

## **ADDRESS TO THE AUSTRALIAN BAR ASSOCIATION**

### **“CHANGE AT THE BAR AND THE GREAT CHALLENGE OF GEN AI”**

**29 August 2025**

**Sydney**

**The Hon A S Bell**

**Chief Justice of New South Wales\***

#### **Introduction**

- 1 I begin by acknowledging the traditional owners of the land on which we meet, the Gadigal of the Eora Nation and pay my respects to elders, past and present, and all First Nations people, and especially First Nations lawyers.
- 2 I thank the Australian Bar Association for inviting me to speak this morning and I acknowledge the important work not only of the ABA but of all of the state and territory bar associations. I was a member of the New South Wales Bar Council and various Bar Association committees for many years and well appreciate the vast amount of work undertaken by local bar associations not only in the regulation of the profession and the maintenance of professional and ethical standards but also in continuing legal education, important policy work, indigenous outreach and collegiality.
- 3 The Bar nationally makes a vital contribution to the administration of justice in Australia, and this annual Conference is an important means of allowing barristers from around the country to meet and discuss critical issues confronting not only the profession but society more generally.

\*The assistance of my tipstaff, Mr Sebastian Braham, in the preparation of this address is gratefully acknowledged.

- 4 Recent events abroad remind us on a daily basis of the importance of the rule of law, and respect for the legal institutions of our nation.

### **Looking back**

- 5 It is now more than 30 years since I was called to the Bar. I have fond memories of that time in my career. In particular, in this national audience, I should say that I greatly enjoyed the opportunity to do many, many inter-state cases and met many barristers from around the country. They shared common professional values and by and large were extremely impressive and highly competent. That is not to say that they did not have particular styles and peculiarities, although exploring some of those would probably be more appropriate for an after-dinner speech!
- 6 A great deal has changed for barristers in the period since my call, not least in terms of numbers of the profession. Over the last two years, just under 3000 new lawyers each year have been admitted to practice in New South Wales, for example. This compares to 785 new lawyers admitted in 1995,<sup>2</sup> the year of my admission to practice and no doubt reflects the proliferation of new law schools over the last 30 years.
- 7 When I started practice in February 1995:
- My chambers had a shared fax machine which was how urgent documents were communicated;
  - I had a Texas Instruments 286 laptop which was not connected to the internet;
  - There were only two female barristers on my Floor and two women on the NSW Supreme Court bench;
  - There was no Federal Circuit Court;
  - There was no Austlii and no medium neutral citations;
  - Judgments did not have paragraph numbers;

<sup>2</sup> 260 of which were interstate practitioners registered on the roll in this State under the Mutual Recognition Act: Supreme Court of New South Wales, *Annual Review 1995* at 56.

- Email was not used nor were PDFs;
- Most people did not have mobile phones;
- There were no fee disclosure rules for barristers that I can recall;
- I kept a note of my invoices in a paper spiral bound Collins notebook;
- Unreported cases could only be found in hard copy in the Bar library;
- There was a task called “devilling” which was the lifeblood of the junior bar;
- Assembling a law library was dauntingly expensive;
- The courts did not use AVL and even as the technology developed over the years, there was a great hostility to, and scepticism about its reliability and use;
- The Bar had a great hostility to mediation;
- There was no CPD;
- Barristers never went to solicitors’ offices;
- Advertising was not permitted;
- There was no Uniform Evidence Law;
- There was no Legal Profession Uniform Law;
- There were no class actions;
- There were no class action lawyers!

- 8 Here is a famous photo, recently published in *Bar News*, the journal of the NSW Bar Association:



It was taken on the occasion of the 70<sup>th</sup> birthday of the late, TEF “Tom” Hughes AO QC in 1993. It contains all the leading and emerging figures of the NSW Bar at the time as well as a number of judges. They were all male and the function was held at an all-male club. Those days are long gone.

- 9 In terms of gender, both the legal profession and the Bar have changed dramatically since that time and the change has been salutary. The rate of change has been greater amongst solicitors than at the Bar but my prediction is that the rate of change at the Bar will pick up significantly. In May of this year, and for the first time, the number of female readers in the NSW Bar’s intake outnumbered male readers. And of the new lawyers admitted to practice in New South Wales over recent years, almost two thirds have been female with a similar percentage in Victoria and just shy of 60% in Western Australia (NSW, Victoria and WA being the Uniform Law States).

- 10 The figures as at 30 June 2023 and 30 June 2024 taken from the Legal Services Council Annual Reports are reflected in the following tables:

**As at 30 June 2023**

| Sex        | NSW   | VIC   | WA  | Total |
|------------|-------|-------|-----|-------|
| Female     | 1,752 | 1,258 | 300 | 3,310 |
| Male       | 1,045 | 699   | 196 | 1,940 |
| Non-binary | 0     | 1     | 12  | 13    |
| Total      | 2,797 | 1,958 | 508 | 5,263 |

| Sex        | NSW   | VIC   | WA    | Total |
|------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Female     | 62.6% | 64.2% | 59.1% | 62.9% |
| Male       | 37.4% | 35.7% | 38.6% | 36.9% |
| Non-binary | 0.0%  | 0.1%  | 2.4%  | 0.2%  |

**As at 30 June 2024**

| Sex        | NSW   | VIC   | WA  | Total |
|------------|-------|-------|-----|-------|
| Female     | 1,856 | 1,277 | 296 | 3,429 |
| Male       | 1,002 | 711   | 165 | 1,878 |
| Non-binary | 5     | 10    | 41  | 56    |
| Total      | 2,863 | 1,998 | 502 | 5,363 |

| Sex        | NSW   | VIC   | WA    | Total |
|------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Female     | 64.8% | 63.9% | 59.0% | 63.9% |
| Male       | 35.0% | 35.6% | 32.9% | 35.0% |
| Non-binary | 0.2%  | 0.5%  | 8.2%  | 1.0%  |

- 11 The change has also been discernible in terms of the leadership of the Bar. The current President of the ABA is Roisin Annesley KC, the fourth female to

hod that post.<sup>3</sup> The two immediate Past Presidents of the NSW Bar Association were Gabrielle Bashir SC and Dr Ruth Higgins SC, and almost half of the Council's current members are female barristers. The current Presidents of the Northern Territory, Queensland, South Australian and Western Australian Bar Associations are also all female, as are the Commonwealth Director of Public Prosecutions, Raelene Sharp SC and the NSW Director and Deputy Director, Sally Dowling SC and Helen Roberts SC - all outstanding advocates.

- 12 It is not only in terms of gender that the composition of the profession and the Bar has changed. As I preside at over 50 admissions ceremonies in New South Wales each year, I can say with confidence that the ethnic and cultural diversity of the profession is also changing rapidly. This is greatly to be welcomed. The profession should reflect the diversity of contemporary Australia, and diversity is important to fostering inclusiveness, which in turn builds trust in and respect for the judiciary, the legal profession and the rule of law.
- 13 In terms of the work of the Bar, personal injury and motor traffic accidents are now principally dealt with administratively whereas they used to dominate the work of the Supreme and District and County courts around the country. Barristers in those areas have had to adapt and move to new practice areas. Some common law chambers have folded.
- 14 Within the criminal sphere, the use and illegal distribution of drugs have had an impact for property theft to fund drug habits but have also led to the commission of terrifying crimes of violence by those under the influence of particular narcotics such as ice and methyldamphetamine. The growth of the drug industry is also closely associated with the growth of organised crime.
- 15 Most significantly, there has been a marked increase in sexual assault or at least prosecutions for sexual assault. There have been over 500 sexual assault trials each year in the District Court of New South Wales since 2020.<sup>4</sup> It is now,

<sup>3</sup> Following R S McColl SC (2001), F McLeod SC (2015), and J Batrouney QC (2019).

<sup>4</sup> District Court of New South Wales, *Annual Review 2023* (Report, 2024) at 32, available at <https://districtcourt.nsw.gov.au/documents/reports/district-court-annual-review-2023.pdf>; District Court

regrettably, the staple work of many courts throughout the country. Another significant change has been the development of terrorism offences and related high-risk offender litigation.

- 16 We have also seen the exponential growth of class actions over the last 25 years, an area that has presented new challenges and opened up important opportunities for barristers. It has been fuelled by the High Court's decision almost 20 years ago in *Campbells Cash and Carry Pty Ltd v Fostif Pty Ltd* (2006) 229 CLR 386, holding that litigation funding was permissible.
- 17 I am on record as being critical of the fact that the class action playing field is not level by reason of the Victorian Government's unilateral decision to depart from the Uniform Law in 2020 and to permit solicitors to charge contingency fees in class actions in Victoria.<sup>5</sup> This has led to a disproportionate number of class actions being filed in the Supreme Court of Victoria, distortion of the market and added significant costs as many of the practitioners involved in such disputes hail from outside Victoria.
- 18 The High Court has recently put paid to the Federal Court's creative attempt to permit the award of contingency fees via a common fund order: *Kain v R&B Investments Pty Ltd* [2025] HCA 28. The levelling of the playing field will have to occur legislatively.
- 19 In terms of disruption, had I been giving this speech 3 years ago, the pandemic would have loomed large. Indeed, it was 3 years ago at this very conference that there was a good deal of debate about the pandemic and the impact it had had on the Bar, the legal profession and the courts, with Chief Justice Anne Ferguson of Victoria and I expressing different views on the importance of

of New South Wales, *Annual Review 2022* (Report, 2023) at 16, available at < <https://districtcourt.nsw.gov.au/documents/reports/district-court-annual-review-2022.pdf> >.

