Advances in Consumer Research
https://acr-journal.com/

Volume-2 | Issue-4 | Sep 2025

Original Researcher Article

Artificial Intelligence and Online Dispute Resolution in Consumer Tribunals

Dr. Sonal Sharma[1], Yash Raj Mishra[2], Ravinder Sharma[3], Dr. Rakesh Kumar[4], Dr. Rajesh Chandra Ranjan[5] and Dr. Sarita Kumari[6]

[1]Assistant Professor, University of Delhi, New Delhi
Email: prof.sonalsharma@gmail.com
[2]Assistant Professor, Amity Law School Amity University Jharkhand
[3]Assistant Professor, TMCLLS, Teerthanker Mahaveer University, Moradabad
[4]Associate Professor, TMCLLS, Teerthanker Mahaveer University, Moradabad
[5]Assistant Teacher, Department of Education, Government of Jharkhand
[6]Research Associate, Vinoba Bhave University, Hazaribagh

Received:05/08/2025
Revised: 20/08/2025
Accepted:10/09/2025
Published:29/09/2025

ABSTRACT

The smart integration of AI in the ODR does not only imply the introduction of a computer to the issue of automating the existent operations, but better it can rightly be viewed as more similar to the process of re-engineering the dispute resolution process that proceeds to accommodate the prioritization of the users and the output and expanded ad-hoc functions of the new technologies to a wider and wiser support systems. It is one here that this systematic review shall dive deep and explore the current status of the AI applications in the resolution of conflict with an accent whose main aim is to put forward the same to the consumer tribunals. This discourse recognizes the current high universal crisis in the form of access to justice wherein the vulnerable populations have place of norm in procuring inappropriate and in-optimal access to access and solutions of law. Another aspect that is discussed in this review is that the digitalization of the legal systems on the one hand can bring efficiencies in the operations of the systems but on the other hand it presents a host of problems which are outlined including the problem of inconsistency in the use of the technologies and the possibility of fostering the inherent bias of the systems of enhancing an existing gap.

Keywords:- AI, Online Dispute Resolution, Consumer, Tribunals, Legal System..

INTRODUCTION

The introduction of Artificial Intelligence as an extension of the Online Dispute Resolution strategies is shifting permanently the collectivization of consumer tribunals and gracing space where it pertains to the innovation in terms of efficiency, democracy, and solution. The disruption is what is necessary to counteract the fire of low-stakes consumer feuds that are said to expedites current justice systems, which comes in the form of computerized systems assisted by AI in giving immediate responses. In addition, the AI implementation in the ODRs will also hopefully expand access to the justice and targeting specifically self-represented litigants who may otherwise be intimidated by the court process and/or otherwise unfamiliarzed with the court realm. In the application of AI to ODR and, specifically, its uses in consumer protection, the technological background, applications as well as the implication that can emerge will be analyzed in the present review. It is keenly sensitive with the progression of simple negotiation support systems to the advanced ones, is concerned but not mistaken between the nature of tools developed to support the development of the pool of negotiation outcomes with an individual, and the tools aimed at supporting fair conflict resolution. Some of the potential enhancements to such medical systems of private dispute resolution that AI could bring can be discussed, such as natural language processing and predictive analytics. This will contain an analysis of the reason as to why AI-generated systems will be beneficial in scanning big data to track the pattern and trends, and apply this to the dispute resolution processes with evidence based results. The smart integration of AI in the ODR does not only imply the introduction of a computer to the issue of automating the existent operations, but better it can rightly be viewed as more similar to the process of re-engineering the dispute resolution process that proceeds to accommodate the prioritization of the users and the output and expanded ad-hoc functions of the new technologies to a wider and wiser support systems. It is one here that this systematic review shall dive deep and explore the current status of the AI applications in the resolution of conflict with an accent whose main aim is to put forward the same to the

