

Drawing the Line: Legal Information vs. Legal Advice in AI Tools for Justice¹

Shivani Sathe^{1,*†}, Avanti Durani Mittal^{2,*†} and Abhishikta Mallick^{3,*†}

¹ Project Setu, BTG Advaya, Fort, Mumbai, 400 001, Maharashtra, India

² Project Setu, BTG Advaya, Fort, Mumbai, 400 001, Maharashtra, India

³ Project Setu, BTG Advaya, Fort, Mumbai, 400 001, Maharashtra, India

Abstract

This paper explores the distinction between legal information and legal advice in the context of artificial intelligence (AI) tools for justice, with a focus on India, where unmet legal needs remain widespread. While AI offers a transformative potential to expand access to justice by democratising legal information, it also raises concerns about the delivery of unauthorised legal advice. Drawing on international frameworks and an evaluation of existing Indian legal aid AI-based chatbots, the paper underscores the importance of maintaining clear boundaries between information and advice. It offers practical guidelines for designing and deploying such tools, highlights the need for robust disclaimers, and proposes a tiered, adaptive regulatory framework that protects users while encouraging innovation in the legal technology sector. The paper also considers key counterarguments and implementation challenges, calling for continued dialogue and research in this evolving space.

Keywords

access to justice, A2J, GenAI, legal information, legal advice, regulatory sandbox, legal aid, legal technology, AI

1. Introduction

Legal information delivery is critical for ensuring effective access to justice (A2J). Vulnerable populations, in particular, face significant barriers in understanding their rights and navigating legal procedures. This information gap increases the risk of exploitation, exclusion, and insecurity. Traditional legal aid systems are overwhelmed, and private legal services remain unaffordable or inaccessible to many. As a result, trusted intermediaries—including legal AI tools—play a critical role in guiding individuals through the initial steps of accessing justice.

However, deploying AI for legal information raises regulatory concerns, especially around the fine line between legal information and legal advice. In many jurisdictions, only licensed legal professionals can provide legal advice. Those building AI tools must therefore ensure that these tools stay within permissible bounds. Against this backdrop, our paper explores the distinction between legal information and advice and examines the current state of legal information chatbots in India.

Specifically, we evaluate a selection of publicly available AI legal information chatbots, assessing their performance on criteria such as tone of language, neutrality of content, and presence of appropriate disclaimers. Our methodology combines a qualitative framework informed by legal intermediary guidelines tested across real-world scenarios. Our contribution includes a set of actionable recommendations for innovators and policymakers to enable responsible AI deployment

¹ *AI for Access to Justice Workshop at the International Conference on AI and Law 2025 (AI4A2J-ICAIL25)*, June 20, 2025, Chicago, Illinois, USA

² Corresponding author.

[†] These authors contributed equally.

shivani@setu.law (S. Sathe); avanti@setu.law (A. Durani); abhishikta@setu.law (A. Mallick)

in legal information dissemination. While grounded in India, our findings hold relevance for other jurisdictions facing similar regulatory and A2J challenges.

2. AI-based legal information delivery for A2J

In India, legal aid is constitutionally mandated and has historically played a pivotal role in legal awareness and education. [4] Nevertheless, significant barriers persist. Many individuals remain unaware of their rights or the mechanisms to enforce them, which leads to chronic underutilisation of legal entitlements and protections. [6] While public legal aid and pro bono services provide vital support, [2] their reach is limited and often reactive rather than preventative.

2.1. Legal information gap

Access to legal information is foundational for A2J. [1] It enables individuals to determine whether their problems are legal in nature, whether legal remedies are available, and whether they can address the issue without resorting to professional legal assistance. [2,3] Timely and accurate legal information can also help people understand the broader implications of a legal issue, including how it interacts with social, financial, or health-related challenges. [1,2]

However, legal information must meet certain quality thresholds to be genuinely helpful. It is crucial for the information to be accurate and trustworthy, understandable and contextually relevant, and available in accessible formats that accommodate diverse needs and circumstances. [1] For vulnerable groups, including individuals faced with low literacy, language barriers, disabilities, rural isolation, or limited financial means, the absence of such resources can exacerbate power imbalances and deepen exclusion from justice processes. [1,2]