<sup>5</sup> See The Hon A S Bell, "Opening Keynote Address to Association of Litigation Funders of Australia" (13 August 2024, Sydney), available at [https://supremecourt.nsw.gov.au/documents/Publications/Speeches/2024-speeches/chief-justice/Bell\\_CJ\\_20240813.pdf](https://supremecourt.nsw.gov.au/documents/Publications/Speeches/2024-speeches/chief-justice/Bell_CJ_20240813.pdf)

returning to the workplace, no doubt reflecting our differing experiences during 2020 and 2021.

- 20 The last few years have, I think, demonstrated that the collegiality and humanity of the profession and the corporate and institutional life of the Bar can be successfully combined with flexible and less traditional work practices.

### **Artificial Intelligence – the great challenge**

- 21 This brings me to the here and now and, inevitably, Artificial Intelligence, which will be the principal focus of my address.<sup>6</sup> It seems appropriate at a Conference which has taken as its theme “Crossroads”.
- 22 The pace of change is rapid and the “quality” of the technology is being constantly refined. The Bar has a vital interest in Gen AI. It represents a competitive threat to aspects of barristers’ work including claim strength assessment technology and outcome likelihood models which may be influenced, inter alia, by profiling of judicial officers who might hear a particular case or appeal based upon a large language model deep dive into any given judge’s track record in various areas of the law; a form of judicial mapping of patterns of decision making.
- 23 As we have seen in other areas, such as the explosion of social media platforms, attempts at regulation frequently lag, often significantly, the development and impact of technology, and that is only exacerbated where one is dealing with technology that does not recognise and or which transcends geographical boundaries and individual jurisdictions.
- 24 A commonly cited benefit of artificial intelligence is efficiency, and many lawyers and law firms are already taking advantage of these capabilities in relation to

<sup>6</sup> An excellent overview of the issues may be found in M Legg, V McNamara and A Alimardani “The Promise and the Peril of the Use of Generative Artificial Intelligence in Litigation” (2025) 48(4) *University of New South Wales Law Journal* (forthcoming).

what have been described as repeatable “everyday legal tasks”.<sup>7</sup> The value of Gen AI in some areas may readily be accepted and I make no criticism of responsible use of Gen AI. But much more than efficiency gains are in play.

- 25 Attitudes to Gen AI should not simply be characterised as “progressive” or “conservative”, or treat the rise and momentum of Gen AI as an inevitable, unregulatable snowball. In 2024, I explored some of the threats and dangers of the rise of artificial intelligence in the administration of justice in a lecture entitled *Truth Decay and its implications for the judiciary: an Australian perspective*.<sup>8</sup>
- 26 Australian Bar Associations and Law Societies have been proactive in equipping practitioners with guidelines to ensure that artificial intelligence is used responsibly in the legal context.<sup>9</sup> Indeed, they were some of the first in the world to do so.
- 27 Many but not all courts in Australia and elsewhere have followed suit but have not spoken uniformly.
- 28 While acknowledging that there is a danger in generalising about Gen AI, and that bespoke platforms may be more effective at ironing out or eliminating some of the difficulties and weaknesses that are routinely pointed out, as I will seek to illustrate, many of the issues that gave rise to concern for courts and the legal profession when Gen AI first burst on to the scene remain.

<sup>7</sup> *Ashurst AI trial shows huge time savings on everyday legal tasks* (Australian Financial Review, 10 April 2024), available at <<https://www.afr.com/work-and-careers/workplace/what-this-law-firm-learnt-from-experimenting-with-ai-20240408-p5fi2k>>; *‘Get the job done’: One in two lawyers use AI* (Australian Financial Review, 16 April 2024), available at <<https://www.afr.com/work-and-careers/workplace/get-the-job-done-one-in-two-lawyers-use-ai-20240415-p5fjz0>>.

<sup>8</sup> The Hon A S Bell, *Truth Decay and its implications for the judiciary: an Australian perspective* (Speech, 4<sup>th</sup> Judicial Roundtable, Durham University, 23 April 2024) <[https://supremecourt.nsw.gov.au/documents/Publications/Speeches/2024-speeches/chief-justice/Truth\\_Decay\\_29042024.pdf](https://supremecourt.nsw.gov.au/documents/Publications/Speeches/2024-speeches/chief-justice/Truth_Decay_29042024.pdf)>.

<sup>9</sup> Professional Support Unit, “A solicitor’s guide to responsible use of artificial intelligence” Law Society Journal (online, 14 November 2023) <<https://lsj.com.au/articles/a-solicitors-guide-to-responsible-use-of-artificial-intelligence/>>; New South Wales Bar Association, Issues Arising from the Use of AI Language Models (including ChatGPT) in Legal Practice (12 July 2023).

## Deepfakes

- 29 We are all aware of doctored images of famous people, some amusing, others more sinister and many outright scandalous, disgraceful and dangerous.
- 30 We are also aware of doctored images of non-famous people, some of the most concerning examples of which involve so-called “nudify apps” which may take an image of a person clothed and produce a nude image of the same person. This has become an extremely serious social problem especially but not only in school environments and especially but not only at the cost of innocent girls and young women, including teachers.<sup>10</sup> Only two weeks ago, the NSW Government introduced legislation to amend the *Crimes Act 1900* (NSW) to make the production of a sexually explicit deepfake designed to be a genuine depiction of a real, identifiable person an offence punishable by up to three years’ jail.<sup>11</sup>
- 31 But the problem of deepfake images, videos or sound files is far broader. In all areas of practice, barristers are concerned in presenting evidence to courts and critically examining that evidence. Many cases turn on documentary evidence and or involve audio visual evidence. The phenomenon of the deep fake is real and poses and will increasingly pose a significant threat to the administration of justice. There have always been skilful forgers of documents but the ability of artificial intelligence and related technology to generate apparently genuine images and documents is alarming.
- 32 There is in circulation a YouTube video which contains footage of two NSW Supreme Court judges speaking but the words each of them is saying are not

<sup>10</sup> In April of this year, a 26 year old was sentenced to 5 years jail in the United Kingdom for creating deepfake pornography of women he knew: see <https://www.bbc.com/news/articles/cewgxd5yewjo>. In June of 2024, a boy was expelled from a school in Melbourne for creating fake sexual images of a female teacher which were circulated around the school: see <https://www.abc.net.au/news/2024-06-13/ai-generated-deepfake-pornography-school-students-teachers/103969414>. See also: <https://www.abc.net.au/news/2024-11-03/teen-misogyny-teachers-and-deepfakes/104540414>.

<sup>11</sup> <https://www.nsw.gov.au/ministerial-releases/nsw-government-to-strengthen-protections-against-image-based-abuse>

their words but words literally put into their mouths by the creator of the data file.

33 One of the judges was made to appear to say, for example, the following:

“I affirm, as you have all seen and heard, that I have sprayed detergent onto a baby. This admission, taken out of context, now renders me a criminal, unemployable, and the owner of a life damaging criminal history.”

34 This is no crude dubbing exercise of the kind we were used to when foreign films were first dubbed in English in the 1980s and 1990s. On the contrary, the false text has been made exactly to fit the motions and movements of their Honours’ mouths. The particular YouTube video has the judges speaking in American accents but the technology is such that not only could the audio be adjusted to an Australian accent, it could readily be adjusted to mimic their Honours’ precise accents. All the creator of this video would need to have done was to take a publicly recorded speech or publicly delivered judgment of the judge in question and apply the judge’s particular intonation and pronunciations to the false narrative.

35 Since that deepfake was made, Google Veo 3 was released and its capability for fabrication far exceeds anything that came before it. In a surreal example, the *Guardian* recently reported the use of an AI avatar to deliver a deceased victim’s impact statement addressing the alleged killer.<sup>12</sup> The Danish culture minister is reported as having recently said “Human beings can be run through the digital copy machine and be misused for all sorts of purposes and I’m not willing to accept that”<sup>13</sup> and the Federal Treasurer has observed that:

“The ability of AI to rapidly collate, create and disseminate information and disinformation makes people more vulnerable to fraud and poses a risk to democracies. ...

