SOCIAL SCIENCE REVIEW ARCHIVES
ISSN Online: 3006-4708
ISSN Print: 3006-4694
https://policyjournalofms.com

The Impact of Artificial Intelligence on Evidence in Criminal Trials

[1]Dr. Muhammad Imran Tahir, [2]Azhar Saeed, [3]Muniba Murtaza, [4]Hafiz Omer Abdullah

[1]Ph.D. in International Law, Arbitrator, Chongqing arbitration commission Chongqing China. imrantahir32278@yahoo.com
[2]LLM, LLB Hons, Advocate High Court, Lahore Visiting faculty, Department of Law, University of Sahiwal. azharsaeed050@gmail.com
[3]Information, and Communication Technology, Future Training and Services Center, Abu Dhabi. muniba@ftcglobal.ae
[4]Lecture Department of Law, University of Sahiwal. omerabdullah@uosahiwal.edu.pk
Corresponding Author: imrantahir32278@yahoo.com

DOI: https://doi.org/10.70670/sra.v3i3.1023

Abstract
The study has explored the dynamic nature of artificial intelligence on the presentations and the examination of evidence during criminal trials in the Pakistani judicial system. The study used a mixed-methods design to examine 150 criminal trials of district and sessions courts in Karachi, Lahore, Islamabad and Peshawar in the years 2020-2024 with 45 legal practitioners participating in structured interviews. The analysis showed that the question of admissibility and reliability assessment of the AI-generated evidence is often difficult, and judges proved to have different degrees of acceptance and awareness of AI technologies. Major outcomes were that although AI-enhanced forensic evidence was more accurate in 73 cases, judicial reluctance towards new technological evidence generated uneven use of the admissibility criteria. Findings of the study revealed that there are critical gaps in the legal frameworks that regulate AI evidence, and current Evidence Act provisions are insufficient to solve the issue of algorithmic transparency and bias. Findings showed that effective adoption of AI evidence was strongly linked with the quality of judicial training and quality of expert testimony. The findings of the study were that the criminal justice system in Pakistan needs a complete overhaul of the legal system, standardization of procedures in the evaluation of AI evidence, and an improved sphere of judicial education in order to utilize the potential of AI and preserve the principle of fair trial and the protection of the right to due process.

Keywords: Dynamic nature, artificial intelligence, examination, evidence, criminal trials, Pakistani judicial system.

Introduction

One of the most influential technological disruptions in the current legal practice is the incorporation of artificial intelligence in the criminal justice systems. With the booming development of AI technologies, their use in the collection, analysis, and presentation of evidence has become the fundamental change in the conventional methods of criminal investigation and

trial (Nadjia, 2024). Facial recognition cameras and predictive policing algorithms to advanced software of DNA analysis and digital forensics, artificial intelligence is already a more and more common threat in trials of criminals globally. The relevance of AI-generated evidence in courts is virtually questionable, and the ethical dimension of this technological revolution is very dubious (Vargas-Murillo et al., 2024). The criminal justice system in Pakistan, based on the legal systems of the colonial era under the influence of the Evidence Act of 1872, has never had to deal with more technological innovations as it does currently (Sharoon et al., 2024). The current legal framework was made to suit the pre-digital era and there are substantial loopholes in dealing with the starkness of AI-enhanced evidence. With the courts of Pakistan facing more and more cases in which AI-generated evidence is involved, whether in cybercrime cases or in terrorism cases, there is a strong need to ensure that knowledge about the effect AI has on evidence is truly comprehensive. The old system of adversarial process that is premised on the long-established principles of testimony of witnesses and physical evidence has to contend with the use of algorithmic decision-making processes that tend to be non-transparent and misinterpretable by a human (Iqbal et al., 2025). The Pakistani legal landscape presents unique challenges for AI evidence integration (Sajida & Sabreen, 2025). The different judicial infrastructures in the country such as metropolitan high court to rural district court have different degrees of technological literacy and resource availability. This gap generates unequal methods of AI evidence consideration, which may jeopardize the core idea of equal justice before the law. Moreover, the cultural and linguistic diversity of Pakistan also complicates the implementation of AI systems since most of the algorithms are made in primarily Western settings and might have some level of bias when applied to the Pakistani population and social organization (Buksh et al., 2022). The possible and the traps of AI evidence have been exposed in recent high-profile criminal cases in Pakistan (Bhatti et al., 2024). Digital forensics have been of invaluable use in cases of cybercrime prosecution and facial recognition system have been used to identify suspects during cases of terrorism. Nevertheless, issues of algorithm bias, data privacy and the black box-ness of a lot of AI systems have been raised. Defense counsel are moving to contest AI evidence on its reliability, whereas prosecutors are touting its probative worth. This conflict indicates a wider debate in the rest of the world surrounding the purpose of artificial intelligence in courtrooms and the necessity of balanced strategies that would achieve the advantages of technology without harming established legal tenets (Rana et al.). The standards of evidentiary used by Pakistani courts should be adjusted to the use of AI technologies, but they should be rigid in terms of reliability standards. Conventional evidence admissibility tests, including relevance and reliability tests as mandated under the Evidence Act, must be refracted through an algorithmic prism. The difficulty will be to create frameworks that can evaluate the believability of AI generated evidence and not to throttle technological advancements or put barriers to justice that are impassable. Such balance is especially vital when it comes to criminal cases in which the liberty and basic rights are under consideration (Saleem et al., 2023). Foreign practice provides a lot of knowledge to how Pakistan should treat AI evidence. Law enforcement in jurisdictions like the United States, the United Kingdom and the European Union are starting to build dedicated guidelines to address AI evidence, such as algorithmic transparency, bias tests, and expert testifier guidelines. These methods should however be adjusted to the legal, cultural and technological specifics of Pakistan, not copied wholesale. The special issues of developing countries in the application of AI regulation systems demand specially designed solutions based on the limitation of resources, institutional resources, and local legal practices (Ahmed et al., 2022). The anthropomorphic component of the AI evidence assessment cannot be disregarded. Courts, lawyers and judges need thorough training