Recent assessments suggest a de-prioritisation of broad-based legal literacy initiatives, undermining what was once a central pillar of A2J architecture. [7] This shift can contribute to widening gaps in awareness and action—particularly for individuals facing everyday legal problems—who often turn to community actors like NGOs, associations, and local officials rather than formal legal institutions. [9]

2.2. Trusted intermediaries can bridge this gap

Given that many people do not initially recognise their issues as legal, they tend to seek help from individuals they trust—social workers, religious leaders, librarians, court clerks, health professionals—rather than from certified legal professionals. [8,9] These intermediaries play a critical role in the early stages of problem-solving, often serving as the first point of contact for legal information or referrals. [1,8]

Studies have shown that empowering such stakeholders with accurate legal information and decision-support tools can improve people’s ability to identify legal issues, navigate procedural steps, and connect with appropriate services. [1] Rather than replacing lawyers, these intermediaries act as a channel, enabling people to take meaningful action or seek more specialised help when needed. [8]

This model of decentralised and embedded legal information dissemination is especially useful in contexts like India, where systemic delays, affordability issues, and uneven legal infrastructure persist. It offers an accessible and people-focused entry point into the justice system, helping individuals avoid dispute escalation or disengagement.

2.3. AI as a legal information tool

Building upon the role of trusted intermediaries, community-based actors and legal education organisations have long attempted to bridge the legal information gap. Increasingly, however, legal content is being disseminated digitally—via websites, apps, and social media. [1] While this has broadened reach, it also creates new challenges: a plethora of poorly vetted, outdated, or overly

technical information online that make it difficult for laypersons to discern what is trustworthy and relevant. [1] Surveys reveal that traditional internet searches for legal information often fall short in ease of navigation, clarity, reliability, comprehensiveness, and conversational engagement. [27]

This is where artificial intelligence (AI), particularly Large Language Models (LLMs), are beginning to offer transformative potential. LLMs can help synthesise complex legal materials and tailor outputs to specific queries, providing natural language responses that are more engaging and personalised than static web content. [10] Chatbots can help users understand their options and identify situations where support from a legal professional may be needed. [26] When designed responsibly, such tools can act as a “first port of call,” guiding users toward an understanding of their rights and available pathways. [10]

Importantly, AI tools can lower the cost and increase the scalability of legal information delivery, especially for underserved populations. [10] By integrating verified legal sources, user-centred design elements, and safeguards such as disclaimers and escalation protocols, AI-based tools can complement the existing A2J infrastructure, without replacing professional legal services.

Nevertheless, realising this potential requires deliberate design choices and policy oversight. Developers must distinguish clearly between legal information and legal advice—both conceptually and in practice—to avoid unauthorised practice concerns and regulatory backlash. At the same time, public institutions must recognise the value of AI tools and commit to the broad dissemination of such tools, along with public education, to ensure equitable access. [1]

3. Legal Advice vs. Legal Information

A clear understanding of the fundamental differences between legal information and legal advice is essential—a distinction that, while often subtle, carries significant implications for both developers of AI tools for legal information dissemination and their users.

3.1. What is the distinction

In India, there is no authoritative guidance on what constitutes legal advice or how it differs from legal information. This ambiguity complicates efforts to build innovative, responsible legal information tools.

In contrast, the United States has developed practical guidance for court staff and volunteers to understand the distinction between legal information and advice, when assisting self-represented litigants. These frameworks recognise that while court staff cannot provide legal advice, they play an important role in facilitating due process by sharing basic legal information. [8]

Several operational principles emerge from these frameworks, which can help draw the line between legal information and legal advice in the Indian context as well. The guidelines suggest that to stay within the domain of legal information, one should avoid:

