


THE INAUGURAL NJSBA AI INSTITUTE – DAY 4

2024 Seminar Material

MI1528.244

New Jersey Institute for
Continuing Legal Education

A Division of the State Bar Association
NJICLE.com



This page intentionally left blank




THE INAUGURAL NJSBA AI INSTITUTE – DAY 4

Speakers

Honorable Xavier Rodriguez, U.S.D.J.
*United States District Court for the Western
District of Texas (San Antonio, TX)*

Honorable Ronald J. Hedges, USMJ (Ret.)
*Ronald J. Hedges LLC
(Hackensack)*

MI1528.244



© 2024 New Jersey State Bar Association. All rights reserved. Any copying of material herein, in whole or in part, and by any means without written permission is prohibited. Requests for such permission should be sent to NJICLE, a Division of the New Jersey State Bar Association, New Jersey Law Center, One Constitution Square, New Brunswick, New Jersey 08901-1520.

Table of Contents

	<u>Page</u>
Discovery of AI/GAI: Possible Requests and Objections The Inaugural NJSBA AI Institute Session #4 PowerPoint Presentation Ronald J. Hedges Honorable Xavier Rodriguez	1
Artificial Intelligence Discovery & Admissibility Case Law and Other Resources Ronald J. Hedges	25
Detailed Table of Contents [page numbers at bottom]	26
“Generative AI and Courts: How Are They Getting Along?” Honorable Bernice Bouie Donald (Ret.) Honorable James C. Francis IV (Ret.) Ronald J. Hedges Kenneth J. Withers	153
About the Panelists...	163

This page intentionally left blank

DISCOVERY OF AI/GAI: POSSIBLE REQUESTS AND OBJECTIONS

THE INAUGURAL NJSBA AI INSTITUTE

SESSION #4

DEC. 19, 2024

PRESENTER
RONALD J. HEDGES

- Principal, Ronald J. Hedges LLC
- United States Magistrate Judge, District of New Jersey, 1986-2007
- Co-Senior Editor, *Sedona Conference Cooperation Proclamation: Resources for the Judiciary Third Edition* (June 2020) and *Supplement* (April 2022)
- Lead Author, *Managing Discovery of Electronic Information, Third Edition* (Federal Judicial Center: 2017)
- Chair of Court Technology Committee of ABA Judicial Division
- Member, NJSBA Artificial Intelligence Committee
- r_hedges@live.com

PRESENTER
HON. XAVIER RODRIGUEZ

- United States District Judge, WDTX since 2003
- Adjunct Professor, St. Mary's School of Law
- Member, State Bar of Texas AI Taskforce
- Editor, Essentials of eDiscovery (TexasBarBooks)

DISCLAIMER

- The information in these slides and presentations is not legal advice and should not be considered legal advice.
- This presentation represents the personal views of the presenters.
- This presentation is offered for informational and educational uses only.

TOPICS TO BE ADDRESSED

- Rules governing discovery of GAI
- GAI as the subject of discovery
- Undue cost and delay
- Best practices

GOVERNING STATE RULES

R. 4:10-2(a) (Scope of Discovery):

“Parties may obtain discovery regarding any matter, not privileged, which is relevant to the subject matter involved in the pending action ***.”

See, e.g., *Alternative Global One, LLC v. Feingold*, ___ N.J. Super. ___ (Oct. 30, 2024) (approved for pub. Oct. 30, 2024)

GOVERNING STATE RULES

R. 4:10-1 (Discovery Methods):

- Depositions
- Interrogatories
- Requests for Production
- Etc.

GOVERNING STATE RULES

R. 4:10-2(c) (Trial Preparation):

“*** a party may obtain discovery *** otherwise discoverable under R. 4:10-2(a) and prepared in anticipation of litigation or for trial by or for another party or by or for that other party's representative *** only upon a showing that the party seeking discovery has substantial need of the materials in the preparation of the case and is unable without undue hardship to obtain the substantial equivalent of the materials by other means. *** In ordering discovery of such materials *** the court shall protect against disclosure of the mental impressions, conclusions, opinions, or legal theories of an attorney or other representative of a party concerning the litigation.”

8

GOVERNING STATE RULES

R. 4:10(c) (Protective Orders):

On motion by a party or by the person from whom discovery is sought, the court, for good cause shown or by stipulation of the parties, may make any order that justice requires to protect a party or person from annoyance, embarrassment, oppression, or undue burden or expense, including, but not limited to, one or more of the following:

- (a) That the discovery not be had;
- (b) That the discovery may be had only on specified terms and conditions, including a designation of the time or place;
- (c) That the discovery may be had only by a method of discovery other than that selected by the party seeking discovery;
- (d) That certain matters not be inquired into, or that the scope of the discovery be limited to certain matters;
- (e) That discovery be conducted with no one present except persons designated by the court;
- (f) That a deposition after being sealed be opened only by order of the court;
- (g) That a trade secret or other confidential research, development, or commercial information not be disclosed or be disclosed only in a designated way;
- (h) That the parties simultaneously file specified documents or information enclosed in sealed envelopes to be opened as directed by the court.

GOVERNING STATE RULES

R. 4:18-1(a):

Any party may serve on any other party a request (1) to produce *** electronically stored information, and any other data or data compilations stored in any medium from which information can be obtained and translated, if necessary, by the respondent into reasonably usable form)***.

GOVERNING FEDERAL RULES

- Rule 26(f)
- Rule 16(b)
- Rule 26(a)(1)
- Rule 26(c)(7)
- Rule 34(a)(1)(A)
- Etc.

DISCOVERY

Causes of action arising out of GAI:

- Breach of privacy
- Data breach
- Cybersecurity
- Discrimination
- Copyright or other intellectual property infringement
- Malicious use, such as deep fakes, hate speech and scamming
- Etc.

DISCOVERY

Questions about discovery of GAI:

- What is “bias?”
- What might raise a question of bias?
- What might be a consequence of allegedly proprietary algorithms?
- What about “black box” algorithms?
- What might be sought in discovery?
- What might be the role of experts?
- What about competence of attorneys?

DISCOVERY

What might be requested:

- Training set
- Source code or algorithm
- “Black box” algorithms
- Prompts
- Metadata – see, e.g., *Moore v. Garnard*, No. CV 19-00290 TUC RM (MAA) (D. Az. July 3, 2024)
- Etc.

DISCOVERY

Discovery-related questions:

- When might a protective order be appropriate?
- Will expert opinion be required before certain discovery is allowed?
- Might requests for production of prompts invade work product?
See Tremblay v. OpenAI, Inc., Case No. 23-cv-03223-AMO, 2024 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 141362 (N.D. Ca. Aug. 8, 2024)

DISCOVERY

- Can a prompt be work product?
- What showing of “substantial need” might overcome work product protection?

DISCOVERY

Take an alleged deepfake:

- What might a party demand in discovery?
- What objections might be asserted?

DISCOVERY

- When might source code be discoverable?
- See *Congoo, LLC v. Revcontent LLC*, Civil Action No. 16-401 (MAS), 2017 WL 3584205 (D.N.J. Aug. 10, 2017)
- See *State v. Pickett*, 466 N.J. Super. 270 (App. Div. 2021), motions to expand record, for leave to appeal, and for stay denied, *State v. Pickett*, 246 N.J. 48 (2021)

UNDUE COST AND DELAY

Rule 26(b)(1):

- proportionality factors now in this Rule.
- discovery must be “directly proportional to the needs of the case” and various factors must be taken into account.

UNDUE COST AND DELAY

The proportionality factors:

- importance of the issues at stake;
- amount in controversy;
- relative access to relative information;
- the parties' resources;
- importance of the discovery; and
- burden or expense *** outweighs its likely benefit.

For a decision addressing each factor, see *Oxbow Carbon & Minerals LLC v. Union Pacific RR Co.*, No. 11-cv-1049 (PLF/GMH) (D.D.C. Sept. 11, 2017).

BEST PRACTICES

- Understand the “tech” that you are working with—yours, your client’s, and other parties
- Consult with “whoever” to understand what you want in discovery and to respond to discovery requests
- Objections require “proof”
- Attempt to reach agreement among counsel as to, among other things, scope of discovery and form(s) of production
- Try to resolve disagreements without judicial intervention—no one might like the ruling

RESOURCES

- B.B. Donald, *et al.*, “Generative AI and the Courts: How Are They Getting Along?” *PLI Chronicle* (Sept. 2023) (in materials)
- R.J. Hedges, “Artificial Intelligence Discovery & Admissibility Case Law and Other Resources” (Jan. 2024) (in materials)
- R.J. Hedges, “Case Law, Etc., Supplement to ‘Trends & Developments’ August 2023” (Aug. 9, 2024) (in materials)
- X. Rodriguez, “Artificial Intelligence (AI) and the Practice of Law,” 24 *Sedona Conf. J.* 783 (2023)
https://thesedonaconference.org/artificial_intelligence_and_the_practice_of_law

FOLLOWING SESSIONS

- Session 5 – AI/GAI in Criminal Investigations and Proceedings – Jan. 22
- Session 6 – Admissibility of AI/GAI Under *Accutane* and *Olenowski* – Feb. 26
- Session 7 – The Ethics of AI/GAI Use by Attorneys – Mar. 12

QUESTIONS?
COMMENTS?
THANK YOU!



ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE DISCOVERY & ADMISSIBILITY CASE LAW AND OTHER RESOURCES

By: Ronald J. Hedges

January 2024



TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	3
AI-Related Case Law	6
AI in Litigation Articles	26
NIST Publications, Including the “Framework”	28
Federal, State, and Local Government “Responses” to AI	
Introduction	32
Federal	32
State	49
Local	55
Other AI Articles	56
Intellectual Property-Federal Agencies and Private C/A	63
GAI	
Introduction	73
GAI and Judges	74
Orders	79
GAI Articles	85
GAI and the Practice of Law	101
GAI and Paralegals	108
GAI and Legal Ethics	108
GAI in Law Schools	109
“International” AI	111
Deepfakes (Civil or Criminal)	118
Law Enforcement Applications of AI	121
Military Applications of AI	123

INTRODUCTION

I began this collection to assemble information on artificial intelligence (“AI”). Unsurprisingly, content grew and continues to grow as AI and generative artificial intelligence (“GAI”) have become mainstream and subjects of interest to many actors, including elected officials and regulators. I hope to update the collection on a regular basis, but the reader should appreciate that new AI- and GAI-related material appears daily.

The reader might also wish to look at compendiums of case law, etc., I have compiled on electronically stored information (“ESI”) in criminal investigations and proceedings which are hosted by the Massachusetts Attorney General’s Office and are available at <https://www.mass.gov/service-details/understanding-electronic-information-in-criminal-investigations-and-actions>.

With the above in mind, let’s start with some basic definitions (from Donahue):

‘Artificial Intelligence’ is the term used to describe how computers can perform tasks normally viewed as requiring human intelligence, such as recognizing speech and objects, making decisions based on data, and translating languages. AI mimics certain operations of the human mind.

‘Machine learning’ is an application of AI in which computers use algorithms (rules) embodied in software to learn from data and adapt with experience.

A **‘neural network’** is a computer that classifies information – putting things into ‘buckets based on their characteristics.

And, with regard to the governance of AI, see “Key Terms for AI Governance,” *IAPP AI Governance Center* (June 2023), <https://iapp.org/resources/article/key-terms-for-ai-governance/>

For a preview of what might be coming in 2024, see D. Coldewey, “8 Predictions for AI in 2024,” *TechCrunch* (Dec. 19, 2023), <https://techcrunch.com/2023/12/19/8-predictions-for-ai-in-2024/>

Please remember that this collection is not intended to be comprehensive. Rather, it is an overview of complex – and fast-evolving -- technology and how law and society attempt to deal with that technology. **NB: Everything in “color” has been added since the last edition was released in September of 2023.**

Also, I have attempted to create sections or “buckets” of materials. Materials may fit into more than one bucket but are not cited more than once. Moreover, each section begins with case law or statutes and regulations, which are followed by relevant articles, although there are sections consisting solely of articles. **And bear in mind that, although most links lead to free article, some may be behind paywalls.**

One final note: Some may recall difficulties that rural and disadvantaged populations had with, among other things, finding secure and consistent Internet access during the pandemic. As we adopt AI and GAI (and anything else), we should bear those populations in mind. See, for example, M. Muro, *et al.*, “Building AI Cities: How to Spread the Benefits of Emerging Technology Across More of America,” *Brookings* (July 20, 2023), <https://www.brookings.edu/articles/building-ai-cities-how-to-spread-the-benefits-of-an-emerging-technology-across-more-of-america/> and M. Reynolds, “How Do Virtual Hearings Affect People on the Wrong Side of the Digital Divide?” *ABA J.* (Dec. 14, 2023), <https://www.abajournal.com/web/article/how-do-virtual-hearings-affect-people-on-the-wrong-side-of-the-digital-divide#:~:text=Practice%20Technology-,How%20do%20virtual%20hearings%20affect%20people%20on,side%20of%20the%20digital%20divide%3F&text=%E2%80%9CYou%20can%20imagine%20how%20horrible,counsel%20at%20Next%20Century%20Cities.>

There are also proposals to amend the Federal Rules of Evidence (or other evidence rules) to address “machine-generated” evidence. See, in this regard:

- A. Roth, “Proposal to the Advisory Committee on Rules of Evidence: Rule Changes to Address Machine-Generated Proof Beyond Authentication,” in Advisory Committee on Evidence Rules at 80 and Tabs 2A and 2B at (Oct. 27, 2023). Tab 2B is a “Proposed Modification of Current Rule 901(b)(9) to Address Authentication Regarding Artificial Intelligence” submitted by Paul W. Grimm and Maura R. Grossman,” https://www.uscourts.gov/sites/default/files/2023-10_evidence_rules_agenda_book_final_10-5.pdf

- S. Martinson, “Law Scholars Propose Court Rule Tweak Aimed at Deepfakes,” *Law360* (Oct. 13, 2023), <https://www.law360.com/pulse/articles/1732270/law-scholars-propose-court-rule-tweak-aimed-at-deepfakes>

Comments, criticisms, and proposed additions are welcome. Please send to me at r_hedges@live.com.

AI-RELATED CASE LAW

There is limited case law on AI and GAI. However, as the representative decisions below indicate, expect to see courts address, among other things, discovery and admissibility issues.

Note that the Federal Judicial Center, the education arm of the Federal Judiciary, has published J.E. Baker, *et al.*, *An Introduction to Artificial Intelligence for Federal Judges*, in February of 2023. It is available at

[https://www.fjc.gov/sites/default/files/materials/47/An Introduction to Artificial Intelligence for Federal Judges.pdf?utm_source=thebrainyacts.beehiiv.com&utm_medium=newsletter&utm_campaign=122-so-damn-convincing](https://www.fjc.gov/sites/default/files/materials/47/An_Introduction_to_Artificial_Intelligence_for_Federal_Judges.pdf?utm_source=thebrainyacts.beehiiv.com&utm_medium=newsletter&utm_campaign=122-so-damn-convincing)

And see “Artificial Intelligence and the Courts: Materials for Judges,” a project of the American Association for the Advancement of Science. These materials are “primarily individual papers, prepared by experts in the relevant field, and finalized through a process that ensures both the technical accuracy of the content and its utility for judges,” and are available at <https://www.aaas.org/ai2/projects/law/judicialpapers>

Congoo, LLC v. Revcontent LLC, Civil Action No. 16-401 (MAS), 2017 WL 3584205 (D.N.J. Aug. 10, 2017)

In this action for, among other things, unfair competition, plaintiff sought discovery of defendants’ source code used to create the content of allegedly false and misleading advertising. The court denied plaintiff’s motion to compel:

In order for the production of source code to be compelled, Plaintiff must prove that it is relevant and necessary to the action. The relevancy and necessity requirements must be met, regardless of whether a Discovery Confidentiality Order exists. Courts have held that when source code is requested not only must it be relevant and necessary to the prosecution or defense of the case but when alternatives are available, a court will not be justified in ordering disclosure.

The majority of cases cited by Plaintiff are distinguishable in that they are patent cases in which production of the source code was necessary to prove infringement claims. The Court finds that unlike in a patent case alleging infringement, Plaintiff does not need to review the actual code because its interest is in the specific functionalities of the software, not the underlying code. ***

In this case, Plaintiff alleges that the Defendants have employed ‘false and misleading representations in advertising to generate greater income from their Ads and those of Defendants’ Advertisers in order to offer its services at more attractive rates than Plaintiff can offer, and to take Plaintiff’s business, erode Plaintiff’s market share and damage Plaintiff’s goodwill in association with Plaintiff’s native advertising business.’ The focus here is *what* Defendants are doing, that is, whether they are creating ads or influencing the creation or content of the ads. The Court is not convinced that an understanding of the Defendants’ influence on or creation of the ads requires production of the technology, i.e., the source code, utilized by the Defendants. Rather, the Court is persuaded that through witness testimony an understanding of the functionality of the software algorithm as it relates to issues in this case, e.g., selection of higher paying Content Recommendations, can be adequately addressed.

Assuming, however, that the source code is relevant, the Court finds that its highly confidential nature is such that it cannot be adequately safeguarded by a Discovery Confidentiality Order and therefore outweighs the need for production. The proprietary nature of Defendants’ source code is outlined in the declaration of Revcontent’s Chief Product Officer ***.

A weighing of the competing interests: an ability to elicit facts for a full assessment of the claims and defenses, on the one hand, and protecting trade secrets, on the other, must be made with full consideration of factors, including availability of other means of proof and dangers of disclosure. Given the proprietary nature of Defendants’ source code, which is not in dispute, and the irreparable harm that could occur if it is produced, the Court finds that production of the source code is not warranted, especially in light of Defendants’ representation that ‘the present discovery dispute concerns only several discrete functions of [Defendants’] technology.’ Moreover, weighing the competing interests, the existing Discovery Confidentiality Order is insufficient to justify production of Defendant Revcontent’s highly protected trade secret.

The Court finds that Plaintiff has not met its burden of demonstrating that production of the source code is relevant and necessary. The Court further finds that the information provided by Defendants regarding the source code and the additional information that Defendants are willing to provide regarding the functionality of the source code is sufficient and that production of the actual source code is not necessary for an adequate assessment of the claims and defenses in this case. Specifically, Defendants have provided a Declaration from Defendants’ Chief Product Officer in which he explains the functionality of Defendants’ technology. Defendants have also provided a proposed stipulation as to the source code which describes how the technology determines which native ads will be displayed in the Revcontent widget from the pool of available native ads. The Court notes that Plaintiff can also depose the employees involved in the creation of the ads in order to prove its false and misleading advertising claims. ***. [citations and footnote omitted].

In re Google RTB Consumer Privacy Litig., Case No. 21-cv-02155-YGR (VKD)
(N.D. Ca. Nov. 2, 2022)

The plaintiffs in this class action sought to compel the defendant to produce documents related to its “automated data selection process” used to select data for distribution to third-party participants in auctions. The court addressed certain disputes as follows:

During the hearing, Google suggested that it does not necessarily have documents that show all of the details of the automated data selection process that plaintiffs say they require. In that case, plaintiffs may of course use other means to obtain the discovery they need, including deposing any witnesses whose testimony may be necessary to provide a more complete understanding of the process or to identify relevant sources of information about the process. If this deposition testimony is important for class certification briefing, the Court expects the parties to cooperate in promptly scheduling such depositions. ***.

RFP [Request for Production] 96 asks for documents sufficient to show ‘the architecture of the software program(s)’ that comprise the automated data selection process. Google says that this is highly sensitive information and that production of such detailed technical information is unnecessary for plaintiffs to understand how data is distributed through the RTB auction. ***. Plaintiffs argue that Google has not shown that the architecture of the software underlying the data selection process is sensitive or trade secret, but even if it is, the protective order affords adequate protection. ***.

The Court is skeptical that discovery of the architecture-level details of Google's software is relevant and proportional to the needs of the case, particularly in view of Google's representation at the hearing that it has no objection to producing (and did not withhold from its prior production) internal design documents that reveal how the automated data selection

process operates. ***. Absent a more specific showing of need for information about the architecture of Google's software, the Court agrees that production of design documents, including schematics, showing how the automated data selection process operates should be sufficient.

In re JUUL Labs, Inc., Marketing, Sales Practices, and Prod. Liability Litig., Case No. 19-md-02913, 2023 WL 6205473 (N.D. Ca. Sept. 19, 2023)

The district court granted final approval to a proposed class action settlement. In doing so, it overruled objections to the Claims Administrator's rejection of claims submitted by ClaimClam, a third-party "claims aggregator:"

Class Counsel directed the Settlement Administrator (Epiq) to reject the 'tens of thousands' of claims submitted 'en masse' by ClaimClam. ***. Class Counsel argues that participation claims aggregators like ClaimClam in class action claims administration can generally create confusion. Specific to this case, Class Counsel point to evidence that the information provided by ClaimClam to Class Members about the JLI Class Settlement and claims process was incorrect or potentially misleading. ***.

The Settlement Administrator appropriately rejected the ClaimClam submissions. The method and contents of the notices given to class members — including the explanation of the case and instructions on how to participate, opt-out, or object — were all approved by the Court ***. The Court also approved the appointment of Epiq as the Claims Administrator based on representations of Epiq's qualifications and experience and an outline of administrative and communication services to be provided to class members, under the supervision of Class Counsel and ultimately the Court. The Court takes these steps to ensure that class members' due process rights are fully protected. Allowing en masse submissions by claims aggregators like ClaimClam raises real risks that Class Members will not receive accurate information regarding the scope of the class and the claims process. Allowing a third-party to submit hundreds or thousands of aggregated claims also hinders the ability of the Court-appointed Claims Administrator to communicate directly with claimants and conduct required follow up to identify fraudulent claims or verify the accuracy of claims and to resolve claim disputes (e.g., confirm hours worked in wage and hour suits, or the amount of product purchased in consumer suits).

Liapes v. Facebook, Inc., A164880 (Ca. Ct. App. 1st App. Dist. Div. 3 Sept. 21, 2022)

Samantha Liapes filed a class action against Facebook, Inc. (Facebook, now known as Meta Platforms, Inc.), alleging it does not provide women and older people equal access to insurance ads on its online platform in violation of the Unruh Civil Rights Act and Civil Code section 51.5 — both of which prohibit businesses from discriminating against people with

protected characteristics, such as gender and age. ***. Liapes alleged Facebook requires all advertisers to choose the age and gender of its users who will receive ads, and companies offering insurance products routinely tell it to not send their ads to women or older people. She further alleged Facebook's ad-delivery algorithm, the system that determines which users will receive ads, discriminates against women and older people by relying heavily on the two key data points of age and gender. As a result, Liapes alleged, women and older people were excluded from receiving insurance ads.

The trial court sustained Facebook's demurrer, deciding Liapes did not plead sufficient facts to support her discrimination claims. It concluded Facebook's tools are neutral on their face and simply have a disproportionate impact on a protected class, rather than intentionally discriminating. The court further concluded Facebook was immune under section 230 of the Communications Decency Act of 1996 (47 U.S.C. § 230 (section 230)), which applies to interactive computer service providers acting as a 'publisher or speaker' of content provided by others. Liapes appealed. We review de novo the ruling on the demurrer. ***. Liberally construing the complaint and drawing all reasonable inferences in favor of Liapes's claims, we conclude the complaint alleges facts sufficient to state a cause of action and reverse. ***.

Facebook's Lookalike Audience tool and ad-delivery algorithm underscore its role as a content developer. According to the complaint, Facebook uses its internal data and analysis to determine what specific people will receive ads. The algorithm relies heavily on age and gender to determine which users will actually receive any given ad. This occurs even if an advertiser did not expressly exclude certain genders or older people. The algorithm then sends or excludes users from viewing ads based on protected characteristics such as age and gender. Because the algorithm ascertains data about a user and then targets ads based on the users' characteristics, the algorithm renders Facebook more akin to a content developer. ***. Facebook is not entitled to section 230 immunity for the claims here.

Disputing this conclusion, Facebook argues its ad tools are neutral because third parties, not Facebook, create the allegedly illegal content. True, providing neutral tools to users to make illegal or unlawful searches does not constitute 'development' for immunity purposes. ***. But the system must do 'absolutely nothing to enhance' the unlawful message at issue 'beyond the words offered by the user.' ***. For example, 'a housing website that allows users to specify whether they will or will not receive emails by means of user-defined criteria might help some users exclude email from other users of a particular race or sex.' ***. 'However, that website would be immune, so long as it does not require the use of discriminatory criteria.' ***. Here, Liapes alleged Facebook 'does not merely provide a framework that could be utilized for proper or improper purposes.' ***. Rather, Facebook, after requiring users to disclose protected characteristics of age and gender, relied on 'unlawful criteria' and developed an ad

targeting and delivery system ‘directly related to the alleged illegality — a system that makes it more difficult for individuals with certain protected characteristics to find or access insurance ads on Facebook. ***. That third-party advertisers are the content providers does not preclude Facebook ‘from also being an information content provider by helping ‘develop’ at least ‘in part’ the information’ at issue here, contrary to Facebook’s assertions. ***. [footnote and citations omitted].

I/M/O Madison Sq. Garden Entertainment Corp. v. NY State Liq. Auth., 2023 NY Slip Op 06090 (App. Div. 1st Dept. Nov. 28, 2023)

In the hybrid article 78 proceeding, petitioners failed to establish a clear legal right to a writ of prohibition based on the allegation that SLA exceeded its authority by investigating and charging them under the Alcoholic Beverages Control Law and regulations promulgated thereunder ***. We reject petitioners' contention that SLA lacks authority to revoke their special on-premises licenses based on the allegation that, among other things, their venues — Madison Square Garden, the Beacon Theater, and Radio City Music Hall — ‘cease[d] to be operated as a bona fide premises within the contemplation of the license issued for such premises, in the judgment of the Authority,’ on the grounds that a policy excluding certain attorneys bringing actions against any of their affiliates renders the venues no longer open to the general public ***.

Modern Font Applications v. Alaska Airlines, Case No. 2:19-cv-00561-DBB-CMR (D. Utah Feb. 3, 2021), interlocutory appeal dismissed, No. 2021-1838 (Fed. Cir. Dec. 29, 2022)

The district court issued a protective order pursuant to which the defendant designated source code. The plaintiff sought modification to allow its in-house counsel access. The court upheld the designation, finding that the source code contained trade secrets and that inadvertent disclosure would be harmful. The court also denied the plaintiff’s request for modification:

Here, Plaintiff argues that even if its in-house counsel is a competitive decisionmaker, his specialized knowledge, the risk of financial hardship to Plaintiff, and the ability to mitigate the risk of disclosure through an amended protective order establish good cause to allow access ***. Defendant responds that Plaintiff has access to competent outside counsel and has otherwise failed to show good cause to amend the protective order ***. The court acknowledges that Plaintiff's in-house counsel has specialized knowledge as a software engineer and institutional knowledge regarding the Patent-in-Suit. However, the fact that Plaintiff has competent outside counsel and could hire outside experts reduces the risk of

prejudice to Plaintiff. Even if reliance on outside counsel and experts causes some financial hardship, the normal burdens of patent litigation are insufficient to outweigh the significant risk of inadvertent disclosure of confidential information in this case. Further, amending the protective order would be insufficient to mitigate this risk because, as explained above, this heightened risk remains even with the existence of a protective order. ***. The court has carefully balanced the conflicting interests in this case and concludes that the risk of inadvertent disclosure outweighs the risk of prejudice to Plaintiff. The court therefore declines to modify the standard protective order or the confidentiality designations therein. [citations omitted].

***People v. Wakefield*, 175 A.D.3d 158, 107 N.Y.S.3d 487 (3d Dept. 2019), affirmed, No. 2022-02771 (N.Y. Ct. App. Apr. 26, 2022)**

From the Third Department decision:

Defendant was subsequently charged in a multicount indictment in connection with the victim’s death. Law enforcement collected a buccal swab from defendant to compare his DNA to that found at the crime scene. The data was eventually sent to Cybergenetics, a private company that used a software program called TrueAllele Casework System, for further testing. The DNA analysis by TrueAllele revealed, to a high degree of probability, that defendant’s DNA was found on the amplifier cord, on parts of the victim’s T-shirt and on the victim’s forearm. ***. At the *Frye* hearing, Supreme Court heard the testimony of Mark Perlin, the founder, chief scientist and chief executive officer of Cybergenetics, among others. Following the *Frye* hearing, the court rendered a decision concluding that TrueAllele was generally accepted within the relevant scientific community. *** Perlin also testified that TrueAllele is designed to have a certain degree of artificial intelligence to make additional inferences as more information becomes available. Perlin explained that, after objectively generating all genotype possibilities, TrueAllele answers the question of “how much more the suspect matches the evidence [than] a random person would,” and the answer takes the form of a likelihood ratio. ***

Supreme Court found that ‘there [was] a plethora of evidence in favor of [TrueAllele], *and there [was] no significant evidence to the contrary.*’ In view of the evidence adduced at the *Frye* hearing, we find that the court’s ruling was proper.

As described in the affirmance by the Court of Appeals:

He argued that the report generated by TrueAllele was testimonial, Prior to trial, defendant moved for disclosure of the source code in order ‘to meaningfully exercise his that the computer program was the functional equivalent of a laboratory analyst and that the source code was the witness that must be produced to satisfy his right to confrontation. He claimed that Perlin’s ‘surrogate’ trial testimony without disclosure of the source code was inadequate— ‘the TrueAllele Casework System source code itself,

and not Dr. Perlin, is the declarant with whom [defendant] has a right to be confronted.’ The court denied the motion, finding that the source code was not a witness or testimonial in nature, and that defendant would have the opportunity to confront and cross-examine Dr. Perlin-the analyst and the developer of the software.

Defendant again raised his confrontation argument prior to Dr. Perlin’s trial testimony, asserting that the TrueAllele Casework System was the witness and that he needed the source code to effectively cross-examine that witness. When the court questioned how one cross-examines a computer program, defendant represented that, once his experts had the opportunity to review the source code, he would then pose questions to Dr. Perlin based on the experts’ review. The court denied the request, stating that the issue defense counsel raised was a discovery issue and that defendant’s ability to cross-examine Dr. Perlin, the developer of the source code, satisfied his right to confrontation.

We must address whether the trial court abused its discretion in determining that TrueAllele ‘is not novel but instead is ‘generally accepted’ under the Frye standard.’

Here, the evidence presented at the Frye hearing established that the relevant scientific community generally accepted TrueAllele’s DNA interpretation process and that the continuous probabilistic genotyping approach is more efficacious than human review of the same data using the stochastic threshold. It was undisputed that the foundational mathematical principles (MCMC and Bayes’ theorem) are widely accepted in the scientific community. It was also undisputed that the relevant scientific community was fully represented by those persons and agencies who weighed in on the approach. Although the continuous probabilistic approach was not used in the majority of forensic crime laboratories at the time of the hearing, the methodology has been generally accepted in the relevant scientific community based on the empirical evidence of its validity, as demonstrated by multiple validation studies, including collaborative studies, peer-reviewed publications in scientific journals and its use in other jurisdictions. The empirical studies demonstrated TrueAllele’s reliability, by deriving reproducible and accurate results from the interpretation of known DNA samples.

Defendant and the concurrence raise the legitimate concern that the technology at issue is proprietary and the developer of the software is involved in many of the validation studies. This skepticism, however, must be tempered by the import of the empirical evidence of reliability demonstrated here and the acceptance of the methodology by the relevant scientific community. [citations and footnote omitted].

***Rodgers v. Christie*, 795 Fed. Appx. 878 (3d Cir. 2020)**

This was an appeal from the dismissal of a products liability action brought under the New Jersey Products Liability Act (NJPLA) against the entity responsible for the development of the “Public Safety Assessment (PSA), a multifactor risk estimation model that forms part of the state’s pretrial release system.” The plaintiff’s son had been murdered by a man who had been granted pretrial release. The Court of Appeals held that the PSA was not a “product” and affirmed:

The NJPLA imposes strict liability on manufacturers or sellers of certain defective ‘product[s].’ But the Act does not define that term. To fill the gap, the District Court looked to the Third Restatement of Torts, which defines ‘product’ as ‘tangible personal property distributed commercially for use or consumption’ or any ‘[o]ther item[]’ whose ‘context of *** distribution and use is sufficiently analogous to [that] of tangible personal property.’ It had good reason to do so, as New Jersey courts often look to the Third Restatement in deciding issues related to the state’s products liability regime. And on appeal, both parties agree the Third Restatement’s definition is the appropriate one. We therefore assume that to give rise to an NJPLA action, the ‘product’ at issue must fall within section 19 of the Third Restatement.

The PSA does not fit within that definition for two reasons. First, as the District Court concluded, it is not distributed commercially. Rather, it was designed as an objective, standardized, and *** empirical risk assessment instrument’ to be used by pretrial services programs like New Jersey’s. Rodgers makes no effort to challenge this conclusion in her briefing and has thus forfeited the issue. Second, the PSA is neither ‘tangible personal property’ nor remotely ‘analogous to’ it. As Rodgers’ complaint recognizes, it is an ‘algorithm’ or ‘formula’ using various factors to estimate a defendant’s risk of absconding or endangering the community. As the District Court recognized, ‘information, guidance, ideas, and recommendations’ are not ‘product[s]’ under the Third Restatement, both as a definitional matter and because extending strict liability to the distribution of ideas would raise serious First Amendment concerns. Rodgers’s only response is that the PSA’s defects ‘undermine[] New Jersey’s pretrial release system, making it ‘not reasonably fit, suitable or safe’ for its intended use. But the NJPLA applies only to defective *products*, not to anything that causes harm or fails to achieve its purpose. [citations and footnote omitted].