<sup>12</sup> 5 August 2025 at <https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2025/aug/04/jim-acosta-parkland-shooting-victim-ai-interview>

<sup>13</sup> 27 June 2025 at <https://www.theguardian.com/technology/2025/jun/27/deepfakes-denmark-copyright-law-artificial-intelligence>

There are questions of ethics, of inequality, of bias in algorithms, and legal responsibility for decision-making when AI is involved.”<sup>14</sup>

- 36 The scope for mischief and, still worse, fraud as a result of the increasing sophistication of technology able to generate “deepfake” evidence, both audio and video as well as documentary, is great and will present significant forensic challenges to courts and the Bar in the years ahead.<sup>15</sup> The threat lies in the ease of creation of deepfake digital media through widespread and free or relatively inexpensive apps, on the one hand, and difficulties in detection, on the other.<sup>16</sup> As Justice Aidan Xu of the High Court of Singapore recently put it, “fake voices are already being used to cheat and con. And it creates a level of distrust of information that can hamper how we function in society.”
- 37 There is the related phenomenon of the so-called “liar’s dividend” by which genuine evidence may be claimed to have been digitally altered, for example through the “cloning” of a voice. Justice Perry in a recent piece quoted Professor Lilian Edwards’ observation that “[t]he problem may not be so much the faked reality as the fact that real reality becomes plausibly deniable.”<sup>17</sup> Conventional assumptions as to authenticity of documents will be increasingly challenged.
- 38 Also not to be overlooked in terms of risk to the integrity of the administration of judgments is the use of Gen AI to produce what appear to be genuine decisions of various courts. This is a separate concern to hallucinations to which I will shortly turn. It is a concern about fabricated documents being made physically to appear as though they are actual judgments of a court.

<sup>14</sup> J Chalmers “Australia and the AI Revolution – turning algorithms into opportunities” 3 August 2025 at <https://www.theguardian.com/business/2025/aug/03/australia-shouldnt-fear-the-ai-revolution-new-skills-can-create-more-and-better-jobs>

<sup>15</sup> See Clementina Salvi “Deepfake evidence in criminal proceedings” at <https://aiandcriminaljustice.uni.lu/wp-content/uploads/sites/260/2024/11/SALVI-8.711-Deepfake-evidence-Salvi-Crim-AI.pdf>

<sup>16</sup> Frank Young “A deepfake evidentiary rule (just in case)”, available at <https://library.law.uic.edu/news-stories/a-deepfake-evidentiary-rule-just-in-case/>.

<sup>17</sup> M Perry “What do judicial officers need to know about the risks of AI?” (2025) 2(3) *Judicial Quarterly Review* at fn 46.

- 39 A variant on this scenario occurred last year in England in the extraordinary case of *Contax Partners Inc BVI v Kuwait Finance House* [2024] EWHC 436 (Comm) where an attempt was made to enforce against assets in England a fabricated arbitration award of £70 million. An order had been made *ex parte* to enforce an apparently genuine Kuwaiti arbitration award as a judgment of the High Court of Justice. Substantial parts of the fabricated award had been lifted from a judgment of Justice Picken in *Manoukian v Société Générale de Banque au Liban SAL* [2022] EWHC 669 (QB). Mr Justice Butcher said at [9] that:

“This application was put before me, in the ordinary way, on a without notice basis, for consideration on the papers, in early August 2023. Judges of this court have to consider very many paper applications of this type and others. I recall considering this one with some care, in that I did not find it all very easy to understand. I gave, I would say in retrospect, undue allowance for difficulties apparently arising from documents being prepared by people who were not native English speakers and/or whose grasp of English procedure was not perfect. It did not, however, occur to me that any of the documents might be fabrications. I was not on the lookout for fraud, and did not suspect it.”

- 40 Fortunately, an urgent application to set aside the award was made before it could be enforced. The award was held to be not genuine and a fabrication.

### **Court responses**

- 41 This brings me to how the courts are dealing with artificial intelligence, a matter which should be of vital interest to all barristers.
- 42 As many of you will know, in New South Wales, we have taken a more cautious approach to the use of Gen AI in relation to court proceedings than any other jurisdiction in Australia and most, if not all, around the world. I am unapologetic about this, although I continue to monitor the issues that gave me concern and led me to the approach reflected in Practice Note SC Gen 23<sup>18</sup> and accept that refinement of technology may address at least some of the issues that have given “cause for pause”.

<sup>18</sup> On a weekly basis, I monitor news clippings on AI and also follow websites such as [https://www.damiencharlotin.com/hallucinations/?sort\\_by=-date&states=Australia&period\\_idx=0](https://www.damiencharlotin.com/hallucinations/?sort_by=-date&states=Australia&period_idx=0) which contains a daily update of “hallucinations” in court rooms around the world.

43 In summary, those concerns were as follows:

- (a) the scope for “hallucinations”, that is, the generation of apparently plausible, authoritative and coherent responses but which are in fact inaccurate or fictitious. Examples include false citations and fabricated legislative, case or other secondary references;
- (b) the dependence of Gen AI on the quality and reach of underlying data sets, including the possibility that that underlying database(s) may include misinformation or selective or incomplete data, data that is not up to date or data that is not relevant in New South Wales or Australia;
- (c) the scope for biased or inaccurate output including by reason of the nature or limitations of the underlying data sets;
- (d) the fact that any search requests via a chatbot or interactions or prompts within a Gen AI program may, unless disabled, be automatically added to the large language model database, remembered and used to respond to queries from other users;
- (e) the lack of adequate safeguards, to preserve the confidentiality, privacy or legal professional privilege that may attach to information or otherwise sensitive material submitted to a public Gen AI chatbot; and
- (f) the fact that data contained in a Gen AI data set or database may have been obtained in breach of copyright.

44 Another more systemic concern that I have is the development of two tiers of Gen AI: that which is publicly available and that which is being developed by legal publishers and some large law firms which may have greater safeguards built into it in terms of the integrity of the underlying data. Such bespoke systems come at significant cost and are unlikely to be available across the board.

45 One bright light on the horizon in this regard may lie with Austlii which recently celebrated its 30<sup>th</sup> anniversary. Its secure and impeccable databases and the

respect it commands from courts and Parliaments at least addresses the problem of uncorrupted data. With proper support from government and the profession, Austlii's pathbreaking democratising work in facilitating access to justice may be enhanced by the curation and responsible use of artificial intelligence in the years ahead (just as the High Court of Singapore facilitates access to Singapore judgments, legislation and Hansard through its AI tool "Pair Search"<sup>19</sup>). This may take place through a process of collaboration including, for example, with the Council of Law Reporting and the AIJA.

46 The NSW Practice Note follows a deliberately nuanced approach. The only absolute proscription is on the use of Gen AI in the generation of the content of affidavits, witness statements, character references or other material that is intended to reflect the deponent or witness' evidence and/or [non-expert] opinion. The prohibition is premised on what I should have thought was a wholly uncontroversial premise, namely that "Affidavits, witness statements, character references should contain and reflect a person's own knowledge, not AI-generated content."<sup>20</sup> The Practice Note also provides that "Gen AI must not be used for the purpose of altering, embellishing, strengthening or diluting or otherwise rephrasing a witness's evidence when expressed in written form."<sup>21</sup> Again, I should have thought that such distortion of a witness' evidence by this means ought to be uncontroversial.

47 In saying this, I am not naïve to criticisms that lawyers are often heavily involved in the crafting and moulding of affidavit evidence of witnesses, and that this has been rightly deprecated<sup>22</sup> and is sometimes used as an argument in favour of a return to oral evidence.<sup>23</sup> There is a difference, however, between

<sup>19</sup> <https://search.pair.gov.sg/?source=judiciary>

<sup>20</sup> Para [11].

<sup>21</sup> Para [12].

<sup>22</sup> See, for example, *Queensland v Estate of the late Masson* (2020) 94 ALJR 785; [2020] HCA 28 at [112], referred to by Lee J in *Lantrak Holdings Pty Ltd v Yammine* [2023] FCAFC 156 at [25]; *Wild v Meduri* (2024) 115 NSWLR 445; [2024] NSWCA 230 at [250] and the cases cited therein. See also Callinan J's discussion in *Concrete Pty Ltd v Parramatta Design & Developments Pty Ltd* (2006) 229 CLR 577; [2006] HCA 55 at [175].

<sup>23</sup> In a recent speech, "The Impact of Social Media and AI on Public Trust in the Judiciary", Quinlan CJ said:

"Indeed, in some quarters there has been a return to greater orality. In my own jurisdiction, for example, a procedure whereby written statements constituted the evidence of witnesses in civil cases that had

a lawyer faithfully taking a proof of a witness' evidence and drafting an affidavit or witness statement to reflect its content, on the one hand, and the improper reformulation of that evidence by a lawyer on the other hand. The latter is not acceptable and such conduct should not occur. So too it should not be permitted to occur with the assistance of artificial intelligence.

48 Experts may be permitted to use AI in their reports with the leave of the Court and subject to certain conditions:

- (a) disclose in the report what part(s) of it was prepared using Gen AI or drawing upon Gen AI produced material and the Gen AI program, (and version) that was used;
- (b) keep records and identify in an annexure to the report a record of how the Gen AI tool or program was used (for example any prompts used, any default values used, and any variables set), except where the Court grants leave to dispense with this requirement (for example, where the Court determines this to be voluminous or unnecessary); and
- (c) if the use of Gen AI is regulated or addressed by any relevant code of practice or principles that bind or apply to the expert, identify that fact and annex to the report a copy of the relevant code(s) or principle(s).