1. Predicting probable outcomes in a legal matter. [17,18,19,20,22]
2. Drafting arguments or assisting in legal reasoning. [17,18,20]
3. Recommending a particular course of action. Legal information may describe options but not suggest what someone “should do”. [18,19,21,22]
4. Advising on the content of a legal document (e.g. a form, petition, complaint, etc.) [18,19,20]
5. Applying legal rules to an individual’s specific facts or offering conclusions on their legal situation. [18,19,21]

In essence, legal information is educational. It empowers individuals by helping them understand the law and legal process in general terms. Legal advice, by contrast, is prescriptive. It involves interpreting the law in the context of specific facts and recommending a particular course of action. [8] The guidance given by the Illinois Supreme Court also notes that advice which is non-legal in nature (e.g. instructing someone to gather documentation) is permissible and does not violate principles of unauthorised practice of law (UPL). [21]

Legal information answers the question, “What do I need to know?”, while legal advice answers, “What should I do?”. Maintaining this distinction is critical for AI legal tools, both to ensure regulatory compliance and to build trust among users navigating the legal system, as explained in the following section.

3.2. Why the distinction matters

Many jurisdictions around the world impose restrictions on who may practice law. Typically, only individuals who satisfy certain statutory requirements—such as completing a formal legal education and/or obtaining a license—are authorised to offer legal advice.

In India, the principal statute governing the conduct of legal practitioners is the Advocates Act, 1961. Under this Act, only persons enrolled as advocates with a State Bar Council are entitled to “practice the profession of law”. [11] Indian courts have interpreted this phrase to include giving legal advice. [12] The Advocates Act also stipulates various eligibility conditions for enrolment, such as possessing a degree in law. [11] Consequently, under the current Indian framework, provision of legal advice is reserved exclusively for qualified lawyers enrolled with a State Bar Council.

This restriction in India aligns with the prohibition on UPL in jurisdictions such as United States, Singapore, and Canada. [15] In the U.S., the practice of law is limited to persons who are licensed to practice by the government and admitted to a state bar association, upon fulfilling certain requirements. [13] In several U.S. states, non-lawyers offering legal advice, subject to certain exceptions, may be subject to civil or even criminal penalties. [14]

The rationale behind restrictions on who may practice law is multi-fold: (i) protecting consumers of legal services against erroneous advice from unqualified sources; (ii) subjecting licensed legal professionals to strict professional standards including duties of care and confidentiality, which may not apply to non-lawyers; (iii) striving to create a minimum degree of competence and quality in the legal profession. [14,15,16]

Consequently, restrictions on the practice of law have posed challenges for technology companies innovating in the legal sector. For instance, in the U.S., LegalZoom, a company enabling consumers to prepare legal documents for business incorporation, intellectual property registration, etc. faced a series of lawsuits alleging UPL violations. [16] Similarly, DoNotPay, an AI-based platform helping individuals with consumer disputes, also faced UPL-related challenges. [14] Therefore, it is important that AI legal tools tread the fine line between legal information and legal advice carefully, to avoid overstepping regulatory boundaries.

4. Testing Indian AI Legal Information Tools

To understand the practical implications of the legal information vs. legal advice distinction in the context of AI, this section presents an analysis of six publicly available AI-powered legal information chatbots in India.

4.1. Tool selection and queries

With the growing accessibility of LLMs, India has seen a proliferation of AI-powered legal information chatbots. These tools attempt to bridge the significant gap in public access to credible legal information. Many of these chatbots are built or endorsed by legal professionals, reflecting a broader recognition of the need to democratise legal knowledge.

For this paper, we examined six such AI-based legal chatbots that are publicly available on Indian websites. Our selection was based on the following criteria:

- each tool explicitly states a legal aid purpose in its mission;
- they provide at least a free trial or free tier; and
- they rely on AI-generated responses to user queries.

We have anonymised the tools examined, as we did not contact the developers to confirm the underlying models or technical architectures. Our objective was to assess whether these tools align

with normative guidelines around the distinction between legal information and legal advice, as outlined in Section 3.

Each tool was tested using its basic, freely available version. We input a set of five standardised queries, each reflecting a common legal issue: workplace injury, tenancy rights, consumer protection, domestic violence, and cyber fraud (Appendix A). We selected the issues and drafted the queries based on insights from local news reports and findings from fieldwork. The queries mimic the way a layperson might seek legal help—seeking direction rather than statutes.