***State v. Ghigliotty*, 463 N.J. Super. 355 (App. Div. 2020)**

At issue in this interlocutory appeal was whether the trial court had erred in directing that a *Frye* hearing be conducted to determine the scientific reliability of

proposed expert testimony on the positive identification of a bullet fragment recovered from a murder victim. The Appellate Division affirmed:

An application of the Frye test at an evidentiary hearing was necessary in this case because BULLETRAX is a new, untested device, operated by Matchpoint, a novel software product. As the trial court found, 'BULLETRAX is a highly automated technology that does not merely photograph the bullet's surface, as suggested by the State, but instead digitally recreates the entire surface area.' The parties did not provide the court with any judicial opinions or authoritative scientific and legal writings demonstrating the reliability of this machine.

In addition, neither Sandford [the State's expert witness] nor Boyle [a salesman with the business that offered the technology] were experts in the science behind the BULLETRAX system and, therefore, were unable to address whether it provided reliable images. In that regard, both witnesses conceded that BULLETRAX created some degree of distortion when it 'stitched together' the images of the bullet fragment and the test bullets that Sandford used to reach his conclusions. The trial court also correctly found that, for many of these same reasons, 'the reliability of Matchpoint' was '[e]qually unproven at this time.'

Under these circumstances, we affirm the trial court's determination that a Frye hearing was necessary to protect defendant's due process rights and ensure that the images produced by BULLETRAX were sufficiently reliable to be admissible under N.J.R.E. 702.

The appellate court also addressed the trial court's order that, among other things, the State provide to defendant algorithms used by the technology in advance of the *Frye* hearing:

The trial court ordered the State to produce the BULLETRAX and Matchpoint algorithms based solely upon defense counsel's request. While it is certainly possible that this information might be needed by defendant's experts to evaluate the reliability of the new technology, the defense did not present a certification from an expert in support of this claim for disclosure. Thus, there is currently nothing concrete in the record to support the court's conclusion that granting defendant 'the opportunity to review the algorithms and elicit testimony concerning' BULLETRAX is necessary 'in order to completely explore and test the integrity of the images it produces.'

Under these circumstances, defendant is required to make a more definitive showing of his need for this material to provide the court with a rational basis to order the State to attempt to produce it. *In that regard, the trial court was aware that the algorithms are proprietary information within UEFT's, rather than the State's, sole possession. While the court was open to issuing a protective order to attempt to overcome UEFT's reluctance to disclose this information to the State, the parties did not submit suggested language to the court to assist it in attempting to craft and issue such an order.*

Therefore, we vacate the court's order directing the turnover of the algorithms, and remand the discovery issues to the court for further consideration. The court must promptly conduct a case management conference with the parties to determine the most efficient way to proceed to identify the types of information that must be shared by them in advance of the Frye hearing. Resolution of discovery issues must be made after a N.J.R.E. 104 hearing to ensure the development of a proper, reviewable record that supports the court's ultimate decision. [emphasis added].

***State v. Loomis*, 371 Wis.2d 235, 881 N.W.2d 749 (2016), cert. denied, 137 S. Ct. 2290 (2017)**

The defendant was convicted of various offenses arising out of a drive-by shooting. His presentence report included an evidence-based risk assessment that indicated a high risk of recidivism. On appeal, the defendant argued that consideration of the risk assessment by the sentencing judge violated his right to due process. The Supreme Court rejected the argument. However, it imposed conditions on the use of risk assessments.

***State v. Morrill*, No. A-1-CA-36490, 2019 WL 3765586 (N.M. App. July 24, 2019)**

Defendant asks this Court to 'find that the attestations made by a computer program constitute 'statements,' whether attributable to an artificial intelligence software or the software developer who implicitly offers the program's conclusions as their own.' (Emphasis omitted.) Based on that contention, Defendant further argues that the automated conclusions from Roundup and Forensic Toolkit constitute inadmissible hearsay statements that are not admissible under the business record exception. In so arguing, Defendant acknowledges that such a holding would diverge from the plain language of our hearsay rule's relevant definitions that reference statements of a 'person.' *** Based on the following, we conclude the district court correctly determined that the computer generated evidence produced by Roundup and Forensic Toolkit was not hearsay. Agent Peña testified that his computer runs Roundup twenty-four hours a day, seven days a week and automatically attempts to make connections with and downloads from IP addresses that are suspected to be sharing child pornography. As it does so, Roundup logs every action it takes. Detective Hartsock testified that Forensic Toolkit organizes information stored on seized electronic devices into various categories including graphics, videos, word documents, and internet history. Because the software programs make the relevant assertions, without any intervention or modification by a person using the software, we conclude that the assertions are not statements by a person governed by our hearsay rules.

***State v. Pickett*, 466 N.J. Super. 270 (App. Div. 2021), motions to expand record, for leave to appeal, and for stay denied, *State v. Pickett*, 246 N.J. 48 (2021)**

In this case of first impression addressing the proliferation of forensic evidentiary technology in criminal prosecutions, we must determine whether defendant is entitled to trade secrets of a private company for the sole purpose of challenging at a Frye hearing the reliability of the science underlying novel DNA analysis software and expert testimony. At the hearing, the State produced an expert who relied on his company's complex probabilistic genotyping software program to testify that defendant's DNA was present, thereby connecting defendant to a murder and other crimes. Before cross-examination of the expert, the judge denied defendant access to the trade secrets, which include the software's source code and related documentation.

This is the first appeal in New Jersey addressing the science underlying the proffered testimony by the State's expert, who designed, utilized, and relied upon TrueAllele, the program at issue. TrueAllele is technology not yet used or tested in New Jersey; it is designed to address intricate interpretational challenges of testing low levels or complex mixtures of DNA. TrueAllele's computer software utilizes and implements an elaborate mathematical model to estimate the statistical probability that a particular individual's DNA is consistent with data from a given sample, as compared with genetic material from another, unrelated individual from the broader relevant population. For this reason, TrueAllele, and other probabilistic genotyping software, marks a profound shift in DNA forensics.

TrueAllele's software integrates multiple scientific disciplines. At issue here—in determining the reliability of TrueAllele—is whether defendant is entitled to the trade secrets to cross-examine the State's expert at the Frye hearing to challenge whether his testimony has gained general acceptance within the computer science community, which is one of the disciplines. The defense expert's access to the proprietary information is directly relevant to that question and would allow that expert to independently test whether the evidentiary software operates as intended. Without that opportunity, defendant is relegated to blindly accepting the company's assertions as to its reliability. And importantly, the judge would be unable to reach an informed reliability determination at the Frye hearing as part of his gatekeeping function.

Hiding the source code is not the answer. The solution is producing it under a protective order. Doing so safeguards the company's intellectual property rights and defendant's constitutional liberty interest alike. Intellectual property law aims to prevent business competitors from stealing confidential commercial information in the marketplace; it was never meant to justify concealing relevant information from parties to a criminal prosecution in the context of a Frye hearing. [footnote omitted].

State v. Saylor, 2019 Ohio 1025 (Ct. App. 2019) (concurring opinion of Froelich, J.)

{¶ 49} Saylor is a 27-year-old heroin addict, who the court commented has ‘no adult record [* * * and] has led a law-abiding life for a significant number of years’; his juvenile record, according to the prosecutor, was ‘virtually nothing.’ The prosecutor requested an aggregate sentence of five to seven years, and defense counsel requested a three-year sentence. The trial court sentenced Saylor to 12 1/2 years in prison. Although it found Saylor to be indigent and did not impose the mandatory fine, the court imposed a \$500 fine and assessed attorney fees and costs; the court also specifically disapproved a Risk Reduction sentence or placement in the Intensive Program Prison (IPP).

{¶ 50} I have previously voiced my concerns about the almost unfettered discretion available to a sentencing court when the current case law apparently does not permit a review for abuse of discretion. *State v. Roberts*, 2d Dist. Clark No. 2017-CA-98, 2018-Ohio-4885, ¶ 42-45, (Froelich, J., dissenting). However, in this case, the trial court considered the statutory factors in R.C. 2929.11 and R.C. 2929.12, the individual sentences were within the statutory ranges, and the court’s consecutive sentencing findings, including the course-of-conduct finding under R.C. 2929.14(C)(4)(b), were supported by the record.

{¶ 51} As for the trial court’s consideration of ORAS, the ‘algorithmization’ of sentencing is perhaps a good-faith attempt to remove unbridled discretion – and its inherent biases – from sentencing. Compare *State v. Lawson*, 2018-Ohio-1532, 111 N.E.3d 98, ¶ 20-21 (2d Dist.) (Froelich, J., concurring). However, ‘recidivism risk modeling still involves human choices about what characteristics and factors should be assessed, what hierarchy governs their application, and what relative weight should be ascribed to each.’ Hillman, *The Use of Artificial Intelligence in Gauging the Risk of Recidivism*, 58 *The Judges Journal* 40 (2019).

{¶ 52} The court’s statement that the ‘moderate’ score was ‘awfully high,’ given the lack of criminal history, could imply that the court believed there must be other factors reflected in the score that increased Saylor’s probable recidivism. There is nothing on this record to refute or confirm the relevance of Saylor’s ORAS score or any ORAS score. Certainly, the law of averages is not the law. The trial court’s comment further suggested that its own assessment of Saylor’s risk of recidivism differed from the ORAS score. The decision of the trial court is not clearly and convincingly unsupported by the record, regardless of any weight potentially given to the ORAS score by the trial court. Therefore, on this record, I find no basis for reversal.

***State v. Stuebe*, No. 249 Ariz. 127, 1 CA-CR 19-0032 (AZ Ct. App. Div. 1. June 30, 2020)**

The defendant was convicted of burglary and possession of burglary tools. On appeal, he challenged the admissibility of an email and attached videos generated by an automated surveillance system. The Arizona Court of Appeals affirmed. First, the court addressed whether the system was a “person” for hearsay purposes:

¶9 In general, hearsay evidence is inadmissible unless an exception applies. Ariz. R. Evid. 801, 802. Hearsay is ‘a statement that: (1) the declarant does not make while testifying at the current trial or hearing; and (2) a party offers in evidence to prove the truth of the matter asserted in the statement.’ Ariz. R. Evid. 801(c). A ‘statement’ is a person’s oral assertion, written assertion, or nonverbal conduct, if the person intended it as an assertion.’ Ariz. R. Evid. 801(a). A ‘declarant’ is ‘the person who made the statement.’ Ariz. R. Evid. 801(b).

¶10 Because the rule against hearsay applies to ‘a person’s statements and ‘the person who made the statement,’ Ariz. R. Evid. 801(a) and (b), we must determine whether a machine that generates information may qualify as a ‘person’ under the Rules. The Rules do not define ‘person.’ See Ariz. R. Evid. 101. Therefore, we may interpret the word according to its common definition. A.R.S. § 1-213 (2002) (‘Words and phrases shall be construed according to the common and approved use of the language.’); *State v. Wise*, 137 Ariz. 468, 470 n.3 (1983) (stating that unless the legislature expressly defines a statutory term, courts give the word its plain and ordinary meaning, which may be taken from the dictionary). ***

¶11 *** Neither statute supports the proposition that a machine can legally be considered a ‘person.’ Additionally, because ‘Arizona’s evidentiary rules were modeled on the federal rules[,]’ we may consider federal precedent to interpret them. *State v. Winegardner*, 243 Ariz. 482, 485, ¶ 8 (2018). The federal circuit courts have repeatedly held that a ‘person’ referenced in the rules of evidence does not include a ‘machine’ or ‘machine-produced’ content. See *United States v. Lizarraga-Tirado*, 789 F.3d 1107, 1110 (9th Cir. 2015) (‘[W]e join other circuits that have held that machine statements aren’t hearsay.’) (collecting federal circuit court cases); *United States v. Washington*, 498 F.3d 225, 231 (4th Cir. 2007) (holding that for hearsay purposes ‘raw data generated by the machines were not the statements of technicians’ who operated the machines); *United States v. Khorozian*, 333 F.3d 498, 506 (3d Cir. 2003) (holding that neither header nor date and time information automatically generated by a facsimile machine was hearsay because they were not statements made by a person).

¶12 Applied to the facts here, the motion-activated security camera automatically recorded the video after a sensor was triggered. The automated security system then produced an email and immediately sent it to the property manager. No ‘person’ was

involved in the creation or dissemination of either. The email only contained the date, time, client ID, serial number, camera location code, and language that read ‘Automated message – please do not reply to this address.’ Because the email and video were ‘machine produced,’ they were not made by a ‘person’ and are not hearsay.

¶13 Machine-produced statements may present other evidentiary concerns. See *Washington*, 498 F.3d at 231 (noting that concerns about machine-generated statements should be ‘addressed through the process of authentication not by hearsay or Confrontation Clause analysis’). At trial, the court denied Stuebe’s authentication objection to the video, see *Ariz. R. Evid.* 901, but Stuebe has not raised this issue on appeal.

The Court of Appeals also rejected the defendant’s argument that admission of the email and video violated the Confrontation Clause:

¶14 The Sixth Amendment’s Confrontation Clause states, ‘[i]n all criminal prosecutions, the accused shall enjoy the right . . . to be confronted with the witnesses against him.’ U.S. Const. amend. VI. In general, testimonial evidence from a declarant who does not appear at trial may be admitted only when the declarant is unavailable and the defendant has had a prior opportunity to cross-examine the declarant. *Crawford v. Washington*, 541 U.S. 36, 68-69 (2004); *State v. Forde*, 233 Ariz. 543, 564, ¶ 80 (2014) (citing *Crawford*, 541 U.S. at 68). ‘[A] statement cannot fall within the Confrontation Clause unless its primary purpose was testimonial.’ *Ohio v. Clark*, 576 U.S. 237, 245 (2015). ‘Testimony’ means ‘[a] solemn declaration or affirmation made for the purpose of establishing or proving some fact.’ *Crawford*, 541 U.S. at 51. Statements are testimonial when the primary purpose is to ‘establish or prove past events potentially relevant to later criminal prosecution.’ *Davis v. Washington*, 547 U.S. 813, 822 (2006); see *Melendez-Diaz v. Massachusetts*, 557 U.S. 305, 310-11 (2009) (holding forensic reports on substances alleged to be drugs, prepared in anticipation of prosecution, are testimonial statements). But statements are not testimonial if made to law enforcement during an ongoing emergency, see *Davis*, 547 U.S. at 827, and are ‘much less likely to be testimonial’ if made to someone other than law enforcement, *Clark*, 576 U.S. at 246.

¶15 Considering all the circumstances we cannot conclude that the ‘primary purpose’ of the email and video was to ‘creat[e] an out-of-court substitute for trial testimony.’ *Id.* at 245 (alteration in original) (quoting *Bryant*, 562 U.S. at 358). And Stuebe does not argue otherwise. The email was sent to the property manager, not law enforcement, and was not made in anticipation of criminal prosecution. Thus, it was not testimonial. See *Davis*, 547 U.S. at 827-28 (finding recording of a 911 call seeking police assistance was not testimonial); *State v. Damper*, 223 Ariz. 572, 575, ¶ 12 (App. 2010) (finding text message from murder victim seeking help not testimonial); *Bohsancurt v. Eisenberg*, 212 Ariz. 182, 191, ¶ 35 (App. 2006) (holding breathalyzer calibration reports not testimonial). The property manager testified and was cross-examined about the email and the video, and the admission of the email and video did not implicate the Confrontation Clause. *State v.*

Fischer, 219 Ariz. 408, 418, ¶ 37 (App. 2008) ('Non-testimonial statements are not subject to a confrontation challenge.');

cf. United States v. Waguespack, 935 F.3d 322, 334 (5th Cir. 2019) (holding that machine-generated images were not 'statements' in the context of the Confrontation Clause).

Defendant's Motion for New Trial, *United States v. Michel*, Case No. 1:19-cr-00148-CKK (D.D.C. Oct. 16, 2023)

The defendant was convicted on campaign finance and foreign influence charges. He moved for a new trial for, among other things, ineffective assistance of counsel. His argument includes the allegation that his attorney "used an experimental AI program to write his closing argument, which made frivolous arguments, conflated the schemes, and failed to highlight key weaknesses in the Government's case."

***United States v. Shipp*, 392 F. Supp. 3d 300 (E.D.N.Y. July 15, 2019)**

The court has serious concerns regarding the breadth of Facebook warrants like the one at issue here. The Second Circuit has observed that '[a] general search of electronic data is an especially potent threat to privacy because hard drives and e-mail accounts may be 'akin to a residence in terms of the scope and quantity of private information [they] may contain.' *Ulbricht*, 858 F.3d at 99 (quoting *Galpin*, 720 F.3d at 445); see also *Galpin*, 720 F.3d at 447 (explaining that '[t]his threat demands a heightened sensitivity to the particularity requirement in the context of digital searches'). This threat is further elevated in a search of Facebook data because, perhaps more than any other location—including a residence, a computer hard drive, or a car—Facebook provides a single window through which almost every detail of a person's life is visible. Indeed, Facebook is designed to replicate, record, and facilitate personal, familial, social, professional, and financial activity and networks. Users not only voluntarily entrust information concerning just about every aspect of their lives to the service, but Facebook also proactively collects and aggregates information about its users and non-users in ways that we are only just beginning to understand. Particularly troubling, information stored in non-Facebook applications may come to constitute part of a user's 'Facebook account'—and thus be subject to broad searches—by virtue of corporate decisions, such as mergers and integrations, without the act or awareness of any particular user.

Compared to other digital searches, therefore, Facebook searches both (1) present a greater 'risk that every warrant for electronic information will become, in effect, a general warrant,' *Ulbricht*, 858 F.3d at 99, and (2) are more easily limited to avoid such constitutional concerns. In light of these considerations, courts can and should take

particular care to ensure that the scope of searches involving Facebook are ‘defined by the object of the search and the places in which there is probable cause to believe that it may be found.’ [citations omitted in part].

In re: Vital Pharmaceutical, Case No. 22-17842 (Bankr. S.D. Fla. June 16, 2023).
The Bankruptcy Court addressed the question of how to determine ownership rights to a social media account. In doing so the court prompted ChatGPT for an answer:

Nor has Congress or the states regulated the use of artificial intelligence, another area where the evolution of technology has outpaced the law, and regulation is needed to mitigate its risks. Matt O'Brien, *ChatGPT Chief Says Artificial Intelligence Should be Regulated by a US or Global Agency*, Associated Press, May 16, 2023, <https://apnews.com/article/chatgpt-openai-ceo-sam-altman-congress-73ff96c6571f38ad5fd68b3072722790> (‘The head of the artificial intelligence company that makes ChatGPT told Congress . . . that government intervention will be critical to mitigating the risks of increasingly powerful AI systems.’). In preparing the introduction for this Memorandum Opinion, the Court prompted ChatGPT to prepare an essay about the evolution of social media and its impact on creating personas and marketing products. Along with the essay it prepared, ChatGPT included the following disclosure: ‘As an AI language model, I do not have access to the sources used for this essay as it was generated based on the knowledge stored in my database.’ It went on to say, however, that it ‘could provide some general sources related to the topic of social media and its impact on creating personas and marketing products.’ It listed five sources in all. As it turns out, none of the five seem to exist. For some of the sources, the author is a real person; for other sources, the journal is real. But all five of the citations seem made up, which the Court would not have known without having conducted its own research. The Court discarded the information entirely and did its own research the old-fashioned way. Well, not quite old fashioned; it's not like the Court used actual books or anything. But this is an important cautionary tale. Reliance on AI in its present development is fraught with ethical dangers.

Wi-LAN Inc. v. Sharp Electronics Corp., 992 F.3d 1366 (Fed. Cir. 2021)

This was an appeal from an award of summary judgment of noninfringement. The district court held that the plaintiff lacked sufficient admissible evidence to prove direct infringement after it found a printout of source code inadmissible. The plaintiff sought to admit the source code to establish that systems used by the defendants “actually practiced” a methodology patented by the plaintiff. The Federal Circuit affirmed.

The plaintiff argued on appeal, among other things, that the source code printout was a business record that was admissible under the business records exception to the hearsay rule:

To establish that the source code printout was an admissible business record under Rule 803(6), Wi-LAN was required to establish by testimony from a ‘custodian or other another qualified witness’ that the documents satisfied the requirements of the Rule. Wi-LAN argues that it properly authenticated the source code printout through the declarations of the chip manufacturers’ employees. We agree with the district court that the declarations could not be used to authenticate the source code printout on the theory that the declarations were a proxy for trial testimony or themselves admissible as business records.

As Wi-LAN notes, declarations are typically used at summary judgment as a proxy for trial testimony. But declarations cannot be used for this purpose unless the witness will be available to testify at trial. Under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 56(c)(2), Wi-LAN was required to ‘explain the admissible form that is anticipated.’ Fed. R. Civ. P. 56(c)(2) advisory committee’s notes on 2010 amendments. Wi-LAN argued that it met this burden by explaining that the declarants were available to testify at trial. The district court, however, found the opposite. Indeed, when asked by the court at the summary judgment hearing whether the declarants would appear at trial, Wi-LAN’s counsel responded that Wi-LAN did not ‘think that [it would be] able to force them to come to trial.’

Wi-LAN thus did not establish that the declarants would be available to testify at trial and, as a result, the declarations could not be used as a substitute for trial testimony. *E.g., Fraternal Order of Police, Lodge 1 v. City of Camden*, 842 F.3d 231, 238 (3d Cir. 2016) (testimony admissible if declarants were available to testify at trial); *J.F. Feeser, Inc. v. Serv-A-Portion, Inc.*, 909 F.2d 1524, 1542 (3d Cir. 1990) (‘[H]earsay evidence produced in an affidavit opposing summary judgment may be considered if the out-of-court declarant could later present the evidence through direct testimony, i.e., in a form that ‘would be admissible at trial.’ (quoting *Williams v. Borough of West Chester*, 891 F.2d 458, 465 n.12 (3d Cir. 1989)).

Wi-LAN also seems to argue that it properly authenticated the source code printout because the declarations were custodial declarations that were themselves admissible as business records under Rule 803(6). Wi-LAN, however, admits that it obtained the source code printout and declarations by filing lawsuits against the manufacturers and then dismissing the lawsuits without prejudice after the manufacturers provided Wi-LAN with the source code printout and declarations it sought. Wi-LAN even explains that ‘[t]he lawsuits were necessary to secure production of the source code and declarations because [the system-on-chip manufacturers] had refused to cooperate in discovery.’ *The declarations thus do not constitute a ‘record [that] was kept in the course of a regularly conducted activity of a business.’* Fed. R. Evid. 803(6)(B). *Instead, the declarations were created and prepared for the purposes of litigation, placing them outside the scope of the*

exception. As a result, the declarations were not admissible as business records for use to authenticate the source code printout. [emphasis added].

The Federal Circuit also rejected the plaintiff's reliance on Rule 901(b)(4):

Wi-LAN also appears to argue that the district court should have found the source code printout admissible under Federal Rule of Evidence 901(b)(4). Rule 901(b)(4) permits a record to be admitted into evidence if '[t]he appearance, contents, substance, internal patterns, or other distinctive characteristics of the item, taken together with all the circumstances' 'support a finding that the item is what the proponent claims it is.' Fed. R. Evid. 901(a), (b)(4).

In support of its Rule 901(b)(4) argument, Wi-LAN states only that 'there was no legitimate reason to question the trustworthiness of the source code.' The district court concluded that the source code printout's 'appearance, contents, substance, internal patterns, [and] other distinctive characteristics,' Fed. R. Evid. 901(b)(4), did not satisfy Rule 901(b)(4)'s strictures 'given the highly dubious circumstances surrounding the production and the lack of indicia of trustworthiness in the source code,' as described in the previous Section. On this record, the district court did not abuse its discretion in refusing to treat the source code printout as evidence under Rule 901(b)(4).

Moreover, the Federal Circuit rejected the plaintiff's reliance on Rule 703:

Wi-LAN alternatively argues that the source code printout should have been admitted into evidence under Federal Rule of Evidence 703. Wi-LAN's expert submitted a report stating that Sharp's and Vizio's television sets infringe the claimed methods of the '654 patent by the use of the source code. Wi-LAN's expert did not attempt to authenticate the source code printout. But Wi-LAN argues that its expert should be able to opine on the meaning of the inadmissible source code printout and to provide the inadmissible source code printout to the jury despite Wi-LAN's failure to authenticate the source code printout.

Wi-LAN's argument presents two separate and distinct questions: (1) whether the source code printout was admissible because it was relied on by the expert and (2) whether the expert's testimony relying on the source code was admissible to establish infringement. The answer to the first question is 'no' because expert reliance does not translate to admissibility. The answer to the second question is also 'no' because Wi-LAN did not establish that experts in the field 'reasonably rely on' unauthenticated source code.

Concluding its discussion of admissibility, the Federal Circuit rejected the plaintiff's argument that the court below should have extended discovery:

In light of these admissibility issues, Wi-LAN's fallback position is that the district court should have granted it additional time to obtain an admissible version of the source code. We disagree. Wi-LAN had ample time to obtain the source code and to find custodial

witnesses to authenticate the source code over the course of discovery but failed to do so.

Wi-LAN had been on notice since early 2016 that it was going to need the system-on-chip source code from third parties to prove its direct infringement case. Throughout the litigation, Wi-LAN repeatedly requested extensions of time to obtain the source code from the third-party manufacturers. Ultimately, however, Wi-LAN only procured a single printout version of the source code with declarations after suing the third-party manufacturers.

Wi-LAN, as the district court found, 'had ample time and opportunities over years of litigation to obtain evidence of infringement from the [system-on-chip] manufacturers' but failed to do so. Given this record, the district court did not abuse its discretion in denying Wi-LAN an additional opportunity to obtain an admissible form of the source code. [citations omitted in part].

AI IN LITIGATION ARTICLES

The Federal Judicial Center, the education arm of the Federal Judiciary, has published J.E. Baker, *et al.*, *An Introduction to Artificial Intelligence for Federal Judges*, in February of 2023. It is available at

[https://www.fjc.gov/sites/default/files/materials/47/An Introduction to Artificial Intelligence for Federal Judges.pdf?utm_source=thebrainyacts.beehiiv.com&utm_medium=newsletter&utm_campaign=122-so-damn-convincing](https://www.fjc.gov/sites/default/files/materials/47/An%20Introduction%20to%20Artificial%20Intelligence%20for%20Federal%20Judges.pdf?utm_source=thebrainyacts.beehiiv.com&utm_medium=newsletter&utm_campaign=122-so-damn-convincing)

And see “Artificial Intelligence and the Courts: Materials for Judges,” a project of the American Association for the Advancement of Science. These materials are “primarily individual papers, prepared by experts in the relevant field, and finalized through a process that ensures both the technical accuracy of the content and its utility for judges,” and are available at

<https://www.aaas.org/ai2/projects/law/judicialpapers>

J. Bambauer, “Negligent AI Speech: Some Thoughts About Duty,” 3 *J. of Free Speech Law* 343 (2023), <https://www.journaloffreespeechlaw.org/bambauer2.pdf>

C. Cwik, P. Grimm, M. Grossman and T. Walsh, “Artificial Intelligence, Trustworthiness, and Litigation.” *Artificial Intelligence and the Courts: Materials for Judges* (AAAS 2022), [https://www.aaas.org/sites/default/files/2022-09/Paper%20AI%20and%20Trustworthiness NIST FINAL.pdf](https://www.aaas.org/sites/default/files/2022-09/Paper%20AI%20and%20Trustworthiness%20NIST%20FINAL.pdf)

C. Gismondi, *et al.*, “Have Algorithms Opened Up Your Software to Product Liability?” (ABA Litigation Section: July 24, 2023), <https://www.americanbar.org/groups/litigation/resources/newsletters/mass-torts/have-algorithms-opened-your-software-product-liability/>

P.W. Grimm, “New Evidence Rules and Artificial Intelligence,” 45 *Litigation* 6 (2018),

https://www.courts.state.co.us/userfiles/file/Court_Probation/Supreme_Court/Committees/Rules_of_Evidence/Grimm.pdf

P.W. Grimm, M.R. Grossman & G.V. Cormack, “Artificial Intelligence as Evidence,” 19 *Nw. J. Tech. & Intell. Prop.* 9 (2021), <https://scholarlycommons.law.northwestern.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1349&context=njtip>

M.R. Grossman, “Is Disclosure and Certification of the Use of Generative AI Really Necessary?” *Judicature*, Vol. 107, No. 2, October 2023 (Forthcoming), https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=4537496#:~:text=Concerns%20about%20the%20misuse%20of,in%20connection%20with%20legal%20filings.

R. Hedges, G. Gottehrer & J.C. Francis IV, “Artificial Intelligence and Legal Issues,” *Litigation* (ABA: Fall 2020), [Artificial Intelligence and Legal Issues \(americanbar.org\)](https://www.americanbar.org/publications/litigation/volume_47_number_4_fall_2020/artificial_intelligence_and_legal_issues/)

“How to Determine the Admissibility of AI-Generated Evidence in Courts?” *UNESCO News* (updated July 21, 2023), <https://www.unesco.org/en/articles/how-determine-admissibility-ai-generated-evidence-courts>

NIST PUBLICATIONS, INCLUDING THE “FRAMEWORK”

P. Phillips, *et al.*, “Four Principles of Explainable Artificial Intelligence” (NIST: Sept. 2021), <https://nvlpubs.nist.gov/nistpubs/ir/2021/NIST.IR.8312.pdf>

We introduce four principles for explainable artificial intelligence (AI) that comprise fundamental properties for explainable AI systems. We propose that explainable AI systems deliver accompanying evidence or reasons for outcomes and processes; provide explanations that are understandable to individual users; provide explanations that correctly reflect the system’s process for generating the output; and that a system only operates under conditions for which it was designed and when it reaches sufficient confidence in its output. We have termed these four principles as explanation, meaningful, explanation accuracy, and knowledge limits, respectively. Through significant stakeholder engagement, these four principles were developed to encompass the multidisciplinary nature of explainable AI, including the fields of computer science, engineering, and psychology. Because one-size fits-all explanations do not exist, different users will require different types of explanations. We present five categories of explanation and summarize theories of explainable AI. We give an overview of the algorithms in the field that cover the major classes of explainable algorithms. As a baseline comparison, we assess how well explanations provided by people follow our four principles. This assessment provides insights to the challenges of designing explainable AI systems.

R. Schwartz, *et al.*, “Toward a Standard for Identifying and Managing Bias in Artificial Intelligence,” NIST Special Pub. 1270 (Mar. 2022), <https://nvlpubs.nist.gov/nistpubs/SpecialPublications/NIST.SP.1270.pdf>

On January 26, 2023, the National Institute of Standards and Technology (“NIST”) released the Artificial Intelligence Risk Management Framework, together with related materials. The Framework is described as follows:

In collaboration with the private and public sectors, NIST has developed a framework to better manage risks to individuals, organizations, and society associated with artificial intelligence (AI). The NIST AI Risk Management Framework (AI RMF) is intended for voluntary use and to improve the ability to incorporate trustworthiness considerations into the design, development, use, and evaluation of AI products, services, and systems.

The Framework and related materials can be found at <https://www.nist.gov/itl/ai-risk-management-framework>

On August 24, 2023, NIST announced that it would begin the process of standardizing algorithms intended to resist attacks by quantum computers. See “NIST to Standardize Encryption Algorithms That Can Resist Attack by Quantum

Computers,” (Aug. 24, 2023), <https://www.nist.gov/news-events/news/2023/08/nist-standardize-encryption-algorithms-can-resist-attack-quantum-computers#:~:text=NIST's%20effort%20to%20develop%20quantum,by%20the%20November%202017%20deadline.>

“What’s Wrong with This Picture? NIST Face Analysis Program Helps to Find Answers,” *News* (NIST: Sept. 20, 2023), <https://www.nist.gov/news-events/news/2023/09/whats-wrong-picture-nist-face-analysis-program-helps-find-answers>

E. Tabassi, “Minimizing Harms and Maximizing the Potential of Generative AI,” *Taking Measure* (NIST: Nov. 20, 2023), <https://www.nist.gov/blogs/taking-measure/minimizing-harms-and-maximizing-potential-generative-ai>

“NIST Calls for Information to Support Safe, Secure and Trustworthy Development and Use of Artificial Intelligence” (NIST: Dec. 19, 2023), <https://www.nist.gov/news-events/news/2023/12/nist-calls-information-support-safe-secure-and-trustworthy-development-and#:~:text=NIST%20seeks%20information%20to%20support,2%2C%202024.>

“NIST Offers Draft Guidance on Evaluating a Privacy Protection Technique for the AI Era,” *News* (NIST: Dec. 11, 2023), <https://www.nist.gov/news-events/news/2023/12/nist-offers-draft-guidance-evaluating-privacy-protection-technique-ai-era>

On December 19, 2023, NIST issued a “Request for Information: NIST’s Assignments under Executive Order 14110 on Safe, Secure, and Trustworthy Development and Use of AI,” <https://www.nist.gov/news-events/news/2023/12/nist-calls-information-support-safe-secure-and-trustworthy-development-and>. For “NIST’s Responsibilities Under the October 30, 2023 Executive Order,” see <https://www.nist.gov/artificial-intelligence/executive-order-safe-secure-and-trustworthy-artificial-intelligence>

J. Daniels & A. Chipperson, “NIST Framework Can Nudge Companies Toward Trustworthy AI Use,” *Bloomberg Law* (Aug. 30, 2023), <https://news.bloomberglaw.com/ip-law/nist-framework-can-nudge-companies-toward-trustworthy-ai-use>

W.J. Denvil, *et al.*, “NIST Publishes Artificial Intelligence Risk Management Framework and Resources,” *Engage* (Hogan Lovells: Jan. 31, 2023), <https://www.engage.hoganlovells.com/knowledgeservices/news/nist-publishes-artificial-intelligence-risk-management-framework-and-resources/>

J. Johnson, *et al.*, “NIST Releases New Artificial Intelligence Risk Management Framework” *Inside Privacy* (Covington: Feb. 1, 2023), <https://www.insideprivacy.com/artificial-intelligence/nist-releases-new-artificial-intelligence-risk-management-framework/>

C.F. Kerry, “NIST’s AI Risk Management Framework Plants a Flag in the AI Debate,” *Brookings TechTank* (Feb. 15, 2023), https://www.brookings.edu/blog/techtank/2023/02/15/nists-ai-risk-management-framework-plants-a-flag-in-the-ai-debate/?utm_campaign=Center%20for%20Technology%20Innovation&utm_medium=email&utm_content=247081757&utm_source=hs_email

J. Near, *et al.*, “The UK-US Blog Series on Privacy: Preserving Federated Learning: Introduction,” *Cybersecurity Insights* (NIST: Dec. 7, 2023), <https://www.nist.gov/blogs/cybersecurity-insights/uk-us-blog-series-privacy-preserving-federated-learning-introduction>

D. Pozza, “Federal Guidance Offers Framework to Minimize Risks in AI Use,” *Bloomberg Law* (Feb. 9, 2023), <https://news.bloomberglaw.com/us-law-week/federal-guidance-offers-framework-to-minimize-risks-in-ai-use>

S. Witley, "AI Risks Guide Sets Starting Point for Compliance, Regulation," *Bloomberg Law* (Feb. 1, 2023), <https://news.bloomberglaw.com/privacy-and-data-security/ai-risks-guide-sets-starting-point-for-compliance-regulation>

FEDERAL, STATE, AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT “RESPONSES” TO AI

INTRODUCTION

AI is being used by business entities to, among other things, sift through job candidates. This use has led to concerns about, among other things, lack of transparency and possible bias in the selection process. Expect statutory and regulatory responses. Here are some.