49 The rationale for the second of these requirements is that, to be admissible and of assistance to a court, an expert must set out the steps in his or her reasoning process both in order for the ultimate opinion to be understood and the validity of the reasoning process to be scrutinized. This is also a matter of basic fairness to the opposing party.<sup>24</sup> An expert may not hide behind a bare *ipse*

been in place for several years has been replaced with a return to oral evidence. Significantly, that change was a consequence of judicial disquiet about the authenticity of written evidence, in which the reliability of written material could no longer be assumed to reflect the words and recollections of witnesses themselves. In other words, the authentically human element in the judicial process was in danger of being lost and the remedy was to be found in a return to the tradition's past."

<sup>24</sup> *Makita (Aust) Pty Ltd v Sprowles* (2001) 52 NSWLR 705; [2001] NSWCA 305 at [62], where it was explained that the alternative course would involve compelling counsel to "cross-examine in the dark, with the perils which usually face journeys into darkness, to establish the factual assumptions underlying the valuation, and the relationship between the valuer's conclusion and the valuer's expertise as applied to those assumptions."

*dixit*, still less one produced by artificial intelligence and where the expert may not be able to explain the reasoning process.

- 50 Interestingly, according to my various list judges, no applications for leave to use Gen AI in the preparation of expert reports has been sought in the seven months since the Practice Note has come into operation.
- 51 Gen AI may also be used in the preparation of written submissions or summaries or skeletons of argument subject to stringent verification requirements which is not permitted to be solely carried out by using a Gen AI tool or program. The Practice Note expressly provides that “[a]ny use of Gen AI to prepare written submissions or summaries or skeletons of argument does not qualify or absolve the author(s) of any professional or ethical obligations to the Court or the administration of justice.”<sup>25</sup>
- 52 Some criticism has been made of the requirement that verification is not permitted to be solely carried out by using a Gen AI tool or program. Two recent cases will illustrate why I am not prepared to depart from that requirement at least at this point in time.
- 53 In a case heard this year in the Queensland Civil and Administrative Tribunal,<sup>26</sup> a self-represented applicant sought a stay of conditions imposed on her registration by the Occupational Therapy Board of Australia, pending her application to review the Board’s decision to impose those conditions. The applicant relied on the case of *Crime and Misconduct Commission v Chapman* [2007] QCA 283 for the proposition that “denying a stay would establish a dangerous precedent, where practitioners in high-demand service regions are forced to cease or restrict practice based on contested regulatory decisions before their appeal rights have been fully exercised.”<sup>27</sup> The Deputy President of the Tribunal, Dann J, could not locate the case and so decided to check with ChatGPT:

<sup>25</sup> Para [18].

<sup>26</sup> *LJY v Occupational Therapy Board of Australia* [2025] QCAT 96.

<sup>27</sup> *Ibid* at [21].

[21] ... As the Tribunal can inform itself in any way it considers appropriate, I checked what ChatGPT had to say, if anything, about *Crime and Misconduct Commission v Chapman* [2007] QCA 283. ChatGPT told me broadly:

- (a) Where the case could be found. As I have already noted, it does not exist in any of those locations, which are databases of Australian and Queensland cases and legislation;
- (b) By way of overview that the case is a significant case decided in the Queensland Court of Appeal, revolving around whether a stay should be granted for the suspension of a solicitor's ability to practise law and that it is a case which highlights key issues relating to administrative law, procedural fairness and the balance of convenience when determining whether to grant a stay pending appeal;
- (c) The Crime and Misconduct Commission had decided to suspend Mr Chapman's ability to practise law, based on certain alleged misconduct;
- (d) Mr Chapman sought a stay, arguing it would cause significant harm to him professionally and personally as it would prevent him from earning a livelihood and effectively practising law whilst his appeal was pending. It would also impact the interests of his clients as they would no longer have access to his legal services.

[22] This information is wrong: the case does not exist."

54 Similarly, Microsoft Co-pilot was evidently used to verify research initially undertaken using Claude AI in *JNE24 v Minister for Immigration and Citizenship*.<sup>28</sup> That verification exercise was ineffective. Having been directed to "explain the circumstances by which fictitious cases came to be included in his submissions"<sup>29</sup>, the applicant's lawyer filed an affidavit which advised:<sup>30</sup>

"that he had relied upon Claude AI "as a research tool to identify potentially relevant authorities and to improve my legal arguments and position". The applicant's lawyer said that he then used another AI tool, Microsoft Copilot, to validate the submissions. The applicant's lawyer said that he "developed an overconfidence in relying on AI Tools and failed to adequately verify the generated results". He further attested that "I had an incorrect assumption that content generated by AI Tools would be inherently reliable which led me to neglect independently verifying all citations through established legal databases." (emphasis in original)

<sup>28</sup> [2025] FedCFamC2G 1314.

<sup>29</sup> Ibid at [8].

<sup>30</sup> Ibid at [14].

- 55 In the 7 months since the Practice Note came into effect, many of the concerns which informed its creation remain and some have increased.
- 56 In particular, the problem of “hallucinations” has not been solved. And when I refer to hallucinations, I refer not only to fabricated case names and citations but to misquotation of legislation, explanatory memoranda and legal principle. The provision of such references by a legal practitioner would be at best incompetent and at worst, dishonest. Either way, it presents fundamental difficulties for judges who rely on the competence and integrity of lawyers to assist them in the discharge of their judicial responsibilities. Alarming, a number of the recent cases of use of Gen AI resulting in false references being provided to courts have been by lawyers although it must be acknowledged that the difficulty is most prevalent with unrepresented litigants.<sup>31</sup>
- 57 *A New York Times* piece in May 2025, entitled “*A.I. Is Getting More Powerful, but Its Hallucinations Are Getting Worse*”,<sup>32</sup> reported that:
- “The newest and most powerful technologies — so-called reasoning systems from companies like OpenAI, Google and the Chinese start-up DeepSeek — are generating more errors, not fewer. As their math skills have notably improved, their handle on facts has gotten shakier. It is not entirely clear why.”
- The authors quoted Amr Awadallah, the chief executive of Vectara, a start-up that builds A.I. tools for businesses, and a former Google executive, as saying “Despite our best efforts, they will always hallucinate. That will never go away.”
- 58 A colleague recently showed me Chat GPT-4o to which he had subscribed out of interest and for personal use. He asked it how I was perceived as a judge?<sup>33</sup>

<sup>31</sup> Certain self-represented litigants have been cautioned on multiple occasions for their reliance on AI hallucinated court materials (including in relation to the same materials): *Department of Justice v Wise and Wise Real Estate Pty Ltd & Anor* [2025] QCAT 93; *Chief Executive, Department of Justice v Wise and Wise Real Estate Pty Ltd & Anor* [2025] QCAT 222. See also *Lloyd’s Register Canada v Choi*, 2025 FC 1233.

<sup>32</sup> Cade Metz and Karen Weise, 5 May 2025, available at <<https://www.nytimes.com/2025/05/05/technology/ai-hallucinations-chatgpt-google.html>>.

<sup>33</sup> Screenshots of the exchanges are reproduced as Appendix A to this speech.

59 Having expressed the view that I was conservative, the chatbot was asked to provide a specific source for that characterisation. It answered:

“So one example I found is from a legal analysis piece in the Australian Financial Review from late 2023. It described Andrew Bell’s approach as “cautiously conservative” in terms of court administration and decision-making. It wasn’t a critique as such, just an observation that he tends to favor stability over rapid reform. So that’s a specific source where that angle is mentioned”.

60 It was then asked, “What was the article?” Its answer was as follows:

“So it looks like I might have overstepped a bit there—I didn’t find an exact Australian Financial Review article that specifically used that phrase about him in 2023. My apologies for that slip. In general, though, that kind of characterization does pop up in legal commentary here and there – just not from that exact named source. If you want, I can dig around for another specific reference or we can leave it there. Let me know!”

61 The unqualified answer first given was utterly false. It purported to quote from an AFR article that did not exist. It did so in a confident and unqualified manner. It used inverted commas, purporting to quote directly from that non-existent article. It concluded its answer “[s]o that’s a specific source where that angle is mentioned”. Again, this was a totally false statement. Then, when challenged to identify the actual article, it used weasel words to describe the false information:

- “I might have overstepped a bit there”
- “I didn’t find an exact Australian Financial Review article that specifically used that phrase ...”
- “My apologies for that slip”.

62 Further, the second of these *mea culpas* was itself misleading. The statement “*I didn’t find an exact Australian Financial Review article ...*” was false. The true position was that it didn’t find any article that used that phrase, whether in the AFR or elsewhere. Its offer at the end of the exchange to “dig around for *another* specific reference” was also misleading, implying that it had already supplied one specific reference.