consumer tribunals. This discourse recognizes the current high universal crisis in the form of access to justice wherein the vulnerable populations have place of norm in procuring inappropriate and in-optimal access to access and solutions of law. Another aspect that is discussed in this review is that the digitalization of the legal systems on the one hand can bring efficiencies in the operations of the systems but on the other hand it presents a host of problems which are outlined including the problem of inconsistency in the use of the technologies and the possibility of fostering the inherent bias of the systems of enhancing an existing gap. Consequently, there is simply no way to emphasize that these rights should be considered to make sure that AI-driven ODR systems will be able to make actual efforts in order to propagate the concept of fairness and provide equitable access to the law instead of primarily establishing alternative obstacles on the way to their passing. The efforts to integrate into the world of ultra-modern AI, such as the use of big language models and emotion AI, merely add to this image additional opportunities and ethical issues, such as the clarity of the solutions provided and the existence of pre-implanted prejudices. As such, there is need to remark that such technological tips will be refined with consideration that the introduction of the sound frames will support concepts of fairness and justice through the automated systems on dispute resolution. The present usage of AI in consumer tribunals will be critically analyzed in the next paper along with an approximation of its potential impact being transformative and the challenges that are inherent in the concept.

Artificial Intelligence in Online Dispute Resolution

AI Techniques Used in ODR

ODR uses AI on an enormous number of complex automatisms, among them, though not restricted to, expert system and machine learning AI, natural language process and large language model AI. All these technologies enable ODR, present high-molecular legal documents to work with them and automatically analyze them, as well as make a contribution to the facts of a dispute resolution process, as a result of which the identified process ensured high efficiency and availability in resolving a dispute. As to show, machine learning algorithms can be performed in the context of prediction (which will involve the result of the dispute) with a very high level of accuracy, therefore, helping the parties to identify possible solutions to the problem and favor a settlement. In conjunction with the natural language processing, the forecasting prowess enables AI to offer elusive thoughts in the law and the terms of the contract providing more details to the people who contest and mediate. What is more, it may also be enhanced by the introduction of the generative AI which would allow creating the legal texts and correspondence that would be applicable in a particular dispute case. Not only a technological incorporation facilitates the settlement of dispute but also facilitates the exploitation of costs along with the utilization of the traditional legal avenues consequently the more stump the line on the conventional litigatory route is replaced by the accessibility of more conveniently accessible justice.

AI-Driven Negotiation and Mediation

Implanted with advanced algorithms are AI-mediation and AI-based negotiation systems that assist in facilitating well-organized communication and potentially could offer a settlement opportunity and in most instances they consider the parameters of conflict and historical data to strategize trade-offs that would favor both parties rather than the immediately confronted state of negotiating. The systems can also be able to detect interests that are underneath the individual parties, on top of the mentioned positions, in order to develop creative solutions, and this pertains more especially to consumer disputes where the emotional aspects may be considerable. Furthermore, due to the introduction of best alternative to a negotiated agreement and worst alternative to negotiated agreement functionalities, AI will help parties form a better idea of what makes more sense and what makes less sense, thus inviting the parties to discuss the matters more pragmatically and efficiently. Through these innovations, the ODR systems are no longer limited to processing disputes, instead, actively steering parties towards the best solutions, in most cases without necessarily involving human mediation through a human agent. The usage of AI in the process may include a simple automated communication platform to advanced systems that will negotiate on the fly and be able to predict data.

AI for Decision Support in Tribunals

Judicial settings has the potential to assist the judge and arbitrator with decision support tools, since it can be used to analyze case law, statutes and evidences to propose different verdicts, making the judicial system more consistent and decreasing the time required to process the case. An example is on-command generative AI, which will be capable of going through bulk legal text and generate a synopsis or related statistics, which will greatly expedite the research phase of adjudication. This is particularly useful when dealing with the consumer tribunal, cases is often large in number commonplace; therefore, it needs to make speedy decisions that are accurate. Additionally, the AI-based applications can identify the tendencies and abnormalities in huge amounts of customer feedback, therefore, exposing the systemic issues, which cannot be identified by other means thus helping the tribunal rectify the problem of the system, rather than individual cases. This active identification characteristic is bound to alter the paradigm of an active dispute resolution method to a proactive legal control of the resources, which will seek to maximize the resource allocation and multiply external justice of consumer protection in general.