For an introduction of sorts—and a suggested regulatory framework, see A. Engler, “A Comprehensive and Distributed Approach to AI Regulation,” *Brookings* (Aug. 30, 2023), <https://www.brookings.edu/articles/a-comprehensive-and-distributed-approach-to-ai-regulation/>

And for another introduction to what is being done on the federal level by Congress, federal agencies, and the White House, see S.M. Anstey, “Artificial Intelligence – Congress, Federal Agencies, and the White House Solicit Information and Take Action,” *JDSUPRA* (Sept. 27, 2023), <https://www.jdsupra.com/legalnews/artificial-intelligence-congress-8504605/>

FEDERAL-WHITE HOUSE

“Statement of Interest of the United States” submitted in *Louis v. Saferent Solutions, LLC*, Case No. 22cv10800-AK (D. Mass. Jan. 9, 2023), <https://www.justice.gov/d9/2023-01/u.s.statement.of.interest.-louis.et.al.v.saferent.et.al.pdf>

The United States respectfully submits this Statement of Interest under 28 U.S.C. § 5171 to assist the Court in evaluating the application of the Fair Housing Act (FHA), 42 U.S.C. § 3601 et seq., in challenges to an algorithm-based tenant screening system. The United States has a strong interest in ensuring the correct interpretation and application of the FHA’s pleading

standard for disparate impact claims, including where the use of algorithms may perpetuate housing discrimination.

Various federal agencies have weighed in on AI in employment decision-making. See “Joint Statement on Enforcement Efforts Against Discrimination and Bias in Automated Systems” (undated), https://www.ftc.gov/system/files/ftc_gov/pdf/EEOC-CRT-FTC-CFPB-AI-Joint-Statement%28final%29.pdf

“Blueprint for an AI Bill of Rights: Making Automated Systems Work for the American People” (White House Office of Science and Technology: Oct. 2022), <https://www.whitehouse.gov/wp-content/uploads/2022/10/Blueprint-for-an-AI-Bill-of-Rights.pdf>.

Summary of the Blueprint at <https://www.whitehouse.gov/ostp/ai-bill-of-rights/>

“Executive Order on Further Advancing Racial Equity and Support for Underserved Communities Through the Federal Government,” (Feb. 16, 2023), <https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/presidential-actions/2021/01/20/executive-order-advancing-racial-equity-and-support-for-underserved-communities-through-the-federal-government/>

“FACT SHEET: Biden-Harris Admin. Secures Voluntary Commitments from Leading Artificial Intelligence Companies to Manage the Risks Posed by AI,” *White House* (July 21, 2023), <https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/statements-releases/2023/07/21/fact-sheet-biden-harris-administration-secures-voluntary-commitments-from-leading-artificial-intelligence-companies-to-manage-the-risks-posed-by-ai/>

Executive Order 14110, “Safe, Secure, and Trustworthy Development and Use of Artificial Intelligence” (The White House: Oct. 30, 2023), <https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/presidential->

[actions/2023/10/30/executive-order-on-the-safe-secure-and-trustworthy-development-and-use-of-artificial-intelligence/](#)

S. Friedler, *et al.*, “How the AI Executive Order and OMB Memo Introduce Accountability for Artificial Intelligence,” *Brookings* (Nov. 16, 2023), [https://www.brookings.edu/articles/how-the-ai-executive-order-and-omb-memo-introduce-accountability-for-artificial-intelligence/](#)

J. Gatto, “Equity and Civil Rights Issues in the White House Executive Order on AI,” *AI Law and Policy Blog* (Sheppard Mullin: Nov. 9, 2023), [https://www.jdsupra.com/legalnews/equity-and-civil-rights-issues-in-the-4760997/](#)

L.A. Harris & C. Jaikaran, “Highlights of the 2023 Executive Order on Artificial Intelligence for Congress,” *Cong. Research Service R47843* (Nov. 17, 2023), [https://crsreports.congress.gov/product/pdf/R/R47843](#)

T.J. Schwartz, *et al.*, “AI Executive Order – Patent Issues,” *MoFo Tech* (Morrison & Foerster: Nov. 8, 2023), [https://mofotech.mofo.com/topics/ai-executive-order-patent-issues](#)

P. Stockburger, “AI Technical Standards Need a Bigger Push than Executive Order,” *Bloomberg Law* (Nov. 6, 2023), [https://news.bloomberglaw.com/environment-and-energy/ai-technical-standards-need-a-bigger-push-than-executive-order](#)

J. Villasenor, “How the White House’s AI Executive Order Could Increase U.S. Cyber Vulnerabilities,” *Brookings* (Nov. 22, 2023), [https://www.brookings.edu/articles/how-the-white-houses-ai-executive-order-could-increase-u-s-cyber-](#)

[vulnerabilities/#:~:text=But%20two%20short%20portions%20of,protect%E2%80%9D%20model%20weights%20associated%20with](#)

FEDERAL-CONGRESS

Algorithmic Accountability Act of 2022, introduced Feb. 3, 2022, see <https://www.wyden.senate.gov/news/press-releases/wyden-booker-and-clarke-introduce-algorithmic-accountability-act-of-2022-to-require-new-transparency-and-accountability-for-automated-decision-systems?peek=BH793HGzEX7gimi20t7HiHEg8n9b3vET476N7MsTy%2BcOuyHe>

Algorithmic Accountability Act of 2023, introduced September 21, 2023, see <https://www.wyden.senate.gov/news/press-releases/wyden-booker-and-clarke-introduce-bill-to-regulate-use-of-artificial-intelligence-to-make-critical-decisions-like-housing-employment-and-education>

N. Krishan, “Sen. Schumer introducing AI Policy Framework, Calls for ‘Comprehensive Legislation,’” *Fedscoop* (June 21, 2013), <https://fedscoop.com/sen-schumer-introduces-ai-policy-framework-calls-for-comprehensive-legislation/>

Senate Comm. on Health, Education, Labor & Pensions, “Exploring Congress’ Framework for the Future of AI: The Oversight and Legislative Role of Congress in the Integration of Artificial Intelligence in Health, Education, and Labor” (Sept. 6, 2023), https://www.help.senate.gov/imo/media/doc/help_committee_gop_final_ai_white_paper1.pdf

N.T. Lee, “Making AI More Explainable to Protect the Public from Individual and Community Harms: Written Statement to the U.S. Senate AI Insight Forum on Transparency, Explainability, Intellectual Property, & Copyright,” *Brookings*

Testimony (Nov. 29, 2023), <https://www.brookings.edu/articles/making-ai-more-explainable-to-protect-the-public-from-individual-and-community-harms/>

FEDERAL-CISA

“2023-2024 CISA Roadmap for Artificial Intelligence” (CISA: Nov. 9, 2023), <https://www.cisa.gov/resources-tools/resources/roadmap-ai>

Press Release, “CISA and UK NCSC Unveil Joint Guidelines for Secure AI System Development” (CISA: Nov. 26, 2023), <https://www.cisa.gov/news-events/alerts/2023/11/26/cisa-and-uk-ncsc-unveil-joint-guidelines-secure-ai-system-development#:~:text=CISA%20and%20UK%20NCSC%20Unveil%20Joint%20Guidelines%20for%20Secure%20AI%20System%20Development,-Release%20Date&text=Today%2C%20in%20a%20landmark%20collaboration,for%20Secure%20AI%20System%20Development%20.>

Today, in a landmark collaboration, the U.S. Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency (CISA) and the UK National Cyber Security Centre (NCSC) are proud to announce the release of the [Guidelines for Secure AI System Development](#). Co-sealed by 23 domestic and international cybersecurity organizations, this publication marks a significant step in addressing the intersection of artificial intelligence (AI), cybersecurity, and critical infrastructure.

The Guidelines, complementing the [U.S. Voluntary Commitments on Ensuring Safe, Secure, and Trustworthy AI](#), provide essential recommendations for AI system development and emphasize the importance of adhering to [Secure by Design](#) principles. The approach prioritizes ownership of security outcomes for customers, embraces radical transparency and accountability, and establishes organizational structures where secure design is a top priority.

The Guidelines apply to all types of AI systems, not just frontier models. We provide suggestions and mitigations that will help data scientists, developers, managers, decision-makers, and risk owners make informed decisions about the secure design, model development, system development, deployment, and operation of their machine learning AI systems.

This document is aimed primarily at providers of AI systems, whether based on models hosted by an organization or making use of external application programming interfaces. However, we urge all stakeholders—including data scientists, developers, managers, decision-makers, and risk owners make—to read this guidance to help them make informed decisions about the design, deployment, and operation of their machine learning AI systems.

CISA invites stakeholders, partners, and the public to explore the [Guidelines for Secure AI System Development](#) as well as our recently published [Roadmap for AI](#) to learn more about our strategic vision for AI technology and cybersecurity. To access learn more, visit [CISA.gov/AI](#).

FEDERAL-EEOC

EEOC Strategic Enforcement Plan Fiscal Years 2024-2028, <https://www.eeoc.gov/strategic-enforcement-plan-fiscal-years-2024-2028#:~:text=The%20final%20FY2024%2D2028%20SEP,making%20that%20vision%20a%20reality>. Among other things, the plan, “[r]ecognizes employers’ increasing use of technology including artificial intelligence or machine learning, to target job advertisements, recruit applicants, and make or assist in hiring and other employment decisions, practices, or policies ***.” [emphasis deleted].

EEOC Artificial Intelligence and Algorithmic Fairness Initiative, <https://www.eeoc.gov/ai#:~:text=As%20part%20of%20the%20initiative,and%20their%20employment%20ramifications%3B%20and>

As part of the initiative, the EEOC will:

- Issue technical assistance to provide guidance on algorithmic fairness and the use of AI in employment decisions;
- Identify promising practices;
- Hold listening sessions with key stakeholders about algorithmic tools and their employment ramifications; and
- Gather information about the adoption, design, and impact of hiring and other employment-related technologies.

EEOC, “The Americans with Disabilities Act and the Use of Software, Algorithms, and Artificial Intelligence to Assess Job Applicants and Employees” (May 12, 2022), <https://www.eeoc.gov/laws/guidance/americans-disabilities-act-and-use-software-algorithms-and-artificial-intelligence>

A Gilbert, “EEOC Settles First-of-Its-Kind AI Bias in Hiring Lawsuit,” *Bloomberg Law* (Aug. 10, 2023), <https://news.bloomberglaw.com/daily-labor-report/eeoc-settles-first-of-its-kind-ai-bias-lawsuit-for-365-000> (Settlement papers available through this link)

R. Setty, “New EEOC Strategic Playbook Sharpens Focus on Systemic Bias (1),” *Bloomberg Law* (Aug. 22, 2023), <https://news.bloomberglaw.com/daily-labor-report/new-eeoc-strategic-plan-doubles-down-on-fighting-systemic-bias>

R. Setty, “New EEOC Enforcement Playbook Features AI Hiring Bias Focus (2),” *Bloomberg Law* (Sept. 21, 2023), <https://news.bloomberglaw.com/daily-labor-report/new-eeoc-enforcement-playbook-features-focus-on-ai-hiring-bias>

N. Ray, *et al.*, “Littler AI in the Workplace Survey Report 2023” (Sept. 25, 2023), <https://www.littler.com/publication-press/publication/littler-ai-employer-survey-report-2023#:~:text=With%20workplace%20AI%20use%20on,strong%20guidelines%20will%20eventually%20emerge.>

Federal-FTC

E. Jillson, “Aiming for Truth, Fairness, and Equity in Your Company’s Use of AI” (FTC: Apr. 21, 2021), <https://www.ftc.gov/business-guidance/blog/2021/04/aiming-truth-fairness-equity-your-companys-use-ai>

FTC, “Policy Statement of the Federal Trade Commission on Biometric Information and Section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act,” see <https://www.ftc.gov/news-events/news/press-releases/2023/05/ftc-warns-about-misuses-biometric-information-harm-consumers>

“FTC Launches New Office of Technology to Bolster Agency’s Work,” (Feb. 17, 2023), https://www.ftc.gov/news-events/news/press-releases/2023/02/ftc-launches-new-office-technology-bolster-agencys-work?utm_source=govdelivery

FTC, “Generative AI Raises Competition Concerns,” *Tech. Blog* (June 29, 2023), <https://www.ftc.gov/policy/advocacy-research/tech-at-ftc/2023/06/generative-ai-raises-competition-concerns>

M. Atleson, “Can’t Lose What You Never Had: Claims About Digital Ownership and Creation in the Age of Generative AI,” *FTC Business Blog* (Aug. 16, 2023), <https://www.ftc.gov/business-guidance/blog/2023/08/cant-lose-what-you-never-had-claims-about-digital-ownership-creation-age-generative-ai>

L. Fair, “For Business Opportunity Sellers, FTC Says “AI” Stands for “Allegedly Inaccurate,” *FTC Business Blog* (Aug. 22, 2023), <https://www.ftc.gov/business-guidance/blog/2023/08/business-opportunity-sellers-ftc-says-ai-stands-allegedly-inaccurate>

“FTC Action Stops Business Opportunity Scheme That Promised Its AI-Boosted Tools Would Power High Earnings Through Online Stores” (Aug. 22, 2023), <https://www.ftc.gov/news-events/news/press-releases/2023/08/ftc-action-stops-business-opportunity-scheme-promised-its-ai-boosted-tools-would-power-high-earnings>

R.G. Kidwell, *et al.*, “FTC Files Complaint on AI-Related Misleading Claims – AI: The Washington Report,” *Mintz* (Sept. 1, 2023), <https://www.mintz.com/mintz/pdf?id=89321>

Office of the Director, Bureau of Consumer Protection, “A Progress Report on Key Priorities, and a Warning on AI Self-Regulation” (FTC: Sept. 19, 2023), https://www.ftc.gov/system/files/ftc_gov/pdf/remarks-of-samuel-levine-at-nad-2023.pdf

N. Goldberg & M.M. Ovanesian, “FTC Continues to Stake Out Role as Key AI Regulator,” *Minding Your Business* (Proskauer: Sept. 26, 2023), <https://www.mindingyourbusinesslitigation.com/2023/09/ftc-continues-to-stake-out-role-as-key-ai-regulator/>

S. Fondrie-Teitler and A. Jayanti, “Consumers Are Voicing Concerns About AI” (Oct. 3, 2023), <https://www.ftc.gov/policy/advocacy-research/tech-at-ftc/2023/10/consumers-are-voicing-concerns-about-ai>

For Release, “FTC Authorizes Compulsory Process for AI-related Products and Services” (Nov. 21, 2023), <https://www.ftc.gov/news-events/news/press-releases/2023/11/ftc-authorizes-compulsory-process-ai-related-products-services>

“FTC Staff Report details Key Takeaways from AI and Creative Fields Panel (FTC: Dec. 18, 2023), <https://www.ftc.gov/news-events/news/press-releases/2023/12/ftc-staff-report-details-key-takeaways-ai-creative-fields-panel-discussion>

“Generative Artificial Intelligence and the Creative Economy Staff Report: Perspectives and Takeaways” (FTC: Dec. 2023), <https://www.ftc.gov/reports/generative-artificial-intelligence-creative-economy-staff-report-perspectives-takeaways>

T. Riley, “FTC’s Rite Aid Action Puts AI Facial Recognition Users on Notice,” *Bloomberg Law* (Dec. 21, 2023), <https://news.bloomberglaw.com/privacy-and-data-security/ftcs-rite-aid-action-puts-ai-facial-recognition-users-on-notice> [NOTE: “Proposed Stipulated Order for Permanent Injunction and Other Relief” linked in article and filed in *FTC v. Rite Aid Corp.*, Case No. 2:23-cv-05023 (E.D. Pa. Dec. 19, 2023)].

FEDERAL-NLRB

NLRB Office of the General Counsel, “Electronic Monitoring and Algorithmic Management of Employees Interfering with the Exercise of Section 7 Rights,” Memorandum GC 23-02 (Oct. 31, 2022), <https://www.nlr.gov/guidance/memos-research/general-counsel-memos>

Recent technological advances have dramatically expanded employers’ ability to monitor and manage employees within the workplace and beyond. As more and more employers take advantage of those new capabilities, their practices raise a number of issues under the Act. An issue of particular concern to me is the potential for omnipresent surveillance and other algorithmic-management tools to interfere with the exercise of Section 7 rights by significantly impairing or negating employees’ ability to engage in protected activity and keep that activity confidential from their employer, if they so choose. Thus, I plan to urge the Board to apply the Act to protect employees, to the greatest extent possible, from intrusive or abusive electronic monitoring and automated management practices that would have a tendency to interfere with

Section 7 rights. I will do so both by vigorously enforcing extant law and by urging the Board to apply settled labor-law principles in new ways, as described below. [footnote omitted].

FEDERAL-SEC

P.J. Himmelfarb & J. Rong, “SEC Disclosures of Artificial Intelligence Technologies,” *Governance & Securities Alert* (Weil: Nov. 27, 2023), <https://www.weil.com/-/media/mailings/2023/q4/sec-disclosures-of-artificial-intelligence-technologies-112723.pdf>

FEDERAL-USPTO

USPTO, “Supplemental Guidance for Examination of Design Patent Applications Related to Computer-Generated Electronic Images, Including Computer-Generated Icons and Graphical User Interfaces,” 88 FR 80277 (Nov. 17, 2023), <https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2023/11/17/2023-25473/supplemental-guidance-for-examination-of-design-patent-applications-related-to-computer-generated>

T. Copeland & A. Barnard, “USPTO Design Claim Guidance Clarifies Digital Image Patentability,” *Bloomberg Law* (Nov. 24, 2023), <https://news.bloomberglaw.com/us-law-week/uspto-design-claim-guidance-clarifies-digital-image-patentability>

Federal-USDOJ

USDOJ Press Release (Jan. 9, 2023): Settlement Agreement & Final Judgment, *United States v. Meta Platforms, Inc. f/k/a Facebook, Inc.*, 22 Civ. 5187-JGK (S.D.N.Y.), <https://www.justice.gov/crt/case/united-states-v-meta-platforms-inc-fka-facebook-inc-sdny>:

On June 27, 2022, the court approved the parties’ [settlement agreement and entered a final judgment](#) in *United States v. Meta Platforms, Inc., f/k/a Facebook, Inc.* (S.D.N.Y.). The [complaint](#), which was filed on June 21, 2022, alleged that Meta’s housing advertising system discriminated against Facebook users based on their race, color, religion, sex, disability, familial status, and national origin, in violation of the Fair Housing Act (FHA). Specifically, the complaint alleged, among other things, that Meta uses algorithms in determining which Facebook users receive housing ads and that those algorithms rely, in part, on characteristics protected under the FHA. Under the settlement, Meta stopped using an

advertising tool (known as the ‘Special Ad Audience’ tool) for housing ads and developed a new system to address racial and other disparities caused by its use of personalization algorithms in its ad delivery system for housing ads. On January 9, 2023, the Justice Department announced that it reached agreement with Meta, as required by the settlement, on compliance targets for that new system. Under the terms of the June 2022 settlement, Meta also will not provide any ad targeting options for housing advertisers that directly describe or relate to FHA-protected characteristics. The settlement also requires Meta to pay a civil penalty of \$115,054, the maximum penalty available under the FHA. The case involves a Secretary-initiated HUD complaint and was referred to the Justice Department after the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) conducted an investigation and issued a charge of discrimination. [hyperlinks in original].

USDOJ, “Algorithms, Artificial Intelligence, and Disability Discrimination in Hiring” (May 12, 2022), <https://www.ada.gov/resources/ai-guidance/>

“Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General Dona Mekki of the Antitrust Division Delivers Remarks at GCR Live: Law Leaders Global 2023,” *USDOJ News* (Feb. 2, 2023), <https://www.justice.gov/opa/speech/principal-deputy-assistant-attorney-general-doha-mekki-antitrust-division-delivers-0>USDOL, Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs, Federal Contract Compliance Manual, Figure F-3: Combined Scheduling Letter and Itemized Listing, https://www.dol.gov/agencies/ofccp/manual/fccm/figures-1-6/figure-f-3-combined-scheduling-letter-and-itemized-listing?utm_medium=email&utm_source=govdelivery

FEDERAL-USDOL

USDOL, Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs, Federal Contract Compliance Manual, Figure F-3: Combined Scheduling Letter and Itemized Listing, https://www.dol.gov/agencies/ofccp/manual/fccm/figures-1-6/figure-f-3-combined-scheduling-letter-and-itemized-listing?utm_medium=email&utm_source=govdelivery

FEDERAL-OTHER

M. Bisanz & T.K. Shinohara, “Supervisory Expectations for Artificial Intelligence Outlined by US OCC” (Mayer Brown: May 20, 2022), <https://www.mayerbrown.com/en/perspectives-events/publications/2022/05/supervisory-expectations-for-artificial-intelligence-outlined-by-us-occ>

F. Boustany & B. Roddy, “First AI Bias Settlement with EEOC Spotlights Pitfalls,” *Bloomberg Law* (Aug. 24, 2023), <https://news.bloomberglaw.com/bloomberglaw-analysis/analysis-first-ai-bias-settlement-with-eeoc-spotlights-pitfalls>

A. Burt & E. Runde, “Anti-Discrimination Laws are Faltering in the Face of Artificial Intelligence; Here’s What to Do About It,” *ABA J.* (Jan. 24, 2023), <https://www.abajournal.com/columns/article/antidiscrimination-laws-are-faltering-in-the-face-of-artificial-intelligence-heres-what-to-do-about-it>

Y. Dori, *et al.*, “FTC Publishes Blog Post Summarizing Consumer Concerns with AI Systems,” *Inside Global Tech* (Covington: Oct. 9, 2023), <https://www.insideprivacy.com/artificial-intelligence/ftc-publishes-blog-post-summarizing-consumer-concerns-with-ai-systems/>

C.J. Edgar, “AI in Healthcare: What You Need to Know About the FDA’s Regulatory Role,” *Filewrapper* (McKee Voorhees & Sease: Jan. 4, 2023),

<https://www.filewrapper.com/ai-in-healthcare-what-you-need-to-know-about-the-fdas-regulatory-role/>

A Engler, “The AI Regulatory Toolbox: How Governments Can Discover Algorithmic Harms,” *Tech Tank* (Brookings: Oct. 9, 2023), <https://www.brookings.edu/articles/the-ai-regulatory-toolbox-how-governments-can-discover-algorithmic-harms/>

A Engler & S. Brown, “Governing the Ascendancy of Automated Valuation Models – Regulating AI in Residential Property Valuation,” *Research* (Brookings: Oct. 12, 2023), <https://www.brookings.edu/articles/governing-the-ascendancy-of-automated-valuation-models/>

D.F. Engstrom, *et al.*, “Government by Algorithm: Artificial Intelligence in Federal Administrative Agencies” (Report submitted to the Admin. Conf. of the United States: Jan. 2020), <https://www-cdn.law.stanford.edu/wp-content/uploads/2020/02/ACUS-AI-Report.pdf>

FDA News Release, “FDA Establishes New Advisory Committee on Digital Health Technologies” (Oct. 11, 2023), <https://www.fda.gov/news-events/press-announcements/fda-establishes-new-advisory-committee-digital-health-technologies>

D.R. Freeman, “Leaked FTC Civil Investigate Demand to OpenAI Provides a Rare Preliminary View of the Future of AI Enforcement,” (Arent Fox Schiff LLP: Aug. 2, 2023), <https://www.afslaw.com/perspectives/privacy-counsel/leaked-ftc-civil-investigative-demand-openai-provides-rare-preliminary> (Demand attached)

R. Gihleb, *et al.*, “Keeping Workers Safe in the Automation Revolution,” *Brookings* (Sept. 12, 2023), <https://www.brookings.edu/articles/keeping-workers-safe-in-the-automation-revolution/>

K.C. Halm, *et al.*, “FTC Proposed ‘Commercial Surveillance and Data Security’ Rulemaking Raises Significant Questions About Risks Arising from AI/Machine

Learning,” *Artificial Intelligence Law Advisor* (Davis Wright Tremaine: Aug. 18, 2022), <https://www.dwt.com/blogs/artificial-intelligence-law-advisor/2022/08/ai-machine-learning-ftc-regulation-anpr>

K.C. Halm, *et al.*, “NIST Releases Two Guidance Documents for Developing Trustworthy AI,” *Artificial Intelligence Law Advisor* (Davis Wright Tremaine: Mar. 24, 2022), [https://www.dwt.com/blogs/artificial-intelligence-law-advisor/2022/03/nist-trustworthy-ai-guidance#:~:text=NIST%20Releases%20Two%20Guidance%20Docun%20for%20Developing%20Trustworthy%20AI&text=On%20March%2016%20and%2017,intelligence%20\(%22AI%22\)](https://www.dwt.com/blogs/artificial-intelligence-law-advisor/2022/03/nist-trustworthy-ai-guidance#:~:text=NIST%20Releases%20Two%20Guidance%20Docun%20for%20Developing%20Trustworthy%20AI&text=On%20March%2016%20and%2017,intelligence%20(%22AI%22))

L. Ispahani, “To Regulate AI, Start with Data Privacy,” *The Hill* (Aug. 15, 2023), <https://thehill.com/opinion/congress-blog/4154163-to-regulate-ai-start-with-data-privacy/#:~:text=Instead%20of%20focusing%20our%20efforts,a%20comprehensive%20data%20protection%20law>.

E.G. Lander, *et al.*, “EEOC Releases New AI Guidance for Employers” (Akin Gump: July 5, 2023), <https://www.akingump.com/en/insights/blogs/ag-data-dive/new-ai-guidance-for-employers-issued>

J.J. Lazzarotti & K.C. Weber, “EEOC, DOJ Release Expectations on Employers’ Use of Technology, AI for Employment Decisions” (Jackson Lewis: May 19, 2022),

<https://www.jacksonlewis.com/publication/eec-doj-release-expectations-employers-use-technology-ai-employment-decisions>

J. Lucas & E. Collier, “Confront AI Threats with More Consistent Federal Legislation,” *Bloomberg Law* (Oct. 19, 2023), <https://news.bloomberglaw.com/us-law-week/confront-ai-threats-with-more-consistent-federal-legislation>

J.E. Moreno, “Employers Seek Clarity on AI Bias Ahead of EEOC Enforcement Push,” *Bloomberg Law* (Feb. 13, 2023), <https://news.bloomberglaw.com/daily-labor-report/employers-seek-clarity-on-ai-bias-ahead-of-eec-enforcement-push>

D. Pasternak, “Impressing a Robot: EEOC Takes a Byte Out of AI Based Hiring” (Squire Patton Boggs: Feb. 6, 2023), <https://www.employmentlawworldview.com/impressing-a-robot-eec-takes-a-byte-out-of-ai-based-hiring-us/>

T. Samp & D. Tobey, “White House AI Bill of Rights May Prompt Agency Rulemaking and Legislation,” *DLA Piper* (Nov. 29, 2022), <https://www.dlapiper.com/en-us/insights/publications/2022/11/white-house-ai-bill-of-rights-may-prompt-agency-rulemaking-and-legislation>

T. Samp, *et al.*, “Momentum Builds for Comprehensive Bipartisan Legislation on Artificial Intelligence,” *DLA Piper* (June 22, 2023), <https://www.dlapiper.com/en-HK/insights/publications/ai-outlook/2023/momentum-builds-for-comprehensive-bipartisan-legislation-on-ai>

P. Samuelson, “Generative AI Meets Copyright,” *Science* (July 13, 2023), <https://www.science.org/doi/10.1126/science.adi0656>

R. Setty, “Labor Agency’s AI Hiring Disclosure Requests Vex Contractors,” *Bloomberg Law* (Sept. 1, 2023), <https://news.bloomberglaw.com/daily-labor->

[report/labor-agencys-ai-hiring-disclosure-requests-vex-contractors?source=newsletter&item=read-text®ion=digest](#)

N. Shaheen, *et al.*, “The Future is Here: Judiciary Committee’s Oversight of AI and Principles for Regulation,” *Data Law Insights* (Crowell: Aug. 4, 2023), [https://www.crowell.com/en/insights/client-alerts/the-future-is-here-senate-judiciary-committees-oversight-of-ai-and-principles-for-regulation](#)

K. Shaw & C. Lentz, “FDA Is Embracing AI for Its Own Purposes. Are You Keeping Pace,” *DLA Piper* (Sept. 5, 2023), [https://www.dlapiper.com/en/insights/publications/ai-outlook/2023/fda-is-embracing-ai-for-its-own-purposes-are-you-keeping-pace](#)

A Thierer & N. Chilson, “Overregulating AI Will Disrupt Markets and Discourage Competition,” *Bloomberg Law* (Nov. 17, 2023), [https://news.bloomberglaw.com/us-law-week/overregulating-ai-will-disrupt-markets-and-discourage-competition](#)

D. Tucker, *et al.*, “Generating Scrutiny: FTC Outlines Competition Concerns in Generative AI,” *Vinson & Elkins LLP Insight* (July 17, 2023), [https://www.velaw.com/insights/generating-scrutiny-ftc-outlines-competition-concerns-in-generative-ai/](#)

A Vassilev, “Powerful AI is Already Here: To Use It Responsibly, We Need to Mitigate Bias,” *Taking Measure* (NIST Blog: Feb. 15, 2023),

<https://www.nist.gov/blogs/taking-measure/powerful-ai-already-here-use-it-responsibly-we-need-mitigate-bias>

E. Weinberger, “Banks’ Reliance on Automated Compliance Systems Draws CFPB’s Eyes,” *Bloomberg Law* (Jan. 20, 2023), <https://news.bloomberglaw.com/banking-law/banks-reliance-on-automated-compliance-systems-draws-cfpbs-eyes>

D.K. Yatter & H. Xie, “A Singular(ity) Challenge: Compliance and Enforcement in Financial Markets in the Age of Artificial Intelligence,” *PCCE* (New York U. School of Law: July 7, 2023), https://wp.nyu.edu/compliance_enforcement/2023/07/07/a-singularity-challenge-compliance-and-enforcement-in-financial-markets-in-the-age-of-artificial-intelligence/

STATE

BSA, “2023 State AI Legislation Summary [As of Sept. 21, 2023],” <https://www.bsa.org/files/policy-filings/09222023statelegai.pdf>

T.M. Jackson & R. Abernathy, “Attorneys General Consider Consumer Protection Issues Related to Artificial Intelligence in Consumer-Facing Healthcare Technology,” *Crowell Retail & Consumer Prod. Law Observer* (July 6, 2023), <https://www.crowell.com/en/insights/client-alerts/Attorneys-General-Consider-Consumer-Protection-Issues-Related-to-Artificial-Intelligence-in-Consumer-Facing-Healthcare-Technology>

Z. Williams, “US States Target AI with a Medley of Regulatory Measures,” *Bloomberg Law* (Aug. 2, 2023), <https://news.bloomberglaw.com/artificial-intelligence/us-states-target-ai-with-a-medley-of-regulatory-measures>

Executive Order N-12-23, Executive Dept., State of California (Sept. 6, 2023), <https://www.gov.ca.gov/wp-content/uploads/2023/09/AI-EO-No.12--GGN-Signed.pdf>

D.M. West, “California Charts the Future of AI,” *Commentary* (Brookings: Sept. 12, 2023), <https://www.brookings.edu/articles/california-charts-the-future-of-ai/>

A.J. Farquhar & Z. W. Shine, “Governor Newsom Issues Executive Order on Use, Procurement, and Development of Generative AI,” *Lawflash* (Morgan Lewis: Sept. 13, 2023), <https://www.morganlewis.com/pubs/2023/09/governor-newsom-issues-executive-order-on-use-procurement-and-development-of-generative->

[ai#:~:text=KEY%20TAKEAWAYS&text=General%20guidelines%20for%20public%20sector,be%20released%20by%20January%202024.](#)

California Govt. Operations Agency, “Benefits and Risks of Generative Artificial Intelligence Report” (Nov. 2023), https://www.govops.ca.gov/wp-content/uploads/sites/11/2023/11/GenAI-EO-1-Report_FINAL.pdf

California SB-313 to create an Office of Artificial Intelligence, introduced Feb. 6, 2023,

[https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billTextClient.xhtml?bill_id=202320240SB313:](https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billTextClient.xhtml?bill_id=202320240SB313)

This bill would establish, within the Department of Technology, the Office of Artificial Intelligence, and would grant the office the powers and authorities necessary to guide the design, use, and deployment of automated systems by a state agency to ensure that all AI systems are designed and deployed in a manner that is consistent with state and federal laws and regulations regarding privacy and civil liberties and that minimizes bias and promotes equitable outcomes for all Californians. ***.