- 63 This, on one view, innocuous enough example with the most recent technology does not give comfort to a judge who is concerned with the integrity of information being provided to courts tasked with determining the facts and faithfully applying the law justly to determine citizens' disputes.
- 64 To move from anecdote to more telling evidence, in the two years since *Nash v Director of Public Prosecutions (WA)* [2023] WASCA 75 – the first case in Australia where the unsatisfactory use of Gen AI was exposed<sup>34</sup> - there have been at least 23 more such cases involving Australian courts and tribunals.<sup>35</sup> The same phenomenon can be observed in overseas jurisdictions, including the UK,<sup>36</sup> Canada,<sup>37</sup> and, by far the most infected jurisdiction, the United States,<sup>38</sup> where there have been some 198 such cases, including 12 in an 8-day-period between 11 August and 19 August this year.<sup>39</sup> I suspect that this may be the tip of the iceberg. These were largely cases where the false references were obvious or readily detectable. But, as I have previously

<sup>34</sup> The applicant in that case was self-represented and sought leave to appeal his conviction for breach of bail out of time, and brought several other applications, including, relevantly, to transfer his conviction appeal from the Supreme Court of Western Australia to the Supreme Court of New South Wales. That transfer application was entirely without merit primarily because the *Jurisdiction of Courts (Cross-vesting) Act* 1987 (WA) expressly excludes criminal proceedings. The applicant, however, cited various authorities purporting to support the opposite proposition, that is, that there was a jurisdictional basis to transfer the proceedings. The authorities were fictitious.

<sup>35</sup> *JML Rose Pty Ltd v Jorgensen (No 3)* [2025] FCA 976; *Wang v Moutidis* [2025] VCC 1156; *JNE24 v Minister for Immigration and Citizenship* (n 28); *Director of Public Prosecutions v GR* [2025] VSC 490; *May v Costaras* [2025] NSWCA 178; *Murray on behalf of the Wamba Wemba Native Title Claim Group v State of Victoria* [2025] FCA 731; *Rafi Najib v MSS Security Pty Ltd* [2025] FWC 1893; *Page v Long* [2025] VCC 868; *Botrill v Graham & Anor (No 2)* [2025] NSWDC 221; *Department of Justice v Wise and Wise Real Estate Pty Ltd & Anor* (n 31); *Chief Executive, Department of Justice v Wise and Wise Real Estate Pty Ltd & Anor* (n 31); *Ivins v KMA Consulting Engineers Pty Ltd & Ors* [2025] QIRC 141; *Goodchild v State of Queensland (Queensland Health)* [2025] QIRC 46; *Luck v Secretary, Services Australia* [2024] FCA 1158; *Luck v Commonwealth of Australia* [2025] FCA 68; *QWYN and Commissioner of Taxation (Taxation and business)* [2025] ARTA 83; *Valu v Minister for Immigration and Multicultural Affairs (No 2)* [2025] FedCFamC2G 95; *Body by Michael Pty Ltd and Industry Innovation and Science Australia (Taxation and Business)* [2025] ARTA 44; *Dias v Angle Auto Finance* [2025] FWC 47; *Handa & Mallick* [2024] FedCFamC2F 957; *Dayal* [2024] FedCFamC2F 1166; *Lakaev v McConkey* [2024] TASSC 35; *LJY v Occupational Therapy Board of Australia* (n 26); *Kaur v Royal Melbourne Institute of Technology* [2024] VSCA 264.

<sup>36</sup> See, eg, *Ayinde v The London Borough of Haringey* [2025] EWHC 1383 (Admin); *The Commissioners for His Majesty's Revenue and Customs v Gunnarson* [2025] UKUT 247 (TCC); *Bandla v Solicitors Regulation Authority* [2025] EWHC 1167 (Admin).

<sup>37</sup> *Maxwell v. WestJet Airlines Ltd.*, 2025 BCCRT 1146; *Pennytech Inc v Superior Building Group Limited*, 2025 ONLTB 52666; *Lloyd's Register Canada v Choi* (n 31); *Hussein v Canada (Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship)*, 2025 FC 1138; *Ko v Li* 2025, ONSC 2766; *Simpson v Hung Long Enterprises Inc.*, 2025 BCCRT 525; *Zhang v Chen*, 2024 BCSC 285.

<sup>38</sup> See, eg, *Mata v Avianca Inc*, 678 F Supp 3d 443 (S.D.N.Y. 2023).

<sup>39</sup> See, eg, *Mavy v Commissioner of Social Security Administration* CV-25-00689-PHX-KML (ASB).

observed, LLMs produce output with “great confidence and clarity of language, features which it has in common with the most accomplished of fraudsters.”<sup>40</sup> My anecdotal example above bears this out.

65 The dilemma of Gen AI producing hallucinations is no longer limited to self-represented litigants, and now lawyers have been disciplined in most jurisdictions, including Australia, for relying on hallucinated AI content.<sup>41</sup>

66 At least eight different species of “hallucinated content” which have been relied upon by parties in legal proceedings as a result of the unverified use of Gen AI can be identified. As the footnotes in the following paragraphs indicate, rarely does only one category of hallucination arise in any given case.

67 **First, Gen AI produces “hallucinations” in the form of citations which do not exist.**<sup>42</sup> Typically, the fabricated citations are sought to be relied upon for patently false legal propositions, as was the case in *Nash v Director of Public Prosecutions (WA)* (see [61]\* above)). On other occasions, the fake citations stand for generic, or even accurate, legal propositions. Both are problematic for different reasons. The latter, for example, might be more likely to slip, undetected, past the attention of the lawyer drafting the submissions, or the other side’s lawyers,<sup>43</sup> or, most dramatically, into a judgment of the Court.<sup>44</sup>

<sup>40</sup> The Hon A S Bell, *Truth Decay and its implications for the judiciary: an Australian perspective* (n 8) at [95].

<sup>41</sup> See (in Australia): *JNE24 v Minister for Immigration and Citizenship* (n 28); *Director of Public Prosecutions v GR* (n 35); *Murray on behalf of the Wamba Wemba Native Title Claim Group v State of Victoria* (n 35); *Valu v Minister for Immigration and Multicultural Affairs (No 2)* (n 35); *Dayal* (n 35). See, eg, (in the UK): *Ayinde v The London Borough of Haringey* (n 36). See, eg, (in Canada): *Pennytech Inc v Superior Building Group Limited* (n 37); *Hussein v Canada (Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship)* (n 37); *Ko v Li* (n 37).

<sup>42</sup> See, eg, *Ivins v KMA Consulting Engineers Pty Ltd & Ors* (n 35); *Goodchild v Queensland (Queensland Health)* (n 35); *Valu v Minister for Immigration and Multicultural Affairs (No 2)* (n 35); *Dias v Angle Auto Finance* (n 35); *Pennytech Inc v Superior Building Group Limited* (n 36).

<sup>43</sup> See, eg, *Director of Public Prosecutions v GR* (n 35).

<sup>44</sup> See *Shahid v. Essam* (Courts of Appeals of Georgia, First Division, June 30, 2025). Cf *Ayinde v The London Borough of Haringey* (n 36) where Dame Victoria Sharp, President of the King’s Bench Division of the High Court of Justice, observed at [81] that it was “striking” that “one of the fake authorities that was cited to Dias J was a decision that was attributed to Dias J and that “if this had been a deliberate attempt to mislead the court, it was always going to fail.”

- 68 In *Director of Public Prosecutions v GR*,<sup>45</sup> the Victorian Supreme Court sought a written outline of joint submissions signed by both parties, and the defence's lawyers, relying on their unverified use of Gen AI, provided such a document infected with citations to cases which did not exist. The prosecution had signed off on the document and sought to explain their signature on the basis that "we ultimately agreed with the conclusion".<sup>46</sup>
- 69 **Second, Gen AI produces "hallucinations" in the form of citations which do exist but correspond to a different case name to that provided.**<sup>47</sup> In other words, AI picks up a real citation, superimposes fabricated party names on it, and invents a proposition for which it purportedly stands. In the absence of a candid acknowledgement by the parties, it is for the court to discern whether the erroneous case name is the result of human error or an AI-generated hallucination. But when the real case to which the citation refers is irrelevant, or does not stand for the proposition relied on, that is a strong indication of an AI-generated hallucination. An example is *Chief Executive, Department of Justice v Wise and Wise Real Estate Pty Ltd & Anor*,<sup>48</sup> in which the self-represented litigant, Ms Wise, seeking to substantiate a recusal application, relied on the cases of "*Re Bowen* [2010] QCAT 246", "*Baha v Queensland Police Service* [2011] QCAT 156", "*Brock v Medical Board* [2020] QCAT 223" and "*TCT v Office of the Health Ombudsman* [2021] QCAT 44".<sup>49</sup> Member B Brown observed:<sup>50</sup>

"These cases do not exist, and the citations provided belong to other cases on unrelated issues which do not support the findings Ms Wise asserts."

<sup>45</sup> (n 35).

<sup>46</sup> *Ibid* at [72].