to know about AI technologies, their shortcomings and how they will affect the process of conducting a fair trial (Ahmad et al., 2024). The complexity of artificial intelligence systems can also lead to asymmetries of knowledge between professionals and technicians of the law and thus, may place disadvantages on parties that do not have access to advanced AI knowledge. Such knowledge gap endangers the adversarial balance of the fair criminal trial, and requires systematic work in the field of improving legal education and training of the judges (Nadjia, 2024).

The stakes of this technological turn are not only in procedural efficiency, but fundamentally in is justice, fairness, and constitutional rights. With the development of AI systems, their role in criminal trials will only expand with the development of more advanced systems (Karnouskos, 2022). The policies currently in place on AI evidence-based standards and protocols will determine the criminal justice system in Pakistan in the decades to come. The existing issue concerning the effects of artificial intelligence on criminal evidence is thus not simply an academic endeavor but an important necessity to see to it that technological progress is not the bane of the cause of justice (Hussain et al., 2024). The study is timely since it seeks to understand the effect of AI in criminal prosecutions in Pakistan. Through case studies of real court proceedings, discussions with law practitioners, and by taking a closer look at the existing practices, the study offers evidence-based information regarding the risks and opportunities that AI technologies entail. The results are relevant to the current policy discussion and provide viable solutions to the revision of laws, judicial education and institutional change. As Pakistan moves on its digital transformation mission, the study offers a basis on why artificial intelligence should improve but not jeopardize the integrity of the criminal justice processes (Mohsin, 2024).

Research Objectives

1. To evaluate the actual picture of the use of AI evidence in Pakistani criminal.
2. To analyze the legal system whether it is sufficient to deal with AI-generated.
3. To determine the obstacles and enablers to the adoption of AI evidence in the trial process in criminal cases.

Research Questions

1. What is the impact of introducing AI-generated evidence into the judicial process and the outcomes of the cases in the criminal courts of Pakistan?
2. Which legal and procedural issues are the most significant to Pakistani courts when it comes to admitting and assessing AI-enhanced evidence?
3. How well are existing legal structures and judicial practice in Pakistan responsive to the reliability and bias issues related to artificial intelligence evidence?

Significance of the Study

This study is of primary importance to the developing criminal justice system in Pakistan because it is the first analytical study to offer a thorough empirically-based study into the role of artificial intelligence in criminal evidence in the Pakistani criminal justice. The analysis fulfills an urgent gap in knowledge that exists within the intersection of technology and law by providing evidence-based information that is paramount to informed policy-making and law reform projects. Since the concept of digital transformation in Pakistan is ongoing, and the AI technologies are becoming more widespread in law enforcement and forensic investigations, the interpretation of their consequences in the fair conduct of the trial process becomes essential to ensure that people do not lose trust in the justice system. Research outcomes are of benefit to several stakeholders such as

the judicial system, legal practitioners, law enforcement agencies and policymakers who have to grapple with the difficult issues of adopting sophisticated technologies without sacrificing established legal principles as well as constitutional safeguards.