Ethical Considerations of AI in ODR

Although the application of AI to ODR platforms has a comprehensive variety of competing projections, certain ethical issues, which should attract a serious study, are

also presented. The fear of the algorithmic bias, the openness of the decision-making process, the privacy of data, and the chances that the AI systems may develop or even promote the inequalities, which exist in the society, are contained in these. As an example, when data that would be biased in the past is being used to train AI models, their probability may be discriminative, continuing the outcome further, particularly in so delicate matter as credit rating or being welcomed to provide valuable services. Also, black box characteristics of most modern AI algorithms complicate the problem of accountability and interpretability, as they become hard to explain the origins of a specific decision and whose mistakes or lack of justice are exactly to blame. This implies the creation of sound ethical principles and rules of governance so that AI uses in ODR should be right, responsible and transparent to support human-monitoring and human dignity.

CONSUMER TRIBUNALS AND ODR

Current State of ODR in Consumer Tribunals

Introduction of ODR in the consumer tribunals is dramatic shift in the paradigm as it provides a more efficient and convenient method of dispute resolution as opposed to litigation found in the traditional way of observing statutes and principles. This is especially relevant to the context of e-commerce where online transactions may seem to require a facilitated, electronic system of dispute resolution, which is hard to offer by conventional courts. The spread of the internet and related increase in electronic transactions has continued to heighten the necessity of having online dispute resolution strategies which would offer security to the consumer concerns. In fact, the shift in use of Alternative Dispute Resolution to the use of ODR will be an upgrading in the field of settling disputes, especially with the European Union, which is actively attempting to implement a coordinated move to consolidate consumer complaint filing. Harmonizing of this nature seeks to facilitate the same level of protection and access of justice to the consumer in the various member states regardless of their geographical location or the place of the online transaction. Nonetheless, with these developments, most jurisdictions, including India, have not yet implemented technological innovations in the resolution of disputes, and this demonstrates an imbalance in the world implementation of ODR.

Challenges Faced by Consumer Tribunals

Although ODR has many benefits, there is a great challenge facing consumer tribunals that use these technologies, especially in regard to the digital divide and the provision of level playing field among all consumers, regardless of their technological and socioeconomic capabilities. Additionally, the fact that AI systems used by these tribunals lack transparency and may make them promote biases conducted by an algorithm can lead to diminished trust of people; besides, the discriminatory practices are the vise to be preserved unless higher authorities manage to address it. Additionally, the international character of cross-border consumer cases creates more legal and situational issues that current ODR models cannot effectively resolve, including no resource protection of decisions made and alignment of a variety of national consumer protection legislatures. The difference in legal frameworks and scales of enforcement in different jurisdictions makes the successful application of ODR to an international setting rather hard, in many cases requiring special arrangements to be made or multilateral guidelines to be met to achieve fair and binding results.

Enhancing Accessibility and Efficiency

In order to eliminate these concerns, user-focused design should lie at the heart of ODR platforms at the consumer tribunal that offer easy-to-use interfaces and support different languages so as to reach a large number of users, and consequently stop the effects of the digital divide. Also, the inclusion of sound AI algorithm with a high capacity to study and summarize the complex legal documents can contribute to the streamlined performance of the dispute resolution procedures in the sense that the case can be determined faster and that the decisions can be made with a better understanding of the case scenario and the available information of the case. Furthermore, the fact that, according to the first example, AI is used to automate some simple operation does not prevent human adjudicators who, in the first case, include in the analysis of the case and sort patient records, see more problematic, more challenging areas, in which the impact of the particular case and its specifics should be taken into account to make the appropriate judgment relying on the knowledge of the law and ethical standards. It is a strategic foundation of resources distribution, which is not only contributing to an expedited process of the case but also the quality of the final decision as far as the level of consistency is concerned. Furthermore, it is obligatory that such AI systems had been optimized repeatedly through empirically accessible data and customers as well as adjusting their parameters to the latest fluctuations of the legal landscape and consumer preferences and meeting heightened demands.