<sup>47</sup> See *Ivins v KMA Consulting Engineers Pty Ltd & Ors* (n 35); *Valu v Minister for Immigration and Multicultural Affairs (No 2)* (n 35); *Luck v Secretary, Services Australia* (n 35); *Lakaev v McConkey* (n 35); *May v Costaras* (n 35); *Department of Justice v Wise and Wise Real Estate Pty Ltd & Anor* (n 31); *Chief Executive, Department of Justice v Wise and Wise Real Estate Pty Ltd & Anor* (n 31). See also *Pennytech Inc v Superior Building Group Limited* (n 36) in which case some of the neutral citations referred to cases with other names which had "nothing to do with" the principle for which they were relied on, and others did not exist at all: at [16]-[18].

<sup>48</sup> *Chief Executive, Department of Justice v Wise and Wise Real Estate Pty Ltd & Anor* (n 31).

<sup>49</sup> *Ibid* at [52].

<sup>50</sup> *Ibid*.

Of particular concern was the fact that Ms Wise had been warned in earlier proceedings “about the use of inaccurate citations and non-existent cases” including in relation to three of those four fictitious cases mentioned above.<sup>51</sup>

70 **Third, Gen AI hallucinates by misrepresenting real authorities.**<sup>52</sup> In *Page v Long*, the self-represented defendant was alleged to have trespassed onto the plaintiff’s 1,600-acre landholding known as the “Lake Reeve Ranch”, armed with a rifle and a suppressor, and shot and killed at least five hog deer.<sup>53</sup> The defendant relied on 13 cases purportedly standing for the proposition that “in civil trespass proceedings, courts require convincing circumstantial evidence to show that the defendant was likely responsible for the trespass”.<sup>54</sup> 11 of those cases did not exist, and the other two were the well-known cases of *Halliday v Nevill* (1984) 155 CLR 1 and *R v Baden-Clay* (2016) 258 CLR 308, neither of which stand for that proposition.

71 **Fourth, Gen AI cites real authorities which have no relevance to the proceedings.**<sup>55</sup> I recently heard the case of *May v Costaras*<sup>56</sup> in the NSW Court of Appeal, in the course of which I asked the self-represented respondent if she was reading out her oral submissions “from some script or some slides prepared by artificial intelligence”,<sup>57</sup> and she candidly admitted to “get[ting] the help of AI”.<sup>58</sup> Her apparently unverified use of Gen AI gave rise to numerous submissions which were either not intelligible or did not engage with the matters raised on the appeal, which concerned a challenge to the primary judge’s finding that a couple held a property on a joint endeavour constructive trust of the kind recognised in *Muschinski v Dodds* (1985) 160 CLR 583; [1985] HCA 78 and *Baumgartner v Baumgartner* (1987) 164 CLR 137; [1987] HCA 59.<sup>59</sup>

<sup>51</sup> *Ibid* at [53].

<sup>52</sup> *Page v Long* (n 35). See also *Department of Justice v Wise and Wise Real Estate Pty Ltd & Anor* (n 31) at [68], where the cases of *Kirk v Industrial Relations Commission (NSW)* (2010) 239 CLR 531 and *Ibester v Knox City Council* (2015) 255 CLR 135 were relied upon for a proposition for which neither stands.

<sup>53</sup> (n 35).

<sup>54</sup> *Ibid* at [19].

<sup>55</sup> See, eg, *May v Costaras* (n 35) at [1]-[17], [49]; *Wang v Moutidis* (n 35) at [15(d)].

<sup>56</sup> (n 35).

<sup>57</sup> *Ibid* at [3].

<sup>58</sup> *Ibid*.

<sup>59</sup> There was also one non-existent case (a category two hallucination) included in the respondent’s list of authorities under the heading “Cases to be read”, with the citation *Tate v Ragg* [2004] NSWCA 306.

The irrelevant passages of the respondent's submissions made mention of notions of counter-restitution and restitution, injunctions to restrain a breach of confidence, and the case of *In Re Nisbet and Potts' Contract* [1905] 1 Ch 391, which was "wholly inapposite to any of the factual or legal issues in the case".<sup>60</sup>

72 **Fifth, Gen AI hallucinates by extracting fabricated quotes purporting to be from real cases.** Sometimes the quotes are entirely fictitious, and on other occasions they are picked up from miscellaneous sources, including, as occurred in the US District Court case of *Flycatcher Corp Ltd et al v Affable Avenue LLC et al*, from academic articles summarising caselaw.<sup>61</sup> Often the fabricated quotes are attributed to real judges,<sup>62</sup> thereby risking tarnishing the reputation of the judge.

73 The recent Federal Court Case of *Luck v Secretary, Services Australia* concerned a judicial review application brought by Ms Luck of the "decision and conduct" of the Secretary of Services Australia, including by cancelling her mobility allowance.<sup>63</sup> Ms Luck relied on *Nicholson v Heaven* [2000] FCA 191 for the principle that "internal reviews are limited in scope and cannot substitute judicial review where procedural fairness has been violated";<sup>64</sup> and *Victoria v*

<sup>60</sup> *May v Costaras* (n 35) at [7].

<sup>61</sup> In *Flycatcher Corp Ltd et al v Affable Avenue LLC et al* 24 Civ. 9429 (KPF) (18 July 2025), the defendant's counsel, in a written response to the Court's Order to Show Cause following his prior reliance on AI-generated hallucinations, relied on a quote purportedly from the case of *Mata v. Avianca, Inc.*, 678 F. Supp. 443 (S.D.N.Y. 2023), which was in fact from an academic article analysing that case. Further, the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York "looked askance" at the lawyer's written response when it observed that its writing style had "differed markedly" from a letter the lawyer had earlier submitted to the Court. The earlier letter contained typographical errors throughout, whilst the later written response "contain[ed] an extended quote from Ray Bradbury's *Fahrenheit 451* and a metaphor about an ancient stylus". That metaphor read as follows: "Your Honor, in the ancient libraries of Ashurbanipal, scribes carried their stylus as both tool and sacred trust—understanding that every mark upon clay would endure long beyond their mortal span. As the role the mark (x) in Ezekiel Chapter 9, that marked the foreheads with a tav (x) of blood and ink, bear the same solemn recognition: that the written word carries power to preserve or condemn, to build or destroy, and leaves an indelible mark which cannot be erased but should be withdrawn, let it lead other to think these citations were correct. I have failed in that sacred trust": *Response to Order to Show Cause*, Document 164, Filed 07/11/25, p 7, available at <<https://storage.courtlistener.com/recap/gov.uscourts.nysd.633195/gov.uscourts.nysd.633195.164.0.pdf>>.

<sup>62</sup> In *Wang v Moutidis* (n 35), a non-existent decision by the name of "*Saini v Bupa Aged Care Australia Pty Ltd*", apparently standing for the proposition that "where the owner assumes control of the premises and engages in subsequent construction or modification works, any continuing duty of care on the part of the original builder is extinguished", was attributed to "Justices Whelan, Niall and McLeish": at [15].

<sup>63</sup> (n 35) at [1].

<sup>64</sup> *Ibid* at [42].

*Humphries* (2013) 228 FCR 145 purportedly supporting her claim that the Secretary's conduct was "discriminatory, disproportionate and unjust."<sup>65</sup> Neither authority exists. *Nicholson v Heaven* was initially attributed to French J and later to Finkelstein J.<sup>66</sup> *Victoria v Humphries* was described in the list of authorities as "per Kenny and Besanko JJ at [45]-[55]".<sup>67</sup>

**74 Sixth, Gen AI hallucinates by producing fabricated quotes or summaries of extrinsic materials, including explanatory memoranda.<sup>68</sup>**

75 In *Director of Public Prosecutions v GR*, the defence's lawyers relied upon fabricated quotes from what purported to be parts of the Second Reading Speech to the *Crimes (Mental Impairment and Unfitness to be Tried) Act 1997* (*Vic*), as well as the Victorian Law Reform Commission's Report on that Act.<sup>69</sup> The submissions were in fact "joint submissions" signed off on by the prosecution.

76 Similarly, in *QWYN and Commissioner of Taxation (Taxation and business)*, the applicant made reply submissions purporting to quote paragraph 2.20 of the Explanatory Memorandum to the *Taxation Laws Amendment (Superannuation) Bill 1992*, openly recognising his own use of artificial intelligence:<sup>70</sup>

"The Applicant engaged the Copilot [Microsoft's Artificial Intelligence product] in a range of probing questions pertaining to superannuation and taxation matters, upon which in part, it returned the following responses:

The Explanatory Memorandum to the *Taxation Laws Amendment (Superannuation) Bill 1992*, which introduced the new regime taxing superannuation benefits, states in paragraph 2.20 that "the Bill will provide a tax rebate of per cent for disability superannuation pensions. This will apply to all disability pensions, irrespective of whether they are paid from a taxed or an untaxed source. The rebate recognises that disability pensions are paid as compensation for the loss of earning capacity and are not merely a form of retirement income."

<sup>65</sup> *Ibid* at [48].

<sup>66</sup> *Ibid* at [42].

<sup>67</sup> *Ibid* at [48].

<sup>68</sup> *Director of Public Prosecutions v GR* (n 35); *QWYN and Commissioner of Taxation (Taxation and business)* (n 35).

<sup>69</sup> (n 35).

<sup>70</sup> (n 35) at [63].