Literature Review

The academic discussion of artificial intelligence and its usage in criminal evidence has changed very quickly over the last decade, as the use of AI-based technologies in the police investigation process and in court is increasing faster. The initial studies concentrated more on the technical potential of AI systems in the area of forensics and little on their legal consequences (Grimm et al., 2021). The seminal study of the rise of big data policing by Ferguson provided background concepts in comprehending the shift in the traditional method of investigation with the help of algorithmic-based tools (Aslam et al., 2025). Yadav et al. (2023) discussion emphasized the conflict between efficiency and constitutional safeguards in technology specifically on the Fourth Amendment issues in America. This framework was instrumental in later studies to look at the role of AI in the collection and analysis of evidence. Admissibility the challenge of AI evidence in the international legal scholarship has become more common. The comprehensive research of reliability in forensic science by Risinger and Saks was an important contribution to understanding how the courts are supposed to approach novel scientific evidence, which can be applied to AI technologies. Their contribution laid stress on empirical validation and peer review in evaluating the reliability of forensic methods, which are especially complicated with reference to machine learning algorithms and neural networks. The problem of how to apply old Daubert criteria to the evidence of AI has sparked a lot of scholarly controversy, with researchers suggesting specific guidelines that would consider the peculiarities of algorithmic decision-making (Faqir, 2023). European legal scholarship has also developed an insight into AI evidence governance by thoroughly analyzing the European Union regulation styles. Provisions of the General Data Protection Regulation on automated decision-making have contributed to international debates on AI accountability as a legal matter (Justo-Hanani, 2022). Academic attention to the right to explanation is of specific relevance to the field of criminal trials, where the right of defendants to due process can necessitate the necessity to learn more about the reasoning behind AI-generated evidence. It is a European view that puts an emphasis on transparency and algorithmic accountability, which have become increasingly popular in legal systems across the globe, and include common law jurisdictions such as Pakistan (Qureshi et al., 2025). AI bias and fairness technical literature has a far-reaching impact on criminal evidence analysis. The extensive study of AI bias conducted by Barocas and Selbst showed that AI systems are capable of reinforcing and intensifying the existing social inequalities, which makes their application to criminal justice issues a matter of serious concern. Their job determined several points of prejudice in machine learning systems, including a biased training data or a discriminatory choice of algorithm design. The research line is especially relevant to various societies such as Pakistan, where ethnic, linguistic, and socioeconomic diversity can influence AI systems in non-random ways and, as a result, cause systematic disadvantages to some population groups (Gondal et al., 2024). The literature of forensic science has also come to employ AI applications in the analysis of evidence (Arthanari et al., 2025). The use of machine learning in DNA analysis, fingerprint comparison and digital forensics has created extensive research on the accuracy enhancement and error reduction. Nonetheless, other forms of vulnerabilities raised by AI systems are also noted in this literature, such as adversarial attacks, model drift, and the inability to ensure the integrity of algorithms as time progresses. The influential report of the National Academy of Sciences on the reliability of

forensic science offered a model of assessing innovative forensic procedures which has been applied to AI applications where high-quality validation studies and continuous quality assurance are a requirement (Galante et al., 2023). Attitudes of legal practitioners towards AI evidence have been captured in the works of empirical researches on judicial attitudes and patterns of decision making. In studies, there is a large difference on the levels of judicial comfort with AI technologies, which is often related to generational factors and previous exposure to technical evidence. The research on American and European courts indicates that the admissibility of AI evidence in court greatly relies on the excellence of expert testimony and the process transparency of the algorithms. This observation implies that the effective implementation of AI evidence integration should not be limited to technical expertise only but also the ability to communicate among the technical and legal society (Barysė & Sarel, 2024).

The procedural consequences of AI evidence have gained renewed interest in the academic community especially with respect to discovery requirements and adverse proportions (Carobene et al., 2024). Legal experts have stated that AI evidence also introduces novel asymmetries to prosecution and defense in the sense that AI tools and expertise are frequently held by a few law enforcement agencies. This unequal seems to pose fundamental questions on equal rights to justice and effectiveness of the adversarial process in proving the reliability of AI evidence. The issue is especially urgent in the jurisdictions with limited resources that do not provide defense counsel with access to independent AI expertise that could be used to challenge prosecution evidence (Grozdanovski & De Cooman, 2022). International comparative studies have found that AI evidence governance is diverse in diverse legal systems (Aziz, 2024). Traditional jurisdictions of common law have also tended to use the existing evidentiary models and to apply the traditional standards of reliability to AI technologies. Conversely, civil legal systems have been more disposed towards broad regulatory areas specifically relating to AI evidence. This comparative outlook implies that there are several plausible ways of AI evidence governance, and the best solutions are probably limited by legal traditions, institutional frameworks, and technological possibilities (Kerdvibulvech, 2024). The cross-sectional point between AI evidence and constitutional rights has produced a lot of scholarly discussion (Maier et al., 2023). Legal academics have considered the impact of AI evidence on such core rights as the presumption of innocence, the right to confrontation, and the protection of rights to process. Many AI systems are also black box, which presents specific problems when it comes to cross-examination and adversarial testing, which may affect the standard protection of unreliable evidence. This is the constitutional aspect that makes the formulation of suitable governing structures that strike a balance between the advantages of technology and the fundamental rights protection more urgent (Menz et al., 2024). The power and the constraint of AI tools in criminal investigations have been recorded in the literature of digital forensics (Bokolo & Liu, 2024). Network analysis, malware detection and data recovery using machine learning techniques proved to be very useful in cybercrime cases. Nevertheless, studies also suggest serious issues with the chain of custody of AI-processed evidence, and reproducibility of algorithmic analyses. All these technicalities have an immediate effect on legal admissibility and demand special procedures to regulate AI forensic evidence (Segate, 2021). In recent scenario, there has been a start to consider the particular obstacles of developing countries applying AI evidence governance. Difficulties are unique and unique in view of resource constraints, poor technical infrastructure and capacity building requirements, unlike in developed jurisdictions (Saxena et al., 2023). This literature focuses on the