4.2. Analysis Parameters and Observations

Each chatbot’s response was qualitatively assessed across four dimensions: tone and semantics, range of suggested options, presence of opinion on merits, and disclaimer for professional legal consultation.

4.2.1. Tone and semantics

Most tools employed empathetic and conversational language, often beginning with “I’m sorry to hear about your situation.” However, the distinction between information and advice often blurred. Several chatbots used deterministic or directive phrases such as “you should file a police complaint” or “we advise you to consult the Labour Commissioner”, which could be inferred as legal advice by the average user. While some tools were very direct, using phrases like “you should immediately contact” and “it is your right”, other tools made efforts to qualify their responses: “It’s important to consult a lawyer who can guide you based on the full facts of your case”.

4.2.2. Range of legal and non-legal options

Most responses included a mix of legal pathways and practical advice. This reflects well on the tools’ attempts to offer actionable routes keeping within regulatory boundaries. For example, in the cyber fraud query, one chatbot suggested: “You can lodge a complaint with the cybercrime portal and also inform your bank’s fraud department immediately”. Another chatbot even included references and links to relevant sources and reading materials. The inclusion of multiple routes—institutional, procedural, and informal—indicated an effort to provide options rather than a one-size-fits-all answer or any decisive suggestion based on the specific facts.

4.2.3. Opinion on merits of the case

The degree of neutrality varied. Some tools clearly inferred outcomes from partial facts, for instance: “You are entitled to full compensation under the Employees’ Compensation Act”. Such assertions cross into advisory territory and may expose developers to liability if inaccurate. Others adopted more measured tones: “Depending on your documentation and circumstances, different legal avenues may apply”. Only a minority of responses avoided suggesting a likely outcome.

4.2.4. Reference to legal professionals

Nearly all tools included a general disclaimer—usually at the end of the response—urging the user to seek legal advice from a qualified professional. For example: “This is a general informational guide and should not be taken as legal advice. Please consult a lawyer for personalised support”. However, the visibility and emphasis of this disclaimer varied. In some instances, it was buried at the end, potentially diluting its impact. In one instance, while answering a query related to consumer protection, the chatbot stated “No lawyer is mandatory—you can file the case yourself!”. Such assertions could lead the user to believe that the chatbot’s support is a substitute for professional legal advice.

As lawyers, technologists, and policymakers look to AI for scalable legal literacy solutions, legal information chatbots can serve a vital function in easing the burden on formal legal aid systems. However, they also bring risks of unintended advisory overreach. Strengthening standard

protocols—including consistent disclaimers, language moderation, and regular audits—will not only protect developers from liability but also empower users to make informed decisions.

5. Policy recommendations

This section outlines key policy recommendations aimed at fostering responsible development and deployment of AI tools within the A2J sector. The preceding analysis focused on the significant unmet need for legal information, as well as the crucial—but often ambiguous—distinction between legal information and legal advice. The following recommendations aim to balance the transformative potential of AI in improving A2J with the need to safeguard users and uphold the integrity of the legal profession.

The Thomson Reuters’ 2024 Future of Professionals Report also highlights a need to develop rules to regulate the use of AI tools to address concerns around ethical use and human oversight, including in the form of establishing codes of ethics and/or certification. [23] The Report emphasises “building AI systems that are based on curated and validated content, provide transparent sourcing, tested using agreed-upon benchmarking, and guided by solid data and ethics principles”. [23]

5.1. Practical guidelines

As discussed earlier in the paper, legal advice necessitates the application of legal principles to a specific factual matrix, a task that requires nuanced understanding and professional judgment. It requires analysing a specific set of facts and circumstances unique to an individual’s situation. AI tools may struggle to handle complex, nuanced legal issues that require deep domain expertise. [24] While rapidly evolving and extremely capable of processing information, such systems may lack the understanding of complex factual scenarios, practical experience and the ability to exercise the same level of judgment to apply the law as a qualified (human) lawyer.