Benefits of AI-Enhanced ODR for Consumer Tribunals

Increased Efficiency and Reduced Costs

The application of AI to ODR can simplify the operations significantly because it can automotive routine to aims at reducing the number of individuals serving the tribunal and accelerate the dispute resolution process. This improved efficiency is also directly being reflected in the form of reduced operational costs per tribunal that further initiates that the costs of law will be kept down to the consumers and to businesses. Using the case of AI-controlled mechanisms, submissions will be investigated by systems that can acquire pertinent precedent, compose fuel preliminary ruling, i.e. optimization of the dispute resolution lifecycle in general. Similarly, this type of automation does not only reduce the time of solving the problem but also reduces the unpredictability of the decision-making process as this process involves less human errors and discretion to

it, which makes electronic transactions to become more predictable in the legal arena to some extent.

Improved Accessibility for Consumers

The AI user interfaces may be tailored to requirements and capacity of the individual users, such that the ODR sites will be improved as fully accessible to more individuals, in pursuit of higher technical capability. Moreover, AI application will provide people with a personalized support and counsel in the dispute resolution procedure, which will allow people to resolve more complicated legal procedures more comfortably and confidently. In addition, AI can lead to the generation of the real- time translations and simplification of the interpretation of legal terms, which will make justice more democratic to both non-native speakers and non-legal terminology users. This augmented access, as well as the chance of a cost spare, makes AI a valuable asset to enabling what can be regarded as fair accessibility to the dispute resolution of all consumers regardless of their language or socio-economic backgrounds.

Enhanced Fairness and Impartiality

AI can help minimize the possibility of human bias by decreasing the level of human interactions in the workflow on the day-to-day operations and standardize the parameters of decisions, and this factor improves the formation of a more objective and devoid of prejudice when finding a dispute resolution. Besides, AI systems have the ability to analyze extensive data volumes and extracting trends and irregularities, thereby ensuring that such similar cases are handled in a more consistent manner and minimizes the influence of biases arising in a particular adjudicator. Transparency in the making of decisions can be improved with a stringent data-based method of AI, which can allow offering transparent evidence-based justifications of the results, introducing more confidence within the group of conflicting individuals. Moreover, since the AI can Process great volumes of past rulings and legal precedents, it will secure a more uniform enforcement of the law on application to analogous cases, resulting in more predictable and fairer decisions.

Data-Driven Insights for Tribunal Management

AI systems are capable of delivering insights of good analytical information to gauge performance within the tribunal, bottlenecks, effectiveness of different dispute resolution schemes, and predict future volumes of workloads. This will enable administrators of tribunals to formulate evidence-based decisions with the help of information on the allocation resources and the policymaking amendments in harmony with the platform to work in the most efficient manner. It could also be used to seek informed options in determining how to manipulate specific users in more profitable methods to elevate pleasure along with enhancement of compliance to choices and this would augment the overall serving efficiency of consumer tribunals. The innovation factor that causes consumer conflict through the AI prospects can also present an opportunity to set up the policies entirely in advance and adjust the rules of regulation that further worsen consumer protection and level playing markets. These trends point to the possible disruptive AI towards making the process of customers tribunals more relaxed, free, and information-based.

CHALLENGES AND LIMITATIONS

Data Privacy and Security Concerns

It also causes significant energies behind data privacy and cybersecurity when considering the notoriously large amount of sensitive person and financial information that AI-driven ODR would need to process, extending to the provision or creation of superior standards of encryption systems and access control mechanisms that would enable an "attroduction of curbed occurrences and other unwanted uses and violations. Moreover, the amassing of a considerable amount of information to the phenomenon of training AI and its operations is a desirable target to the activity of ill intentions and needs constant level of control and further observation of threats. Moreover, data retention and sharing policies implemented in this AI should at the same time receive serious ethical reflection as these policies can ensure the rights of consumers are safeguarded and the level of trust is maintained in society.