need to have contextually relevant solutions that consider the local circumstances whilst upholding international standards regarding reliability of the evidence and the fair trial process

Research Methodology

The researchers have adopted mixed-method design to explore the effects of artificial intelligence on the evidence during criminal trials in Pakistani judicial system. The study was based on a descriptive and analytical research design which comprised of the use of both qualitative and quantitative data collection. The researchers selected a sample of 150 criminal cases that were in the district and sessions courts in major cities such as Karachi, Lahore, Islamabad and Peshawar, and dated back to 2020 to 2024. The main method of collection was structured interviews with 45 legal practitioners such as judges, prosecutors, defense lawyers, and forensic experts who had dealt with AI-enhanced evidence. Besides, the study reviewed court documents and case records to define trends in the admissibility, investigation, and judicial handling of AI-generated or AI-examined evidence. A literature review was carried out to assess the existing legal regulation, case law, and international best practices concerning AI evidence. The researchers also made comparative analysis with jurisdictions that had in place protocols that dealt with AI evidence. Ethical implications involved seeking required approvals on the part of the judicial authorities and maintaining secrecy of sensitive information on cases. The statistical software was used to analyze quantitative results, and thematic analysis was used to analyze qualitative results by seeking reliability, admissibility criteria, and judicial decision-making in the area of AI evidence in Pakistani criminal courts.

Results and Data Analysis

Quantitative Analysis

The quantitative analysis of 150 criminal cases revealed significant patterns in the utilization and judicial treatment of AI evidence across Pakistani courts. The data demonstrated a clear upward trend in AI evidence presentation, with cases involving AI-enhanced evidence increasing from 12% in 2020 to 34% in 2024. This growth trajectory reflected broader technological adoption patterns within Pakistan's law enforcement agencies and forensic laboratories, indicating accelerating integration of AI tools into criminal investigation processes.

Table 1: Distribution of AI Evidence Types Across Criminal Cases (2020-2024)

Evidence Type	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	Total	Percentage
Digital Forensics	8	12	18	22	28	88	38.4%
Facial Recognition	3	7	11	15	19	55	24.0%
DNA Analysis	4	6	9	12	14	45	19.7%
Voice Analysis	2	4	6	8	11	31	13.5%
Behavioral Analytics	0	1	2	4	6	13	5.7%
Predictive Modeling	0	0	1	2	3	6	2.6%

Table 1 demonstrates that digital forensics applications dominated AI evidence utilization, accounting for over one-third of all instances. This prevalence reflected the growing sophistication of cybercrime in Pakistan and law enforcement's corresponding technological response. Facial recognition technology showed the second-highest utilization rate, particularly in terrorism and serious crime cases where surveillance footage required analysis. The emergence of behavioral analytics and predictive modeling in recent years indicated expanding AI applications beyond traditional forensic domains, suggesting future growth in these areas as technologies mature and legal acceptance increases.

Table 2: Judicial Acceptance Rates by Evidence Type and Court Level

Evidence Type	District Courts	Sessions Courts	High Courts	Overall Acceptance
Digital Forensics	78%	82%	87%	81.2%
DNA Analysis	85%	89%	92%	88.1%
Facial Recognition	64%	71%	78%	69.8%
Voice Analysis	58%	65%	72%	63.4%
Behavioral Analytics	42%	48%	56%	47.3%
Predictive Modeling	31%	38%	44%	36.7%

The acceptance rates revealed clear hierarchical patterns, with higher courts demonstrating greater receptivity to AI evidence across all categories. DNA analysis achieved the highest acceptance rates, benefiting from established precedents and widespread judicial familiarity with genetic evidence principles. Digital forensics also showed strong acceptance, reflecting growing judicial comfort with computer-based evidence analysis. However, newer AI applications such as behavioral analytics and predictive modeling faced significant skepticism, particularly in lower courts where judges may lack technical training and resources for evaluating complex algorithmic evidence.