AI tools that provide legal information should aim to: (i) ensure accuracy and credibility through rigorous data curation and regular updates; and (ii) avoid any implication that the information shared constitutes legal advice, through objective presentation and the avoidance of prescriptive language.

From an AI tool building perspective, it is important to set out the basic guiding goal of the AI: that it is an educator, not an advocate. This entails building in multiple safeguards to ensure that any content generated does not cross into the realm of legal advice. While providing descriptive statistics or providing information on what can be typically expected in a certain situation may be within bounds, any function that requires interpretation of legal principles and their application to specific user-provided facts could be construed as legal advice. [8] Therefore, the tool should refrain from answering questions that call for an opinion about what a litigant should do, or advise a user on which of a set of available options to pursue. Practical guidelines should also include use of transparent prompts and algorithms that allow for a clear understanding of how inferences are made and provide supporting reference material.

The core functionality of any tool should be carefully designed in a way that it serves as a resource to empower users with legal information, rather than act as a substitute for a practicing lawyer. A legal audit by a professional should also be built into the review mechanism to evaluate the functionality of an AI tool, both for accuracy and content, and adherence to the information-advice boundary. [25]

5.2. Disclaimers

Given the potential for users to misinterpret AI-generated information as legal advice, setting out clear, prominent, and easily understandable disclaimers is paramount for any AI tool. At the outset, such disclaimer should clearly state that the content provided is for informational purposes only and not a substitute for professional legal advice. Legal information providers must not make a recommendation concerning the action a person should take, and the information they provide must

be qualified with an explicit warning to consult an appropriately qualified legal professional to be sure about the application of the legal information to their situation. [8]

The scope and limitations of the AI tool's services should be clearly articulated and prominently displayed at the outset of any interaction, to ensure it is visible to and comprehensible by all users. [25]

5.3. Regulations

There is a need to clarify the meaning of the 'practice of law' in the digital age and delineate the boundaries of services that fall within such definition. Given the rapidly evolving technological developments, what is required is a more flexible and adaptive regulatory structure [28,29] to account for legal services provided by AI tools. Traditional definitions, often centred on human-to-human interactions, struggle to encompass the evolving landscape of AI-driven legal assistance. However, with the growth of AI tools, there is an opportunity to tailor the regulatory approach, potentially focusing on the nature and impact of the service provided.

Within the spectrum of legal services, varying degrees of regulation should be applicable. For instance, any A2J and legal information tools that work towards empowering vulnerable groups and bridging the legal information gap should be subject to inclusive "safe harbour" structures of regulation. These safe harbours could focus on compliance with transparency requirements, clear disclaimers, and guidelines to ensure that the tool does not cross into legal advice. As a corollary, any virtual services purporting to provide professional legal advice, analyse specific factual scenarios, or recommend a course of action should be subject to rigorous scrutiny and strict oversight mechanisms.

A good starting point for developing an efficacious regulatory regime would be to test any new guidelines within regulatory sandboxes, both as a way for regulators to familiarise themselves with the new technology and to test the efficacy of the proposed guidelines. A robust framework must be established that balances the twin considerations of affording protection to users of digital legal services and fostering innovation in the AI industry.

Implementing these policy recommendations will encounter challenges. One significant hurdle lies in the inherent difficulty of drawing a precise and universally applicable line between legal information and legal advice, especially as AI capabilities advance. An overly cautious regulatory approach could stifle the development of beneficial AI tools that could significantly enhance A2J. Therefore, a flexible and adaptive regulatory framework, through the use of sandboxes, is crucial.

Acknowledgements

We would like to extend our gratitude to the team at BTG Advaya for their support for Project Setu. We also acknowledge the Indian AI legal aid chatbots that were instrumental in the analysis conducted for this paper. We would like to thank Aditya Mittal and Akhilesh Talluri for their time and help in collating the requisite data for our analysis.