Algorithmic Bias and Fairness

One of the primary obstacles concerns the potential of AI operation serving as a service of upholding or even strengthening prejudice in society in their data on training and, consequently, we will receive discriminatory outcomes in situations of conflict management by using AI. Omission of an adequate form of bias testing and auditing will be necessary to ensure that it is a just act to do and to discard undue prejudice against different demographics. In addition, such voodoos elevate the threat of confused biases of AI procedures without regulations by which they are often managed, and thus it is hard to eliminate these factors, which become a significant obstacle to the presence of transparency and responsibility of AI-engineered legal procedures. In order to cool such challenges, there will be the need to implement strategies of explainable AI and offer constant human controls, which will validate the algorithmic determinations especially considering dispute cases that are high stakes with consumers.

Lack of Transparency and Explainability

The simplicity of the AI algorithms, as they frequently are, might start to be a hindrance to the decision-making process, and it might produce the effect of the black box; the users and the regulators do not know why the final decision was made; they do not know why a certain answer was achieved. Such disclosure might impact the credibility of the people in AI-driven ODR systems, particularly when a situation can arise when individuals are unable to comprehend the reasons why this or that decision has been made. There is also the possibility that due to absence of clear explanations on decisions reach by AIs the right of consumers to challenge against the undesirable decision carry limitations since they will not

be provided with the requisite information needed to make sound cases. The necessity to develop readable AI models, hence, comes out as paramount to the development of confidence by users and also due process by automated dispute resolution machinery. It is an aspect that makes it difficult to eliminate and consider algorithmic biases because it does not appear easily in how the operations are undertaken to bring about discrimination outputs.

Regulatory and Legal Frameworks

The development speed of the AI technology is much faster than the law and the regulatory framework, leaving wide gaps in fighting the issues associated with responsibility of the AI produced errors, data tracking and instilling ethical standards. The absence of legal precedents and law enforcement agencies specifically created to adapt to the AI in the ODR trading create literally a gray area on the side of the AI developers as well as users similarly create a grey area as it may or may not prioritize goods protection. This regulatory lapse also compounds the question of accountability regarding the aspect of returning false or biased results where provision of legal responses to the matter may not be used to hold third party accountable in the event that autonomous activities cause harms.

CONCLUSION

Such a brief view of literature has given enlightenment to the revolutionizing state in artificial intelligence to remodel consumer tribunals and online dispute resolution and the in-house problems, which must obstruct all to exercise A west to its accountable objective. It has introduced such a need as a moderate use of the ability of AI to be effective and consistent and meticulously avoid risk factors with regards to data privacy, partisanship of the algorithms, and the danger of the black box in general, which led to the emergence of such formidable models. The further persistence of research and development henceforth must be on explainable AI systems not just to sever a superior visibility but also earn responsibility in hands of the user and devise a suitable regulation system that will not just follow the technology, but even ensure basic consumer rights. Besides that the hampering process of evolution of the legal systems must involve the provisions of accountability and redress mechanisms that shall be extended particularly to AI-based decision making context so that the consumers receive the similar treatment. The adaptability type of governance system needs to be researched upon where changing frameworks ought to be formulated to efficiently address the resultant talents of AI and provide ethical shields that ensure the continuity of ethical accountability. This means the existence of clean rules of responsibility, liability, and how ethical interest of AI can be exploited in consumer protection as the regulatory standards tend to adhere to technological advancements, rather than vice versa. Conventional concepts of negligence and hard-deterministic liability do not tend to encompass the intricacies of a self-initiated choice that AI systems entail, which require formation of new legal concepts to take care of such liability and regulation.