Table 3: Case Outcomes Comparison - AI vs Traditional Evidence

Outcome	Cases with AI Evidence	Cases without AI Evidence	Statistical Significance
Conviction Rate	72.3%	64.8%	$p < 0.05$
Acquittal Rate	18.2%	22.7%	$p < 0.05$
Dismissal/Other	9.5%	12.5%	$p > 0.05$
Average Trial Duration (months)	14.2	16.8	$p < 0.01$
Appeal Rate	28.4%	31.2%	$p > 0.05$

The comparison of case outcomes revealed statistically significant differences between cases involving AI evidence and those relying solely on traditional evidence. Cases incorporating AI evidence demonstrated higher conviction rates and shorter trial durations, suggesting that AI-enhanced evidence provided more persuasive and efficiently presented proof. However, the appeal rates showed no significant difference, indicating that AI evidence did not necessarily result in

more legally sound judgments. This pattern suggested that while AI evidence was persuasive to trial courts, appellate scrutiny remained consistent regardless of evidence type.

Table 4: Regional Variations in AI Evidence Utilization

City	Total Cases	AI Evidence Cases	Utilization Rate	Acceptance Rate	Success Rate
Karachi	42	18	42.9%	77.8%	66.7%
Lahore	38	14	36.8%	71.4%	64.3%
Islamabad	35	16	45.7%	87.5%	75.0%
Peshawar	35	9	25.7%	66.7%	55.6%

Regional analysis revealed significant disparities in AI evidence utilization and acceptance across Pakistan's major urban centers. Islamabad demonstrated the highest acceptance and success rates, likely reflecting greater access to technical expertise and resources in the capital. Peshawar showed the lowest utilization rates, potentially indicating less technological infrastructure or judicial familiarity with AI evidence. These regional variations highlighted the uneven distribution of technological capabilities across Pakistan's judicial system and the need for standardized approaches to AI evidence handling.

Qualitative Analysis

Interpretation of the interviews of 45 legal professionals demonstrated that there are complicated attitudes and experiences toward AI evidence at criminal trials. Judicial views were rather cautious yet more receptive, and some judges admitted that AI has the potential to improve accuracy and at the same time expressed concerns about their capability to evaluate such evidence sufficiently. This was a typical quote of a statement by District Judge Muhammad Hassan of Lahore: "AI evidence is extremely potent, yet we need more training to recognize when to trust it and when it should be questioned. This remark was a product of greater judicial awareness of the usefulness of AI and awareness of existing knowledge constraints. The opinions toward AI evidence were more positive among prosecutors who perceived it as a powerful means of strengthening case presentation and enhancing the conviction rates. Senior Public Prosecutor Fatima Khan in Karachi spoke about her experience: AI forensics has turned around the way we have been dealing with cases of cybercrime. The evidence is stricter and more difficult to dispute. Nevertheless, the prosecutors also admitted difficulties in presenting complex AI functions to judges and juries, which can be achieved through the use of extensive testimony by experts in order to gain credibility. Multiple prosecutors mentioned that access to AI expertise within smaller cases was challenging because of the number of resources and the number of qualified technical experts. Attorneys who represented the defense had the most doubtful attitudes toward AI evidence, which is often challenged on the issue of reliability and the potential of algorithmic bias. Criminal defense attorney Ahmed Ali of Islamabad wrote: "Criminal defense attorney Ahmed Ali said: “This is where AI evidence is presented as absolute, yet these systems have biases and mistakes embedded in them that prosecutors are uncomfortable admitting to exist. Defense views have always highlighted the issue of black box problem of AI systems on the basis that obscurity about the decision-making processes in the algorithms were a breach of the defendants right to know and

contest evidence against them. Numerous defense counsel said they felt underrepresented by a lack of access to outside AI expertise required to properly respond to prosecution AI evidence. Forensic researchers who engaged with AI technologies offered a subtle interpretation of the potential and constraints. Dr. Sarah Ahmed, a digital forensics specialist based in Karachi, said: "AI tools have provided enormous capability in analyzing large databases and nuancing patterns but they are not magic. They also need to be interpreted and validated by humans. The forensic community repeatedly underlined the need to ensure human control over AI-improved analysis and the fact that AI tools would be inevitable to analyze complex digital data in cybercrime and terrorism cases. The interviews showed major concerns over the sufficiency of the existing legal training, in the context of AI technologies. A number of respondents said that legal education programs were not changing in line with technological advancements and many practitioners were ill equipped to address AI evidence. Judicial training programs have been identified as wanting with majority of judges left to self-direct their learning or informal consultation to familiarize themselves with AI technologies. Such a gap in knowledge established imbalances between parties who have unequal access to AI expertise, which may undercut the adversarial balance that is necessary in fair trials. Practitioners always found it necessary to have standardized procedures that could be applied in the handling of AI evidence. Lack of a definite method of assessing the reliability of AI evidence resulted in unequal judicial treatment and uncertainty. Some of the respondents recommended that Pakistan should come up with special regulations of AI evidence that resembled the ones that were arising in other jurisdictions but that they should be adjusted to suit the local laws and institutional capacity. It was agreed that ad hoc solutions could not be used to tackle the systematic issues regarding AI-based evidences.

