The consultation closes on **14th April 2026 at midnight.**

Consultees do not need to answer all questions if only some are of interest or relevance.

Answers should be submitted by PDF or word document to **CJC.AI.consultation@judiciary.uk.**

If you have any questions about the consultation or submission process, please contact **CJC@judiciary.uk**.

Please name your submission as follows: 'name/organisation - CJC The Use of AI for Preparing Court Documents.

You must fill in the following and submit this sheet with your response:

Your response is (public/anonymous/confidential):	
First name:	
Last name:	
Location:	
Role:	
Job title:	
Organisation:	
Are you responding on behalf of your organisation?	
Your email address:	

Information provided to the Civil Justice Council:

We aim to be transparent and to explain the basis on which conclusions have been reached. We may publish or disclose information you provide in response to Civil Justice Council papers, including personal information. For example, we may publish an extract of your response in Civil Justice Council publications or publish the response itself. Additionally, we may be required to disclose the information, such as in accordance with the Freedom of Information Act 2000. We will process your personal data in accordance with the General Data Protection Regulation and the Data Protection Act 2018.

Consultation responses are most effective where we are able to report which consultees responded to us, and what they said. If you consider that it is necessary for all or some of the information that you provide to be treated as **confidential** and so neither published nor disclosed, please contact us before sending it. Please limit the confidential material to the minimum, clearly identify it and explain why you want it to be confidential. We cannot guarantee that confidentiality can be maintained in all circumstances and an automatic disclaimer generated by your IT system will not be regarded as binding on the Civil Justice Council.

Alternatively, you may want your response to be **anonymous**. That means that we may refer to what you say in your response but will not reveal that the information came from you. You might want your response to be anonymous because it contains sensitive information about you or your organisation, or because you are worried about other people knowing what you have said to us.

We list who responded to our consultations in our reports. If you provide a confidential response your name will appear in that list. If your response is anonymous, we will not include your name in the list unless you have given us permission to do so. Please let us know if you wish your response to be anonymous or confidential.

The full list of consultation questions is below:

Scope

1. The scope of this work has been concerned with rules relating to legal representatives, on the basis that guidance is a matter for their professional bodies. Do you agree with that approach to guidance? If not, please explain why not.

Statements of Case

2. The CJC proposes that provided a statement of case bears the name of the legal representative who is taking professional responsibility for it, there is no need for any (further) rules relating to statements of case produced with the assistance of AI. Do you agree? If not why not?

3. An alternative would be to require a specific declaration to make clear if the legal representative has used AI in the preparation of the statement of case. Do you prefer this alternative? If so, please explain why and consider which uses of AI ought to be covered.

4. Skeleton arguments and other advocacy documents [Part E - paragraph 41-45]

5. The CJC proposes that provided the skeleton argument or other advocacy document bears the name of the legal representative who is taking professional responsibility for it, there is no need for any (further) rules relating to these documents produced with the assistance of AI. Do you agree? If not why not?

6. An alternative would be to require a specific declaration to make clear if the legal representative has used AI in the preparation of these documents. Do you prefer this alternative? If so, please explain why and consider which uses of AI ought to be covered.

Disclosure

7. The CJC proposes that there does not appear to be a pressing case introduce a requirement that disclosure lists/statements have a section addressing the extent to which AI tools/software have been used. Do you agree that disclosure lists/statements do not need to contain such a statement? If not why not?

Witness statements

8. The CJC makes different proposals for different kinds of witness statements, in particular drawing a distinction between trial witness statement and non-trial witness statements. Do you agree with that approach? What distinction if any would you propose?

9. In relation to non-trial witness statements, the proposal is that provided the statement bears the name (or firm name?) of the legal representative who is taking professional responsibility for its preparation, there is no need for any (further) rules relating to these documents produced with the assistance of AI. Do you agree? If not, why not?

10. An alternative would be to require a specific declaration to make clear if the legal representative has used AI in the preparation of non-trial witness statements. Do you prefer this alternative? If so, please explain why and consider which uses of AI ought to be covered.

11. In relation to witness statements covered by PD57AC and within the scope of this paper (i.e. trial witness statements prepared with the involvement of a legal representative), the proposal is that there be a rule requiring a declaration on such a statement that AI has <u>not</u> been used for the purposes of generating its content (including by way of altering, embellishing, strengthening, diluting or rephrasing the witness's evidence). Do you agree? If not, why not?

12. In relation to witness statements under CPR Part 32, not covered by PD57AC but within the scope of this paper (i.e. trial witness statements prepared with the involvement of a legal representative), the proposal is that there be a rule requiring a declaration on such a statement that AI has <u>not</u> been used for the purposes of generating its content (including by way of altering, embellishing, strengthening or diluting or rephrasing the witness's evidence). Do you agree? If not, why not?

13. In relation to witness statements involving translation, one issue relates to use of AI by translators. Should there be a rule making provision for the use of AI by human translators? If a translator is prepared to sign a statement of accuracy, taking responsibility for it, is there any need to enquire further? A further proposal is to permit the use of publicly available machine translation, provided the tool used

is identified, and provided (if necessary) that provision is made clarifying that other parties are entitled to check the translation themselves by using such a tool. Do you agree? If not, why not? Do you favour the alternative below? If so why

14. An alternative to the previous proposal would be only to permit such use by a legal representative and to require that the legal representative involved in the preparation of the translation should identify what tool has been used. Do you favour this alternative?

Experts

15. The proposal is that the specific provisions for statements of truth used by experts should be amended to add a further requirement confirming that the expert's report identifies and explains any AI which has been used, other than for administrative uses such as transcription. Do you agree? If not why not?

General Issues

16. Is the term artificial intelligence sufficiently clear to be used in these proposed rules? If not do you have an alternative proposal?

17. One of the distinctions drawn between different uses of AI is between activity defined in the report as administrative uses, which merely corrects spelling or grammar, provides transcription, operates as accessibility software, or assists with formatting and otherwise does not generate substantive content on the one hand, and activity which generates substantive text, images or videos on the other. Another distinction drawn is between fact evidence and the product of legal research.   Do you agree with the distinctions drawn in these proposals? If not what alternatives do you propose?

18. Should the endorsements proposed always identify the AI tool used? If so, to what end?

19. Should there be a rule providing for a power to give a party permission to use AI for some specific purpose? If such a rule should be introduced, should it be general or confined to specific uses?