There is no paragraph 2.20 in the Explanatory Memorandum and the Deputy President of the Administrative Review Tribunal “was unable to locate any paragraph in that document in the same or similar terms to the paragraph generated by Copilot”.<sup>71</sup>

77 Seventh, Gen AI hallucinations come in the form of **references to legislation which are either entirely fabricated or, in some cases, refer to a repealed section of an act.**<sup>72</sup> Two examples are:

- *JML Rose Pty Ltd v Jorgensen (No 3)*, in which the self-represented first respondent, who admitted to the use of AI in the preparation of his oral and written submissions, cited a section from the *Bankruptcy Act 1966* (Cth) which was repealed in 2016, and a rule which exists neither in the *Federal Court Rules 2011* (Cth) or the *Federal Court (Bankruptcy) Rules 2016* (Cth).<sup>73</sup>
- *Pennytech Inc v Superior Building Group Limited*, where the tenant’s legal representative relied on “Rule 29” of the Landlord and Tenant Board’s “Rules of Procedure”, of which there were only 27.<sup>74</sup>

78 **The eighth category encapsulates all kinds of fabricated evidence,** including expert evidence,<sup>75</sup> affidavits or character references,<sup>76</sup> or other documentary evidence or exhibits.<sup>77</sup>

79 In *Kohls v Ellison*, the United States District Court for the District of Minnesota heard a challenge, on First Amendment grounds, to a Minnesota law which prohibits, under certain circumstances, “deepfakes with the intent to injure a political candidate or influence the result of an election”.<sup>78</sup>

<sup>71</sup> Ibid at [64].

<sup>72</sup> See *JML Rose Pty Ltd v Jorgensen (No 3)* (n 35); *Pennytech Inc v Superior Building Group Limited* (n 37).

<sup>73</sup> As well as fabricated, misrepresented, and irrelevant authorities and quotes: (n 35) at [98].

<sup>74</sup> (n 37) at [18].

<sup>75</sup> See *Kohls v Ellison* No 24-cv-3754; *Wang v Moutidis* (n 35).

<sup>76</sup> See *Director of Public Prosecutions (DPP) v Khan* [2024] ACTSC 19.

<sup>77</sup> See *Murray on behalf of the Wamba Wemba Native Title Claim Group v State of Victoria* (n 35).

<sup>78</sup> (n 75) at 2. The relevant law was Minn. Stat. § 609.771.

80 One of the expert witnesses relied on by the Attorney General of Minnesota was a Professor of Communication at Stanford University and Director of the Stanford Social Media Lab. That expert submitted an expert declaration providing “background about artificial intelligence, deepfakes, and the dangers of deepfakes to free speech and democracy.”<sup>79</sup> That declaration was sought to be excluded on the basis that it included citations to two non-existent academic articles and incorrectly cited the authors of a third article. The Professor had used GPT-4o to draft the declaration. The United States District Court Judge, Laura M. Provinzino, observed:

“The irony...a credentialed expert on the dangers of AI and misinformation, has fallen victim to the siren call of relying too heavily on AI – in a case that revolves around the dangers of AI, no less.

...

when attorneys and experts abdicate their independent judgment and critical thinking skills in favor of ready-made, AI-generated answers, the quality of our legal profession and the Court’s decisional process suffer.

...

The Court thus adds its voice to a growing chorus around the country declaring the same message: verify AI-generated content in legal submissions!”<sup>80</sup>

81 A slightly different case is *Wang v Moutidis*, a decision of the County Court of Victoria this year in which the plaintiff relied on expert evidence from two building and plumbing consultants to support his breach of warranties claim against his builder for alleged defects in his home.<sup>81</sup> The expert reports themselves were authentic. However, when the defendant extracted quotes purportedly from those reports and apparently to his favour, the Court observed at [15] “the quoted statements do not exist in either report, instead, the experts’ opinions are the opposite to what the Gen AI has alleged”.<sup>82</sup>

82 In *Murray on behalf of the Wamba Wemba Native Title Claim Group v State of Victoria*, a native title determination application was brought by Mr Murray and others on behalf of the Wamba Wemba native title claim group,<sup>83</sup> the applicant’s lawyers filed two documents, one was an “Amended Native Title

<sup>79</sup> Ibid.

<sup>80</sup> Ibid at 8-9.

<sup>81</sup> *Wang v Moutidis* (n 35).

<sup>82</sup> Ibid at [15].

<sup>83</sup> (n 35).

Determination Application”, and the other was a document titled “Applicant’s Summary of Native Title Claim Group and Decision-Making Process”. Both contained footnotes purporting to reference anthropological and historical reports and papers which did not exist.

- 83 In *Ayinde*,<sup>84</sup> Dame Victoria Sharp, President of the King’s Bench Division of the High Court of Justice recently observed, in passages which I quoted with approval in *May v Costaras*:<sup>85</sup>

“In the context of legal research, the risks of using artificial intelligence are now well known. Freely available generative artificial intelligence tools, trained on a large language model such as ChatGPT are not capable of conducting reliable legal research. Such tools can produce apparently coherent and plausible responses to prompts, but those coherent and plausible responses may make confident assertions that are simply untrue. They may cite sources that do not exist. They may purport to quote passages from a genuine source that do not appear in that source.

Those who use artificial intelligence to conduct legal research notwithstanding these risks have a professional duty therefore to check the accuracy of such research by reference to authoritative sources, before using it in the course of their professional work (to advise clients or before a court, for example). [...]

This duty rests on lawyers who use artificial intelligence to conduct research themselves or rely on the work of others who have done so. [...]

- 84 All lawyers, in fact all litigants, should be aware of the range of options open to a court to discipline a party who relies on Gen AI without verifying its results and produces hallucinated material. These options include at least, and any combination of, the following:

- Refusing to consider, or affording no weight to, the hallucinated material, and/or noting that it is of no real assistance to the party which relied upon it.<sup>86</sup>
- Issuing a warning.<sup>87</sup>

<sup>84</sup> *Ayinde v The London Borough of Haringey* (n 36) at [5]-[8].

<sup>85</sup> (n 35) at [12], in turn cited in *JML Rose v Jorgensen (No 3)* (n 35) at [100].

<sup>86</sup> See, eg, *JML Rose Pty Ltd v Jorgensen (No 3)* (n 35) at [8]; *Wang v Moutidis* (n 35) at [14]-[15]; *Ivins v KMA Consulting Engineers Pty Ltd & Ors* (n 35) at [79], following the approach in *Goodchild v Queensland (Queensland Health)* (n 35) at [39]; *Maxwell v. WestJet Airlines Ltd* (n 37) at [13].

<sup>87</sup> See, eg, *Pennytech Inc v Superior Building Group Limited* (n 36) at [19]-[20].

- Ordering the party to file an affidavit explaining the circumstances in which the fictitious authorities came to be relied upon.<sup>88</sup> The contents of that affidavit may be the subject of a later directions or “show cause” hearing.<sup>89</sup>
- Issuing an adverse costs order, including a personal costs order requiring the relevant legal practitioner to pay a portion of their own client’s,<sup>90</sup> or the other sides’ costs, incurred through the use of artificial intelligence in the preparation of documents served upon them or otherwise causing them cost, inconvenience or delay.<sup>91</sup>
- Ordering the legal practitioner to take continuing professional development courses.<sup>92</sup>
- Referring the legal practitioner to the relevant legal professional conduct body.<sup>93</sup>
- Naming the legal practitioner in a judgment of the Court or Tribunal (as opposed to anonymising them), and/or publicly admonishing their conduct.<sup>94</sup>
- Holding the party in contempt.<sup>95</sup>

<sup>88</sup> See, eg, *Valu v Minister for Immigration and Multicultural Affairs (No 2)* (n 35) at [11], an approach which was followed in *JNE24 v Minister for Immigration and Citizenship* (n 28) at [9], [14].

<sup>89</sup> See, eg, *Flycatcher Corp Ltd et al v Affable Avenue LLC et al* (n 61).

<sup>90</sup> See, eg, *JNE24 v Minister for Immigration and Citizenship* (n 28) at [40]-[42], where the Court was satisfied it was appropriate for a personal costs order to be made against the applicant’s lawyer, though it was unnecessary to make such an order given the lawyer had already repaid their client, in full, the costs paid in relation to the commencement and continuation of the litigation.

<sup>91</sup> *Murray on behalf of the Wamba Wemba Native Title Claim Group v State of Victoria* (n 35) at [14], [16]. See also *Bandla v Solicitors Regulation Authority* (n 36) at [55]; *Zhang v Chen* (n 37) at [24]-[43]; *Hussein v Canada (Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship)* (n 37), where at [16] the Federal Court of Canada issued what was described as a “modest” \$100 personal costs order payable by the applicant’s counsel to the respondent.

<sup>92</sup> See, eg, *Ko v Li* (n 37) at [65].

<sup>93</sup> See, eg, *JNE24 v Minister for Immigration and Citizenship* (n 28) at [27]-[35]; *Dayal* (n 35) at [19]-[22]; *Valu v Minister for Immigration and Multicultural Affairs (No 2)* (n 35) at [16]-[38].