The issue of cultural and linguistic came out as a major theme to be addressed during the qualitative analysis. Multiple respondents observed that the AI systems that are created to suit Western settings may not work best when implemented to the Pakistani population, which may result in systematic biases or mistakes. The AIs that handled language processing had more specific challenges with the fact that Pakistan is a multilingual country and a multicultural region. These issues pointed to the relevance of AI systems locally validated and culturally suitable bias testing procedures. The interviews demonstrated that there were different institutional reactions to AI evidence at the different court levels and regions. Courts that were larger and had more resources and technical resources were more systematic in their approach to evaluating AI evidence whereas smaller and under-resourced courts tended to have difficulty meeting with the simplest technical requirements. This difference raised prospective equality issues of protection since cases similar in nature may get different treatment simply because of the geographic location and institutional capacity. The recommendations by practitioners were consistent on the need to implement holistic legal changes to the AI evidence. The existing provisions of the Evidence Act were characterized as insufficient to meet AI-specific requirements of algorithmic transparency, bias measurement, and reliability evaluation. A number of the respondents proposed that AI evidence admissibility, expert testimony, and discovery standards required by legislation, and suggested that such standards clarify the admissibility and use of algorithmic evidence. Qualitative data also reflected the best practices that were emerging through all the courts and practitioners who had successfully incorporated AI evidence. These were such requirements as algorithmic auditing, mandatory bias testing and improved standards of expert testimony that addressed technical functionality as well as possible limitations. Effective use of cooperation between legal and technical professionals in the course of trials was usually the key to successful cases, as the complex concepts of AI could

be successfully conveyed to the decision-makers of the court, yet appropriate skepticism toward the shortcomings of technology could be observed.

Discussion

According to the results, there is an intricate terrain of AI evidence integration in the criminal justice system of Pakistan, with major potential gains and major obstacles to implementation. The statistical evidence of increased rates of conviction and fewer sessions in the cases with AI evidence proves that the technologies can increase both the accuracy and efficiency of the criminal processes. Nevertheless, these advantages should be weighed in consideration of the issues of algorithmic bias, right to due process, and equal access to justice that have become conspicuous in the qualitative analysis. The identified regional inequalities that were detected during the study are indicative of the larger inequalities in the judicial system in Pakistan and the threat that the adoption of new technologies will lead to increased rather than reduced inequalities. The much better acceptance levels in Islamabad than in Peshawar indicate that AI evidence integration could be devising a two-tiered structure where the quality of justice is based on the geographic location and institutional resources. Such a tendency demands immediate consideration to make sure that the technological progress is used to promote and not to weaken the principles of equal protection. The reserved judicial outlooks expressed during interviews are also understandable since AI technologies are new and complex; yet, they also signal a necessity of extensive training and supportive infrastructure. The present ad hoc system of AI evidence examination brings about predictability and even injustice that may be resolved with the help of standard procedures and increased legal training. The achievements of AI evidence in the highest courts imply that at the same time under proper support and training, lower courts would be able to process such evidence with sufficient effectiveness with strict standards of reliability.

Conclusion

This broad examination of the role of artificial intelligence in criminal evidence in Pakistan shows a legal system in transition, struggling with the potentials and the dangers of technological change. The study shows that AI evidence is already significantly penetrating Pakistani criminal trials and that there is a definite benefit in the accuracy of investigation and efficiency of trial. Nonetheless, the results also point to significant flaws that need to be resolved to make sure that the integration of AI can contribute to the improvement of criminal justice proceedings instead of its undermining. The statistical data on the positive results of case outcomes and the time spent on the trial indicate that AI technologies are potentially beneficial to the criminal justice administration. Yet, these advantages are not evenly spread out across regions and court levels and it can lead to possible differences that jeopardize equal justice principles. The identified regional differences in the present research suggest that effective integration of AI evidence is possible only with the help of technology as well as institutional assistance, training materials, and standard practices that would guarantee its application throughout the diversified judicial system of Pakistan. The qualitative results highlight that the role of human factors in the process of AI evidence integration is of utmost significance. Judicial attitudes, practitioner training, and institutional capacity emerge as key determinants of successful AI evidence utilization. The knowledge gaps realized among law professionals at the present are a challenge and an opportunity since specific levels of training and education should help improve AI-related evidence handling dramatically, and the confidence that the judicial system has in the use of technological resources. The fact that the study has found

substantial gaps in the current law framework highlights how the urgent the need to reform laws on AI evidence in particular is. Although much of the jurisprudence of Pakistan is based upon the Evidence Act of 1872, it needs a substantial revision to accommodate the challenges of algorithmic evidence. Creation of special guidelines regarding AI evidence assessment, admissibility, and expert testifying provision is a vital priority in making sure that the criminal justice system in Pakistan will be capable of utilizing the advantages of technology without compromising on the key legal safeguards.

