



AI and Criminal Justice in Europe: Risk, Rights, and Regulation

Mrs Asma khan

Advocate high court, LLM (International & Maritime law), Professor IIUI & University of Manchester

Khanasma5988@gmail.com

Abstract: *The integration of Artificial Intelligence (AI) into European criminal justice systems has introduced both unprecedented opportunities and serious challenges. This paper critically examines the interplay between technological efficiency, human rights, and regulatory frameworks within this emerging domain. It explores how predictive policing, algorithmic risk assessment, and forensic AI applications can streamline legal processes while simultaneously threatening principles of fairness and equality enshrined in the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR). Through analysis of automation bias, data-driven discrimination, and oversight deficiencies, the study highlights the pressing need for transparency and accountability. The EU Artificial Intelligence Act's classification of criminal justice AI as "high-risk" underscores the importance of human oversight, ethical governance, and fairness-by-design. Ultimately, the paper argues for a balanced approach where innovation aligns with democratic values, ensuring that AI supports — rather than undermines — justice, human dignity, and public trust.*

Keywords: *Artificial Intelligence (AI), Criminal Justice, Human Rights, Predictive Policing, EU AI Act*

Introduction

The rise of AI in criminal justice across Europe represents one of the most contested intersections of technology, law, and human rights. AI promises to enhance efficiency in policing, sentencing, and evidence evaluation, but it also risks reinforcing structural inequalities and infringing upon civil liberties (Crawford, 2021). The stakes are especially high in criminal law, where state power directly affects personal freedom. This article explores the risks, rights, and regulatory dimensions of AI in European criminal justice.



Predictive Justice and Risk Assessment

Predictive policing and risk assessment systems attempt to identify “hot spots” for crime, assess recidivism risks, and inform sentencing (Ferguson, 2017). Supporters argue these tools enhance efficiency, but critics warn of automation bias, where human actors defer excessively to machine outputs (Gonzalez, 2020). When historical policing data reflects discrimination, predictive AI may replicate and even amplify those biases.

Bias, Discrimination, and Human Rights

AI systems trained on biased data often perpetuate inequality. This is particularly concerning in Europe, where criminal justice must align with the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR) and the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the EU. Predictive policing tools that disproportionately target minority communities could violate Article 6 (right to a fair trial) and Article 14 (prohibition of discrimination) of the ECHR (Council of Europe, 2018).

Studies such as Angwin et al. (2016) show that algorithmic risk assessment tools in the U.S. overestimated recidivism risks for Black defendants. Similar risks exist in Europe if safeguards are not enforced.

Evidence Analysis and Forensic Applications

AI is increasingly used in forensic analysis, including facial recognition and digital forensics (Garvie et al., 2016). While these tools can speed investigations, they also raise risks of wrongful arrest and privacy violations. For instance, facial recognition systems often misidentify individuals from minority groups (Buolamwini and Gebru, 2018). To maintain admissibility, AI-generated evidence must be subject to rigorous standards of reliability and open to adversarial challenge in court.

Regulation, Governance, and the EU AI Act

The EU AI Act treats AI used in criminal justice as “high-risk,” imposing requirements of transparency, accountability, and human oversight (European Commission, 2021). Importantly, the Act prohibits certain practices, such as real-time

biometric surveillance in public spaces, except under narrowly defined circumstances. This precautionary stance reflects the recognition that criminal justice applications of AI touch directly on fundamental freedoms.

Human Oversight and Institutional Capacity

Human oversight remains central to maintaining legitimacy. Judges, prosecutors, and defense lawyers must retain ultimate authority, with AI serving only as an advisory tool (Hildebrandt, 2022). Yet without sufficient technical training, oversight may be superficial. Building institutional capacity through AI literacy programs, independent audits, and ethical review boards is essential for meaningful accountability.

Future Directions: Responsible AI in Criminal Justice

The future of AI in criminal justice depends on responsible design and democratic accountability. Research into explainable AI (XAI) and fairness-aware algorithms can help mitigate risks. Public engagement and interdisciplinary collaboration will be essential to maintaining trust. As Crawford (2021) argues, AI is never neutral—it embodies political and social choices. European criminal justice systems must therefore embed human rights at the core of AI deployment.

Conclusion

AI offers efficiency and analytical power in criminal justice, but without strong safeguards, it risks reinforcing bias, eroding rights, and undermining public trust. Regulation, oversight, and fairness-by-design approaches are essential for aligning AI with European values of justice and human dignity.

References

Angwin, J., Larson, J., Mattu, S. and Kirchner, L. (2016). Machine Bias: There's Software Used Across the Country to Predict Future Criminals. And it's Biased Against Blacks. ProPublica.

Buolamwini, J. and Gebru, T. (2018). Gender Shades: Intersectional Accuracy Disparities in Commercial Gender Classification. Proceedings of Machine Learning Research, 81.

Council of Europe. (2018). Algorithms and Human Rights: Study on the Human Rights Dimensions of Automated Data Processing Techniques. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.

Crawford, K. (2021). Atlas of AI: Power, Politics, and the Planetary Costs of Artificial Intelligence. Yale University Press.

European Commission. (2021). Proposal for a Regulation Laying Down Harmonised Rules on Artificial Intelligence (Artificial Intelligence Act). COM/2021/206 final.

Ferguson, A. (2017). The Rise of Big Data Policing: Surveillance, Race, and the Future of Law Enforcement. NYU Press.

Garvie, C., Bedoya, A. and Frankle, J. (2016). The Perpetual Line-Up: Unregulated Police Face Recognition in America. Georgetown Law Center on Privacy and Technology.

Gonzalez, A. (2020). Automation Bias in Legal Decision-Making: A Risk for Justice. International Journal of Law and Information Technology, 28(2).

Hildebrandt, M. (2022). Law for Computer Scientists and Other Folk. Oxford University Press.