California Privacy Rights Act (“CPRA”), Cal. Civ. Code Sec. 1798.185 (a)(16)

Directs regulations be adopted “governing access and opt-out rights with respect to businesses’ use of automated decision-making technology, including profiling and requiring businesses’ response to access requests to include meaningful information about the logic involved ... [and] a description of the likely outcome of the process with respect to the consumer.” See

<https://cpa.gtlaw.com/regulations-2/>

California Civil Rights Council, “Proposed Modifications to Employment Regulations Regarding Automated-Decision Systems” (Version: Feb. 10, 2023), <https://calcivilrights.ca.gov/wp-content/uploads/sites/32/2023/02/Attachment-C-Proposed-Modifications-to-Employment-Regulations-Regarding-Automated-Decision-Systems.pdf>

California Privacy Protection Agency, Draft “Sample Questions for Preliminary Rulemaking” (New Rules Subcommittee: undated), https://cppa.ca.gov/meetings/materials/20221216_item8.pdf

California Privacy Protection Agency, “Draft Automated Decisionmaking Technology Regulations December 2023), https://cppa.ca.gov/meetings/materials/20231208_item2_draft.pdf

S.J. McMenemy, *et al.*, “California Privacy Protection Agency Releases First Draft Regulation of AI and Other Automated Decision Technology,” *Ogletree Deakins* (Nov. 29, 2023), [https://ogletree.com/insights-resources/blog-posts/california-privacy-protection-agency-releases-first-draft-regulations-of-ai-and-other-automated-decision-technology/#:~:text=On%20November%2027%2C%202023%2C%20the,incluing%20artificial%20intelligence%20\(AI\).](https://ogletree.com/insights-resources/blog-posts/california-privacy-protection-agency-releases-first-draft-regulations-of-ai-and-other-automated-decision-technology/#:~:text=On%20November%2027%2C%202023%2C%20the,incluing%20artificial%20intelligence%20(AI).)

California Privacy Protection Agency, “Proposed Rulemaking Draft: Cybersecurity Audit Regulations December 2023), https://cppa.ca.gov/meetings/materials/20231208_agenda_item2a_cybersecurity_audit_regulations_redline.pdf

C.J. Buontempo, “Updates to CCPA Proposed Regulations: Cybersecurity Audits,” *Mintz* (Dec. 14, 2023), <https://www.mintz.com/mintz/pdf?id=91561>

California Privacy Protection Agency, “Revised Draft Risk Assessment Regulations December 2023),” https://cppa.ca.gov/meetings/materials/20231208_item2_draft_clean.pdf

L. Tonsager, *et al.*, “CPPA Releases Draft Risk Assessment Regulations,” *Inside Privacy* (Covington: Dec. 7, 2023), <https://www.insideprivacy.com/artificial-intelligence/cppa-releases-draft-risk-assessment-regulations/#>

T. Wu, “As Attention on AI Increases, California Ramps Up Oversight,” *Bloomberg Law* (Feb. 23, 2023), <https://news.bloomberglaw.com/tech-and-telecom-law/as-attention-on-ai-increases-california-ramps-up-oversight?usertype=External&bwid=00000186-5670-d06a-a5df-f7f692330001&qid=7425217&cti=COR&uc=47893&et=NEWSLETTER&emc=blnw>

[nl%3A2&source=newsletter&item=body-link®ion=text-section&access-ticket=eyJjdHh0ljojVEVOVyIsImkljoiMDAwMDAxODYtNTY3MC1kMDZlLWE1ZGYtZjdmNjkyMzMwMDAxliwic2lnljojVIJ0S0kzanVDVWQ4aGdZNnE4NXZEWwZyTzY0PSlSnRpbWUiOiIxNjc3MTc5MjQzliwidXVpZCI6ImZrdXJhbXZNOVpuTUUpZR2xzVStBTIE9PTBQbFlIc09tS25JdFhPcHNIVzNucFE9PSIsInYiOiIxIn0%3D](https://www.debevoise.com/insights/publications/2023/10/the-final-colorado-ai-insurance-regulations-whats)

Colorado S.B. 169, “Restrict Insurers’ Use of External Consumer Data:” The act prohibits an insurer from *** using any external consumer data and information source, algorithm, or predictive model (external data source) with regard to any insurance practice that unfairly discriminates against an individual based on an individual's race, color, national or ethnic origin, religion, sex, sexual orientation, disability, gender identity, or gender expression.

A Gesser, *et al.*, “The Final Colorado AI Insurance Regulations: What’s New and How to Prepare,” *Debevoise in Depth* (Debevoise & Plimpton: Oct. 3, 2023), <https://www.debevoise.com/insights/publications/2023/10/the-final-colorado-ai-insurance-regulations-whats>

Eversheds Sutherland, “Colorado Division of Insurance’s First Installment of Regulations Prohibiting the Use of External Consumer Data and Algorithms and What’s to Come” (Feb. 10, 2023), <https://www.jdsupra.com/legalnews/colorado-division-of-insurance-s-first-3226747/#:~:text=On%20February%201%2C%202023%2C%20the,discriminate%20against%20specified%20protected%20classes.>

Illinois Artificial Intelligence Video Interview Act, 820 ICLS 42/
Regulates video recording of job interviews and use of AI to analyze the videos, requires notice and consent, limits sharing of video, requires report on demographic data and provides for destruction of videos. See <https://www.ilga.gov/legislation/ilcs/ilcs3.asp?ActID=4015&ChapterID=68>

[Maryland] House Bill 1202, “Labor and Employment – Use of Facial Recognition Services – Prohibition,

https://mgaleg.maryland.gov/2020RS/Chapters_noln/CH_446_hb1202t.pdf:

FOR the purpose of prohibiting an employer from using certain facial recognition services during an applicant’s interview for employment unless the applicant consents under a certain provision of this Act; authorizing an applicant to consent to the use of certain facial recognition service technologies during an interview by signing a waiver; providing for the contents of a certain waiver; defining certain terms; and generally relating to employer use of facial recognition service technologies during job interviews.

New York State Education Dept., “**Order Bans the Use of Facial Recognition Technology in Schools**” (Sept., 27, 2023),

<https://www.nysed.gov/news/2023/state-education-department-issues-determination-biometric-identifying-technology-schools>

New York State Education Department Commissioner Betty A. Rosa today issued a determination on the use of biometric identifying technology in schools, as required by [State Technology Law](#) Section 106-b. The order prohibits schools in New York State from purchasing or utilizing facial recognition technology. Schools can decide whether to use biometric identifying technology other than facial recognition technology at the local level so long as they consider the technology’s privacy implications, impact on civil rights, effectiveness, and parental input.

In reaching this decision, Commissioner Rosa considered the recommendations of the [biometrics report](#) conducted by the Office of Information Technology Services, which was released on August 7, 2023. She concluded that serious concerns surrounding the use of facial recognition technology do not outweigh its claimed benefits.

2023 ND H 1361 (Enacted Apr. 11, 2023)

SECTION 1. AMENDMENT. Subsection 8 of section 1-01-49 of the North Dakota Century Code is amended and reenacted as follows:

8. 'Person' means an individual, organization, government, political subdivision, or government agency or instrumentality. The term does not include environmental elements, artificial intelligence, an animal, or an inanimate object.

SECTION 2. EMERGENCY. This Act is declared to be an emergency measure.

Z. Williams, "AI Impact Measurements Gain Favor in States to Combat Abuse," *Bloomberg Law* (Nov. 8, 2023), <https://news.bloomberglaw.com/artificial-intelligence/ai-impact-measurements-gain-favor-in-states-to-combat-abuse>

LOCAL

New York City Local Law No. 1894-A

Effective April 15, 2023, regulates use of “automated employment decision tools” in hiring and promotion, requires notice prior to being subject to a tool, allows opting-out and another process, and requires annual, independent “bias audit.” See [Legislation Text - Int 1894-2020 \(srz.com\)](#).

M. Capezza, *et al.*, “Deploying a Holistic Approach to Automated Employment Decision-Making in Light of NYC’s AEDT Law” (Mintz: Feb. 3, 2023),

<https://www.mintz.com/insights-center/viewpoints/2226/2023-02-03-deploying-holistic-approach-automated-employment>

Press Release, “Mayor Adams Releases First-of-Its-Kind Plan for Responsible Artificial Intelligence Use in NYC Government,” (Office of the Mayor: Oct. 16, 2023), <https://www.nyc.gov/office-of-the-mayor/news/777-23/mayor-adams-releases-first-of-its-kind-plan-responsible-artificial-intelligence-use-nyc#/0>.

The plan outlines 37 key actions — 29 of which are set to be started or completed within the next year. Under this plan, the city will, among other things:

- Establish a framework for AI governance that acknowledges the risks of AI, including bias and disparate impact;
- Create an external advisory network to consult with stakeholders across sectors around the opportunities and challenges posed by AI;
- Build AI knowledge and skills in city government to prepare city employees to effectively and responsibly work with and on AI;
- Enable responsible AI acquisition with AI-specific procurement standards or guidance to support agency-level contracting; and
- Publish an annual AI progress report to communicate about the city’s progress and implementation.

OTHER AI ARTICLES

As noted above, documents related to AI appear daily. Here is a sampling:

S. Anderson, “The Alt-Right Manipulated My Comic. Then A.I. Claimed It.” *N.Y. Times* (Dec. 31, 2022), <https://www.nytimes.com/2022/12/31/opinion/sarah-andersen-how-algorithm-took-my-work.html>

L.F. Barrett, “Darwin Was Wrong: Your Facial Expressions Do Not Reveal Your Emotions,” *Scientific American* (Apr. 27, 2022), <https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/darwin-was-wrong-your-facial-expressions-do-not-reveal-your-emotions/>

E.M. Bosman & M. Robinson, “AI Trends for 2023 – Budgeting for the Future of AI,” *MoFo Tech* (Dec. 29, 2022), <https://www.mofo.com/resources/insights/221229-ai-trends-for-2023-budgeting>

D. Brin, “Give Every AI a Soul – or Else,” *Wired* (July 6, 2023), <https://www.wired.com/story/give-every-ai-a-soul-or-else/> **PS HE IS A GREAT WRITER OF SCIENCE FICTION!**

S. Bushwick, “10 Ways AI was Used for Good This Year,” *Scientific American* (Dec. 15, 2022), <https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/10-ways-ai-was-used-for-good-this-year/>

B. Chakravorti & The Conversation, “How Will AI Change Work? A Look Back at the ‘Productivity Paradox’ of the Computer Age Shows It’s Won’t Be So Simple,”

Fortune (June 25, 2023), <https://fortune.com/2023/06/25/ai-effect-jobs-remote-work-productivity-paradox-computers-iphone-chatgpt/>

P. Coffee, “An Anticipated Wave of AI Specialist Jobs Has Yet to Arrive,” *Wall St. J.* (Dec. 20, 2023), <https://www.wsj.com/articles/an-anticipated-wave-of-ai-specialist-jobs-has-yet-to-arrive-01a8169c>

L. Donahue, “A Primer on Using Artificial Intelligence in the Legal Profession,” *JOLT Digest* (Jan. 3, 2018), <http://jolt.law.harvard.edu/digest/a-primer-on-using-artificial-intelligence-in-the-legal-profession>

K.D. Finley, “How to Be ‘Smart’ About Using Artificial Intelligence in the Workplace,” (JDSUPRA: Jan. 31, 2023), <https://www.jdsupra.com/legalnews/how-to-be-smart-about-using-artificial-3826623/>

D. Frost & H. Nolan, “The Potential and Peril in AI in the Newsroom,” *The Media Today* (Columbia Journalism Rev.: Oct. 25, 2023), https://www.cjr.org/the_media_today/the-potential-and-peril-of-ai-in-the-newsroom.php#:~:text=As%20Hamilton%20Nolan%20puts%20it,needs%20to%20be%20carefully%20negotiated

C.T. Gazeley, “Autonomous Merchant Ships are Coming. Are We Ready?” *U.S. Naval Inst. Proceedings* 43 (Jan. 2023), <https://www.usni.org/magazines/proceedings/2023/january/autonomous-merchant-ships-are-coming-are-we-ready>

R. Giarda & C. Ambrosini, “Artificial Intelligence in the Administration of Justice,” *Global Litig. News* (Baker McKenzie: Feb. 15, 2022), <https://globallitigationnews.bakermckenzie.com/2022/02/15/artificial-intelligence-in-the-administration-of-justice/#page=1>

M. Ingram, “Researchers Under Attack, as Platforms Cut Back and AI-Powered Disinfo Grows,” *The Media Today* (Columbia Journalism Review: Sept. 28, 2023), https://www.cjr.org/the_media_today/researchers_under_attack_disinformation.php

Misinformation and disinformation have arguably never been as prominent or widely distributed as they are now, thanks to smartphones, the social Web, and apps such as Facebook, X (formerly Twitter), TikTok, and YouTube. Unfortunately, as the US draws closer to a pivotal election in which trustworthy information is likely to be more important than ever, various researchers and academic institutions are scaling back or even canceling their misinformation programs, due to legal threats and government pressure. At the same time, a number of large digital platforms have laid off hundreds or even thousands of the employees who specialized in finding and removing hoaxes and fakes, in some cases leaving only a skeleton staff to handle the problem. And all of this is happening as the quantity of fakes and conspiracy theories is expanding rapidly, thanks to cheap tools powered by artificial intelligence that can generate misinformation at the click of a button. In other words, a perfect storm could be brewing.

Technical Advisory Comm. Report, *EEO and DEI&A Considerations in the Use of Artificial Intelligence in Employment Decision Making* (Institute for Workplace Equality: Dec. 2022), <https://www.theinstitute4workplaceequality.org/ai-tac-report-release>

Privacy and AI Governance Report, *IAPP Resource Center* (Jan. 2023), <https://iapp.org/resources/article/ai-governance-report-summary/>

W. Knight, “Sloppy Use of Machine Learning is Causing a ‘Reproducibility Crisis’ in Science,” *Wired* (Aug. 18, 2022), <https://www.wired.com/story/machine-learning-reproducibility-crisis/>

L. Laffer, “How Search Engines Boost Misinformation,” *Scientific American* (Dec. 20, 2023), <https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/how-search-engines-boost-misinformation/#:~:text=Encouraging%20Internet%20users%20to%20rely,study%20published%20today%20in%20Nature.>

B. Macon-Cooney, “AI is Now Essential National Infrastructure,” *WIRED* (Dec. 26, 2022), <https://www.wired.com/story/digital-infrastructure-artificial-intelligence/>

G. Maliha, *et al.*, “Who is Liable When AI Kills?” *Scientific American* (Feb. 14, 2023), <https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/who-is-liable-when-ai-kills/#:~:text=Liability%20inquiries%20often%20start%E2%80%94and,or%20she%20should%20be%20liable.>

J.M. McNichols, “How Do You Cross-Examine Siri If You Think She’s Lying?” *Litigation News* (ABA: May 24, 2022), <https://www.wc.com/portalresource/lookup/poid/Z1tOI9NPluKPtDNIqLMRVPMQilSw4pDt0ZC/document.name=/How%20Do%20You%20CrossExamine%20Siri%20If%20You%20Think%20She%E2%80%99s%20Lying.pdf>

E. Morozov, “The True Threat of Artificial Intelligence,” *N.Y. Times* (June 30, 2023), <https://www.nytimes.com/2023/06/30/opinion/artificial-intelligence-danger.html>

S. Morrow, “Machine Learning to Fully Automate Insulin Delivery System,” *Illinois Tech* (Dec. 7, 2022), <https://www.iit.edu/news/machine-learning-fully-automate-insulin-delivery-system>

H. Nolan, “Writing the AI Rulebook: The Pursuit of Collective Commitment, with Journalism’s Future at Stake,” *Columbia Journalism Review* (Oct. 16, 2023), https://www.cjr.org/business_of_news/writing-ai-rulebook-artificial-intelligence-journalism.php

D.J. Pryzbylski, “Do Smartwatches, GPS Devices, and Other Employee Tracking Technologies Violate Labor Law?” (Barnes & Thornburg: Nov. 1, 2022),

<https://btlaw.com/insights/blogs/labor-relations/2022/do-smartwatches-gps-devices-and-other-employee-tracking-technologies-violate-labor-law>

L. Redins, “Journalists Uses AI Voice to Break Into Own Bank Account,” *BioMetric Update.Com* (Feb. 24, 2023),
<https://www.biometricupdate.com/202302/journalist-uses-ai-voice-to-break-into-own-bank-account>

H. Rollins, “Secretary Jobs in the Age of AI,” *Noahpinion* (Jan. 17, 2023),
<https://noahpinion.substack.com/p/secretary-jobs-in-the-age-of-ai>

S. Rose, “Five Ways AI Might Destroy the World: ‘Everyone’ on Earth Could Fall Over Dead in the Same Second,” *Guardian* (July 7, 2023),
<https://www.theguardian.com/technology/2023/jul/07/five-ways-ai-might-destroy-the-world-everyone-on-earth-could-fall-over-dead-in-the-same-second>

“Neurotechnology, Law and the Legal Profession,” (Horizon Report for the Law Society: Aug. 2022), <https://www.scottishlegal.com/uploads/Neurotechnology-law-and-the-legal-profession-full-report-Aug-2022.pdf>

I.A. Sandoval & S. V. Riddell, “How AI is Advancing the Securities and Commodities Industry,” *Insight* (Morgan Lewis: Jan. 19, 2023),
<https://www.morganlewis.com/pubs/2023/01/how-ai-is-advancing-the-securities-and-commodities-industry#:~:text=Within%20the%20securities%20and%20commodities,%2C%20algorithms%2C%20and%20human%20interaction.>

T.S. Schwartz & H.M. Whitney, “AI Trends for 2023 – Public Attention to AI Will Continue to Rise,” *MOFO Tech* (Morrison Foerster: Dec. 23, 2022), <https://www.mofo.com/resources/insights/221223-public-attention-ai-rise>

C.B. Shaffer, “‘Defensible’ by What Standard?” 13 *Sedona Conf. J.* 217 (2012), <https://thesedonaconference.org/sites/default/files/publications/217-234%20Shaffer.pdf>

H. Shevlin, “The Artist is Dead, AI Killed Them,” *iai News* (Oct. 21, 2022), <https://iai.tv/articles/the-artist-is-dead-ai-killed-them-aid-2275>

T. Simonite, “The WIRED Guide to Artificial Intelligence,” *WIRED* (Feb. 9, 2023), <https://www.wired.com/story/guide-artificial-intelligence/>

J. Sink & A. Edgerton, “Amazon, Meta, Others to Unveil AI Safeguards Amid Biden Push,” *Bloomberg Law* (July 21, 2023), <https://news.bloomberglaw.com/artificial-intelligence/amazon-meta-among-firms-to-unveil-ai-safeguards-amid-biden-push>

C. Sperry, “Artificial Intelligence (AI) Takes a Role in USPTO Patent Searches” (Mintz: Nov. 8, 2022), [https://www.mintz.com/insights-center/viewpoints/2231/2022-11-08-artificial-intelligence-ai-takes-role-uspto-patent#:~:text=Artificial%20Intelligence%20\(AI\)%20Takes%20a%20Role%20in%20USPTO%20Patent%20Searches,-By%20Christina%20Sperry&text=In%202021%20the%20U.S.%20Patent,during%20examination%20of%20patent%20applications](https://www.mintz.com/insights-center/viewpoints/2231/2022-11-08-artificial-intelligence-ai-takes-role-uspto-patent#:~:text=Artificial%20Intelligence%20(AI)%20Takes%20a%20Role%20in%20USPTO%20Patent%20Searches,-By%20Christina%20Sperry&text=In%202021%20the%20U.S.%20Patent,during%20examination%20of%20patent%20applications)

D. Suskind, “The AI Nanny in Your Baby’s Future,” *Wall St. J.* (Aug. 11, 2023), <https://www.wsj.com/articles/the-ai-nanny-in-your-babys-future-999d0e50>

E. Trickey, “In South Korea, Robots Are on the Job, So How is the Service?” *Experience* (Oct. 12, 2022), <https://expmag.com/2022/10/in-south-korea-robots-are-on-the-job-so-how-is-the-service/>

A. Tyson & E. Kikuchi, "Growing Public Concern About the Role of Artificial Intelligence in Daily Life," *Pew Research Ctr.* (Aug. 28, 2023), <https://www.pewresearch.org/short-reads/2023/08/28/growing-public-concern-about-the-role-of-artificial-intelligence-in-daily-life/>

"What Role for Regulators in the Developing a Creditable AI Audit Industry?" *Digital Hub* (Gilbert + Tobin: May 30, 2022), <https://www.gtlaw.com.au/knowledge/what-role-regulators-developing-creditable-ai-audit-industry-0>

Vinson & Elkins, "AI Antitrust Issues Checklist" (July 17, 2023), <https://www.velaw.com/insights/ai-antitrust-issues-checklist/>

T. Wheeler, "AI Makes Rules for the Metaverse Even More Important," *Brookings ThinkTank* (July 13, 2023), <https://www.brookings.edu/articles/ai-makes-rules-for-the-metaverse-even-more-important/>

S. Wilson *et al*, "Artificial Intelligence and Discrimination: Combating the Risk of Bias in AI Decision-making," *NJ Labor and Employment Law Quarterly*, Vol. 42, No. 4. (May 2021). See <https://www.reedsmith.com/en/perspectives/2021/05/artificial-intelligence-and-discrimination-combating-the-risk-of-bias>

N. Xenskis & B. Parets, "Artificial Intelligence and Algorithms in the Next Congress" *Global Policy Watch* (Covington: Aug. 8, 2022), <https://www.globalpolicywatch.com/2022/08/artificial-intelligence-and-algorithms-in-the-next-congress/>

INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY- FEDERAL AGENCIES AND PRIVATE CAUSES OF ACTION

U.S. Copyright Office, Library of Congress, Copyright Registration Guidance, 88 Fed. Reg. 16190 (Mar. 16, 2023),

<https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2023/03/16/2023-05321/copyright-registration-guidance-works-containing-material-generated-by-artificial-intelligence>

The Copyright Office issues this statement of policy to clarify its practices for examining and registering works that contain material generated by the use of artificial intelligence technology.

U.S. Copyright Office, Library of Congress, Notice of Inquiry and Request for Comments, 88 Fed. Reg. 59942 (Aug. 30, 2023)

The United States Copyright Office is undertaking a study of the copyright law and policy issues raised by artificial intelligence ('AI') systems. To inform the Office's study and help assess whether legislative or regulatory steps in this area are warranted, the Office seeks comment on these issues, including those involved in the use of copyrighted works to train AI models, the appropriate levels of transparency and disclosure with respect to the use of copyrighted works, and the legal status of AI-generated outputs.

Request for Comments Regarding Artificial Intelligence and Inventorship, 88 FR 9492 (Feb. 14, 2023)

The United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO) plays an important role in incentivizing and protecting innovation, including innovation enabled by artificial intelligence (AI), to ensure continued U.S. leadership in AI and other emerging technologies (ET). In June 2022, the USPTO announced the formation of the AI/ET Partnership, which provides an opportunity to bring stakeholders together through a series of engagements to share ideas, feedback, experiences, and insights on the intersection of intellectual property and AI/ET. To build on the AI/ET Partnership efforts, the USPTO is seeking stakeholder input on the current state of AI technologies and inventorship issues that may arise in view of the advancement of such technologies, especially as AI plays a greater role in the innovation process. As outlined in sections II to IV below, the USPTO is pursuing three main avenues of engagement with stakeholders to inform its future efforts on inventorship and promoting AI-enabled innovation: a series of stakeholder engagement sessions; collaboration with academia through scholarly

research; and a request for written comments to the questions identified in section IV. The USPTO encourages stakeholder engagement through one or more of these avenues.

Comment of the United States Federal Trade Commission to the United States Copyright Office, Docket No. 2023-6 (Oct. 30, 2023), https://www.ftc.gov/system/files/ftc_gov/pdf/p241200_ftc_comment_to_copy_right_office.pdf

Comment of the Copia Institute, Docket No. 2023-6 (Oct. 30, 2023), see <https://www.techdirt.com/2023/11/03/wherein-the-copia-institute-tells-the-copyright-office-theres-no-place-for-copyright-law-in-ai-training/>

Reply Comment of the Copia Institute, Docket No. 2023-6 (Dec. 6, 2023), see <https://www.techdirt.com/2023/12/08/the-copia-institute-tells-the-copyright-office-again-that-copyright-law-has-no-business-obstructing-ai-training/>

***Re: Second Request for Reconsideration for Refusal to Register A Recent Entrance to Paradise* (Correspondence ID 1-3ZPC6C3; SR # 1-7100387071 (Copyright Review Board: Feb. 14, 2022), <https://www.copyright.gov/rulings-filings/review-board/docs/a-recent-entrance-to-paradise.pdf>)**

This was the denial of a request by Steven Thaler (see above) to reconsider his attempt to register a “two-dimensional artwork claim” that had been rejected by the Registration Program of the United States Copyright Office. Thaler identified the author of the artwork as the “Creativity Machine,” and stated that it was “autonomously created by a computer algorithm running on a machine.” The Office refused to register the claim as it lacked “human authorship necessary to support a copyright claim.” The Review Board affirmed the refusal to register the claim:

Thaler does not assert that the Work was created with contribution from a human author, so the only issue before the Board is whether, as he argues, the Office’s human authorship requirement is unconstitutional and unsupported by case law. Currently, ‘the Office will refuse to register a claim if it determines that a human being did not create the work.’ Under that standard, the Work is ineligible for registration. After reviewing the statutory text, judicial precedent, and longstanding Copyright Office practice, the Board again concludes that human authorship is a prerequisite to copyright protection in the United States and that the Work therefore cannot be registered. [citation and footnote omitted].

The Review Board also rejected Thaler’s argument that the human authorship requirement was unconstitutional:

[T]he Board rejects Thaler’s argument that the human authorship requirement is ‘unconstitutional’ because registration of machine-generated works would ‘further the underlying goals of copyright law, including the constitutional rationale for copyright protection.’ Congress is not obligated to protect all works that may constitutionally be protected. ‘[I]t is generally for Congress,’ not the Board, ‘to decide how best to pursue the Copyright Clause’s objectives.’ *Eldred v. Ashcroft*, 537 U.S. 186, 212 (2003). The Board must apply the statute enacted by Congress; not second-guess whether a different statutory scheme would better promote the progress of science and useful arts. [citation omitted].

Re: Zarya of the Dawn (Registration # V Au001480196), United States Copyright Office (Feb. 21, 2023), [Letter: In re Zarya of the Dawn](#)

The Office has completed its review of the Work’s original registration application and deposit copy, as well as the relevant correspondence in the administrative record. We conclude that Ms. Kashtanova is the author of the Work’s text as well as the selection, coordination, and arrangement of the Work’s written and visual elements. That authorship is protected by copyright. However, as discussed below, the images in the Work that were generated by the Midjourney technology are not the product of human authorship. Because the current registration for the Work does not disclaim its Midjourney-generated content, we intend to cancel the original certificate issued to Ms. Kashtanova and issue a new one covering only the expressive material that she created. [footnote admitted].

Re: Second Request for Reconsideration for Refusal to Register Theatre D’opera Spatial (Correspondence ID 1-5T5320R; SR # 1-11743923581 (Copyright Review

Board: Sept. 5, 2023), <https://www.copyright.gov/rulings-filings/review-board/docs/Theatre-Dopera-Spatial.pdf>

Andersen v. Stability AI Ltd., Case No. 23-cv-00201-WHO (N.D. Ca. Oct. 30, 2023)

In this putative class action, various artists challenged the defendants’ creation or use of an AI software product that, they alleged, was trained on their copyrighted works of art. The district court “largely” granted the defendants’ motion to dismiss, but granted plaintiffs leave to amend to “provide clarity regarding their theories of how each defendant separately violated their copyrights, removed or altered their copyright management information, or violated their rights of publicity and plausible facts in support.’

Kadrey v. Meta Platforms, Inc., Case No. 23-cv-03417-VC (N.D. Ca. Nov. 20, 2023)

This civil action arose from plaintiffs’ allegations that defendant’s large language model (“LLaMA”) was trained on their works and, among other things, that the use of their works constituted copyright infringement. The district court granted defendant’s motion to dismiss the infringement claim:

1. The plaintiffs allege that the ‘LLaMA language models are themselves infringing derivative works’ because the ‘models cannot function without the expressive information extracted’ from the plaintiffs’ books. This is nonsensical. A derivative work is ‘a work based upon one or more preexisting works’ in any ‘form in which a work may be recast, transformed, or adapted.’ ***. There is no way to understand the LLaMA models themselves as a recasting or adaptation of any of the plaintiffs’ books.

2. Another theory is that ‘every output of the LLaMA language models is an infringing derivative work,’ and that because third-party users initiate queries of LLaMA, ‘every output from the LLaMA language models constitutes an act of vicarious copyright infringement.’ But the complaint offers no allegation of the contents of any output, let alone of one that could be understood as recasting, transforming, or adapting the plaintiffs’ books. Without any plausible allegation of an infringing output, there can be no vicarious infringement. ***.

Thomson Reuters Enterprise Centre GMBH v. Ross Intelligence Inc., No. 1:20-cv-613-SB (D. Del. Sept. 25, 2023)

Facts can be messy even when parties wish they were not. But summary judgment is proper only if factual messes have been tidied. Courts cannot clean them up.

Thomson Reuters, a media company, owns a well-known legal research platform, Westlaw. It alleges that Ross, an artificial intelligence startup, illegally copied important content from Westlaw. Thomson Reuters thus seeks to recover from Ross. Both sides move for summary judgment on a variety of claims and defenses. But many of the critical facts in this case remain genuinely disputed. So I largely deny Thomson Reuters's and Ross's motions for summary judgment.

The underlying facts included the following:

Ross Intelligence is a legal-research industry upstart. It sought to create a 'natural language search engine' using machine learning and artificial intelligence. ***. It wanted to 'avoid human intermediated materials.' ***. Users would enter 3 questions and its search engine would spit out quotations from judicial opinions—no commentary necessary.

It is sufficient to note that plaintiff asserted causes of action for copyright infringement and tortious interference and that defendant raised a fair use defense, all of which (with some exceptions) will go to the jury.

***Thaler v. Perlmutter*, Civil Action No. 22-1564 (BAH) (D.D.C. Aug. 18, 2023)**

The plaintiff appealed from the denial of his copyright application:

Plaintiff Stephen Thaler owns a computer system he calls the 'Creativity Machine,' which he claims generated a piece of visual art of its own accord. He sought to register the work for a copyright, listing the computer system as the author and explaining that the copyright should transfer to him as the owner of the machine. The Copyright Office denied the application on the grounds that the work lacked human authorship, a prerequisite for a valid copyright to issue, in the view of the Register of Copyrights. Plaintiff challenged that denial, culminating in this lawsuit against the United States Copyright Office and Shira Perlmutter, in her official capacity as the Register of Copyrights and the Director of the United States Copyright Office ('defendants'). Both parties have now moved for summary judgment, which motions present the sole issue of whether a work generated entirely by an artificial system absent human involvement should be eligible for copyright. See Pl.'s Mot. Summ. J. (Pl.'s Mot.), ECF No. 16; Defs.' Cross-Mot. Summ. J. ('Defs.' Mot.), ECF No. 17. For the reasons explained below, defendants are correct that human authorship is an essential part of a valid copyright claim, and therefore plaintiff's pending motion for summary judgment is denied and defendants' pending cross-motion for summary judgment is granted.

***Thaler v. Hirshfeld*, No. 1:20-cv-903-(LMB/TCB), 2021 WL 3934803 (E.D. Va. Sept. 2, 2021), affirmed, *Thaler v. Vidal*, 2021-2347 (Fed. Cir. Aug. 5, 2022), petition for panel and rehearing *en banc* denied (Fed. Cir. Oct. 20, 2022)**

This was an appeal from the refusal of the USPTO to process two patent applications. The plaintiff alleged that he was the owner of DABUS, “an artificial intelligence machine” listed as the inventor on the applications. The applications included a document through which DABUS had “ostensibly assigned all intellectual property rights” to the plaintiff. The court held:

Before the Court are the parties’ cross-motions for summary judgment, which address the core issue—can an artificial intelligence machine be an ‘inventor’ under the Patent Act? Based on the plain statutory language of the Patent Act and Federal Circuit authority, the clear answer is no.

[P]laintiff’s policy arguments do not override the overwhelming evidence that Congress intended to limit the definition of ‘inventor’ to natural persons. As technology evolves, there may come a time when artificial intelligence reaches a level of sophistication such that it might satisfy accepted meanings of inventorship. But that time has not yet arrived, and, if it does, it will be up to Congress to decide how, if at all, it wants to expand the scope of patent law.

***Sedlik v. Von Drachenberg*, CV 21-1102 (C.D. Ca. Oct. 10, 2023)**

The district court granted in part motions for reconsideration of prior summary judgement rulings, concluding that the Supreme Court decision in *Andy Warhol Foundation for the Visual Arts, Inc. v. Goldsmith*, 143 S. Ct. 1258 (2023) had made a material change in the evaluation of the fair use defense and that there was a triable issue of fact on fair use.

Class Action Complaint, *Chabon v. OpenAI, Inc.*, Case No. 3:23-cv-03625-PHK (N.D. Ca. filed Sept. 8, 2023), <https://www.courtlistener.com/docket/67778017/chabon-v-openai-inc/>. Complaint alleges that OpenAI, among other things, used plaintiffs’ copyrighted works as training material for GPT models without their consent. (see *Wester* below).