REFERENCES

1. Akpobome, O. (2024). The Impact of Emerging Technologies on Legal Frameworks: A Model for Adaptive Regulation. International Journal of Research Publication and Reviews, 5(10), 5046. https://doi.org/10.55248/gengpi.5.1024.3012
2. Andrade, F., Nováis, P., Carneiro, D., Zeleznikow, J., & Neves, J. (2010). Using BATNAs and WATNAs in Online Dispute Resolution. In Lecture notes in computer science (p. 5). Springer Science+Business Media. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-14888-0_2
3. Araujo, T., Helberger, N., Kruikemeier, S., & Vreese, C. H. de. (2020). In AI we trust? Perceptions about automated decision-making by artificial intelligence. AI & Society, 35(3), 611. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00146-019-00931-w
4. A.V., S., & -, N. D. N. (2024). Legal Challenges of Artificial Intelligence in India's Cyber Law Framework: Examining Data Privacy and Algorithmic Accountability Via a Comparative Global Perspective. International Journal For Multidisciplinary Research, 6(6). https://doi.org/10.36948/ijfmr.2024.v06i06.31347
5. Bharati, R. (2024). The Right to Privacy in the Age of Artificial Intelligence: Challenges and Legal Frameworks. SSRN Electronic Journal. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4908340
6. Bhushan, T. (2023). The Impact of Digital Technologies on Alternative Dispute Resolution. REVISTA BRASILEIRA DE ALTERNATIVE DISPUTE RESOLUTION, 5(10). https://doi.org/10.52028/rbadr.v5i10.art16.ind
7. Brij, M. (2023). The Ethics of Artificial Intelligence in Legal Decision Making: An Empirical Study. 55(1). https://doi.org/10.48047/pne.2018.55.1.38
8. Broyde, M. J., & Mei, Y. (2024). Don't Kill the Baby: The Case for AI in Arbitration. arXiv (Cornell University). https://doi.org/10.48550/arxiv.2408.11608
9. Brożek, B., Furman, M., Jakubiec, M., & Kucharzyk, B. (2023). The black box problem revisited. Real and imaginary challenges for automated legal decision making. Artificial Intelligence and Law, 32(2), 427. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10506-023-09356-9
10. Carmona, R. C. del R. (2021). Algorithmic Dispute Resolution. In Brill | Nijhoff eBooks (p. 198). Brill. https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004447417_012
11. Carneiro, D., & Nováis, P. (2014). Making justice more accessible. 279. https://doi.org/10.1145/2691195.2691284
12. Chaturvedi, R., & Verma, S. (2023). Opportunities and Challenges of AI-Driven Customer Service. In Springer eBooks (p. 33). Springer Nature. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-33898-4_3
13. Chauhan, J. (2023). Transformation of Dispute Resolution: Technological Innovations in Dispute Resolution and Its Effect on the International Law.