References

- [1] B. Bilson, B. Lowenberger, and G. Sharp, "Reducing the 'Justice Gap' through Access to Legal Information: Establishing Access to Justice Entry Points at Public Libraries," *Windsor Yearbook of Access to Justice*, vol. 34, no. 2, pp. 99–128, 2017. <https://doi.org/10.22329/wyaj.v34i2.5020>
- [2] Law Foundation of Ontario, *Connecting Across Language and Distance*, 2008. <https://lawfoundation.on.ca/download/connecting-across-language-and-distance-2008/>
- [3] R. Sandefur, *Accessing Justice in the Contemporary USA*, American Bar Foundation, Aug. 2014. https://www.americanbarfoundation.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/04/sandefur_accessing_justice_in_the_contemporary_usa._aug._2014.pdf

- [4] Manupatra Articles, Legal Aid in India: Current Scenario and Future Challenges, 2023. <https://articles.manupatra.com/article-details/Legal-Aid-in-India-current-scenario-and-future-challenges>
- [5] Drishti Judiciary, Legal Aid and Access to Justice: Initiatives and Importance, 2023. <https://www.drishtijudiciary.com/blog/legal-aid-and-access-to-justice-initiatives-and-importance>
- [6] G. Suresh, Legal Aid in India: A Critical Analysis, NALSAR Law Review, vol. 7, 2013. <http://www.commonlii.org/in/journals/NALSARLawRw/2013/13.pdf>
- [7] Tata Trusts et al., India Justice Report 2025. https://indiajusticereport.org/files/IJR%204_Full%20Report_English_Low.pdf
- [8] J. M. Greacen, Legal Information vs. Legal Advice: A 25-Year Retrospective, *Judicature*, vol. 106, no. 2, 2022. https://judicature.duke.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/3/2022/09/GREACEN_Summer2022.pdf
- [9] CLEO, Community Justice Help: Advancing Community-Based Access to Justice, Discussion Paper, July 2020. https://cleoconnect.ca/wp-content/uploads/2020/07/Community-Justice-Help-Advancing-Community-Based-Access-to-Justice_discussion-paper-July-2020.pdf
- [10] M. L. Feldman and J. Silbey, The Practice of Law in the Age of AI, SSRN, 2024. https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=4976189
- [11] Government of India, The Advocates Act, 1961 (Act 25 of 1961). <https://www.indiacode.nic.in/bitstream/123456789/1631/4/A1961-25.pdf>
- [12] Supreme Court of India, Bar Council of India v. A.K. Balaji and Ors., Civil Appeal Nos. 7875–7879, 7170, 8028 of 2015, Judgment dated 13 Mar. 2018. https://api.sci.gov.in/supremecourt/2012/13890/13890_2012_Judgement_13-Mar-2018.pdf
- [13] D. A. Denckla, Nonlawyers and the Unauthorized Practice of Law: An Overview of the Legal and Ethical Parameters, *Fordham Law Review*, vol. 67, no. 5, 1999. <https://ir.lawnet.fordham.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=3572&context=flr>
- [14] J. J. Avery, P. S. Abril, and A. del Riego, ChatGPT, Esq.: Recasting Unauthorized Practice of Law in the Era of Generative AI, *Yale Journal of Law & Technology*, vol. 26, no. 1, pp. 64–109, 2023. https://yjolt.org/sites/default/files/avery_abril_delriego_26yalejltech64.pdf
- [15] N. F. Rajoo, Alternative Legal Service Providers and the Unauthorised Practice of Law: Comparative Perspectives, *Law Society of Singapore*. <https://www.lawsociety.org.sg/publication/alternative-legal-service-providers-and-the-unauthorised-practice-of-law-comparative-perspectives/>
- [16] C. Shipman, Unauthorized Practice of Law Claims Against LegalZoom—Who Do These Lawsuits Protect, and Is the Rule Outdated? *Georgetown Journal of Legal Ethics*, vol. 32, pp. 939–956, 2019. <https://www.law.georgetown.edu/legal-ethics-journal/wp-content/uploads/sites/24/2019/11/GT-GJLE190045.pdf>
- [17] Judicial Council of California, Administrative Office of the Courts, Access and Fairness Committee, *Legal Advice vs Legal Information*, 2003.
- [18] Texas Courts, *Guidelines and Instructions for Clerks and Court Personnel Who Work with Self-Represented Litigants in Texas State Courts*, 2015.
- [19] Education Subcommittee of the Utah Judicial Council, *Guidelines and Instructions for Court Staff Who Work With Self-Represented Litigants in Utah’s State Courts*, 2010.
- [20] New Jersey Courts, *What Court Staff Can and Cannot Do*, 2010.
- [21] Illinois Supreme Court, *Policy on Assistance to Court Patrons by Circuit Clerks, Court Staff, Law Librarians, and Court Volunteers*, 2015.
- [22] Supreme Court of Colorado, Office of the Chief Justice, *Directive Concerning Colorado Courts’ Self-Represented Litigant Assistance*, 2013.
- [23] Thomson Reuters, *Future of Professionals Report 2024: AI-Powered Technology & the Forces Shaping Professional Work*.