Class Action Complaint, Silverman v. OpenAI, Inc., Case No. 3:23-cv-03416 (N.D. Ca. July 7, 2023),

<https://www.courtlistener.com/docket/67569254/silverman-v-openai-inc/>.

Complaint alleges that defendants wrongfully used copyrighted materials in training sets. (see Davis below).

Class Action Complaint, Tremblay v. OpenAI, Case No. 3-23-cv-03223 (N.D. Ca. June 28, 2023), see

https://www.bloomberglaw.com/public/desktop/document/TremblayetalvOPENAIINCetalDocketNo323cv03223NDCalJun282023CourtDo?doc_id=X7Q1NOIOROV928BCLAKKL91E1R5. Similar allegations to those in Silverman

above. (see Cho below).

Complaint, New York Times v. Microsoft Corp., Case # 1:23-cv-11195-UA S.D.N.Y. Dec. 27, 2023),

https://i2.res.24o.it/pdf2010/Editrice/ILSOLE24ORE/ILSOLE24ORE/Online/Oggetti_Embedded/Documenti/2023/12/27/nyt_complaint_dec2023.pdf.

Complaint alleges that, among other things, “[d]efendants’ GenAI tools can generate output that recites Times content verbatim” and infringes plaintiff’s copyrights.

M.G. Aronchik, *et al.*, *Lessons Learned from Major Technology & IP Transactions* (Mayer Brown: Sept. 26, 2023),

<https://www.mayerbrown.com/en/perspectives-events/publications/2023/09/lessons-learned-from-major-technology-ip-transactions-legal-perspectives-from-mayer-brown>

NOTE: THIS PUBLICATION INCLUDES VARIOUS ARTICLES RELATED TO AI AND GAI AND IS WORTH THE READ!

R.M. Assmus & E.A. Nash, “Generative Artificial Intelligence and Intellectual Property,” *Perspectives & Events* (Mayer Brown: Nov. 28, 2023),

<https://www.mayerbrown.com/en/perspectives-events/publications/2023/11/generative-artificial-intelligence-and-intellectual-property>

A. Belanger, “Artists May ‘Poison’ AI Models Before Copyright Office Can Issue Guidance,” *Ars Technica* (Nov. 3, 2023), <https://arstechnica.com/tech->

[policy/2023/11/artists-may-poison-ai-models-before-copyright-office-can-issue-guidance/](#)

J. Bockman & J.A. Crawford, “AI Trends for 2023 – AI Technology Leads Patent Filing Growth,” *MoFo TECH* (Morrison Foster: Dec. 15, 2022), <https://mofotech.mofo.com/topics/ai-trends-for-2023-ai-technology-leads-patent-filing-growth>

C. Casey, “From Gavel to Gigabytes: ChatGPT’s Groundbreaking Year in Law,” *Reveal* (Nov. 30, 2023), <https://resource.revealdata.com/en/blog/from-gavel-to-gigabytes-chatgpts-groundbreaking-year-in-law>

W. Cho, “Authors Sue OpenAI Claiming Mass Copyright Infringement of Hundreds of Thousand of Novels,” *Hollywood Reporter* (June 29, 2023), <https://www.hollywoodreporter.com/business/business-news/authors-sue-openai-novels-1235526462/>

W. Davis, “Sarah Silverman Is Suing OpenAI and Meta for Copyright Infringement,” *The Verge* (July 9, 2023), <https://www.theverge.com/2023/7/9/23788741/sarah-silverman-openai-meta-chatgpt-llama-copyright-infringement-chatbots-artificial-intelligence-ai>

W. Davis, “AI Companies Have All Kinds of Arguments Against Paying for Copyrighted Content,” *The Verge* (Nov. 4, 2023), <https://www.theverge.com/2023/11/4/23946353/generative-ai-copyright-training-data-openai-microsoft-google-meta-stabilityai> REPORTING ON COMMENTS OF AI COMPANIES IN RESPONSE TO U.S. COPYRIGHT OFFICE AUGUST 30 REQUEST FOR COMMENT ABOVE.

H.B. Dixon, “Artificial Intelligence versus Copyright Protections and Data Privacy,” *The Judges Journal* (ABA: Dec. 8, 2023), https://www.americanbar.org/groups/judicial/publications/judges_journal/2023/fall/artificial-intelligence-versus-copyright-protections-data-privacy/

C. Duffy & D. Goldman, “The New York Times Sues OpenAI and Microsoft for Copyright Infringement,” *CNN* (Dec. 27, 2023), **CANNOT FIND**

“OpenAI Argues Fair Use in Bid to Trim Authors’ Copyright Lawsuits,” *The Fashion Law* (Aug. 31, 2013), <https://www.thefashionlaw.com/openai-sheds-light-on-fair-use-in-bid-to-trim-copyright-lawsuits/#:~:text=What%20OpenAI%20does%20do%20in,language%20models%20now%20at%20the>

W.H. Frankel & A.D. Sussman, “Artificial Intelligence Inventions Are Patentable Under U.S. Patent Law, Even If Artificial Intelligence Can’t Be An Inventor” (Crowell: Feb. 22, 2023), <https://www.crowell.com/NewsEvents/AlertsNewsletters/all/Artificial-Intelligence-Inventions-Are-Patentable-Under-US-Patent-Law-Even-If-Artificial-Intelligence-Cant-Be-An-Inventor>

A. George & T. Walsh, “Artificial Intelligence is Breaking Patent Law,” *Nature* (May 24, 2022), <https://www.nature.com/articles/d41586-022-01391-x>

T. Hu, “The Big IP Questions Artificial Intelligence Art is Raising,” *Law360* (Jan. 13, 2023), <https://www.morganlewis.com/-/media/files/news/2023/the-big-ip-questions-artificial-intelligence-art-is-raising.pdf?rev=7c58570550874808a69f592327cbb810&hash=B46D102F5B74EB19DFCC692DAD3045C6>

H. Hogan, *et al.*, “Copyright Liability for Generative AI Pivots on Fair Use Doctrine,” *Bloomberg Law* (Sept. 22, 2023), <https://news.bloomberglaw.com/us-law-week/copyright-liability-for-generative-ai-pivots-on-fair-use-doctrine>

D. Matthews, “The AI Rules that US Policymakers are Considering, Explained,” *Vox* (Aug. 1, 2023), <https://www.vox.com/future-perfect/23775650/ai-regulation-openai-gpt-anthropic-midjourney-stable#:~:text=The%20main%20congressional%20proposal%20on,Commission%20to%20enforce%20the%20requirement.>

R. Metz, "Dall-E 3 is Stoking an Artist Revolt Against AI Scraping," *Bloomberg Law* (Nov. 3, 2023), <https://news.bloomberglaw.com/artificial-intelligence/dall-e-3-is-stoking-an-artist-revolt-against-ai-scraping>

A. Mills, "FTC Investigation of ChatGPT Aims at AI's Inherent Challenges," *Bloomberg Law* (July 17, 2023), <https://news.bloomberglaw.com/us-law-week/ftc-investigation-of-chatgpt-aims-at-ais-inherent-challenges>

I. Poritz, "AI Copyright Ruling Invites Future Battles Over Human Inputs," *Bloomberg Law* (Aug. 24, 2023), <https://news.bloomberglaw.com/ip-law/ai-art-copyright-ruling-invites-future-battles-over-human-inputs>

I. Poritz, "AI's Billion-Dollar Copyright Battle Starts with a Font Designer," *Bloomberg Law* (Dec. 18, 2023), <https://news.bloomberglaw.com/ip-law/ais-billion-dollar-copyright-battle-starts-with-a-font-designer>

Proskauer Rose LLP, "An Overview of Key IP Issues in AI," *JDSUPRA* (July 3, 2023), [https://www.jdsupra.com/legalnews/an-overview-of-key-ip-issues-in-ai-9058201/#:~:text=Copyright%20infringement%20\(developer%20liability%20and,be%20contributorily%20liable%20for%20user](https://www.jdsupra.com/legalnews/an-overview-of-key-ip-issues-in-ai-9058201/#:~:text=Copyright%20infringement%20(developer%20liability%20and,be%20contributorily%20liable%20for%20user)

M. Reynolds, "vLex Releases New Generative AI Tool," *ABA J.* (Oct. 17, 2023), <https://www.abajournal.com/web/article/vlex-releases-new-generative-ai-legal-assistant>

Reuters, "Microsoft to Defend Customers on AI Copyright Challenges" (Sept. 7, 2023), <https://www.reuters.com/technology/microsoft-defend-customers-ai-copyright-challenges-2023-09-07/>

O. Seddiq & I. Gottlieb, "AI Rules from US Government Push Companies to Show Tech is Safe," *Bloomberg Government* (Dec. 5, 2023), <https://news.bgov.com/bloomberg-government-news/ai-rules-from-us-government-push-companies-to-show-tech-is-safe>

R. Setty, “AI-Assisted Inventions Offer Wiggle Room for US Patent Agency,” *Bloomberg Law* (Feb. 15, 2023), <https://news.bloomberglaw.com/ip-law/ai-assisted-inventions-offer-wiggle-room-for-us-patent-agency>

R. Setty, “AI Comic Art Dispute Leaves Copyright Protections Open-Ended,” *Bloomberg Law* (Feb. 24, 2023), <https://news.bloomberglaw.com/ip-law/ai-comic-art-dispute-leaves-copyright-protections-open-ended>

E. Sherman, “Copyright Law and Generative AI: What a Mess,” *ABA J.* (Aug. 30, 2023), <https://www.abajournal.com/web/article/copyright-generative-ai-what-a-mess>

D.C. Weiss, “Artificial Intelligence Companies Are Accused of Violating Copyrights for Artwork and Photos,” *ABA J.* (Jan. 19, 2023), <https://www.abajournal.com/news/article/artificial-intelligence-companies-are-accused-of-violating-copyrights-for-art-work-and-photos#:~:text=Legal%20actions%20filed%20on%20behalf,metadata%20to%20train%20AI%20software.>

J. Wester, “Bestselling Authors Challenge ChatGPT Developer OpenAI’s Use of Their Work,” *N.Y.L.J.* (ALM: Sept. 20, 2023), <https://www.law.com/newyorklawjournal/2023/09/20/bestselling-authors-challenge-chatgpt-developer-openais-use-of-their-work/#:~:text=The%20suit%20accuses%20OpenAI%20of,market%20for%20the%20authors'%20works.>

O. Wolfe, et al., “Some Stability for AI Defendants: Judge Dismisses All but One Claim in Andersen et al., v. Stability AI LTD, et. al.,” *Gadgets, Gigabytes & Goodwill Blog* (Seyfarth: Nov. 9, 2023), <https://www.gadgetsgigabytesandgoodwill.com/2023/11/some-stability-for-ai-defendants-judge-dismisses-all-but-one-claim-in-andersen-et-al-v-stability-ai-ltd-et-al/>

GAI INTRODUCTION

I. Gottlieb, et al., “The Power of the Prompt,” *Bloomberg Law* (Aug. 30, 2023) <https://news.bloomberglaw.com/artificial-intelligence/the-power-of-the-prompt->

[a-special-report-on-ai-for-in-house-counsel?source=newsletter&item=body-link®ion=text-section.](#)

R.J. Hedges, “Artificial Intelligence” A Judge’s View of Generative AI,” *LexisNexis Practical Guidance* (undated), <https://www.lexisnexis.com/pdf/practical-guidance/ai/ai-a-judges-view-of-generative-ai.pdf>

McKinsey & Co., “What’s the Future of Generative AI? An Early View of 15 Charts” (Aug. 25, 2023), <https://www.mckinsey.com/featured-insights/mckinsey-explainers/whats-the-future-of-generative-ai-an-early-view-in-15-charts>

GAI AND JUDGES

This section is a little different than the others because it begins with a short introduction rather than “diving” immediately into references. Not surprisingly, given the availability of GAI, attorneys are – or may – rely on it to do research. This has led to the imposition of sanctions in the *Mata* decision (see below) and proactive attempts by judges to deal with the possible use of GAI by attorneys. There does not appear to be any likelihood that the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure, or the Federal Rules of Evidence will be amended to address GAI or, for that matter, AI. But we will see. And with that, let’s look at some case law and actions by individual federal judges.

***Mata v. Avianca, Inc.*, No. 22-cv-1461, 2023 WL 3696209 (PKC) (S.D.N.Y. June 22, 2023)**

The plaintiff’s attorneys in this civil action “submitted non-existent judicial opinions with fake quotes and citations created by *** ChatGPT, then continued to stand by the fake opinions after judicial orders called their existence into question.” The district court concluded that the attorneys acted with subjective bad faith and violated Rule 11. The court held the firm that represented the plaintiff jointly and severally liable for the attorney’s violation but rejected the imposition of sanctions under Section 1927 because, “[r]eliance on fake cases has caused several harms but dilatory tactics and delay were not among them.” The

court also held that, “alternatively” to Rule 11, sanctions were appropriate under its inherent power. The court imposed a \$5,000.00 monetary penalty, required the attorneys to “inform their client and the judge whose names were wrongfully invoked of the sanctions imposed,” but did not require an apology from the attorneys.

***Berman v. Matteucci*, Case No. 6:23-cv-00660-MO (D. Ore. July 10, 2023)**

The *pro se* petitioner in this *habeas* proceeding responded to an order to show cause why it should not be dismissed as untimely by asserting that, prior to April 2023, when “an artificial intelligence chatbot provided him with insights that helped him discover his claims” that the policy under which he had been sentenced violated several constitutional provisions, “artificial intelligence technology was not sufficiently advanced to impart this knowledge to him.” The district court held that the petitioner’s understanding of his legal claim was not a “factual predicate” under *habeas* law and that his lack of understanding of “the legal significance of known facts” was insufficient to avoid dismissal.

***Ex Parte Allen Michael Lee*, No. 10-22-00281-CR, 2023 WL 4624777 (Tex. Crim. App. July 19, 2023)**

The appellate court here noted that “none of the three published cases cited [in the petitioner’s brief] actually exist ***. Each citation provides the reader a jump-cite into the body of a different case that has nothing to do with the propositions cited by Lee. Two of the citations take the reader to cases from Missouri.” The court observed: “It appears that at least the ‘Argument’ portion of the brief may have been prepared by artificial intelligence AI,” but took no action.

People v. Crabill, 23 PDJ067 (Colorado Office of Attorney Regulation: Nov. 22, 2023)

The Presiding Disciplinary Judge approved the parties' stipulation to discipline and suspended Zachariah C. Crabill (attorney registration number 56783) for one year and one day, with ninety days to be served and the remainder to be stayed upon Crabill's successful completion of a twoyear period of probation, with conditions. The suspension took effect November 22, 2023.

In April 2023, a client hired Crabill to prepare a motion to set aside judgment in the client's civil case. Crabill, who had never drafted such a motion before working on his client's matter, cited case law that he found through the artificial intelligence platform, ChatGPT. Crabill did not read the cases he found through ChatGPT or otherwise attempt to verify that the citations were accurate. In May 2023, Crabill filed the motion with the presiding court. Before a hearing on the motion, Crabill discovered that the cases from ChatGPT were either incorrect or fictitious. But Crabill did not alert the court to the sham cases at the hearing. Nor did he withdraw the motion. When the judge expressed concerns about the accuracy of the cases, Crabill falsely attributed the mistakes to a legal intern. Six days after the hearing, Crabill filed an affidavit with the court, explaining that he used ChatGPT when he drafted the motion.

Through this conduct, Crabill violated Colo. RPC 1.1 (a lawyer must competently represent a client); Colo. RPC 1.3 (a lawyer must act with reasonable diligence and promptness when representing a client); Colo. RPC 3.3(a)(1) (a lawyer must not knowingly make a false statement of material fact or law to a tribunal); and Colo. RPC 8.4(c) (it is professional misconduct for a lawyer to engage in conduct involving dishonesty, fraud, deceit, or misrepresentation).

United States v. Cohen, 18-CR-602 (JMF) (S.D.N.Y.)

On December 12, 2023, Judge Jesse M. Furman issued an Order to directing counsel for defendant to show cause why sanctions should not be imposed on him for citing what appeared to be decisions that did not exist, assuming that counsel could not provide copies of the decisions. Counsel's response is available at <https://www.courthousenews.com/wp-content/uploads/2023/12/Cohen-declaration.pdf>.

R. Buckland, "AI, Judges and Judgment: Setting the Scene," M-RCBG Associate Working Paper Series 2023.220, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA, Nov. 2023), [https://www.hks.harvard.edu/sites/default/files/centers/mrcbg/programs/senior.fellows/2023-24/Buckland%20paper%20final.pdf](https://www.hks.harvard.edu/sites/default/files/centers/mrcbg/programs/senior fellows/2023-24/Buckland%20paper%20final.pdf)

Artificial intelligence (AI) in the administration of justice is growing at rapid pace. ¹ This is driven by widespread recognition of AI justice’s undeniable advantages, despite the risks it presents to the integrity of legal systems.

AI justice may, for example, lower the administrative burden of cases. The Crown Courts in England and Wales ended 2022 with a near-record load of over 60,000 outstanding cases.² AI can dramatically increase court efficiency and reduce backlogs, providing standardised outcomes faster and at lower cost. After all, AI judges do not need to rest. At the same time, AI-driven judicial decision-making could make justice more accessible to the large segments of society that cannot afford human lawyers.

Proponents also argue algorithms could improve the fairness of judgements because ‘AI judges strictly follow precedents, restrict improper judicial discretion, prevent personal biases and preferences of individual judges, handle large amounts of information, complete complicated calculative balances, and discover statistical representations of variations of fact patterns and legal factors.’ Even where AI tools assist human judges, these tools can push relevant legal provisions through comprehensive data retrieval. This in turn can improve judges’ understanding of cases, helping them avoid one-sided access to data and information.

At this point, it is important to clarify the different ways in which AI is being deployed in the courtroom. At a foundation level, AI may be used for auxiliary administrative functions. This includes communication between judicial personnel, allocation of resources and cases, and ensuring the anonymisation of judicial decisions, documents, or data. These activities may ostensibly appear separate from the core of judicial decision-making but carry subtler implications. For instance, the allocation of a case to a specific judge, given their unique expertise or biases, could indirectly influence the outcome. These nuances notwithstanding, the primary objective of these AI-driven tasks remain administrative in nature, aiming to streamline the judicial process rather than directly determine case outcomes. [footnotes omitted].

S. Rao & A. Ramstad, “Legal Fictions and ChatGPT Hallucinations: ‘Mata v. Avianca’ and Generative AI in the Courts,” N.Y.L.J. (ALM: Dec. 21, 2023), <https://www.law.com/newyorklawjournal/2023/12/21/legal-fictions-and-chatgpt-hallucinations-mata-v-avianca-and-generative-ai-in-the-courts/>

S. Schlegel, “A Call for Education Over Regulation: An Open Letter,” *Schelegel Fifth Circuit Blog* (Nov. 28, 2023), <https://www.judgeschlegel.com/blog/-a-call-for-education-over-regulation-an-open-letter>

C. Toutant, “Keep an Eye on Judges’ Chambers for Insight into AI Adoption in Law,” *Legaltech News* (ALM: Nov. 21, 2023), <https://www.law.com/legaltechnews/?id=1202511515991>

E. Volokh, “Colorado Lawyer ‘Says ChatGPT Created Fake Cases He Cited in Court Documents,’” *Reason* (The Volokh Conspiracy: June 15, 2023), <https://reason.com/volokh/2023/06/15/colorado-lawyer-says-chatgpt-created-fake-cases-he-cited-in-court-documents/>

E. Volokh, “Lawyer’s Affidavit in the Colorado AI-Hallucinated Precedent Case,” *Reason* (The Volokh Conspiracy: June 16, 2023), <https://reason.com/volokh/2023/06/16/lawyers-affidavit-in-the-colorado-ai-hallucinated-precedent-case/>

E. Volokh, “Another ‘Filing That Cited Fake Court Cases,’ This Time in L.A. Superior Court,” *Reason*, (The Volokh Conspiracy: Oct. 13, 2023), <https://reason.com/volokh/2023/10/13/another-filing-that-cited-fake-court-cases-this-time-in-l-a-superior-court/>

E. Volokh, “Six Federal Cases of Self-Represented Litigants Citing Fake Cases in Briefs, Likely Because They Used AI Programs,” *Reason* (Nov. 13, 2023), <https://reason.com/volokh/2023/11/13/self-represented-litigants-use-ai-to-write-briefs-produce-hallucinated-citations/>

S. Watwe, “Judges Reflect on GenAI Use One Year After ChatGPT’s Debut,” *Bloomberg Law* (Nov. 28, 2023), <https://news.bloomberglaw.com/litigation/judges-reflect-on-genai-use-one-year-after-chatgpts-debut>

ORDERS

“Interim Rules on the Use of Generative AI,” Utah Judicial Council (Oct. 25, 2023), <https://legacy.utcourts.gov/utc/judicial-council/wp-content/uploads/sites/48/2023/10/2023-10-23Judicial-Council-Materials-1.pdf>:

These rules set forth the only authorized use of generative AI tools for court-related work or on court owned devices. Any use not expressly permitted herein will be considered a violation of court policies. Deviations must be pre-approved by the state court administrator.

Judges and court employees should recognize the limitations of generative AI and may not rely solely on AI-generated content. Generative AI tools are intended to provide assistance and are not a substitute for judicial, legal, or other professional expertise. It is also important to remember that AI models learn from vast datasets of text, images, and other content created by humans. As a result, generative AI tools have been known to produce outputs that inadvertently promote stereotypes, reinforce prejudices, or exhibit unfair biases. [footnote omitted].

The United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit is considering amending its Rule 32.3 and Form 6 as shown below. Proposed changes are underlined:

32.3. Certificate of Compliance. See Form 6 in the Appendix of Forms to the Fed. R. App. P. Additionally, counsel and unrepresented filers must further certify that no generative artificial intelligence program was used in drafting the document presented for filing, or to the extent such a program was used, all generated text, including all citations and legal analysis, has been reviewed for accuracy and approved by a human. A material misrepresentation in the certificate of compliance may result in striking the document and sanctions against the person signing the document.

FORM 6.

3. This document complies with the AI usage reporting requirement of 5th Cir. R. 32.3 because:

no generative artificial intelligence program was used in the drafting of this document,
or

a generative artificial intelligence program was used in the drafting of this document and all generated text, including all citations and legal analysis, has been reviewed for accuracy and approved by a human.

“*In re: Use of Unverified Sources*,” General Order 23-1 (D. Hawaii Nov. 14, 2023):

Briefs and memoranda generated by artificial intelligence (AI) platforms (for example, ChatGPT or Bard) and online briefs or memoranda drafted by persons compensated to produce materials not tailored to specific cases (collectively, ‘unverified sources’), have increased the courts concern about the reliability and accuracy of filings and other court submissions. In

particular, the court is concerned about whether factual or legal citations or references in court filings and submissions have been properly vetted by counsel and pro se parties. For example, courts sometimes receive briefs containing fictitious case cites either generated by AI or by human authors.

To address these concerns, if any counsel or pro se party submits to the court any filing or submission generated by an unverified source, that attorney or pro se party must submit a declaration concurrently with that material captioned “Reliance on Unverified Source” that: (1) advises the court that counsel or the pro se party has relied on one or more unverified sources; and (2) verifies that the counsel or pro se party has confirmed that any such material is not fictitious. The scope of the required declaration is that required by Rule 11 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

This order does not affect the use of basic research tools such as Westlaw, Lexis, or Bloomberg, and no declaration is required if all sources can be located on such well-accepted basic research tools.

“Mandatory Certification Regarding Generative Artificial Intelligence,” Judge Specific Requirement of Judge Brantley Starr, Northern District of Texas, <https://www.txnd.uscourts.gov/judge/judge-brantley-starr>:

All attorneys and pro se litigants *** must, file on the docket a certificate attesting either that no portion of any filing will be drafted by generative artificial intelligence (such as ChatGPT, Harvey.AI, or Google Bard) or that any language drafted by generative artificial intelligence will be checked for accuracy, using print reporters or traditional legal data bases, by a human being. ***.

“Order on Artificial Intelligence,” Judge Stephen Alexander Vaden, U.S. Ct. of International Trade (June 8, 2023), <https://www.cit.uscourts.gov/sites/cit/files/Order%20on%20Artificial%20Intelligence.pdf>:

*** any submission in a case assigned to Judge Vaden that contains text drafted with the assistance of a generative artificial intelligence program on the basis of natural language prompts, including but not limited to ChatGPT and Google Bard, must be accompanied by:

A disclosure notice that identifies the program used and the specific portions of text that have been so drafted;

A certification that the use of such program has not resulted in the disclosure of any confidential or business proprietary information to any unauthorized party ***.

“Notice to counsel: New AI Provision Effective as of July 14, 2023,” Judge Michael J. Newman, Southern District of Ohio, Western Division, Dec. 14, 2023):

VI. ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE (“AI”) PROVISION

No attorney for a party, or a *pro se* party, may use Artificial Intelligence (“AI”) in the preparation of any filing submitted to the Court. Parties and their counsel who violate this AI ban may face sanctions including, *inter alia*, striking the pleading from the record, the imposition of economic sanctions or contempt, and dismissal of the lawsuit. The Court does not intend this AI ban to apply to information gathered from legal search engines, such as Westlaw or LexisNexis, or Internet search engines, such as Google or Bing. All parties and their counsel have a duty to immediately inform the Court if they discover the use of AI in any document filed in their case.

“Standing Order Re: Artificial Intelligence (‘AI’) in Cases Assigned to Judge Baylson,” Eastern District of Pennsylvania (June 6, 2023), <https://www.paed.uscourts.gov/documents/standord/Standing%20Order%20Re%20Artificial%20Intelligence%206.6.pdf>:

If any attorney for a party, or a *pro se* party, has used Artificial Intelligence (‘AI’) in the preparation of any complaint, answer, motion, brief, or other paper, filed with the Court, and assigned to Judge Michael M. Baylson, **MUST**, in a clear and plain factual statement, disclose that AI has been used in any way in the preparation of the filing, and **CERTIFY**, that each and every citation to the law or the record in the paper, has been verified as accurate. [emphasis in original].

General Order 23-11, General Order Amending Local Rules (E.D. Tex. Oct. 30, 2023)

Added to Local Rule CV-11:

- (g) Use of Technology by Pro Se Litigants. Litigants remain responsible for the accuracy and quality of legal documents produced with the assistance of technology (e.g., ChatGPT, Google Bard, Bing AI Chat, or generative artificial intelligence services). Litigants are cautioned that certain technologies may produce factually or legally inaccurate content. If a litigant chooses to employ technology, the litigant continues to be bound by the requirements of Fed. R. Civ. P. 11 and must review and verify any computer-generated content to ensure that it complies with all such standards. See also Local Rule AT-3(m).

COMMENT: Recent advancements in technology have provided *pro se* litigants access to tools that may be employed in preparing legal documents or pleadings. However, often the product of those tools may be factually or legally inaccurate. Local Rule CV-11 is amended to add new subsection (g) to alert *pro se* litigants to this risk. The rule also alerts litigants that they remain bound by the certification requirements of Fed. R. Civ. P. 11 when employing such tools to verify all content meets those standards. A similar rule, Local Rule AT-3(m), is added to the standards of practice to be observed by attorneys.

Added to Local Rule AT-3:

(m) If the lawyer, in the exercise of his or her professional legal judgment, believes that the client is best served by the use of technology (e.g., ChatGPT, Google Bard, Bing AI Chat, or generative artificial intelligence services), then the lawyer is cautioned that certain technologies may produce factually or legally inaccurate content and should never replace the lawyer's most important asset – the exercise of independent legal judgment. If a lawyer chooses to employ technology in representing a client, the lawyer continues to be bound by the requirements of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 11, Local Rule AT-3, and all other applicable standards of practice and must review and verify any computer-generated content to ensure that it complies with all such standards.

COMMENT: Recent advancements in technology have provided the legal profession with many useful tools for daily practice. Ultimately, however, the most valuable benefit a lawyer provides to a client is the lawyer's independent judgment as informed by education, professional experiences, and participation in the legal and professional community in which the lawyer practices. Although technology can be helpful, it is never a replacement for abstract thought and problem solving. Local Rule AT-3 is amended to add new subsection (m) to remind lawyers of their continuing duties under applicable rules of practice despite any choice to employ technological tools in the course of providing legal services.

In re: Pleadings Using Generative Artificial Intelligence, General Order 2023-03 (N.D. Tex. Bankr. Ct. June 21, 2023),

<https://www.txnb.uscourts.gov/news/general-order-2023-03-pleadings-using-generative-artificial-intelligence>:

If any portion of a pleading or other paper filed on the Court's docket has been drafted utilizing generative artificial intelligence, including but not limited to ChatGPT, Harvey.AI, or Google Bard, the Court requires that all attorneys and pro se litigants filing such pleadings or other papers verify that any language that was generated was checked for accuracy, using print reporters, traditional legal databases, or other reliable means. Artificial intelligence systems hold no allegiance to any client, the rule of law, or the laws and Constitution of the United States and are likewise not factually or legally trustworthy sources without human verification. Failure to heed these instructions may subject attorneys or pro se litigants to sanctions pursuant to Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 9011.

Standing Order for Civil Cases Before Magistrate Judge Fuentes, Magistrate Judge Gabriel A. Fuentes (N.D. Ill.),

<https://www.ilnd.uscourts.gov/assets/documents/forms/judges/Fuentes/Standing%20Order%20For%20Civil%20Cases%20Before%20Judge%20Fuentes%20revision%208-11-23.pdf>:

The Court has adopted a new requirement in the fast-growing and fast-changing area of generative artificial intelligence ('AI') and its use in the practice of law. The requirement is as follows: Any party using any generative AI tool in the preparation or drafting of documents for filing with the Court must disclose in the filing that AI was used and the specific AI tool that was used to conduct legal research and/or to draft the document. Further, Rule 11 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure continues to apply, and the Court will continue to construe all filings as a certification, by the person signing the filed document and after reasonable inquiry, of the matters set forth in the rule, including but not limited to those in Rule 11(b)(2). Parties should not assume that mere reliance on an AI tool will be presumed to constitute reasonable inquiry, because, to quote a phrase, 'I'm sorry, Dave, I'm afraid I can't do that This mission is too important for me to allow you to jeopardize it.' 2001: A SPACE ODYSSEY (MetroGoldwyn-Mayer 1968). One way to jeopardize the mission of federal courts is to use an AI tool to generate legal research that includes 'bogus judicial decisions' cited for substantive propositions of law. See *Mata v. Avianca, Inc.*, ***. Just as the Court did before the advent of AI as a tool for legal research and drafting, the Court will continue to presume that the Rule 11 certification is a representation by filers, as living, breathing, thinking human beings, that they themselves have read and analyzed all cited authorities to ensure that such authorities actually exist and that the filings comply with Rule 11(b)(2). ***.

Belenzon v. Paws Up Ranch, LLC, CV 23-69-M-DWM (D. Mont. June 22, 2023):

Order granting *pro hac* admission on "condition that *pro hac* counsel shall do his or her own work. This means that *pro hac* counsel must do his or her own writing; sign his or her own pleadings, motions, and briefs; and appear and participate personally, Use of artificial intelligence automated drafting programs, such as Chat GPT, is prohibited."

Paragraph IB, "Use of Generative Artificial Intelligence," Judge Evelyn Padin's General Pretrial and Trial Procedures (Revised Nov. 13, 2023), <https://www.njd.uscourts.gov/sites/njd/files/EPProcedures.pdf>:

The use of any GAI (e.g., OpenAI's ChatGPT or Google's Bard) for any court filings requires a mandatory disclosure/certification that: (1) identifies the GAI program; (2) identifies the portion of the filing drafted by GAI; and (3) certifies that the GAI work product was diligently reviewed by a human being for accuracy and applicability.

Paragraph 8F, Individual Practices in Civil Cases, District Judge Arun Subramanian (S.D.N.Y.) (revised July 29, 2023), https://www.nysd.uscourts.gov/sites/default/files/practice_documents/AS%20Subramanian%20Civil%20Individual%20Practices.pdf:

Use of ChatGPT and Other Tools. Counsel is responsible for providing the Court with complete and accurate representations of the record, the procedural history of the case, and any cited legal authorities. Use of ChatGPT or other such tools is not prohibited, but counsel must at all times personally confirm for themselves the accuracy of any research conducted by these means. At all times, counsel—and specifically designated Lead Trial Counsel—bears responsibility for any filings made by the party that counsel represents.

“Court Advisory Concerning Discovery and Other Matters,” *Nine Line Apparel, Inc. v. Sergio*, Civil Action No. SA-23-CV-0997-FB (W.D. Tex. Oct. 31, 2023):

As this case begins, the Court wishes to apprise counsel and the parties of the Court’s expectations concerning the conduct of discovery and other matters: ***

6. In this modern environment of artificial intelligence, counsel are reminded of traditional obligations of professional responsibility to be honest with the Court and opposing counsel, regardless of drafting methodology employed. The signature of counsel on all pleadings constitutes an affirmation that all the pleading contents have been validated for accuracy and authenticity. [emphasis in original].

Baroness Carr of Walton-on-the-Hill,
Lady Chief Justice of England & Wales, *et al.*, “Artificial Intelligence (AI): Guidance for Judicial Office Holders,” *Courts and Tribunals Judiciary* (Dec. 12, 2023),
<https://www.judiciary.uk/guidance-and-resources/artificial-intelligence-ai-judicial-guidance/>

From the Introduction:

This guidance has been developed to assist judicial office holders in relation to the use of Artificial Intelligence (AI).

It sets out key risks and issues associated with using AI and some suggestions for minimising them. Examples of potential uses are also included.

