (2025). FATE in AI. In *Lecture Notes in Electrical Engineering* (Vol. 1385, pp. 153–167). [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-96-5066-8\\_11](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-96-5066-8_11)
- Rankin, S. M. G. (2025). Criminal investigations. In *Elgar encyclopedia of AI and law* (pp. 143–148). <https://doi.org/10.4337/9781035336906.00041>

- Riekkinen, J., & Söderholm, S. (2023). AI and evidence law in Finland. *Revue Internationale de Droit Penal*, 287–314.
- Rodrigues, R. (2020). Legal and human rights issues of AI. *Journal of Responsible Technology*, 4, 100005. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrt.2020.100005>
- Rohatgi, S., Shrivastava, S., & Singla, S. (2022). Penology and justice. In *Crime scene management* (pp. 367–405). [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-16-6683-4\\_14](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-16-6683-4_14)
- Saini, K., Sonone, S. S., Sankhla, M. S., & Kumar, N. (2024). AI in forensic science. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003287810>
- Sampaio, R. X. M. (2025). AI and admissibility of evidence. *Revista do CAAP*, 30(2). <https://doi.org/10.69811/8bmk6478>
- Sawalhi, G., Abdallah, M., & Barqawi, L. (2025). AI ethical regulations. In *ICCLAA Proceedings*. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICCIAA65327.2025.11013404>
- Sierocka, H. (2025). Legal and ethical issues of AI. *Bialostockie Studia Prawnicze*, 30(4), 177–195. <https://doi.org/10.15290/bsp.2025.30.04.11>
- Silva, S. R., & Vadillo, D. C. (2024). AI and judiciary. *Revista de Internet, Derecho y Política*, 41. <https://doi.org/10.7238/idp.v0i41.426865>
- Singh, V., et al. (2023). AI in criminal investigation. In *IEEE Proceedings*. <https://doi.org/10.1109/iQ-CCHESS56596.2023.10391288>
- Sorvatzioti, D. F. (2021). Free evaluation of evidence. *International Criminal Law Review*, 22(5–6), 895–919. <https://doi.org/10.1163/15718123-bja10109>
- State, L., et al. (2025). Explanation dialogues under GDPR. *Artificial Intelligence and Law*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10506-024-09430-w>
- Stoica, A. (2025). Loyalty of evidence. *Studia Iuridica Lublinensia*, 34(4), 211–226. <https://doi.org/10.17951/sil.2025.34.4.211-226>
- Studzńska, J. (2024). AI in civil procedure. *Frontiers in AI and Applications*, 396, 446–452. <https://doi.org/10.3233/FAIA241371>
- Thomas, A. (2024). AI-driven judicial decision making. In *AI-driven decision making* (pp. 337–351). <https://doi.org/10.4018/979-8-3693-0639-0.ch015>
- Turner, J. (2025). Algorithmic evidence. In *Elgar encyclopedia of AI and law* (pp. 28–32). <https://doi.org/10.4337/9781035336906.00013>
- Voitovich, L. V., Nakhova, E. A., & Silina, E. V. (2023). Burden of proof. *Vestnik SPb University Law*, 14(4), 1062–1076. <https://doi.org/10.21638/spbu14.2023.414>
- Xu, Z. (2022). Human judges in AI era. *Applied Artificial Intelligence*, 36(1), 2013652. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08839514.2021.2013652>
- Yadav, A., Yadav, P., & Yadav, D. (2024). AI in criminal justice in India. In *Lecture Notes in Networks and Systems* (Vol. 1085, pp. 379–389). [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-97-6726-7\\_30](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-97-6726-7_30)
- Yasynok, D., et al. (2025). Standard of proof. *Law of Justice Journal*, 39(1), 125–152. <https://doi.org/10.5335/rjd.v39i1.16882>
- Zarosylo, V. O., et al. (2020). Law enforcement reform in Ukraine. *Asia Life Sciences*, Supp. 22(2), 791–800.