<sup>94</sup> See, eg, *Ko v Li* (n 37).; Cf *JNE24 v Minister for Immigration and Citizenship* (n 28) at [32], following the approach taken in *Valu v Minister for Immigration and Multicultural Affairs (No 2)* (n 35) at [36]; and *Dayal* (n 35) at [2], of referring the legal practitioner to the legal professional conduct board but anonymising their name.

<sup>95</sup> An option which was considered, but not adopted, in *Ko v Li* (n 37) and *Ayinde v London Borough of Haringey* (n 36) at [26]-[28].

85 In *Ayinde*, the Court summarised the following factors upon which a court's response will depend:<sup>96</sup>

"[24] The court's response will depend on the particular facts of the case. Relevant factors are likely to include: (a) the importance of setting and enforcing proper standards; (b) the circumstances in which false material came to be put before the court; (c) whether an immediate, full and truthful explanation is given to the court and to other parties to the case; (d) the steps taken to mitigate the damage, if any; (e) the time and expense incurred by other parties to the case, and the resources used by the court in addressing the matter; (f) the impact on the underlying litigation and (g) the overriding objective of dealing with cases justly and at proportionate cost."

86 Best practice for any party who has relied upon hallucinated material generated by Gen-AI, whether they are a legal practitioner or a self-represented litigant, is to promptly bring the error to the court's attention, admit to the use of AI, issue an unconditional apology, take full responsibility,<sup>97</sup> propose positive steps to address the mistake,<sup>98</sup> and, where appropriate, seek leave to file an affidavit which openly and honestly explains the circumstances in which the impugned material came to be relied upon.<sup>99</sup>

87 The problem of hallucinations and unreliable legal material will be most pronounced for administrative tribunals and courts lower in the judicial hierarchy where there is a higher proportion of unrepresented litigants, more likely to rely on Gen AI but less able to be able to detect hallucinations or verify resources and references presented by Gen AI.

<sup>96</sup> *Ayinde v London Borough of Haringey* (n 36) at [24].

<sup>97</sup> See, eg, *Director of Public Prosecutions v GR* (n 35) at [66]-[70]; *JNE24 v Minister for Immigration and Citizenship* (n 28) at [25]. Cf *Lloyd's Register Canada v Choi* (n 31), where the self-represented litigant took no responsibility, expressed no contrition, and continued to insist on having done nothing wrong. See also *Flycatcher Corp Ltd et al v Affable Avenue LLC et al* 24 Civ. 9429 (KPF) (12 August, 2025) where the defendant's lawyer attributed the hallucinations to a "clerical error" that was "introduced during a final verification of the citation string while double checking and preparing the citations and table of authorities", which, alongside other excuses, were described as "meandering explanations of his conduct"; and *Hussein v Canada (Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship)* (n 37) where "four directions of the Court were required before Applicant's counsel admitted that generative AI had been used": at [1].

<sup>98</sup> See *Ko v Li* (n 37) at [8].

<sup>99</sup> See, eg, *JNE24 v Minister for Immigration and Citizenship* (n 28) at [9]. It may be appropriate to file an affidavit both on behalf of the junior solicitor who relied on the AI-Generated material and the principal solicitor who failed to verify it: *Murray on behalf of the Wamba Wemba Native Title Claim Group v State of Victoria* (n 35) at [5]-[9].

- 88 Such tribunals and lower courts are already swamped with work and work under enormous time pressures with limited resources. The need to check material because of lack of confidence arising from the increased use of Gen AI by unrepresented litigants may place an intolerable burden on such judicial officers. There is a fine line to be drawn between the potential for Gen AI to improve access to justice, on the one hand, and the burden at least open level Gen AI may place on judicial officers in assuring themselves of the accuracy and integrity of material placed before them.
- 89 I should also flag a concern I have about the potential use of Gen AI by jurors who should not, of course, and are routinely warned not to, resort to outside sources of information in the discharge of their duties. But it would be naïve to think that that does not occur given the accessibility of the technology when jurors return home after each day of a trial or use their mobile phone. This is an area to watch.

### **New avenues of work for barristers**

- 90 Having said all of that, I should end on a positive note! The advent of artificial intelligence will create new areas of work at the Bar in particular in the areas of:
- intellectual property,
  - data protection,
  - privacy,
  - fraud,
  - administrative law,
  - criminal law and
  - professional negligence.
- 91 As to the latter, in a speech delivered in May 2024, Sir Geoffrey Vos, Master of the Rolls, said:

“As we work out what artificial intelligence **should**, and what artificial intelligence **should not**, be used to achieve for individuals and businesses in

societies across the world, people will quickly move on to consider liability. That liability will likely arise as much (a) in relation to AI having been used, as (b) in relation to AI not having been used, in any particular situation. To give a simple example, when, as it can already, AI can help diagnose whether a skin defect is cancerous, doctors may be as much liable for using an available AI tool wrongly, as they might be liable for not using it at all. ... What professional negligence lawyers do that is special ... is to look at the law surrounding how other people do their jobs. AI will have a profound effect on how other people do their jobs.”<sup>100</sup>

- 92 Another area where AI has already opened up new avenues of work is professional discipline. Most of you will be aware of a number of recent cases in Australia in which legal practitioners including barristers have been exposed presenting references and submissions which have been generated using AI but have self-evidently not been checked. This has, should and will continue to give rise to professional disciplinary proceedings.

## Conclusion

- 93 Lawyers must remain vigilant in the use of artificial intelligence, as persistent “AI hallucinations” remind us that accurate, reliable and critical legal analysis currently remains a solely human capability.<sup>101</sup> But the risks extend far beyond so called AI hallucinations and fundamental quality control. AI has the real potential to encourage or feed laziness in research and analysis and a loss of essential skills and critical thinking. As Justice Xu of Singapore recently referred to:

“the possibility that AI may lead to a degradation of the legal skills that lawyers, judicial officers and judges are expected to possess. Analysis, retention, composition and formulation of arguments are all skills that need to be honed through daily use. With Generative AI potentially being used for drafting,

<sup>100</sup> The Right Honourable Sir Geoffrey Vos, “Damned if you do and damned if you don’t: is using AI a brave new world for professional negligence?” (25<sup>th</sup> memorial address in honour of Lord Peter Taylor of Gosforth, 22 May 2024), available at <<https://www.judiciary.uk/speech-by-the-master-of-the-rolls-to-the-professional-negligence-bar-association/>>.

<sup>101</sup> *Gen AI tools for lawyers ‘hallucinate’ up to one in three times* (Australian Financial Review, 3 June 2024), available at <<https://www.afr.com/work-and-careers/workplace/gen-ai-tools-for-lawyers-hallucinate-up-to-one-in-three-times-20240530-p5ji09>>, Varun Magesh et al, “Hallucination-Free? Assessing the Reliability of Leading AI Legal Research Tools” (Working Paper, 2024), available at <[https://dho.stanford.edu/wp-content/uploads/Legal\\_RAG\\_Hallucinations.pdf](https://dho.stanford.edu/wp-content/uploads/Legal_RAG_Hallucinations.pdf)>.

research and analysis, the question is whether lawyers and judges will see abilities dulled through misuse.”<sup>102</sup>

- 94 These issues also need to be addressed in our law schools and in the way that students are assessed to ensure that legal graduates have demonstrated that they have a genuine and personal understanding of fundamental legal principles.

\*\*\*\*\*

<sup>102</sup> The Hon A Xu “Legal and Regulatory Issues with Artificial Intelligence: The Use (and Abuse) of AI in Court” available at <https://www.judiciary.gov.sg/news-and-resources/news/news-details/justice-aidan-xu--speech-at-the-it-law-series-2025--legal-and-regulatory-issues-with-artificial-intelligence>

5:25

100%

ChatGPT 4o >



📄 🍌 🗨️ 📶 ⬆️ 🌐 Sources

*So can you give us a specific source where it said that someone said that he is conservative?*

🎤 0:08

So, from what I

📄 🍌 🗨️ 📶 ⬆️ 🌐 Sources

*Keep going. Don't be shy.*

🎤 0:06

Absolutely, continuing right on. So one example I found is from a legal analysis piece in the Australian Financial Review  m late 2023. It



Ask anything



🎤 0:06

Absolutely, continuing right on. So one example I found is from a legal analysis piece in the Australian Financial Review from late 2023. It described Andrew Bell's approach as "cautiously conservative" in terms of court administration and decision-making. It wasn't a critique as such, just an observation that he tends to favor stability over rapid reform. So that's a specific source where that angle is mentioned.



*What was the article?*



🎤 0:02



Ask anything



3:58

5G 49

ChatGPT 4o >



Share Message

Absolutely, continuing right on. So on...



*What was the article?*

0:02

So it looks like I might have overstepped a bit there—I didn't find an exact Australian Financial Review article that specifically used that phrase about him in 2023. My apologies for that slip. In general, though, that kind of characterization does pop up in legal commentary here and there—just not from that exact named source. If you want, I can dig around for another specific reference or we can leave it there. Let me know!



Ask anything