Any use of AI by or on behalf of the judiciary must be consistent with the judiciary’s overarching obligation to protect the integrity of the administration of justice.

This guidance applies to all judicial office holders under the Lady Chief Justice and Senior President of Tribunal’s responsibility, their clerks and other support staff.

B.B. Donald, J.F. Francis IV, K.J. Withers & R.J. Hedges, “Generative AI and Courts: How Are They Getting Along?” [*PLI Chronicle: Insights and Perspectives for the Legal Community* \(Sept. 2023\)](#),

<https://www.jamsadr.com/files/uploads/documents/articles/francis-james-pli-generative-ai-1023.pdf>

R.J. Hedges, “Artificial Intelligence: A Judge’s View of Generative AI,” *Lexis Nexis Practical Guidance Practice Note* (available from the author of this compilation)

J. Hulle, “AI Standing Orders Proliferate as Federal Courts Forge Own Paths,” *Bloomberg Law* (Nov. 8, 2023), <https://news.bloomberglaw.com/us-law-week/ai-standing-orders-proliferate-as-federal-courts-forge-own-paths>

M. Spoto, “AI Tool to Redact Minors’ Info in Testing Phase for Los Angeles Court,” *Bloomberg Law* (Dec. 8, 2023), <https://news.bloomberglaw.com/litigation/ai-tool-to-redact-minors-info-in-testing-for-los-angeles-court>

GAI ARTICLES

M.J. Ahn & Y-C Chen, “Building Guardrails for ChatGPT,” *Brookings TechTank* (Feb. 7, 2023), <https://www.brookings.edu/blog/techtank/2023/02/07/building-guardrails-for-chatgpt/>

D. Alba, “Google’s AI Chatbot is Trained by Humans Who Say They’re Overworked, Underpaid and Frustrated,” *Straits Times* (updated July 12, 2023), <https://www.straitstimes.com/life/google-s-ai-chatbot-is-trained-by-humans-who-say-they-are-overworked-underpaid-and-frustrated#:~:text=Home-,Google's%20AI%20chatbot%20is%20trained%20by%20humans%20who,are%20overworked%2C%20underpaid%20and%20frustrated&text=NEW%20YORK%20%E2%80%93%20Google's%20Bard%20artificial,with%20a%20surfeit%20of%20confidence.>

A-M Alcantara, “Is It Human or AI? New Tools Help You Spot the Bots,” *Wall St. J.* (Jan. 10, 2023), <https://www.wsj.com/articles/is-it-human-or-ai-new-tools-help-you-spot-the-bots-11673356404>

R. Amadeo, "ChatGPT-Style Search Represents a 10x Cost Increase for Google, Microsoft," *Ars Technica* (Feb. 22, 2023), <https://arstechnica.com/gadgets/2023/02/chatgpt-style-search-represents-a-10x-cost-increase-for-google-microsoft/>

Z. Argento, *et al.*, "An Overview of the Employment Law Issues Posed by Generative AI in the Workplace," *Littler Report* (Littler Mendelson PC: May 2023), <https://www.littler.com/publication-press/publication/overview-employment-law-issues-posed-generative-ai-workplace>

M.G. Aronchik & S.J. Hartman, "How Artificial Intelligence Changes Deal Terms," *Perspectives & Events* (Mayer Brown: Nov. 14, 2023), <https://www.mayerbrown.com/en/perspectives-events/publications/2023/10/how-artificial-intelligence-changes-deal-terms>

"Harness the Power of Generative AI with Creative Collaboration," *Artificial Lawyer* (Jan. 4, 2023), <https://www.artificiallawyer.com/2023/01/04/harness-the-power-of-generative-ai-with-creative-collaboration/>

F.J. Azzopardi, *et al.*, "Navigating Generative AI in M&A Transactions," *Davis Polk* (July 5, 2023), <https://www.davispolk.com/insights/client-update/navigating-generative-ai-ma-transactions>

D. Baddeley, J. Oliver & P. Waters, "Can New AI Help to Level Up the Scales of Justice," (Nov. 27, 2023), <https://law.stanford.edu/press/can-new-ai-help-to-level-up-the-scales-of-justice/>

M. Bannigan, *et al.*, "Does Your Company Need a ChatGPT Policy? Probably" (Debevoise & Plimpton: Feb. 8, 2023), <https://www.debevoise.com/insights/publications/2023/02/does-your-company-need-a-chatgpt-policy-probably#:~:text=Probably.,-8%20February%202023&text=Key%20Takeaways%3A,editing%2C%20idea%20generation%20and%20coding.>

D. Bass, “Who Owns the Content AI Creates?” *Bloomberg Bus. Week* (Jan. 9, 2023), <https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2023-01-09/github-s-openai-powered-copilot-sparks-legal-debate>

C. Bean, “The AI Detection Arms Race is On,” *WIRED* (Sept. 14, 2023), <https://www.wired.com/story/ai-detection-chat-gpt-college-students/#:~:text=And%20college%20students%20are%20developing,and%20tools%20to%20evade%20detection.&text=Edward%20Tian%20didn't%20think%20of%20himself%20as%20a%20writer.>

W. Bedingfield, “Hollywood Writers Reached an AI Deal That Will Rewrite History,” *WIRED* (Sept. 27, 2023), <https://www.wired.com/story/us-writers-strike-ai-provisions-precedents/>

L.A. Bennett & S.N. Jorge, “Fake It till You Break It: Insurance Coverage Implications for ChatGPT Mishaps,” *Client Alert* (Lowenstein Sandler: Sept. 7, 2023), <https://www.jdsupra.com/legalnews/fake-it-till-you-break-it-insurance-1547618/>

P. Bloom, “How Moral Can A.I. Really Be?” *The New Yorker* (Nov. 29, 2023), <https://www.newyorker.com/science/annals-of-artificial-intelligence/how-moral-can-ai-really-be>

T. Brooke, *et al.*, “Image-Generating AI: Trends and Legal Challenges,” *Holland & Knight Masters of the Metaverse Blog* (Dec. 15, 2022), <https://www.hklaw.com/en/insights/publications/2022/12/imagegenerating-ai-trends-and-legal-challenges#:~:text=The%20creation%20of%20AI%2Dgenerated,addressed%20by%20courts%20and%20legislators.>

J. Bureau, “The New Age CPO,” *Future of Sourcing* (Feb. 3, 2023), <https://futureofsourcing.com/the-new-age-cpo-jim-bureau>

M. Cantor, “Incredibly Smart or Incredibly Stupid? What We Learned from Using ChatGPT for a Year,” *The Guardian* (Oct. 12, 2023), <https://www.theguardian.com/technology/2023/oct/12/chatgpt-uses-writing-recipes-one-year>

C. Casey, et al., “AI-Human Interaction: Soft Law Considerations and Application,” 1 *J. of AI, Robotics & Workplace Automation* 360 (2022), https://www.bakerlaw.com/webfiles/JAIA_1_4_JAIA0010_Casey.pdf

R.L. Cassin, “Generative AI: The Problem of ‘Mere Information’ Versus Values,” *FCPA Blog* (July 27, 2023), <https://fcpablog.com/2023/07/27/generative-ai-the-problem-of-mere-information-versus-values/#:~:text=The%20program%20can%20also%20interactively,get%20whatever%20answers%20they%20want>.

B. Chavis, “Does ChatGPT Produce Fishy Briefs?” *ABA J.* (Feb. 21, 2023), <https://www.abajournal.com/web/article/does-chatgpt-produce-fishy-briefs>

S. CH-Wang, et al., “Do Androids Know They’re Only Dreaming of Electric Sheep?” *State of AI* (Dec. 29, 2023), <https://stateofaigpt.substack.com/p/do-androids-know-theyre-only-dreaming>

THIS IS A “POPULAR” ARTICLE ON AN ACADEMIC PAPER AVAILABLE AT <https://arxiv.org/abs/2312.17249>

M. Coatney, “Navigating the Legal Landscape of Generative Artificial Intelligence: The Risks and Opportunities of ChatGPT,” (ABA: Aug. 15, 2023), https://www.americanbar.org/groups/litigation/publications/litigation_journal/2022-23/summer/navigating-legal-landscape-generative-artificial-intelligence-risks-and-opportunities-chatgpt/?login

L. Choo, “The Do’s and Don’ts of Using Generative AI in the Workplace,” *Wall St. J.* (Nov. 26, 2023), <https://www.wsj.com/tech/ai/generative-ai-workplace-rules-052ab0d2>

“The Growing Threat of ChatGPT-Based Phishing Attacks” (Cyble Research & Intelligence Labs: Feb. 22, 2023), <https://blog.cyble.com/2023/02/22/the-growing-threat-of-chatgpt-based-phishing-attacks/>

G.L. Cohen & R.C. Marshall, “Concerns and Considerations for Using Generative Artificial Intelligence as Part of Routine Business Operations,” *National L. Rev.* (Aug. 8, 2023), <https://www.natlawreview.com/article/concerns-and-considerations-using-generative-artificial-intelligence-part-routine>

“Generative AI: A Guide for Corporate Legal Departments,” *Deloitte Legal* (June 2023), <https://www.deloitte.com/global/en/services/legal/services/generative-ai-legal-departments.html>

H. Desaire, et al., “Distinguishing Academic Science Writing from Humans or ChatGPT with Over 99% Accuracy Using Off-the-Shelf Machine Learning Tools,” *Cell Press Open Access* (June 21, 2023), <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S266638642300200X>

G. De Vynck, et al., “Microsoft’s AI Chatbot is Going Off the Rails,” *Washington Post* (Feb. 16, 2023), <https://www.washingtonpost.com/technology/2023/02/16/microsoft-bing-ai-chatbot-sydney/>

B. Edwards, “ChatGPT in One Year Old. Here’s How It Changed the Tech World,” *Ars Technica* (Nov. 30, 2023), <https://arstechnica.com/information-technology/2023/11/chatgpt-was-the-spark-that-lit-the-fire-under-generative-ai-one-year-ago-today/#:~:text=Within%20a%20few%20months%2C%20it,critics%2C%20and%20stoked%20existential%20angst.>

B. Edwards, “A Song of Hype and Fire: The 10 Biggest AI Stories of 2023,” *Ars Technica* (Dec. 18, 2023), <https://arstechnica.com/information-technology/2023/12/a-song-of-hype-and-fire-the-10-biggest-ai-stories-of-2023/>

B. Elliott, “Big AI Won’t Stop Election Deepfakes with Watermarks,” *Wired* (July 27, 2023), <https://www.wired.com/story/ai-watermarking-misinformation/>

V. Elliott, “Generative AI Learned Nothing from Web. 2.0,” *WIRED* (Dec. 28, 2023), <https://www.wired.com/story/generative-ai-web-2-mistakes/>

M. Elsen-Rooney, “NYC Education Department Blocks ChatGPT on School devices, Networks,” *Chalkbeat* (Jan. 3, 2023), <https://ny.chalkbeat.org/2023/1/3/23537987/nyc-schools-ban-chatgpt-writing-artificial-intelligence>

A. Engler, “Early Thoughts on Regulating Generative AI Like ChatGPT,” *Brookings TechTank* (Feb. 21, 2023), https://www.brookings.edu/blog/techtank/2023/02/21/early-thoughts-on-regulating-generative-ai-like-chatgpt/?utm_campaign=Governance%20Studies&utm_medium=email&utm_content=247299400&utm_source=hs_email

A. Ezzell, “FPF Releases Generative AI Internal Policy Checklist ***” (*Future of Privacy Forum*) (Aug. 1, 2023), <https://fpf.org/blog/fpf-releases-generative-ai-internal-policy-checklist-to-guide-development-of-policies-to-promote-responsible-employee-use-of-generative-ai-tools/>

A. Ezzell, “Generative AI for Organizational Use: Internal Policy Checklist,” *Future of Privacy Forum* (July 2023), <https://fpf.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/07/Generative-AI-Checklist.pdf>

B. Fernandez, “Generative AI Promises an Economic Revolution. Managing the Disruption Will Be Helpful,” *Wall St. J.* (Aug. 28, 2023), <https://www.wsj.com/articles/generative-ai-promises-an-economic-revolution-managing-the-disruption-will-be-crucial-b1c0f054#:~:text=Generative%20AI%2C%20by%20some%20estimates,is%20a%20more%20complicated%20story.>

S. Frenkel & S.A. Thompson, “‘Not for Machines to Harvest:’ Data Revolts Break Out Against A.I.,” *N.Y. Times* (July 15, 2023), <https://www.nytimes.com/2023/07/15/technology/artificial-intelligence-models-chat-data.html>

U. Gal, “Chat GPT is a Data Privacy Nightmare, and We Ought to be Concerned,” *The Conversation* (Updated Feb. 9, 2023), <https://theconversation.com/chatgpt-is-a-data-privacy-nightmare-if-youve-ever-posted-online-you-ought-to-be-concerned-199283>

J. Gatto, “5 Things Corporate Boards Need to Know About Generative AI Risk Management,” *SheppardMullin Alert* (Sept. 13, 2023), <https://s3.amazonaws.com/documents.lexology.com/18e4e2b5-91bb-4116-b055-25765ec36547.pdf?AWSAccessKeyId=AKIAVYILUYJ754JTDY6T&Expires=1704041722&Signature=983DvWWJJziEw4eylM3XSugwTS8%3D#page=1>

D. Gewirtz, “If You Use AI-Generated Code, What’s Your Liability Exposure?” *ZDNet* (June 20, 2023), <https://www.zdnet.com/article/if-you-use-ai-generated-code-whats-your-liability-exposure/>

I Gottlieb, “Corporate AI Legal Policies Race to Keep Up with Technology,” *Bloomberg Law* (updated Aug. 31, 2023), <https://news.bloomberglaw.com/artificial-intelligence/corporate-ai-legal-policies-race-to-keep-up-with-technology>

I Gottlieb, “By the Numbers: Six AI Questions for In-House Counsel in 2024,” *Bloomberg Law* (Jan. 2, 2024), <https://news.bloomberglaw.com/business-and-practice/by-the-numbers-six-ai-questions-for-in-house-counsel-in-2024>

J.C.P. Goldberg, “Defamation by Hallucination,” *Jotwell* (Nov. 14, 2023), <https://torts.jotwell.com/defamation-by-hallucination/>. THIS IS A REVIEW OF THE VOLOKH ARTICLE CITED BELOW.

E. Goldman, “Web Scraping for Me, But Not for Thee,” *Tech. & Mkt’ing Blog* (Aug. 24, 2023), <https://blog.ericgoldman.org/archives/2023/08/web-scraping-for-me-but-not-for-thee-guest-blog-post.htm#:~:text=The%20idea%20behind%20this%20legal,and%20an%20element%20of%20damages.>

K. Grossenbacher, “Employers Should Consider These Risks When Employees Use ChatGPT,” *Bloomberg Law* (Feb. 16, 2023), <https://news.bloomberglaw.com/us-law-week/employers-should-consider-these-risks-when-employees-use-chatgpt>

K. Hao, “What is ChatGPT? What to Know About the AI Chatbot That Will Power Microsoft Bing,” *Fox Business* (Feb. 10, 2023), <https://www.foxbusiness.com/technology/what-is-chatgpt-what-to-know-about-the-ai-chatbot-that-will-power-microsoft-bing>

R. Heath & S. Fischer, “Newsrooms Grapple with Rules for AI,” *AXIOS* (Aug. 22, 2023), <https://www.axios.com/2023/08/22/ai-rules-newsrooms-training-data>

B. Heidelberger, “Artificial Intelligence Terms of SAG-AFTRA TV Theatrical Contract,” *Loeb & Loeb* (Nov. 13, 2023), <https://quicktakes.loeb.com/post/102isht/artificial-intelligence-terms-of-sag-aftra-tv-theatrical-contract>

C. Higgins, “Should My Company Use ChatGPT for Commercial Use?” *Bernstein Shur* (Nov. 9, 2023), <https://www.bernsteinshur.com/what/news/should-my-company-use-chatgpt-for-commercial-use/>

K. Hirsh-Pasek & E. Blinkoff, “ChatGPT: Educational Friend or Foe?” *Brookings* (Jan. 9, 2023), <https://www.brookings.edu/blog/education-plus-development/2023/01/09/chatgpt-educational-friend-or-foe/>

J.D. Horgan, “6 Contract Considerations for Generative Artificial Intelligence Providers,” *Publications* (Koley Jessen: Nov. 20, 2023), <https://www.koleyjessen.com/newsroom-publications-contract-considerations-generative-ai-providers>

C.T. Howell, “The Most Critical Factors for AI Legal Compliance: Transparency and Explainability” (Foley & Lardner: Sept. 18, 2023), <https://www.foley.com/insights/publications/2023/09/critical-factors-ai-legal-compliance-transparency/>

IAPP, “Artificial Intelligence Resource Center,” https://iapp.org/resources/topics/artificial-intelligence-1/?mkt_tok=MTM4LUVaTS0wNDIAAAGJ0UnTxcCgbEji10QiOfOF0Lgvj7m1_5uXC5UiY27kjMJDUjgr0bvJc8nuknLUGklgtr1g0i-mTZl6fZcPFU2_nckKYn8ZAtMjTwONdnSVm3at

White Paper, “AI at Work: Navigating the Legal Landscape of Automated Decision-Making Tools in Employment,” *Jones Day* (July 2023), <https://www.jonesday.com/en/insights/2023/07/ai-at-work-automated-decisionmaking-tools-in-employment>

A. Kelly, “Exploring the Use of ChatGPT by Damages Experts,” *HKA* (June 15, 2023), <https://www.hka.com/exploring-the-use-of-chatgpt-by-damages-experts/#:~:text=Efficiency%20and%20speed%20%E2%80%93%20ChatGPT%20can,guidance%20and%20generate%20relevant%20text.>

S.M. Kelly, “ChatGPT creator rolls out ‘imperfect’ tool to help teachers spot potential cheating,” *CNN Business* (Feb. 1, 2023), <https://www.cnn.com/2023/01/31/tech/chatgpt-check-tool/index.html>

C.F. Kerry, “How Privacy Legislation Can Help Address AI,” *Brookings* (July 7, 2023), <https://www.brookings.edu/articles/how-privacy-legislation-can-help-address-ai/>

C. Keyser, “You Can’t Govern AI Without Governing Data: Why Data Governance is Key to LLM Safety,” *Medium* (June 27, 2023), <https://coreykeyser.medium.com/you-cant-govern-ai-without-governing-data-27bb88d8f9ea>

T. Kneese, “Using Generative AI to Resurrect the Dead Will Create a Burden for the Living,” *Wired* (Aug. 21, 2023), <https://www.wired.com/story/using-generative-ai-to-resurrect-the-dead-will-create-a-burden-for-the-living/>

W. Knight, “ChatGPT Has Investors Drooling, But Can It Bring Home the Bacon?” *Ars Technica* (Jan. 15, 2023), <https://arstechnica.com/information-technology/2023/01/chatgpt-has-investors-drooling-but-can-it-bring-home-the-bacon/>

W. Knight, “A New Attack Impacts Major AI Chatbots – and No One Knows How to Stop It,” *Wired* (Aug. 1, 2023), <https://www.wired.com/story/ai-adversarial-attacks/>

W. Knight, “Researchers Figure Out How to Make AI Misbehave, Serve Up Prohibited Content,” *Ars Technica* (Aug. 2, 2023), <https://arstechnica.com/ai/2023/08/researchers-figure-out-how-to-make-ai-misbehave-serve-up-prohibited-content/> See Zou below.

W. Knight, “The Myth of ‘Open Source’ AI,” *Wired* (Aug. 24, 2023), <https://www.wired.com/story/the-myth-of-open-source-ai/>

W. Knight, “AI Chatbots Can Guess Your Personal Information from What You Type,” *WIRED* (Oct. 17, 2023), <https://www.wired.com/story/ai-chatbots-can-guess-your-personal-information/>

J. Kraemer & A. Green, “Six Ways Generative AI Can Transform Corporate Operating Models,” *AlixPartners* (Nov. 29, 2023), <https://insights.alixpartners.com/post/102iu18/six-ways-generative-ai-can-transform-corporate-operating-models#:~:text=As%20we%20consider%20here%2C%20AI,Processes%2C%20and%20Tools%20and%20Technology.>

M. Krieger, “ChatGPT in E-Discovery,” *JDSUPRA* (Feb. 2, 2023), <https://www.jdsupra.com/legalnews/chatgpt-in-e-discovery-8784592/>

I Kullgren, “LA Strikes Embody Widespread Anxiety Over Worker Pay, Rise of AI,” *Bloomberg Law* (July 26, 2023), <https://news.bloomberglaw.com/daily-labor-report/la-strikes-embody-widespread-anxiety-over-worker-pay-rise-of-a>

K.D. Kumayama & P. Chiruvolu, “Risks of Unleashing AI on Company Data,” *Reuters* (Dec. 22, 2023), <https://www.reuters.com/legal/legalindustry/risks-unleashing-generative-ai-company-data-2023-12-22/>

J. Lehman & M. Crisanti, “Generative AI’s Second Act,” *AlixPartners* (Nov. 28, 2023), <https://insights.alixpartners.com/post/102ismh/generative-ais-second-act#:~:text=While%20the%20first%20act%20involved,develop%20plans%20to%20generate%20answers.>

Y. Levin, “Artificial Intelligence and the Law of the Horse,” *Wall St. J.* (Dec. 21, 2023), <https://www.wsj.com/articles/artificial-intelligence-and-the-law-of-the-horse-regulation-ai-policy-25e70fc8>

S. Lohr, “Can A.I. Invent?” *N.Y. Times* (July 15, 2023), <https://www.nytimes.com/2023/07/15/technology/ai-inventor-patents.html>

F. Manjoo, “A Creator (Me) Made a Masterpiece with A.I.,” *N.Y. Times* (Aug. 25, 2023), <https://www.nytimes.com/2023/08/25/opinion/ai-art-intellectual-property.html>

McKinsey & Co., “What is Prompt Engineering?” (Sept. 22, 2023), <https://www.mckinsey.com/featured-insights/mckinsey-explainers/what-is-prompt-engineering>

L. CM Melchionna, “Bias and Fairness in Artificial Intelligence,” *NYSBA* (June 29, 2023), <https://nysba.org/bias-and-fairness-in-artificial-intelligence/>

K. Miller, “Introducing the Foundation Model Transparency Index,” *Stanford HAI* (Oct. 18, 2023), <https://hai.stanford.edu/news/introducing-foundation-model-transparency-index>

E. Mollick, "ChatGPT is a Tipping Point for AI," *Harvard Bus. Rev.* (Dec. 14, 2022), <https://hbr.org/2022/12/chatgpt-is-a-tipping-point-for-ai>

T. Monnay, "Deepfakes Political Ads Are 'Wild West' for Campaign Lawyers," *Bloomberg Law* (Sept. 5, 2023), <https://news.bloomberglaw.com/business-and-practice/deepfake-political-ads-are-wild-west-for-campaign-lawyers?source=newsletter&item=body-link®ion=text-section>

S. Morrison, "Is the AI Boom Already Over?" *VOX* (Aug. 19, 2023), <https://www.vox.com/technology/2023/8/19/23837705/openai-chatgpt-microsoft-bing-google-generating-less-interest>

M. Murgia, "AI Firms Working on 'Constitutions' to Keep AI from Spewing Toxic Content," *Ars Technica* (Oct. 6, 2023), <https://arstechnica.com/ai/2023/10/ai-firms-working-on-constitutions-to-keep-ai-from-spewing-toxic-content/>

M. Muro & J. Jacobs, "New Data Shows That Without Intervention, Generative AI Jobs Will Continue to Cluster in the Same Big Tech Hubs," *Brookings* (Oct. 2, 2023), <https://www.brookings.edu/articles/new-data-shows-that-without-intervention-generative-ai-jobs-will-continue-to-cluster-in-the-same-big-tech-hubs/>

N. Nield, "How to Use Generative A.I. Tools While Still Protecting Your Privacy," *Wired* (July 16, 2023), <https://www.wired.com/story/how-to-use-ai-tools-protect-privacy/>

T. O'Connor, "AI ... Is It Safe?" *NOBA Blog* (Apr. 18, 2023), <https://www.neworleansbar.org/?pg=news&blAction=showEntry&blogEntry=90403>

T. O'Connor, "Has Legal Artificial Intelligence (AI) Become a Flight Club?" *DigitalWarRoom* (Dec. 2, 2019), <https://www.digitalwarroom.com/blog/is-ai-the-fight-club-of-legal-technology-and-ediscovery>

Y. Park, “Companies Grapple with Limits in Bringing AI into the Boardroom,” *Bloomberg Law* (Aug. 11, 2023), <https://news.bloomberglaw.com/artificial-intelligence/companies-grapple-with-limits-in-bringing-ai-into-the-boardroom>

M. Perault, “Section 230 Won’t Protect ChatGPT,” *LAWFARE* (Feb. 23, 2023), <https://www.lawfareblog.com/section-230-wont-protect-chatgpt#:~:text=from%20legal%20liability%3F-Courts%20will%20likely%20find%20that%20ChatGPT%20and%20other%20LLMs%20are,rather%20than%20interactive%20computer%20services>.

J.E. Pierce & J.B. Cahill, “Generative AI – Copyright Overview Part 1” (Venable: Feb. 8, 2023), <https://www.venable.com/insights/publications/2023/02/generative-ai-copyright-overview-part-1>

J.E. Pierce & J.B. Cahill, “Generative AI – Copyright Overview Part 2” (Venable: Feb, 15, 2023), <https://www.venable.com/insights/publications/2023/02/generative-ai-copyright-overview-part-2>

I Poritz, “Open Ai’s Legal Woes Driven by Unclear Mesh of Web-Scraping Laws,” *Bloomberg Law* (July 5, 2023), <https://news.bloomberglaw.com/ip-law/openai-legal-woes-driven-by-unclear-mesh-of-web-scraping-laws>

I Poritz, “AI’s Thorny Copyright Questions Create International Patchwork,” *Bloomberg Law* (Dec. 27, 2023), <https://news.bloomberglaw.com/ip-law/ai-thorny-copyright-questions-create-international-patchwork>

I Poritz, “OpenAI Faces Existential Threat in New York Times Copyright Suit,” *Bloomberg Law* (Dec. 29, 2023), <https://news.bloomberglaw.com/ip-law/openai-faces-existential-threat-in-new-york-times-copyright-suit>

G.M. Ramsey & J. Kingsolver, “Can AI Defame? We May Know Sooner Than You Think,” *Client Alert* (Crowell: Sept. 21, 2023), <https://www.crowell.com/en/insights/client-alerts/can-ai-defame-we-may-know-sooner-than-you-think>

R. Reid, “Licensing Generative AI Tools Gains Momentum but Pitfalls Abound,” *Bloomberg Law* (Dec. 29, 2023), <https://news.bloomberglaw.com/us-law-week/licensing-generative-ai-tools-gains-momentum-but-pitfalls-abound?source=newsletter&item=read-text®ion=digest>

A.S. Solanski, “Using AI to Analyze Contracts,” *LegaMart* (Updated Nov. 23, 2023), <https://legamart.com/articles/using-ai-to-analyze-contracts/>

J. Steeve & J.W. Gordon, “Generative AI is Here and Ready to Disrupt,” *Riley Safer Holmes & Cancila Insight* (Aug. 24, 2023), <https://www.rshc-law.com/news/news-detail/2023/08/28/generative-ai-is-here-and-ready-to-disrupt>

A Stivers, “Generative AI and Guidance on Abusiveness May Illuminate a New Focus on ‘Dark Patterns’ for Enforcement and Related Consumer Research,” *The Antitrust Source* (ABA Antitrust Section: Aug. 30, 2023), https://www.americanbar.org/groups/antitrust_law/resources/source/2023-august/generative-ai-guidance-on-abusiveness/

N. Suggs & P. Venables, “Shared Fate: Protecting Customers with Generative AI Indemnification,” *Google Cloud* (Oct. 12, 2023), <https://cloud.google.com/blog/products/ai-machine-learning/protecting-customers-with-generative-ai-indemnification>

I Syed & E. Cole, “From Singularity to Signal: Innocence Clinics and the Integrity of the Legal System,” (ABA: Aug. 15, 2023), https://www.americanbar.org/groups/litigation/publications/litigation_journal/2

[022-23/summer/from-singularity-signal-innocence-clinics-and-integrity-the-legal-system/#:~:text=In%20the%20innocence%20clinic%2C%20we,to%20learn%20fro m%20their%20mistakes](#)

K. Tornone, “7 Things to Include in a Workplace Generative AI Policy,” *HRDIVE* (Nov. 3, 2023), <https://www.hrdiver.com/news/generative-AI-employee-handbook-policy/698680/>

R. Tracy & I. Yu, “Some of the Thorniest Questions About AI Will Be Answered in Court,” *Wall St. J.* (Aug. 23, 2023), <https://www.wsj.com/tech/ai/some-of-the-thorniest-questions-about-ai-will-be-answered-in-court-e7fd444b>

C.J. Valente, *et al.*, “Recent Trends in Generative Artificial Intelligence Litigation in the United States,” *US Litig. And Dispute Resolution Alert* (K&L Gates: Sept. 5, 2023), <https://www.klgates.com/Recent-Trends-in-Generative-Artificial-Intelligence-Litigation-in-the-United-States-9-5-2023#:~:text=In%20addition%2C%20while%20the%20current,generative%20AI%20products%20or%20solutions.>

J. Vincent, “7 Problems Facing Bing, Bard, and the Future of AI Search,” *The Verge* (Feb. 9, 2023), <https://www.theverge.com/2023/2/9/23592647/ai-search-bing-bard-chatgpt-microsoft-google-problems-challenges>

A Vittorio, “AI ‘Watermarking’ Tools Emerging to Tag Machine-Made Content,” *Bloomberg Law* (Aug. 7, 2023), <https://news.bloomberglaw.com/privacy-and-data-security/ai-watermarking-tools-emerging-to-tag-machine-made-content>

E. Volokh, “Large Libel Models? Liability for AI Output,” 3 *J. Free Speech L.* 489 (2023), https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=4546063

J. Warner, “The ChatGPT Reincarnation of the Marquis de Sade is Coming,” *WIRED* (Feb. 21, 2023), <https://www.wired.com/story/generative-ai-marquis-de-sade-chatgpt/>

K. Wiggers, “Are AI Models Doomed to Always Hallucinate?” *TechCrunch* (Sept. 4, 2023), <https://techcrunch.com/2023/09/04/are-language-models-doomed-to-always-hallucinate/>

M. Williams & A. Heyerick, “Does Using CHATGPT Count as a Public Disclosure?” (Marks & Clark: Jan. 30, 2023), <https://reacts.marks-clerk.com/post/102i6ex/does-using-chatgpt-count-as-a-public-disclosure#page=1>

K. Wiggins, “The Current Legal Cases Against Generative AI are Just the Beginning,” *TechCrunch* (Jan. 27, 2023), <https://techcrunch.com/2023/01/27/the-current-legal-cases-against-generative-ai-are-just-the-beginning/#:~:text=Microsoft%2C%20GitHub%20and%20OpenAI%20are,code%20snippets%20without%20providing%20credit.>

S. Witley, “X Plans for AI on Collision Course With Latest US Privacy Laws,” *Bloomberg Law* (Sept. 1, 2023), <https://news.bloomberglaw.com/privacy-and-data-security/x-corp-s-new-privacy-policy-is-latest-to-put-ai-in-spotlight?source=newsletter&item=read-text®ion=digest>

L. Young, “Chatbots Are Trying to Figure Out Where Your Shipments Are,” *Wall St. J.* (Aug. 30, 2023), <https://www.wsj.com/articles/chatbots-are-trying-to-figure-out-where-your-shipments-are-7f7f9ee7>

A Zou, *et al.*, “Universal and Transferable Adversarial Attacks on Aligned Language Models” (July 28, 2023), <https://llm-attacks.org/>

GAI AND THE PRACTICE OF LAW

MillerKing, LLC v. DoNotPay, Inc., Case No. 3:23-CV-863 (S.D. Ill. Nov, 17, 2023)

This case pits real lawyers against a robot lawyer. Defendant DoNotPay, Inc. ('DNP'), is an online subscription service that touts its robot lawyer's ability to allow consumers to '[f]ight corporations, beat bureaucracy and sue anyone at the press of a button.' But, DNP and its robot lawyer are not actually licensed to practice law. So, Plaintiff MillerKing, Inc. ('MK'), a small Chicago law firm that claims to be a direct competitor of DNP, has sued DNP for false association and false advertising under the Lanham Act and Illinois state law.

Now pending before the Court is DNP's motion to dismiss under Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 12(b)(1) and 12(b)(6). ***. DNP essentially asks MK, in the words of Justice Antonin Scalia, 'What's it to you?' More precisely, how has DNP's conduct injured MK such that it has standing under Article III of the U.S. Constitution to sue DNP in federal court? This Court finds that MK has not adequately alleged such an injury and, thus, its complaint must be dismissed for lack of standing.

Principles (Version 0.2), *MIT Task Force on Responsible Use of Generative AI for Law* (June 2, 2023), <https://law.mit.edu/ai>

K. Basu, "Immigration Lawyers Look to AI to Make Rote Work Faster, Cheaper," *Bloomberg Law* (Sept. 28, 2023), <https://news.bloomberglaw.com/us-law-week/immigration-lawyers-look-to-ai-to-make-rote-work-faster-cheaper>

M.L. Bilek & D. Merritt, "ChatGPT Almost Passed the Bar, But Competent Lawyers Do Much More," *Bloomberg Law* (Feb. 13, 2023), <https://news.bloomberglaw.com/business-and-practice/chatgpt-almost-passed-the-bar-but-competent-lawyers-do-much-more>

N. Black, "AI Ethics Guidance Arrives Amid Rapid Legaltech Deployments," *Above the Law* (Nov. 30, 2023), <https://abovethelaw.com/2023/11/ai-ethics-guidance-arrives-amid-rapid-legaltech-deployments/#:~:text=COPRAC%20advises%20that%20lawyers%20may,its%20su%20bmission%20to%20a%20court>.