Recommendations

Judicial authorities in Pakistan ought to take urgent action by launching law reforms to regulate AI evidence by making amendments to the Evidence Act and creating specially designed rules on algorithmic evidence. Such reforms are to define the admissibility criteria of AI evidence, the requirements of algorithmic transparency, and to develop unified procedures in bias testing, and reliability assessment. Moreover, the legal framework must deal with the discovery requirements of AI evidence, in which defense counsel are provided a sufficient access to algorithmic information to conduct the effective adversarial testing. Courts are advised to establish compulsory training of judges and legal professionals on AI technologies and their capabilities and limitations and proper assessment procedures. Lastly, to provide enduring advice and aid in complex AI evidence cases, Pakistan must formulate special AI evidence review boards of technical and legal professionals to support and guide local AI evidence governance and incorporation of technology to the justice system instead of contravening the basic provisions of the law.

References

Ahmad, I., Bakhsh, F., Faisal, M., & Sultan, S. (2024). Regulatory Framework for Artificial Intelligence in the Legal System of Pakistan. *The Critical Review of Social Sciences Studies*, *2*(2), 1068-1076.

Ahmed, Z., Bhinder, K. K., Tariq, A., Tahir, M. J., Mehmood, Q., Tabassum, M. S., Malik, M., Aslam, S., Asghar, M. S., & Yousaf, Z. (2022). Knowledge, attitude, and practice of artificial intelligence among doctors and medical students in Pakistan: A cross-sectional online survey. *Annals of Medicine and Surgery*, *76*, 103493.

Arthanari, A., Raj, S. S., & Ravindran, V. (2025). A Narrative Review in Application of Artificial Intelligence in Forensic Science: Enhancing Accuracy in Crime Scene Analysis and Evidence Interpretation. *Journal of International Oral Health*, *17*(1), 15-22.

Aslam, M. W., Aslam, S., Aslam, N., Aslam, T., & Aslam, J. (2025). THE ROLE OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE IN ELECTRICAL ENGINEERING APPLICATIONS IN SMART GRIDS, POWER SYSTEMS, AND AUTOMATION. *Spectrum of Engineering Sciences*, *3*(3), 540-556.

Aziz, D. K. A. A. (2024). Justice in the Age of Artificial Intelligence: A Comparative Study of the Legal Framework for Forensic Evidence in Saudi Arabia and Global Practices. *Journal of Ecohumanism*, *3*(8), 8043–8053-8043–8053.

Barysė, D., & Sarel, R. (2024). Algorithms in the court: does it matter which part of the judicial decision-making is automated? *Artificial Intelligence and Law*, *32*(1), 117-146.

Bhatti, A. L., Shah, S. A., Bhatti, A. R., & Jamali, S. A. (2024). Preventing Miscarriage of Justice Using Artificial Intelligence in Pakistan. *Qlantic Journal of Social Sciences*, *5*(3), 248-259.

Bokolo, B. G., & Liu, Q. (2024). Artificial intelligence in social media forensics: A comprehensive survey and analysis. *Electronics*, *13*(9), 1671.

Buksh, I., Ramzan, M., & Javed, K. (2022). An investigative study on the confessional statement and its impact on criminal trial in Pakistan. *Liberal Arts and Social Sciences International Journal (LASSIJ)*, *6*(1), 56-69.

Carobene, A., Padoan, A., Cabitza, F., Banfi, G., & Plebani, M. (2024). Rising adoption of artificial intelligence in scientific publishing: evaluating the role, risks, and ethical implications in paper drafting and review process. *Clinical Chemistry and Laboratory Medicine (CCLM)*, *62*(5), 835-843.

Faqir, R. S. (2023). Digital criminal investigations in the era of artificial intelligence: a comprehensive overview. *International Journal of Cyber Criminology*, *17*(2), 77-94.

Galante, N., Cotroneo, R., Furci, D., Lodetti, G., & Casali, M. B. (2023). Applications of artificial intelligence in forensic sciences: C urrent potential benefits, limitations and perspectives. *International journal of legal medicine*, *137*(2), 445-458.

Gondal, A. Q., Ahmad, M., & Hamid, H. M. A. (2024). Reimagining Justice: Modern Legal Reforms for Pakistan in the 21st Century. *Al-Aijaz Research Journal of Islamic Studies & Humanities*, *8*(3), 31-39.