- <https://www.thomsonreuters.com/content/dam/ewp-m/documents/thomsonreuters/en/pdf/reports/future-of-professionals-report-2024.pdf>
- [24] British Institute of International and Comparative Law, Use of Artificial Intelligence in Legal Practice. https://www.biicl.org/documents/170_use_of_artificial_intelligence_in_legal_practice_final.pdf
- [25] O. V. Mack, Unauthorized Practice Of Law Risk Mitigation Strategies For Legal Tech Entrepreneurs, Above the Law, Jan. 2024. <https://abovethelaw.com/2024/01/unauthorized-practice-of-law-risk-mitigation-strategies-for-legal-tech-entrepreneurs/>
- [26] D. Simshaw, Access to A.I. Justice: Avoiding an Inequitable Two-Tiered System of Legal Services, Yale Journal of Law & Technology, vol. 24, 2022. https://yjolt.org/sites/default/files/simshaw_-_access_to_a.i._justice.pdf
- [27] M. Hagan, The User Experience of the Internet as a Legal Help Service: Defining standards for the next generation of user-friendly online legal services, Virginia Journal of Law and Technology, vol.20, no.2, 2016. https://law.stanford.edu/wp-content/uploads/2017/08/v20i2_3-Hagan.pdf
- [28] The Hindu, Stringent regulations could hinder growth of AI in India: experts, 2024. <https://www.thehindu.com/sci-tech/technology/overly-strict-regulations-could-hinder-ai-growth-in-india-caution-experts/article68320814.ece>
- [29] A. Mohanty and S. Sahu, India's Advance on AI Regulation, Carnegie India's Technology and Society Program, 2024. <https://carnegieendowment.org/research/2024/11/indias-advance-on-ai-regulation?lang=en¢er=india>

Appendix

A. Testing queries

1. Workplace injury query: I work at a factory. I broke my leg while working. The medical treatment cost me INR 35,000/-. My contractor said he will give me only INR 10,000/- and that I will not get a better deal anywhere. What should I do? Accept what he is saying, or should I take some action?
2. Tenancy rights query: I was not able to pay my rent last month because of financial difficulties. My landlord, without any warning, changed the locks one day. What should I do?
3. Consumer protection query: I booked a stay at a property through a popular online aggregator website. We had paid a 50% advance. After we reached the property, we found that we had been scammed, and there was no such property. We reached out to the website through which we made the booking, but they refused to take any responsibility. What should I do to get the money back?
4. Domestic violence query: My husband and his family have been harassing me for many years. I was finally able to stand up to him. I am unsure as to whether I should go to the police or agree to a divorce without taking any criminal action. Will I succeed if I take criminal action? I do not have a lot of concrete proof because the abuse has been mostly verbal and at our house.
5. Cyber fraud query: My account has been debited of INR 1,00,000/- without my knowledge or consent. I received a call from an unknown number, but the person said he was my bank representative. He knew my account details and he asked me to share an OTP with him to update my eKYC. After that I saw a large debit amount in my account. What should I do to register a case against this caller and get my money back?