D. Braff, "Office Aide," *ABA J.* (Oct. 1, 2023), <https://www.abajournal.com/magazine/article/some-attorneys-are-using-chatgpt-to-help-them-practice-more-efficiently>

D. Bruce, *et al.*, "Unlocking the Potential of Generative AI: Three Key Questions for Government Agencies," *McKinsey & Company* (Dec. 7, 2023),

<https://www.mckinsey.com/industries/public-sector/our-insights/unlocking-the-potential-of-generative-ai-three-key-questions-for-government-agencies>

C. Casey, “How I learned to Stop Worrying and Love Legal ESI,” *reveal data* (Sept. 16, 2022), <https://resource.revealdata.com/en/blog/how-i-learned-to-stop-worrying-and-love-legal-ai>

T.J. Chinnici, “Lawyer Bot Short-Circuited by Class Action Alleging Unauthorized Practice of Law,” *Wilson Elser* (Mar. 17, 2023), https://www.wilsonelser.com/news_and_insights/insights/4845-lawyer-bot-short-circuited-by-class-action-alleging

“What is AI and How Can Law Firms Use It?” (Clio: undated), <https://www.clio.com/resources/ai-for-lawyers/lawyer-ai/>

P. Cihon & M. Demirer, “How AI-Powered Software Development May Affect Labor Markets,” *Brookings* (Aug. 1, 2023), [https://www.brookings.edu/articles/how-ai-powered-software-development-may-affect-labor-markets/#:~:text=Earlier%20AI%20and%20automation%20technologies,and%20designers%20\(Felten%20et%20al.](https://www.brookings.edu/articles/how-ai-powered-software-development-may-affect-labor-markets/#:~:text=Earlier%20AI%20and%20automation%20technologies,and%20designers%20(Felten%20et%20al.)

“The Promise of AI,” Part 5 of “2023 Legal Trends Report,” *Clio*, <https://www.clio.com/resources/legal-trends/>

K. Crutchfield, “ChatGPT – Are the Robots Finally Here?” *Above the Law* (Jan. 10, 2023), <https://abovethelaw.com/2023/01/chatgpt-are-the-robots-finally-here/>

“Generative AI: A Guide for Corporate Legal Departments,” *Deloitte Legal* (June 2023), <https://www.deloitte.com/global/en/services/legal/perspectives/generative-ai.html>

G. De Vynck, “ChatGPT ‘Hallucinates.’ Some Researchers Worry It Isn’t Fixable,” *Washington Post* (updated May 30, 2023), <https://www.washingtonpost.com/technology/2023/05/30/ai-chatbots-chatgpt-bard-trustworthy/>

B. Edwards, “‘Please Slow Down’ – The 7 Biggest AI Stories of 2022,” *Ars Technica* (Dec. 28, 2022), <https://arstechnica.com/information-technology/2022/12/please-slow-down-the-7-biggest-ai-stories-of-2022/>

L.A. Eramo, “Leveraging ChatGPT and Generative AI in Healthcare Analytics,” *J. of AHIMA* (June 27, 2023), <https://journal.ahima.org/page/leveraging-chatgpt-and-generative-ai-in-healthcare-analytics>

M. Germann, “Vetting AI for Attorneys,” Iowa State Bar Ass’n, (undated), https://www.iowabar.org/?pg=WP_vettingAI#:~:text=Generative%20AI%20models%20can%20help,redact%20sensitive%20or%20privileged%20information.

G. Exall, “Using AI to Search for Case Law and Make Submissions: It Makes Cases Up – It Really Does,” *Civil Litig. Brief* (Dec. 7, 2023), <https://www.civillitigationbrief.com/2023/12/07/using-ai-to-search-for-case-law-and-make-submissions-it-makes-cases-up-it-really-does/> [This is part of “Updates and Commentary on Civil Procedure, by a Barrister of the Kings Chambers, Leeds, Manchester & Birmingham. 4-5 Gray's Inn Square, London”].

D. Gilbert, “Microsoft’s AI Chatbot Replies to Election Questions with Conspiracies, Fake Scandals, and Lies,” *WIRED* (Dec. 15, 2023), <https://www.wired.com/story/microsoft-ai-copilot-chatbot-election-conspiracy/>

I Gottlieb, “Law Firms Wrestle with How Much to Tell Clients About AI Use,” *Bloomberg Law* (Nov. 29, 2023), <https://news.bloomberglaw.com/business-and-practice/law-firms-wrestle-with-how-much-to-tell-clients-about-ai-use>

M. Haddad, “Generative AI and the Small Law Firm: Leveling the Playing Field,” *Thomson Reuters* (Oct. 19, 2023), <https://www.thomsonreuters.com/en-us/posts/legal/generative-ai-small-law-level-field/>

M. Hiltzik, “Opinion: Is ChatGPT’s Hype Outstanding Its Usefulness? *LA Times* (July 13, 2023), <https://www.latimes.com/business/story/2023-07-13/column-artificial-intelligence-chatbots-are-spreading-fast-but-hype-about-them-is-spreading-faster>

“Artificial Intelligence for Law Firms: A Practical and Tactical Guide,” *InfoTrack* (undated),

[https://info.abovethelaw.com/hubfs/Infotrack%202023%20Content%20Syndication/AI For Lawfirms ebook infotrack.pdf](https://info.abovethelaw.com/hubfs/Infotrack%202023%20Content%20Syndication/AI%20For%20Lawfirms%20ebook%20infotrack.pdf)

D. Jolly, “DLA Piper Audits the Robots as Big Law Digs into AI Work,” *Bloomberg Law* (Dec. 13, 2023), <https://news.bloomberglaw.com/artificial-intelligence/dla-piper-audits-the-robots-as-big-law-digs-into-ai-work>

Legal AI Update, “2023 Generative AI & The Legal Profession,” *LexisNexis* (Mar. 15, 2023), <https://www.lexisnexis.com/pdf/lexisnexis-legal-ai-sample-report.pdf>

S. Leeds, “Why Arizona State Law School Applicants May Use Generative AI,” *Bloomberg Law* (Aug. 10, 2023), <https://news.bloomberglaw.com/us-law-week/why-arizona-state-law-school-applicants-may-use-generative-ai>

C. Lew, “Will Legal Prompt Engineers Replace Lawyers?” *Forbes Business Council Post* (Sept. 21, 2023), https://www.google.com/search?q=C.+Lew%2C+%E2%80%9CWill+Legal+Prompt+Engineers+Replace+Lawyers%3F%E2%80%9D&oq=C.+Lew%2C+%E2%80%9CWill+Legal+Prompt+Engineers+Replace+Lawyers%3F%E2%80%9D&gs_lcrp=EgZjaHJvbWUyBggAEEUYODIBCDEwMjNqMGo3qAIAAsAIA&sourceid=chrome&ie=UTF-8

O.V. Mack, “Hit the Gas on AlaaS: Benefits Often Outweigh Legal Challenges,” *Above the Law* (Jan. 17, 2023), <https://abovethelaw.com/2023/01/hit-the-gas-on-aaas-benefits-often-outweigh-legal-challenges/>

I Marathe, “Generative AI May Worsen Access to Justice—At Least in the Short Term,” *Legaltech news* (ALM: Oct. 19, 2023), <https://www.law.com/legaltechnews/2023/10/19/generative-ai-may-worsen-access-to-justice-at-least-in-the-short-term/#:~:text=ANALYSIS-Generative%20AI%20May%20Worsen%20Access%20to%20Justice%E2%80%94At%20Least%20in,at%20the%20Masters%20Conference%202023.>

M. Maschke, *et al.*, “ChatGPT Is a Lot More Valuable to Lawyers Now,” *Attorney at Work* (Oct. 4, 2023), <https://www.attorneyatwork.com/chatgpt-for-lawyers/>

S.D. Nelson, *et al.*, “AI’s Impact on the Future of Law: Will Lawyers Survive?” *Above the Law* (Feb. 7, 2023), <https://abovethelaw.com/2023/02/ais-impact-on-the-future-of-law-will-lawyers-survive/>

“23 Legal Technology Insights for 2023,” *NetDocuments Annual Trend Report* (undated), <https://www.netdocuments.com/resource/23-insights-for-2023>

T. O’Connor, “Do We Really Need for AI for Ediscovery in Small Cases?, ” *NOBA Blog* (New Orleans Bar Ass’n Blog: Undated), <https://www.neworleansbar.org/?pg=news&blAction=showEntry&blogEntry=95834#:~:text=DO%20WE%20REALLY%20NEED%20AI%20FOR%20EDISCOVERY%20IN%20SMALL%20CASES%3F,-News%3A%20Committees&text=The%20short%20answer%20is%2C%20no,any%20question%20is%20%E2%80%9Cdepends%E2%80%9D.>

D. Patty, “An Assessment of the Artificial Intelligence Landscape for Lawyers,” *Phelps Dunbar* (Nov. 14, 2023), <https://www.phelps.com/insights/an-assessment-of-the-artificial-intelligence-landscape-for-lawyers.html>

N. Pierce & S. Goutos, “ChatGPT Doesn’t Have Ethical Obligations, But Attorneys Do,” (July 11, 2023), <https://news.bloomberglaw.com/us-law-week/chatgpt-doesnt-have-ethical-obligations-but-attorneys-do>

M. Reynolds, “How ChatGPT and Other AI Platforms Could Dramatically Reshape the Legal Industry,” *ABA J.* (June 1, 2023), <https://www.abajournal.com/magazine/article/how-chatgpt-and-other-ai-platforms-could-dramatically-reshape-the-legal-industry#:~:text=It%20can%20help%20with%20legal,on%20context%20and%20legal%20precedent.>

M. Reynolds, “LexisNexis and Thomson Reuters Publish Report on Lawyers’ Attitudes Toward AI,” *ABA J.* (Aug. 23, 2023), <https://www.abajournal.com/web/article/lexisnexis-and-thomson-reuters-publish-reports-on-lawyers-attitudes-toward-ai>

S. Regazzoni, “Navigating Ediscovery and AI in Legal Tech - 2023 Trends,” *JDSUPRA*, (Dec. 20, 2023), <https://www.jdsupra.com/legalnews/navigating-ediscovery-and-ai-in-legal-7714387/>

M. Reynolds, "Inside the Claims Against DoNotPay's Joshua Browder and the 'World's First Robot Lawyer,'" *ABA J.* (Dec. 1, 2023), <https://www.abajournal.com/magazine/article/inside-the-claims-against-donotpays-joshua-browder-and-the-worlds-first-robot-lawyer#:~:text=In%20her%20court%20filing%2C%20Tewson,of%20about%20%2436%20a%20person.%E2%80%9D>

C. Stokel-Walker, "Generative AI is Coming for the Lawyers," *WIRED* (Feb. 21, 2023), https://www.wired.com/story/chatgpt-generative-ai-is-coming-for-the-lawyers/?bxid=5cc9e1a43f92a477a0e8c3ef&cnid=54274653&esrc=OIDC_SELECT_ACCOUNT_PAGE&source=Email_0_EDT_WIR_NEWSLETTER_0_DAILY_ZZ&utm_brand=wired&utm_campaign=aud-dev&utm_content=WIR_Daily_022123&utm_mailing=WIR_Daily_022123&utm_medium=email&utm_source=nl&utm_term=P5

E. Sohn & J. Um, "Generative AI's Rise in Legal Space Could Be a Win for Clients," *Bloomberg Law* (Nov. 16, 2023), <https://news.bloomberglaw.com/us-law-week/generative-ais-rise-in-legal-space-could-be-a-win-for-clients>

V.J. Syracuse & A.C. Goldrich, "Using AI In Your Practice? Proceed with Caution," *NYSBA Latest News* (Aug. 7, 2023), <https://nysba.org/using-ai-in-your-practice-proceed-with-caution/#:~:text=All%20in%20all%2C%20while%20these,on%20the%20side%20of%20caution.>

J. Tredennick & W. Webber, "What Will Ediscovery Lawyers Do After ChatGPT?" (Merlin: Jan. 25, 2023), <https://www.merlin.tech/chatgpt-1/>

J. Tredennick & W W. Webber, "Will ChatGPT Replace Ediscovery Review Teams?" (Merlin: Feb. 21, 2023), <https://www.merlin.tech/gpt-review/>

"Attorneys and Algorithms: Generative AI, ChatGPT and the Future of Law," *UnitedLex* (undated), <https://unitedlex.com/insights/attorneys-amp-algorithms-generative-ai-chatgpt-and-the-future-of-law-white-paper/>

A. Valencia, “5 Reasons You Shouldn’t Use ChatGPT for Legal Website Content,” *Search Engine J.* (Aug. 10, 2023), <https://www.searchenginejournal.com/chatgpt-law-firm-website-content/490442/>

J. VillaSenor, “How AI Will Revolutionize the Practice of Law,” *Brookings TechTank* (Mar. 20, 2023), <https://www.brookings.edu/articles/how-ai-will-revolutionize-the-practice-of-law/#:~:text=AI%20can%20be%20used%20to,be%20much%20faster%20with%20AI.>

D. Wagner, “This Prolific LA Eviction Firm was Caught Faking Cases in Court. Did They Misuse AI?” *LAist* (Oct. 12, 2023), <https://laist.com/news/housing-homelessness/dennis-block-chatgpt-artificial-intelligence-ai-eviction-court-los-angeles-lawyer-sanction-housing-tenant-landlord>

GAI AND PARALEGALS

S. Grela, “Generative AI, Legal Technology, & Durable Skills – Why Paralegals Will Need All Three,” *Facts & Findings Q4* (NALA: Nov. 2023), <https://nala.org/generative-ai-legal-technology-durable-skills-q4-2023-facts-findings/>

R. Spiegel, “Will AI Replace Paralegals? How to Upskill in the Age of AI,” *Smokeball* (Oct. 8, 2023), <https://www.smokeball.com/blog/will-ai-replace-paralegals-how-to-upskill-in-the-age-of-ai#:~:text=Rather%20than%20replacing%20paralegals%2C%20AI,valuable%20members%20of%20legal%20teams.>

GAI AND LEGAL ETHICS

“ABA Issues Ethics Guidance for Lawyers’ Use of Legal Assistants” (ABA: June 7, 2023), <https://www.americanbar.org/news/abanews/aba-news-archives/2023/06/ethics-legal-assistants/>

Formal Ethics Opinion 506, ABA Standing Comm. on Ethics and Prof. Responsibility 506 (June 7, 2023), https://www.americanbar.org/content/dam/aba/administrative/professional_responsibility/ethics-opinions/aba-formal-opinion-506.pdf

Executive Summary, “Recommendations from Committee on Professional Responsibility and Conduct on Regulation of Use of Generative AI by Licensees” (Nov. 16, 2023), <https://board.calbar.ca.gov/docs/agendaitem/Public/agendaitem1000031754.pdf>:

“the chair of the Board of Trustees directed COPRAC, which is charged with studying and providing consultation and assistance to the Board on matters involving professional responsibility, to explore potential regulation of the ethical use of generative AI in the legal profession. The chair directed that *** COPRAC issue recommendations, which could include practical guidance, an advisory opinion or other resources, changes to the Rules of Professional Conduct or other rules or statutes, or other recommendations to ensure that AI is used competently and in compliance with the professional responsibility obligations of lawyers.”

“Proposed Advisory Opinion 24-1 Regarding Lawyers’ Use of Generative Artificial Intelligence – Official Notice” (Nov. 13, 2023), <https://www.floridabar.org/the-florida-bar-news/proposed-advisory-opinion-24-1-regarding-lawyers-use-of-generative-artificial-intelligence-official-notice/#:~:text=In%20sum%2C%20a%20lawyer%20may,with%20the%20lawyer's%20ethical%20obligations>. Conclusion to the proposed advisory opinion:

In sum, a lawyer may ethically utilize generative AI technologies but only to the extent that the lawyer can reasonably guarantee compliance with the lawyer’s ethical obligations. These obligations include the duties of confidentiality, avoidance of frivolous claims and contentions, candor to the tribunal, truthfulness in statements to others, avoidance of clearly excessive fees and costs, and compliance with restrictions on advertising for legal services. Lawyers should be cognizant that generative AI is still in its infancy and that these ethical concerns should not be treated as an exhaustive list. Rather, lawyers should continue to develop competency in their use of new technologies and the risks and benefits inherent in those technologies.

H. Gerzhoy, *et al.*, “AI and Legal Ethics: What Lawyers Need to Know,” *LexisNexis* (Current as of Apr. 18, 2023), <https://www.lexisnexis.com/pdf/practical-guidance/ai/ai-and-legal-ethics-what-lawyers-need-to-know.pdf>

GAI IN LAW SCHOOLS

J. Hill, “Law Students Will Gain Access to LexisNexis’ Generative Artificial Intelligence Platform,” *ABA J.* (Dec. 20, 2023), <https://www.abajournal.com/web/article/law-students-gain-access-to-lexis-ai-generative-ai#:~:text=Updated%3A%20LexisNexis%20announced%20Wednesday%20that,during%20the%20upcoming%20spring%20semester>.

M. Ma, “Legal Training Should Embrace Generative AI Large Language Models,” *Bloomberg Law* (Dec. 21, 2023), <https://news.bloomberglaw.com/us-law-week/legal-training-should-embrace-generative-ai-large-language-models>

S.F. Ward, “Some Law Schools Already Are Using ChatGPT to Teach Legal Research and Writing,” *A.B.A. J.* (June 1, 2023), <https://www.abajournal.com/magazine/article/some-law-schools-already-are-using-chatgpt-to-teach-legal-research-and-writing>

S.F. Ward, "If Law Schools Prohibit ChatGPT in Writing, Can They Back It Up?" *ABA J.* (Aug. 31, 2023), <https://www.abajournal.com/web/article/law-schools-may-try-to-prohibit-ai-technology-in-writing-but-enforcement-would-likely-be-difficult>

“INTERNATIONAL” AI

AI is not unique to the United States. Countries all over the world are dealing with it. Here is a sampling of what is being done:

N. Lomas, “Social Media Giants Urged to Tackle Data-Scraping Privacy Risks,” *TechCrunch* (Aug. 24, 2023), <https://techcrunch.com/2023/08/24/data-scraping-privacy-risks-joint-statement/>

Various Foreign Regulators, “Joint Statement on Data Scraping and the Protection of Privacy” (Aug. 24, 2023), see https://www.priv.gc.ca/en/opc-news/speeches/2023/js-dc_20230824/

M. Drake, *et al.*, “From Washington to Brussels: A Comparative look at the Biden Administration’s Executive Order and the EU’s AI Act,” *Inside Privacy* (Covington: Nov. 7, 2023), <https://www.insideprivacy.com/artificial-intelligence/from-washington-to-brussels-a-comparative-look-at-the-biden-administrations-executive-order-and-the-eus-ai-act/>

AEPD—EDPS Joint Paper, “10 Misunderstandings About Machine Learning” (European Data Protection Supervisor: Sept. 30, 2022), https://edps.europa.eu/data-protection/our-work/publications/papers/2022-09-20-aepd-edps-joint-paper-10-misunderstandings-about-machine-learning_en

“European Ethical Charter on the Use of Artificial Intelligence in Judicial Systems and Their Environment” (European Comm’n on the Efficiency of Justice: adopted Dec. 4, 2018), <https://rm.coe.int/presentation-note-en-for-publication-4-december-2018/16808f699d#:~:text=The%20%20E2%80%9CEuropean%20Ethical%20Charter%20on%20the%20use%20of,judicial%20decisions%20and%20data%2C%20based%20on%20AI%20techniques>

“Revised roadmap for ensuring an appropriate follow-up of the CEPEJ Ethical Charter on the use of artificial intelligence in judicial systems and their

environment,” *CEPEJ*(2021)16 (European Comm’n for the Efficiency of Justice: Dec. 9, 2021), [1680a4cf2f \(coe.int\)](https://coe.int)

“EDPB letter to the European Commission on adapting liability rules to the digital age and artificial intelligence (AI)” (European Data Protection Board: Feb. 22, 2022), https://edpb.europa.eu/our-work-tools/our-documents/letters/edpb-letter-european-commission-adapting-liability-rules_en

“Interim Guidance on Government Use of Public Generative AI Tools – November 2023” (Australian Government Architecture: Updated Nov. 22, 2023), <https://architecture.digital.gov.au/generative-ai>

“Canadian Guardrails for Generative AI – Code of Practice” (ISED Canada: modified Aug. 16, 2023), <https://ised-isde.canada.ca/site/ised/en/consultation-development-canadian-code-practice-generative-artificial-intelligence-systems/canadian-guardrails-generative-ai-code-practice>

“Guidance to Civil Servants on Use of Generative AI” (Central Digital & Data Office: Updated Sept. 29, 2023), <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/guidance-to-civil-servants-on-use-of-generative-ai#full-publication-update-history>

“Auditing Algorithms: The Existing Landscape, Role of Regulators and Future Outlook” (Digital Regulation Cooperation Forum: published Apr. 28, 2022), <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/findings-from-the-drcf-algorithmic-processing-workstream-spring-2022/auditing-algorithms-the-existing-landscape-role-of-regulators-and-future-outlook>

“Benefits and Harms of Algorithms: A Shared Perspective from the Four Digital Regulators” (Digital Regulation Cooperation Forum: published Apr. 28, 2022), <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/findings-from-the-drcf->

[algorithmic-processing-workstream-spring-2022/the-benefits-and-harms-of-algorithms-a-shared-perspective-from-the-four-digital-regulators](#)

World Health Organization, “Ageism in Artificial Intelligence for Health,” *WHO Policy Brief* (Feb. 9, 2022), [https://www.who.int/news/item/09-02-2022-ensuring-artificial-intelligence-\(ai\)-technologies-for-health-benefit-older-people](https://www.who.int/news/item/09-02-2022-ensuring-artificial-intelligence-(ai)-technologies-for-health-benefit-older-people)

B. Edwards, “‘Catastrophic’ AI Harms Among Warnings in Declaration by 28 Nations,” *Ars Technica* (Nov. 1, 2023), <https://arstechnica.com/information-technology/2023/11/catastrophic-ai-harms-among-warnings-in-declaration-signed-by-28-nations/>

K.J. Chandler, “China Finalizes New AI Rules as the Global Race to Regulate AI Intensifies,” *Resources* (Benesch: Sept. 5, 2023), <https://www.beneschlaw.com/resources/china-finalizes-new-ai-rules-as-the-global-race-to-regulate-ai-intensifies.html>

C. Duffy & K. Uzquiano, “Bot or Not? How to Tell When You’re Reading Something Written by AI,” *CNN* (July 11, 2023), <https://www.cnn.com/interactive/2023/07/business/detect-ai-text-human-writing/>

B. Evans, *et al.*, “An Update on Artificial Intelligence: A US Executive Order, a UK Summit and a Plethora of Letters, Codes and Resolutions,” *King & Wood Mallesons* (Nov. 15, 2023), <https://www.kwm.com/us/en/insights/latest->

[thinking/an-update-on-artificial-intelligence-a-us-executive-order-a-uk-summit-and-a-plethora-of-letters-codes-and-resolutions.html](#)

A Faiola, C. Zakrzewski, & B. Rios, “E.U. Reaches Deal on Landmark AI Bill. Racing Ahead of U.S.,” *Washington Post* (Dec. 8, 2023),
<https://www.washingtonpost.com/technology/2023/12/08/ai-act-regulation-eu/>

H. Farrell, *et al.*, “Spirals of Delusion: How AI Distorts Decision-Making and Makes Dictators More Dangerous,” *Foreign Affairs* (Aug. 31, 2022),
<https://www.foreignaffairs.com/world/spirals-delusion-artificial-intelligence-decision-making>

S. Gong & M/ Parsons, “China Finalizes Generative AI Regulation” (Aug. 30, 2023),
<https://www.engage.hoganlovells.com/knowledgeservices/news/china-finalizes-generative-ai-regulation>

H. Farah, “Court of Appeal Judge Praises ‘Jolly Useful’ ChatGPT After Asking It for Legal Summary,” *The Guardian* (Sept. 15, 2023),
<https://www.theguardian.com/technology/2023/sep/15/court-of-appeal-judge-praises-jolly-useful-chatgpt-after-asking-it-for-legal-summary#:~:text=3%20months%20old-,Court%20of%20appeal%20judge%20praises%20'jolly%20useful'%20ChatGPT%20after,asking%20it%20for%20legal%20summary&text=A%20court%20of%20appeal%20judge,artificial%20intelligence%20%E2%80%9Cjolly%20useful%E2%80%9D.>

V. Hordem, “The UK’s Proposed Regulatory AI Principles of Transparency, Explainability and Fairness,” *Taylor Wessing* (July 10, 2023),
<https://www.taylorwessing.com/en/global-data-hub/2023/july---ai-and-data/the-uks-proposed-regulatory-ai-principles-of-transparency-explainability-and-fairness>

A. Kremer, *et al.*, “As Gen AI Advances, Regulators—and Risk Functions—Rush to Keep Pace,” *Risk & Resilience Practice* (McKinsey & Company: Dec. 21, 2023), <https://www.mckinsey.com/capabilities/risk-and-resilience/our-insights/as-gen-ai-advances-regulators-and-risk-functions-rush-to-keep-pace>

Centre for Information Policy Leadership, “Ten Recommendations for Global AI Regulation,” (Hunton Andrews Kurth: Oct. 2023), https://www.informationpolicycentre.com/uploads/5/7/1/0/57104281/cipl_ten_recommendations_global_ai_regulation_oct2023.pdf

B.C. Larsen, “The Geopolitics of AI and the Rise of Digital Sovereignty,” *Brookings* (Dec. 8, 2022), <https://www.brookings.edu/research/the-geopolitics-of-ai-and-the-rise-of-digital-sovereignty/>

N. Lomas, “ChatGPT-maker OpenAI Accused of String of Data Protection Breaches in GDPR Complaint Filed by Privacy Research,” *TechCrunch* (Aug. 30, 2023), https://techcrunch.com/2023/08/30/chatgpt-maker-openai-accused-of-string-of-data-protection-breaches-in-gdpr-complaint-filed-by-privacy-researcher/?guccounter=1&guce_referrer=aHR0cHM6Ly93d3cuZ29vZ2xILmNvbS8&guce_referrer_sig=AQAAAALynyl57v2agN0Wx501gVOsSn62obRkemhHRBTr6pdZaM7-C9QHVogJTOKl8RvUZmiMk-bUP-RgPb9YRyFJnkbRRJyLXf0Qoi2nQ6-tY3HoDafvUGsgbJzA-oH9ApSGxB3h9ZwW wc8UJe7-38gCdzC29wrXEb ceDxXyyEWC

M. MacCarthy, “The US and Its Allies Should Engage with China on AI Law and Policy,” *Brookings* (Oct. 19, 2023), <https://www.brookings.edu/articles/the-us-and-its-allies-should-engage-with-china-on-ai-law-and-policy/>

News Media Alliance, “Global Principles on Artificial Intelligence” (Sept. 6, 2023), <https://www.newsmediaalliance.org/global-principles-on-artificial-intelligence-ai/>

M.L. Paul, “A Brazilian City Passed a Law About Water Meters. ChatGPT Wrote It,” *Washington Post* (Dec. 4, 2023), <https://www.washingtonpost.com/nation/2023/12/04/ai-written-law-porto-alegre-brazil/>

S. Pearson & L. Magalhaes, “The City That’s Trying to Replace Politicians with Computers (It’s Working),” *Wall St. J.* (Dec. 22, 2023), <https://www.wsj.com/tech/politican-ramiro-rosario-artificial-intelligence-brazil-82ca338d>

M. Stassen, *et al.*, “European Data Protection Supervisor Releases New Opinion on the EU’s Proposed AI Act,” *Data Privacy Insights* (Crowell: Nov. 13, 2023), <https://www.crowell.com/en/insights/client-alerts/european-data-protection-supervisor-releases-new-opinion-on-the-eus-proposed-ai-act#:~:text=The%20EDPS%20emphasizes%20that%20the,engaging%20in%20'forum%20shopping'>.

P. Stockburger, “US Businesses That Prepare for EU AI Act Will Have an Advantage,” *Dentons* (Dec. 20, 2023), <https://www.dentons.com/en/insights/articles/2023/december/20/us-businesses-that-prepare-for-eu-ai-act-will-have-an-advantage#:~:text=Have%20an%20Advantage-,US%20Businesses%20That%20Prepare%20for%20EU%20AI%20Act%20Will%20Have,for%20general%2Dpurpose%20AI%20use.&text=The%20European%20Parliament%2C%20European%20Council,Commission%20reached%20consensus1%20Dec.>

C. Stupp, “Privacy Regulators Step Up Oversight of AI Use in Europe,” *Wall St. J.* (Feb. 16, 2023), <https://www.wsj.com/articles/privacy-regulators-step-up-oversight-of-ai-use-in-europe-b1a894b9#:~:text=Growth%20of%20AI%20business%20applications,open%20dedicated%20units%2C%20hire%20staff&text=European%20privacy%20regulators%20are%20intensifying,crack%20down%20on%20data%20violations.>

UNESCO, “Artificial Intelligence: “Examples of Ethical Dilemmas,” Sharing Humanity (last update: April 21, 2023), <https://www.unesco.org/en/artificial-intelligence/recommendation-ethics/cases#ai-in-the-court-of%20law>

S.B. Vale & G. Zanfir-Fortuna, “Automated Decision-Making Under the GDPR: Practical Cases from Courts and Data Protection Authorities” (Future of Privacy Forum: May 2022), <https://fpf.org/blog/fpf-report-automated-decision-making-under-the-gdpr-a-comprehensive-case-law-analysis/>

S. Vos, *et al.*, “Spotlight Series of Global AI Policy – Part I: European Union,” *Global Policy Watch* (Covington: Oct. 4, 2023), <https://www.globalpolicywatch.com/2023/10/spotlight-series-on-global-ai-policy-part-i-european-union/>

Y. Wu, “Understanding China’s New Regulations on Generative AI,” *China Briefing* (May 23, 2023), <https://www.china-briefing.com/news/understanding-chinas-new-regulations-on-generative-ai-draft-measures/>

DEEPAKES (CIVIL OR CRIMINAL)

New York Bill No. SO1042 signed into law Sept. 29, 2023, “includes ‘deep fake’ images created by digitalization within the definition of unlawful dissemination or publication of an intimate image.” See Z. Williams, “New York Bans Deepfake Revenge Porn Distribution as AI Use Grows,” *Bloomberg Law* (Oct. 2, 2023), <https://news.bloomberglaw.com/in-house-counsel/n-y-outlaws-unlawful-publication-of-deepfake-revenge-porn>

R.A. Delfino, “Deepfakes on Trial: A Call to Expand the Trial Judge’s Gatekeeping Role to Protect Legal Proceedings from Technological Fakery,” *74 Hastings L. J.* 293 (2023), https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=4032094 From the

Abstract:

Picture this: You are arrested and accused of a serious crime, like carjacking, assault with a deadly weapon, or child abuse. The only evidence against you is a cellphone video showing the act of violence. To the naked eye, the perpetrator on the video is you. But you are innocent. The video is a ‘deepfake’ – an audiovisual recording created using readily available Artificial Intelligence technology that allows anyone with a smartphone to believably map one person’s movements and words onto another person’s face. How will you prove the video is deepfake in court? And, who—the judge or the jury—gets to decide if it’s fake? The law does not provide clear answers.

But this much is certain--deepfake evidence is an emerging threat to our justice system’s truth-seeking function. Deepfakes will invade court proceedings from several directions—parties may fabricate evidence to win a civil action, governmental actors may rely on deepfakes to secure criminal convictions, or lawyers may purposely exploit juror bias and skepticism about what is real.

Currently, no evidentiary procedure explicitly governs the presentation of deepfake evidence in court. The existing legal standards governing the authentication of evidence are inadequate because the rules were developed before the advent of deepfake technology. As a result, they do not solve the urgent problems of--how to show a video is fake and how to show it isn’t. In addition, although in the last several years, legal scholarship and the popular news media have addressed certain facets of deepfakes, there has been no commentary on the procedural aspects of deepfake evidence in court. Absent from the discussion is who gets to decide whether a deepfake is authentic. This article addresses the matters that prior academic scholarship about deepfakes obscures. It is the first to propose a new rule of evidence reflecting a unique reallocation of the fact-determining responsibilities between the jury and the judge, treating the question of

deepfake authenticity as one for the court to decide as part of an expanded gatekeeping function under the rules of evidence. Confronting deepfakes evidence in legal proceedings demands that courts and lawyers use imagination and creativity to navigate pitfalls of proof and manage a jury's doubts and distrust about what is real. Your freedom may depend on how we meet these challenges.