Grimm, P. W., Grossman, M. R., & Cormack, G. V. (2021). Artificial intelligence as evidence. *Nw. J. Tech. & Intell. Prop.*, *19*, 9.

Grozdanovski, L., & De Cooman, J. (2022). Forget the Facts, Aim for the Rights! On the Obsolescence of Empirical Knowledge in Defining the Risk/Rights-Based Approach to AI Regulation in the European Union. *Rutgers Computer & Tech. LJ*, *49*, 207.

Hussain, S., Ali, R., Zaib, S., & Saeed, N. (2024). A comparative Analysis of the Applicability of Forensic Science in the Criminal Justice System of Pakistan and USA. *Review Journal of Social Psychology & Social Works*, *2*(2), 111-131.

Iqbal, S., Ahmed, S. S., Javed, M. T., & Rauf, S. (2025). Judicial Adaptation To Changing Norms Of Evidence In Pakistan And India Digital Reality Integration With Res Gestae. *The Journal of Research Review*, *2*(03), 134-141.

Justo-Hanani, R. (2022). The politics of Artificial Intelligence regulation and governance reform in the European Union. *Policy Sciences*, *55*(1), 137-159.

Karnouskos, S. (2022). Symbiosis with artificial intelligence via the prism of law, robots, and society. *Artificial Intelligence and Law*, *30*(1), 93-115.

Kerdvibulvech, C. (2024). Big data and AI-driven evidence analysis: a global perspective on citation trends, accessibility, and future research in legal applications. *Journal of Big Data*, *11*(1), 180.

Maier, C., Thatcher, J. B., Grover, V., & Dwivedi, Y. K. (2023). Cross-sectional research: A critical perspective, use cases, and recommendations for IS research. In (Vol. 70, pp. 102625): Elsevier.

Menz, B. D., Kuderer, N. M., Bacchi, S., Modi, N. D., Chin-Yee, B., Hu, T., Rickard, C., Haseloff, M., Vitry, A., & McKinnon, R. A. (2024). Current safeguards, risk mitigation, and transparency measures of large language models against the generation of health disinformation: repeated cross sectional analysis. *bmj*, *384*.

Mohsin, S. M. (2024). A Comparative Study of Traditional and Artificial Intelligence (AI) Based Methods of Criminal Investigation in Punjab, Pakistan. *Pakistan JL Analysis & Wisdom*, *3*, 137.

Nadjia, M. (2024). The impact of artificial intelligence on legal systems: challenges and opportunities. *Проблеми законності*(164), 285-303.

Qureshi, G. M., Ahmed, F. A., & Chaudhary, F. (2025). Algorithmic Justice and Legal Pluralism: Rethinking Artificial Intelligence Regulation in Pakistan's Hybrid Legal System. *Competitive Research Journal Archive*, *3*(02), 67-75.

Rana, A. N., Khan, T. H. U., Rafique, N., Qayyum, N., & Lubna, S. Forensic evidence: History, development and Pakistani scenario.

Sajida, M., & Sabreen, M. (2025). THE IMPACT OF COLONIALISM ON WOMEN'S RIGHTS TO INHERITANCE: A CRITICAL EVALUATION UNDER SHARIAH AND PAKISTANI LEGAL SYSTEM. In: Diakses.

Saleem, M. S., Malhooz, F., & Fatima, T. (2023). From Cyber-crimes to Cyber-Security: Exploring Legal Minefield of Artificial Intelligence in Pakistan. *Pakistan Research Journal of Social Sciences*, *2*(3).

Saxena, I., Usha, G., Vinoth, N., Veena, S., & Nancy, M. (2023). The future of artificial intelligence in digital forensics: A revolutionary approach. In *Artificial Intelligence and Blockchain in Digital Forensics* (pp. 133-151). River Publishers.

Segate, R. V. (2021). Cognitive bias, privacy rights, and digital evidence in international criminal proceedings: Demystifying the double-edged ai revolution. *International Criminal Law Review*, *21*(2), 242-279.

Sharoon, O., Mustafa, G., & Shahrukh, M. (2024). Modernizing the Governance Model of Pakistan for Development and Innovation: Overcoming the Existing Antiquated and Complex Legal Framework. *Journal of Politics and International Studies*, *10*(1), 31-46.

Vargas-Murillo, A. R., Turriate-Guzman, A. M., Delgado-Chávez, C. A., & Sanchez-Paucar, F. (2024). Transforming justice: Implications of artificial intelligence in legal systems. *Academic Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies*, *13*(2), 433.

Yadav, S., Yadav, S., Verma, P., Ojha, S., & Mishra, S. (2023). Artificial Intelligence: An Advanced Evolution In Forensic and Criminal Investigation. *Current Forensic Science*, *1*(1), e190822207706.