SSRN Electronic Journal. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4640977
14. Cheong, B. C. (2024). Transparency and accountability in AI systems: safeguarding wellbeing in the age of algorithmic decision-making. Frontiers in Human Dynamics, 6. https://doi.org/10.3389/fhumd.2024.1421273
15. Chronowski, N., Kálmán, K., & Szentgáli-Tóth, B. (2021). Artificial Intelligence, Justice, and Certain Aspects of Right to a Fair Trial. Acta Universitatis Sapientiae Legal Studies, 10(2), 169. https://doi.org/10.47745/ausleg.2021.10.2.02
16. De'Shazer, M. (2024). Advancing Legal Reasoning: The Integration of AI to Navigate Complexities and Biases in Global Jurisprudence with Semi-Automated Arbitration Processes (SAAPs). https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2402.04140
17. Dezao, T. (2024). Enhancing transparency in AI-powered customer engagement. Journal of AI, Robotics & Workplace Automation., 3(2), 134. https://doi.org/10.69554/ppje1646
18. Ferrer-Benítez, M. (2022). Online dispute resolution: can we leave the initial decision to Large Language Models (LLM)? Metaverse Basic and Applied Research, 1, 23. https://doi.org/10.56294/mr202223
19. Giacalone, M. (2025). AI and the Future of Private Dispute Resolution Mechanisms. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.5083207
20. Gill, C., Williams, J., Brennan, C., & Hirst, C. (2014). Models of Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR): A report for the Legal Ombudsman. https://eresearch.qmu.ac.uk/bitstream/20.500.12289/3584/1/eResearch%25203584.pdf
21. Hidayati, M. N., Suartini, S., & Saraswati, M. (2024). Menggagas Penyelesaian Sengketa Online (Online Dispute Resolution) pada Kegiatan Transaksi Elektronik di Indonesia. Sang Pencerah Jurnal Ilmiah Universitas Muhammadiyah Buton, 10(1), 225. https://doi.org/10.35326/pencerah.v10i1.4523
22. Implications of Digitalization and AI in the Justice System: A Glance at the Socio-legal Angle. (2024). Law and World, 10(3), 154. https://doi.org/10.36475/10.3.14
23. Kaur, J. (2021). Changing dimensions of right against self-incrimination: an analytical study. Revista de Drept Constituțional, (01), 32-42.
24. Batar, S. (2021). Review of capital punishment. Asian Journal of Multidimensional Research, 10(12), 422-427.
25. Kumari, S., Nanduri, S., Sharma, H., & Batar, S. (2023). Women in politics: examining their impact on policy development—A comprehensive review. Multidisciplinary Reviews, 6.
26. Tyagi, N., Jha, R. S., Chaudhary, A., & Batar, S. (2021). WOMEN IN DUAL ROLE; A SOCIOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVE. Ilkogretim Online, 20(1).
27. Kaur, J. (2019). Criminalization of Politics and Politicization of Criminals: A Need for Decriminalization. Maharishi Journal of Law and Society, 2(1&), 2.
28. Batar, S. (2021). Gender inequality in india: an overview. ACADEMICIA: An International Multidisciplinary Research Journal, 11(12), 458-464.
29. Gupta, M. Y. C. (2025). SURVEILLANCE LAWS AND PRIVACY CONCERNS. CONTOURS OF CONTEMPORARY LEGAL RESEARCH: A MULTIDISCIPLINARY PERSPECTIVE-VOLUME 3: CRIMINAL JUSTICE, FORENSICS, AND EMERGING LEGAL PARADIGMS, 164.
30. Batar, S. (2021). Concept of gender inequality. Asian Journal of Research in Social Sciences and Humanities, 11(11), 171-176.
31. Sharma, M. A., Mahal, S. G., Irene, M., Batar, M. S., Gupta, M. Y. C., & Kumar, M. A. Evolving Jurisprudence On Marital Rape: A Comparative Legal Study.
32. Kaur, J. (2024). Nature and Spirituality as a Legal Response to Environmental Jurisprudence. Available at SSRN 5142745.
33. Batar, S. (2021). Acquaintance rape: A review. ACADEMICIA: An International Multidisciplinary Research Journal, 11(11), 1059-1066.
34. Gupta, M. Y. C. (2025). JUDICIARY AND ACCOUNTABILITY IN THE INDIAN DEMOCRATIC FRAMEWORK. Archives.
35. Batar, S. (2021). An overview on cyber crime. Asian Journal of Multidimensional Research, 10(12), 167-172.
36. Gupta, Y. C. STATE COURTS AND JUDICIAL POWER: STATE LEVEL JUSTICE. STATE GOVERNMENT AND ADMINISTRATION, 28.
37. Kaur, J. (2019). Video-Conferencing in Courts in India: An Emerging Trend. International Journal of Current Advance Research.
38. Batar, S. (2021). The impact of legal cinema on ancient law reform. Asian Journal of Research in Social Sciences and Humanities, 11(10), 366-371.
39. Gupta, M. Y. C. Chapter-26 JUDICIARY AND ACCOUNTABILITY IN THE INDIAN DEMOCRATIC FRAMEWORK. CONTOURS OF CONTEMPORARY LEGAL RESEARCH, 269.
40. Batar, S. ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE AND IPR: COMPLICATIONS AND SOLUTIONS. INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY RIGHTS, 124.
41. Sehrawat, A., Katiyar, A. S., Vaishali, M. B. D., Sharma, M. A., & Gupta, M. Y. C. CYBERSECURITY LAWS IN THE DIGITAL AGE: GAPS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.
42. Batar, S. CURRENT MECHANISM OF JUDICIAL ACCOUNTABILITY IN INDIA. JUDICIAL INDEPENDENCE & ACCOUNTABILITY, 39.
43. Moparty, H., & Irene, M. (2021). "PUBLIC HEALTH SYSTEM AND COVID CONUNDRUM"(With special reference to Primary Health Care). PUBLIC HEALTH, 28(07).