M. Hinchey, "Hinchley Bill to Ban Non-Consensual Deepfake Images Signed into Law," *N.Y. State Senate Message Senator* (Oct. 2, 2023), <https://www.nysenate.gov/newsroom/press-releases/2023/michelle-hinchey/hinchey-bill-ban-non-consensual-deepfake-images#:~:text=KINGSTON%2C%20NY%20%E2%80%93%20Senator%20Michelle%20Hinchey,explicit%20media%20using%20someone's%20likeness.>

J. McNicholas, "How Real Are Deepfakes," *ABA Litig. News* (Aug. 23, 2023), <https://www.americanbar.org/groups/litigation/resources/litigation-news/2023/summer/how-real-are-deepfakes/>

M. Nkengla, "Deepfakes and AI Misinformation – Real vs. Unreal," (Nov. 20, 2023), <https://www.linkedin.com/pulse/11202023-executive-data-bytes-deepfakes-ai-real-vs-nkengla-ph-d--nvsme?trk=article-ssr-frontend-pulse-more-articles-related-content-card>

J. Parham, "None of Your Photos Are Real," *WIRED* (Oct. 16, 2023), <https://www.wired.com/story/google-pixel-8-artificial-intelligence-photos/>

I Poritz, "AI Deepfakes Bill Pushes Publicity Rights, Spurs Speech Concerns," *Bloomberg Law* (Oct. 17, 2023), <https://news.bloomberglaw.com/ip-law/ai-deepfakes-bill-pushes-publicity-rights-spurs-speech-concerns>

A. Preminger & M.B. Kugler, "The Right of Publicity Can Save Actors from Deepfakes Armageddon," *Berkeley Technology Law Journal, Forthcoming* (Last revised Sept. 25, 2023), https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=4563774

M. Reynolds, "Generative AI Creates Fake Images that Bring to Life Real Stories from Australia's Offshore Detention Camp," *A.B.A.J.* (Oct. 12, 2023), <https://www.abajournal.com/web/article/generative-ai-creates-fake-images-that-bring-to-life-real-stories-from-australias-offshore-detention-camp>

P. Verma, "AI Fake Nudes Are Booming. It's Ruining Real Teens' Lives," *Wash. Post* (Nov. 5, 2023), <https://www.washingtonpost.com/technology/2023/11/05/ai-deepfake-porn-teens-women-impact/>

LAW ENFORCEMENT APPLICATIONS OF AI

Technology is neutral. That does not mean, however, that a given technology cannot have a military use. AI is no exception, as the examples in this and the section following it demonstrate.

Public Service Announcement, “Malicious Actors Manipulating Photos and Videos to Create Explicit Content and Sextortion Schemes” (FBI: June 5, 2023), <https://www.ic3.gov/Media/Y2023/PSA230605>

Guidelines 05/2022 on the Use of Facial Recognition Technology in the Area of Law Enforcement, Version 2.0, *European Data Protection Board* (adopted Apr. 26, 2023), https://edpb.europa.eu/system/files/2023-05/edpb_guidelines_202304_frtlawenforcement_v2_en.pdf

M. Caldwell, et al., “AI-Enabled Future Crime,” *Crime Sci* 9, 14 (2020), <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40163-020-00123-8>

S. Fischer, “Cyber AI Chronicles II – AI-Enabled Cyber Threats and Defensive Measures,” *Constangy Cyber Advisor* (July 17, 2023), <https://www.constangy.com/constangy-cyber-advisor/cyber-ai-chronicles-ii-ai-enabled-cyber-threats-and-defensive-measures>

B. Heater, “San Francisco Police Can Now Use Robots to Kill,” *TechCrunch* (Nov. 30, 2022), <https://techcrunch.com/2022/11/30/san-francisco-police-can-now-use-robots-to-kill/>

E. Press, “Does A.I. Lead Police to Ignore Contradictory Evidence?” *The New Yorker* (Nov. 13, 2023), <https://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2023/11/20/does-a-i-lead-police-to-ignore-contradictory-evidence>

M. Reynolds, “California Innocence Project Harnesses Generative AI for Work to Free Wrongfully Convicted,” *ABA J.* (Aug. 14, 2023), <https://www.abajournal.com/web/article/california-innocence-project->

[harnesses-generative-ai-for-work-to-free-wrongfully-convicted#:~:text=California%20Innocence%20Project%20harnesses%20generative%20AI%20for%20work%20to%20free%20wrongfully%20convicted,-By%20Matt%20Reynolds&text=%E2%80%9CIt's%20always%20taken%20a%20human,%2C%E2%80%9D%20says%20attorney%20Michael%20Semanchik.](#)

MILITARY APPLICATIONS OF AI

USDOD, *Autonomy in Weapon Systems*, DoD Directive 3000.09 (Jan. 25, 2023),

<https://www.esd.whs.mil/portals/54/documents/dd/issuances/dodd/300009p.pdf>

The purpose of the Directive:

- Establishes policy and assigns responsibilities for developing and using autonomous and semiautonomous functions in weapon systems, including armed platforms that are remotely operated or operated by onboard personnel.
- Establishes guidelines designed to minimize the probability and consequences of failures in autonomous and semi-autonomous weapon systems that could lead to unintended engagements.
- Establishes the Autonomous Weapon Systems Working Group.

Bureau of Arms Control, Verification and Compliance, US State Dept., *Political Declaration on Responsible Use of Artificial Intelligence and Autonomy* (Feb. 16, 2023), <https://www.state.gov/political-declaration-on-responsible-military-use-of-artificial-intelligence-and-autonomy/>

An increasing number of States are developing military AI capabilities, which may include using AI to enable autonomous systems. Military use of AI can and should be ethical, responsible, and enhance international security. Use of AI in armed conflict must be in accord with applicable international humanitarian law, including its fundamental principles. Military use of AI capabilities needs to be accountable, including through such use during military operations within a responsible human chain of command and control. A principled approach to the military use of AI should include careful consideration of risks and benefits, and it should also minimize unintended bias and accidents. States should take appropriate measures to ensure the responsible development, deployment, and use of their military AI capabilities, including those enabling autonomous systems. These measures should be applied across the life cycle of military AI capabilities. [footnote omitted].

Congressional Research Service, *Emerging Military Technologies: Background and Issues for Congress* (Updated Nov. 1, 2022), <https://sgp.fas.org/crs/natsec/R46458.pdf>

Although the U.S. government has no official definition of artificial intelligence, policymakers generally use the term AI to refer to a computer system capable of human-level cognition. AI is further divided into three categories: narrow AI, general AI, and artificial superintelligence. Narrow AI systems can perform only the specific task that they were trained to perform, while general AI systems would be capable of performing a broad range of tasks, including those for which they were not specifically trained. Artificial superintelligence refers to a system “that greatly exceeds the cognitive performance of humans in virtually all domains of interest.” General AI systems and artificial superintelligence do not yet—and may never—exist.

Narrow AI is currently being incorporated into a number of military applications by both the United States and its competitors. Such applications include but are not limited to intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance; logistics; cyber operations; command and control; and semiautonomous and autonomous vehicles. These technologies are intended in part to augment or replace human operators, freeing them to perform more complex and cognitively demanding work. In addition, AI-enabled systems could (1) react significantly faster than systems that rely on operator input; (2) cope with an exponential increase in the amount of data available for analysis; and (3) enable new concepts of operations, such as swarming (i.e., cooperative behavior in which unmanned vehicles autonomously coordinate to achieve a task) that could confer a warfighting advantage by overwhelming adversary defensive systems.

Narrow AI, however, could introduce a number of challenges. For example, such systems may be subject to algorithmic bias as a result of their training data or models. Researchers have repeatedly discovered instances of racial bias in AI facial recognition programs due to the lack of diversity in the images on which the systems were trained, while some natural language processing programs have developed gender bias. Such biases could hold significant implications for AI applications in a military context. For example, incorporating undetected biases into systems with lethal effects could lead to cases of mistaken identity and the unintended killing of civilians or noncombatants.

Similarly, narrow AI algorithms can produce unpredictable and unconventional results that could lead to unexpected failures if incorporated into military systems. In a commonly cited demonstration of this phenomenon ^{***}, researchers combined a picture that an AI system correctly identified as a panda with random distortion that the computer labeled ‘nematode.’ The difference in the combined image is imperceptible to the human eye, but it resulted in the AI system labeling the image as a gibbon with 99.3% confidence. Such vulnerabilities could be exploited intentionally by adversaries to disrupt AI-reliant or -assisted target identification, selection, and engagement. This could, in turn, raise ethical concerns—or, potentially, lead to violations of the law of armed conflict—if it results in the system selecting and engaging a target or class of targets that was not approved by a human operator.

Finally, recent news reports and analyses have highlighted the role of AI in enabling increasingly realistic photo, audio, and video digital forgeries, popularly known as ‘deep fakes.’ Adversaries could deploy this AI capability as part of their information operations in a ‘gray zone’ conflict. Deep fake technology could be used against the United States and its allies to generate false news reports, influence public discourse, erode public trust, and attempt blackmail of government officials. For this reason, some analysts argue that social media platforms—in addition to deploying deep fake detection tools—may need to expand the means of labeling and authenticating content. Doing so might require that users identify the time and location at which the content originated or properly label content that has been edited. Other analysts have expressed concern that regulating deep fake technology could impose an undue burden

on social media platforms or lead to unconstitutional restrictions on free speech and artistic expression. These analysts have suggested that existing law is sufficient for managing the malicious use of deep fakes and that the focus should be instead on the need to educate the public about deep fakes and minimize incentives for creators of malicious deep fakes.

Government Accountability Office, “Artificial Intelligence: DOD Needs Department-Wide Guidance to Inform Acquisitions,” GAO-23-105850 (June 2023), <https://www.gao.gov/products/gao-23-105850>. Conclusions:

Because of the opportunities AI presents, efforts to acquire AI tools or integrate AI into DOD weapon systems are poised for rapid growth— growth that could outpace DOD’s efforts to develop appropriate and sufficiently broad guidance for those acquisitions. AI offers the potential for broad application across the military services and joint acquisition programs to significantly enhance capabilities available to the warfighter. However, DOD has not issued department-wide guidance to provide a framework to ensure that acquisition of AI is consistent across the department and accounts for the unique challenges associated with AI.

It is especially important that DOD and the military services issue guidance to provide critical oversight, resources, and provisions for acquiring AI given that the U.S. will face AI-enabled adversaries in the future. Without such guidance, DOD is at risk of expending funds on AI technologies that do not consistently address the unique challenges associated with AI and are not tailored to each service’s specific needs. The private company observations previously discussed offer numerous considerations DOD may wish to leverage in guidance, as appropriate, as it continues to pursue AI-enabled capabilities.

U.S. Dept. Of Homeland Security, “Robot Dogs Take Another Step Towards Deployment at the Border” (Feb. 1, 2022), <https://www.dhs.gov/science-and>

[technology/news/2022/02/01/feature-article-robot-dogs-take-another-step-towards-deployment](#)

G. De Vynck, "Some Tech Leaders Fear AI. ScaleAI is Selling It to the Military," *Wash. Post* (Oct. 22, 2023),

<https://www.washingtonpost.com/technology/2023/10/22/scale-ai-us-military/>

B. Dress, "Why the Pentagon's 'Killer Robots' are Spurring Major Concerns," *The Hill* (Sept. 28, 2023), <https://thehill.com/policy/defense/4225909-why-the-pentagons-killer-robots-are-spurring-major-concerns/#:~:text=Fully%20autonomous%20systems%20have%20been,world%20relies%20on%20AI%20weapons>

J. Grady, "DEPSECDEF Hicks: DoD Wants Thousands of Drones to Counter China's Military Mass," *USNI News* (Aug. 28, 2023), <https://news.usni.org/2023/08/28/depsecdef-hicks-dod-wants-thousands-of-drones-to-counter-chinas-military-mass-advantage>

R. Harris, "Face Tonkin Ghosts Before Cyber Phantoms," *Proceedings* (U.S. Naval Institute: Sept. 2023), <https://www.usni.org/magazines/proceedings/2023/september/face-tonkin-ghosts-cyber-phantoms-strike>

J. Hudson & K. Khudov, "The War in Ukraine is Spurring a Revolution in Drone Warfare Using AI," *Washington Post* (July 26, 2023), <https://www.washingtonpost.com/world/2023/07/26/drones-ai-ukraine-war-innovation/>

D. Ignatius, "How the Algorithm Tipped the Balance in Ukraine," *Washington Post* (Dec. 19, 2022),

<https://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/2022/12/19/palantir-algorithm-data-ukraine-war/>

D. Ignatius, "A 'Good' War Gave the Algorithm its Opening, but Dangers Lurk," *Washington Post* (Dec. 20, 2022),

<https://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/2022/12/20/ukraine-war-russia-tech-battlefield/>

W. Knight, "The AI-Powered, Totally Autonomous Future of War is Here," *Wired* (July 25, 2023), <https://www.wired.com/story/ai-powered-totally-autonomous-future-of-war-is-here/>

W. Knight, "AI Goes to War," *WIRED* 68 (Sept. 2023),

<https://www.magzter.com/stories/Science/WIRED/A-I-Goes-to-War>

W. Knight, "The US Wants China to Start Talking About AI Weapons," *WIRED* (Nov. 13, 2023), <https://www.wired.com/story/us-china-killer-ai-weapons-apec-talks/>

S. Lagrone, "The U.S. Navy's Unmanned Future Remains Murky as China Threat Looms," *USNI News* (Updated Dec. 15, 2023),

<https://news.usni.org/2023/11/30/the-u-s-navys-unmanned-future-remains-murky-as-china-threat-looms>

R. McCormack, “The Replicator Initiative is Key to the Army’s Modernization,” *Brookings* (Dec. 20, 2023), <https://www.brookings.edu/articles/the-replicator-initiative-is-key-to-the-armys-modernization/>

B. O’Rourke, “See—But Verify,” USNI Proceedings (June 2023), <https://www.usni.org/magazines/proceedings/2023/june/see-verify>

R. O’Rourke, “Navy Large Unmanned Surface and Undersea Vehicles: Issues for Congress,” *Cong. Research Service* R45757 (Updated Dec. 20, 2023), <https://sgp.fas.org/crs/weapons/R45757.pdf>

K.M. Sayler, “Defense Primer: U.S. Policy on Lethal Autonomous Weapon Systems,” *Cong. Research Service* (Updated May 15, 2023), <https://crsreports.congress.gov/product/pdf/IF/IF11150>

E. Volokh, “Robots Don’t Kill People (at Least Not Yet); People Use Robots to Kill People,” *The Volokh Conspiracy* (Nov. 28, 2022), <https://reason.com/volokh/2022/11/28/robots-dont-kill-people-at-least-not-yet-people-use-robots-to-kill-people/>

RJH 1/3/24

This article was published in *PLI Chronicle: Insights and Perspectives for the Legal Community*, <https://plus.pli.edu>. Not for resale.



September 2023

Generative AI and Courts: How Are They Getting Along?

Hon. Bernice Bouie Donald (Retired)

Sixth Cir. Court of Appeals

Hon. James C. Francis IV (Retired)

JAMS

Ronald J. Hedges

Ronald J. Hedges LLC

Kenneth J. Withers

The Sedona Conference®

Introduction

Generative artificial intelligence (GAI) burst into public consciousness in November of 2022. It's fair to say that, as of today, GAI has gone mainstream and is a regular—and constant—feature of articles that, among other things, address the benefits and risks associated with its use. As was inevitable, GAI is now a feature of civil litigation as an element of a claim and (soon) an element of a defense. However it arises in litigation, GAI will be a subject of discovery. Moreover, GAI is also a research tool that attorneys have used and misused, and the latter has led to sanctions in one civil action and a number of prophylactic orders issued by federal judges.

Reprinted with permission.

This article will examine the nature of GAI and what it can offer attorneys, the concept of “hallucinations” and what those have led courts to do, and likely causes of action arising out of GAI.

And stay tuned. We expect GAI to evolve as a technology on a rapid basis, as we expect federal and state courts to address it!

GAI: What It Is and What Attorneys Might Do with It

Artificial Intelligence (AI) is a broad term that refers to the ability of machines to perform tasks that are typically associated with human intelligence, such as learning, reasoning, and problem-solving.

Technically speaking, the [National Institute for Standards and Technology](#) defines [artificial intelligence](#) as “an engineered or machine-based system that can, for a given set of objectives, generate outputs such as predictions, recommendations, or decisions influencing real or virtual environments.” The [U.S. military](#) defines it as “the ability of machines to perform tasks that normally require human intelligence – for example, recognizing patterns, learning from experience, drawing conclusions, making predictions, or taking action – whether digitally or as the smart software behind autonomous physical systems.”

The concept of artificial intelligence has been with us for almost 200 years. In the early 19th century, Ada Lovelace (1815-1852) collaborated with Charles Babbage (1791-1871) to design the Analytical Engine, a primitive mechanical computer. Lovelace's notes on the machine included an algorithm for calculating Bernoulli numbers, which is considered by most historians to be the first computer program. In other writings, she proposed that machines could be programmed to simulate human thought. Later, the concept of artificial intelligence was popularized in science fiction but generally embodied in mechanical humanoid characters, like Robbie the Robot in the movie *Forbidden Planet*, R2D2 in *Star Wars*, or Marvin the Manic-Depressive Robot in *Hitchhikers Guide to the Galaxy*.

AI has been with us for a long time, built into things we use every day. Common examples are spam filters that learn which email messages you want to read and which you would rather trash. Recommendation systems suggest which song to listen to or movie to watch next based on your prior selections or those of other users. Smart household appliances can be programmed to cater to your preferences. Later, customer support systems can diagnose the problem with your smart household appliances when they go haywire. Medical diagnostic systems interpret x-rays and lab results, often more accurately than trained physicians. Self-driving vehicles are an advanced set of AI

Generative AI and Courts: How Are They Getting Along?

applications that we are all learning to share the road, bike lane, or sidewalk with. And the list goes on.

Most AI applications we interact with on a daily basis are computational in nature. They produce results based on predefined sets of operations. While the speed and accuracy with which the machines present results may impress us as “intelligence” beyond that of mere mortals, AI at the most common level is really a sophisticated *imitation* of human intelligence. The machines are not “thinking,” they are matching patterns.

Machine Learning (ML) takes AI to a higher level by enabling machines to modify their operations based on data inputs. ML’s operational algorithms engage in data analysis to identify patterns and make predictions based on statistical probability. As more data is ingested into the system, it refines its algorithms without a human programmer making the modifications.

Examples of ML in common use include language translation programs, facial and voice recognition programs, and weather prediction models. In the legal profession, we have already become accustomed to ML, without necessarily knowing it. You may be using “natural language queries” to find statutes or court decisions online, or you may have noticed that your word processor or email application is getting much better at finishing the word you just started typing or suggesting the next word for you to type. ML is a convincing imitation of human intelligence, but it’s not inventive or creative—just better at statistical analysis leading to accurate predictions of what you want.

GAI is a subset of ML that entered popular culture at the end of last year when ChatGPT, developed by OpenAI, was made available to the public. We asked ChatGPT to define itself, and it replied, “Generative artificial intelligence creates content, such as text, images, or music, autonomously, using machine learning models to produce original and creative output.”

That’s the key distinction. AI can crunch massive volumes of words and numbers to find answers and ML can learn as it goes with various feedback mechanisms. GAI goes one step further and presents its findings as newly generated text, images, charts, graphs, audio and video, even legal articles. As GAI continuously improves with more data and feedback from users, its presentations become difficult, if not impossible, to distinguish from human-generated presentations.

It should be pointed out that GAI is not a search engine like Google, Lexis, or Westlaw. It operates on a completely different model and presents completely different results. Using a search engine, you might want to find documents that use the phrase “due process” or “due within three words of process.” The search engine will return

citations or links to the documents that meet those criteria. Forty years ago, we thought that was miraculous, but today it can hardly be called intelligent.

GAI, on the other hand, can be prompted to create a new document summarizing the concept of “due process” by assembling all the words relevant to “due process,” drawn from a large dataset of text, based on statistical probability, arranged in sentences and paragraphs that follow appropriate grammatical and stylistic rules. In other words, GAI can write a memo on “due process.” It does not present a list of court decisions or law review articles to read (unless specifically prompted to do so) but creates what appears to be a polished essay on the topic. It might create references or footnotes with what appear to be citations to sources, but these are *imitation* citations, based on the statistical probability that the elements of the citation (name, date, court, reporter page number, etc.) are responsive to the inquiry.

With that understanding of GAI, and a healthy skepticism regarding the accuracy of its results, there is still plenty of room for productively using GAI in the everyday practice of law:

- GAI has been harnessed for contract review, processing thousands of contracts to identify commonalities or gaps to assess risk and recommend updated contract clauses. It can also be used to summarize complex legal language in “plain English” so that parties better understand their contracts or other legal documents.
- GAI has been used to present complex statistical analysis in simpler terms, with charts or graphs when appropriate, to better understand how courts have decided categories of cases, or what the likely settlement range might be for a particular cause of action.
- GAI has been incorporated into language translation programs to significantly improve the readability of translated legal or technical documents; a great advance over the literal translations that computers performed until recently.
- GAI has been used to create initial drafts of complaints, answers, and deposition questions. In this role, GAI is similar to the “form files” kept by many firms for generations to assist novice associates and paralegals, always with the warning that they are just examples and shouldn’t be slavishly copied.
- GAI has a legitimate role in legal research, despite its reputation for inaccuracy. As a tool for brainstorming or creating initial outlines of a research project, it can stimulate thinking and even suggest novel ideas. Just take everything GAI presents with a large grain of salt, and always do your own fact and citation checking.

Hallucinations and How One Court Has Dealt with These

The poster child for the dysfunctional relationship between generative AI and the judiciary is *Mata v. Avianca, Inc.*, 2023 WL 4114965 (S.D.N.Y. June 22, 2023). This was a personal injury case brought against an air carrier, for which the governing substantive law was the Montreal Convention. The air carrier moved to dismiss on statute of limitations grounds, and the plaintiff answered the motion, arguing that the limitations period was tolled during the period that the carrier had been in bankruptcy. Defense counsel alerted the court that many decisions cited in the plaintiff's answer to the motion could not be found, that the decisions appeared to be fake, and that those decisions that could be located did not stand for the propositions for which they were cited. The court then ordered plaintiff's counsel to provide certain of the cited cases. But the copies or excerpts submitted did not relate to actual decisions.

As it turns out, counsel had drafted the original affirmation in opposition by giving ChatGPT prompts such as “provide case law in support that statute of limitations is tolled by bankruptcy of [the airlines] under montreal convention.” Then, when the decisions were called into question, counsel sought to verify their authenticity by querying ChatGPT itself, which reassured them that the decisions were real and could be found on legal research databases such as Westlaw and LexisNexis.

The court held that counsel had acted in bad faith and sanctioned the individual attorneys and their firm under Rule 11 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and the court's inherent power. It found that, in addition to submitting fabricated decisions and failing to withdraw the submission after becoming aware of its deficiencies, counsel falsely attested to having made a reasonable inquiry as to the law, misrepresented to the court the basis for seeking an extension, and stated that ChatGPT was used to “supplement” other research when it was, in fact, the only source of the case law cited.

Mata illustrates the need for counsel to be cognizant of the limitations of any generative AI tool. Counsel were unaware that the ChatGPT was not performing actual legal research but was merely fabricating “cases” in the style of actual decisions in response to the instructions of counsel to achieve a predetermined result. One of the fake decisions, which is attached to the *Mata* opinion, is a striking example of a GAI hallucination: It has an apparent docket number, uses legal jargon, cites “precedent,” and is attributed to a real judge. But, as the court in *Mata* observed, the hallucination goes off on irrelevant tangents, its legal analysis is “gibberish,” and it ends without any conclusion. It is effectively a caricature of legal reasoning.

Mata also exemplifies the need for attorneys who choose to use GAI to be aware of its benefits and risks. In other words, those attorneys must be competent to use GAI (and AI) consistent with their ethical duties under Model Rule of Professional

Conduct 1.1. (We leave for another day the applicability of other model rules, including MRPC 5.3, the duty to supervise non-lawyers.)

Proactive Approaches to GAI Use

Some judges have been quick to react to the advent of GAI in general and to *Mata* in particular. One Texas appellate court identified nonexistent “published” cases and errant jump-cites in a brief filed in connection with a criminal appeal. Previously, the court might have assumed incompetence or willful fabrication by counsel. In the present environment, however, the court opined that “at least the ‘Argument’ portion of the brief may have been prepared by artificial intelligence.” *Ex parte Lee*, No. 10-22-00281-CR (Tex. 10th Ct. App. July 19, 2023).

While the court in *Lee* did not ultimately need to decide whether the offending brief had been authored by GAI, the case illustrates the fact that GAI does “hallucinate” and does that so well that we may not tell the difference between a real and illusory citation just by looking at it. As they say, “To err is human, to really screw things up requires a computer.” Which is why, in our opinion, human review is imperative—and required by Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 11(b) and 26(g)(1).

Some judges have sought to preempt misuse of GAI in the courtroom by issuing chambers’ rules or practices. For example, one judge requires that counsel attest that no portion of any filing will be drafted by GAI or, if it is, it will be checked against traditional legal databases by a human. See “[Mandatory Certification Regarding Generative Artificial Intelligence](#),” Judge Specific Requirement of Judge Brantley Starr, Northern District of Texas.

Another judge mandates that counsel identify any specific portions of text created by GAI as well as the program used and certify that use of the GAI has not resulted in disclosure of confidential or proprietary information. See “[Order on Artificial Intelligence](#),” Judge Stephen Alexander Vaden, U.S. Ct. of International Trade (June 8, 2023).

A third judge, perhaps unwittingly, requires disclosure of the use of *any* artificial intelligence—not specifically limited to generative AI. By its terms, this requirement directs counsel to reveal the use of seemingly innocuous programs like Grammarly. “[Standing Order Re: Artificial Intelligence \(‘AI’\) in Cases Assigned to Judge Baylson](#),” Eastern District of Pennsylvania (June 6, 2023).

The danger of rules or practices such as these is that, by suggesting skepticism of GAI and associating its use with added burden and risk, courts will impede GAI’s use in court filings even when it has attained reliability equivalent to that of human drafters.

A more thoughtful approach has been adopted by Judge Subramanian in the Southern District of New York, whose rule states that “use of ChatGPT and or other such tools is not prohibited, but counsel must at all times personally confirm for themselves the accuracy of any such research conducted by these means.” [“Individual Practices in Civil Cases,”](#) Southern District of New York (July 28, 2023).

Causes of Action Arising Out of GAI Use or Misuse

Here are causes of action implicating GAI that have already been pled in complaints—or that we expect will be:

- Antitrust
- Data Breach
- Privacy Breach
- Discrimination
- Copyright or Other Intellectual Property Infringement
- Defamation
- Malicious use-related, such as Deepfakes, Hate Speech, and Scamming

We will not address these in detail, and, of course, we have only listed civil actions. We leave for another day regulatory investigations and proceedings involving GAI. And, needless to say, expect to see criminal investigations and proceedings!

Conclusion

As GAI approaches one year on the public scene, it has stimulated prolific conversation, research, application, excitement, and concern. There is a mix of apprehension and anticipation about GAI's impact on society generally, and its impact on the legal profession specifically. Undoubtedly, it presents exciting opportunities for the advancement of the legal profession, but nobody quite yet knows the boundaries of GAI or what it means for the future of work; and courts are now only scratching the surface as to the limitations on which attorneys can use GAI.

New technologies offer benefits and risks as they enter the “market.” The full spectrum of those perils and opportunities may not be fully appreciated by designers and developers.

So it is with GAI. There is one certainty: inevitably, within years if not sooner, GAI will become a fixture of modern society; and it will continue to play a role in the relationship between attorneys and the courts and attorneys and clients.

Nevertheless, the foundational rules of the legal profession will remain, and new issues will be addressed within existing ethical, procedural, and substantive frameworks. Judges will continue to discharge their obligation to protect the integrity of the judicial process and apply ethical precepts, all while adjudicating complicated issues. Attorneys must assist the courts by being faithful to their ethical duties.

As attorneys respond to what many see as a technologically driven need to generate higher quality work with increased efficiency, some attorneys may see GAI as a means to “ease” or minimize the burdens of, among other things, writing and researching. But while GAI is one among many tools available to attorneys, it cannot supplant the lawyer’s duties of competence and diligence.

The Honorable Bernice Bouie Donald was nominated to the United States Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit by President Barack Obama and became the first African woman to serve as a judge on that court. Judge Donald has handled complex bankruptcy, commercial, insurance, ERISA, labor and employment, and malpractice cases, as well as other cases under federal statutes and laws while serving in the federal judiciary at three levels.





The Honorable James C. Francis IV is an arbitrator, mediator, and special master with JAMS. From 2017 through 2019, he was a Distinguished Lecturer at the CUNY School of Law, where he taught Electronic Discovery, Civil Procedure, Evidence, Federal Courts, and Constitutional Torts. From 1985 until 2017, he served as a United States Magistrate Judge in the Southern District of New York.

Ronald J. Hedges is the Principal of Ronald J. Hedges LLC. He served as a United States Magistrate Judge in the District of New Jersey for over 20 years. Ron speaks and writes on a variety of topics, many of which are related to electronic information, including procedural and substantive criminal law, information governance, litigation management, and integration of new technologies such as artificial intelligence into existing information governance policies and procedures.

Kenneth J. Withers is the Deputy Executive Director of The Sedona Conference® and its Corporate Secretary. He has authored widely distributed papers on electronic discovery, hosted a popular website on electronic discovery and electronic records management issues, and presented at more than 300 conferences and workshops for legal, records management, and industry audiences. From 1999 through 2005, he was

Generative AI and Courts: How Are They Getting Along?

a Senior Education Attorney at the Federal Judicial Center in Washington D.C., where he developed Internet-based distance learning programs for the federal judiciary concentrating on issues of technology and the administration of justice.

			
<p>You may also be interested in this PLI Program:</p> <p>Generative AI and Judges: How Are They Getting Along?</p>	<p>PLI Press Publications you may be interested in</p>	<p>To submit an article for consideration, please contact the editor at editor.plichronicle@pli.edu or visit pli.edu/PLIChronicle/contribute for more information</p>	<p>Sign up for a free trial of PLI PLUS at pli.edu/pliplusrial</p>

Disclaimer: The article is based on comments made by the authors during a recent webinar. The viewpoints expressed by the authors are their own and do not necessarily reflect the opinions, viewpoints and official policies of Practising Law Institute, or the authors' organizations or clients.

This article is published on PLI PLUS, the online research database of PLI. The entirety of the PLI Press print collection is available on PLI PLUS—including PLI's authoritative treatises, answer books, course handbooks and transcripts from our original and highly acclaimed CLE programs.

This page intentionally left blank

About the Panelists...

Honorable Ronald J. Hedges, USMJ (Ret.) is a Principal in Ronald J. Hedges LLC in Hackensack, New Jersey. Formerly Senior Counsel for Dentons in New York City and a member of the Litigation and Dispute Resolution Practice Group, he has extensive experience in e-discovery and the management of complex civil litigation matters, and has served as a special master, arbitrator and mediator. He also consults on the management and discovery of electronically stored information (ESI).

Admitted to practice in New Jersey, New York, Texas and the District of Columbia, and before several federal courts, Judge Hedges is a former United States Magistrate Judge in the United States District Court for the District of New Jersey (1986-2007), where he was the Compliance Judge for the Court Mediation Program, a member of the Lawyers Advisory Committee, and a member of and reporter for the *Civil Justice Reform Act* Advisory Committee. Chair of the Court Technology Committee of the Judicial Division of the American Bar Association, he has been a member of the American Law Institute, the American and Federal Bar Associations, and the Historical Society and the Lawyers Advisory Committee of the United States District Court for the District of New Jersey. He is a member of task forces established by the New Jersey and New York State Bar Associations to address artificial intelligence. Judge Hedges has served on the Sedona Conference Judicial Advisory Board; the Sedona Conference Working Group on Protective Orders, Confidentiality, and Public Access; and the Sedona Conference Working Group on Best Practices for Electronic Document Retention & Protection. He has also been a member of the Advisory Board of the Advanced E-Discovery Institute of Georgetown University Law Center. He is a former Fellow at the Center for Information Technology of Princeton University and has been a member of the College of the State Bar of Texas.

Judge Hedges has been an adjunct professor at Rutgers School of Law-Newark and is a former adjunct professor at Georgetown University Law Center and Seton Hall University School of Law, where he has taught courses on electronic discovery and evidence and mediation skills. He is the author of "Rule 26(f): The Most Important E-Discovery Rule" (*New Jersey Law Journal*, 5/18/2009) and has authored, edited and co-edited a number of other publications on ESI topics including *Discovery of Electronically Stored Information: Surveying the Legal Landscape* (BNA, 2007). He is the co-senior editor of *The Sedona Conference Cooperation Proclamation, Resources for the Judiciary, Third Edition* (June 2020) and its 2022 supplement; and the principal author of the third edition of the Federal Judicial Center's *Pocket Guide for Judges on Discovery of Electronic Information*.

Judge Hedges received his B.A. from the University of Maryland and his J.D. from Georgetown University Law Center.

Honorable Xavier Rodriguez, U.S.D.J. is a United States District Judge, Western District of Texas, and sits in San Antonio, Texas. Appointed to the federal bench in 2003, he was formerly a Justice of the Supreme Court of Texas and prior to that was a Partner in the international law firm Fulbright & Jaworski (now known as Norton Rose Fulbright).

A Fellow of the American and Texas Bar Foundations, Judge Rodriguez is Past Chair of the State Bar of Texas' Litigation and Labor and Employment Law Sections, as well as the organization's Continuing Legal Education Committee. He serves on the Sedona Conference

Judicial Advisory Board, the Georgetown Advanced E-Discovery Institute Advisory Board and the Electronic Discovery Reference Model (EDRM) Global Advisory Council, and was board-certified in labor and employment law by the Texas Board of Legal Specialization. He has been a member of several judicial organizations as well as numerous professional, charitable and community groups.

The editor of *Essentials of E-Discovery* (TexasBarBooks, 2d. Ed., 2021), Judge Rodriguez is a frequent lecturer at continuing legal education seminars and has authored articles on employment law, discovery and arbitration issues. He is the recipient of several honors, including the State Bar of Texas Gene Cavin Award for Excellence in CLE and the Texas Bar Foundation's Samuel Pessarra Outstanding Jurist Award.

Judge Rodriguez received his B.A. from Harvard University, his Master's degree from the University of Texas LBJ School of Public Affairs, his J.D. from the University of Texas Law School and his LL.M. in Judicial Studies from Duke University's Bloch Judicial Institute.