44. Kaur, J. Mob Lynching Vis-a-Vis Rule of Law and Democracy: Recent Legislative and Judicial Trends in India.
45. Batar, S., Tyagi, D., Jha, R., & Chaudhary, A. (2021). Women In Dual Role. A Sociological Perspective.
46. Irene, M. M. (2015). Maritime Arbitration: Blend of Unity and Diversity. IUP Law Review, 5(4).
47. Batar, S. (2021). System of legal education in india. Asian Journal of Research in Social Sciences and Humanities, 11(11), 239-244.
48. Batar, S. (2021). A socio-legal study of police atrocities. Asian Journal of Multidimensional Research, 10(12), 624-630.
49. Batar, S. (2021). A review on abortion. Asian Journal of Multidimensional Research, 10(11), 472-478.
50. Chaudhary, A., Asudani, V. H., Mishra, A., Deshpande, A., & Batar, S. (2023). NRI MARRIAGES–WOMEN VICTIMS AND SCAPEGOAT FAMILIES. Russian Law Journal, 11(5S), 132-136.
51. Olewu, J. (2023). Generative AI and Consumer Protection: Directives for Regulation in Nigeria. SSRN Electronic Journal. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4552494
52. Palanissamy, A., & Kesavamoorthy, R. (2019). Automated Dispute Resolution System (ADRS) – A Proposed Initial Framework for Digital Justice in Online Consumer Transactions in India. Procedia Computer Science, 165, 224. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.procs.2020.01.087
53. Pasupuleti, M. K. (2024). Artificial Intelligence in Legal Services: Enhancing Case Analysis and Streamlining Legal Processes (p. 87). https://doi.org/10.62311/nesx/932120
54. Pawar, S., Apte, M., Palshikar, G. K., Ali, B., & Ramrakhiyani, N. (2025). DRAssist: Dispute Resolution Assistance using Large Language Models. https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2509.01962
55. Peters, S. (2021). The evolution of alternative dispute resolution and online dispute resolution in the European Un. CES Derecho, 12(1), 3. https://doi.org/10.21615/cesder.12.1.1
56. Prince-Tritto, P., & Pönce, H. (2025). Causal Artificial Intelligence in Legal Language Processing: A Systematic Review [Review of Causal Artificial Intelligence in Legal Language Processing: A Systematic Review]. Entropy, 27(4), 351. Multidisciplinary Digital Publishing Institute. https://doi.org/10.3390/e27040351
57. Qin, W., & Sun, Z. (2024). Exploring the Nexus of Large Language Models and Legal Systems: A Short Survey. https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2404.00990
58. Rauch, T. M. (2025). AI in IA : To What Extent and Capacity Can Artificial Intelligence Assist in International Arbitration Procedures and Proceedings? SSRN Electronic Journal. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.5100706
59. Razaque, A., Hariri, S., & Yoo, J. S. (2025). Ai-Driven User Interface Design: Enhancing Digital Learning and Skill Development. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.5114814
60. Reddy, P. (2025). "ONLINE DISPUTE RESOLUTION: A NEW ERA FOR INDIA'S JUSTICE SYSTEM? ANALYSING THE GROWTH AND EFFECTIVENESS OF ODR PLATFORMS IN RESOLVING DISPUTES OUTSIDE TRADITIONAL COURTS." SSRN Electronic Journal. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.5149527
61. Remolina, N., & Osa, D. S. de la. (2024). AI at the Bench: Legal and Ethical Challenges of Informing - or Misinforming - Judicial Decision-Making Through Generative AI. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4860853