SCIENCEZONE | ONLINE SCIENTIFIC CONFERENCES

OPTIMIZING ADVOCACY PRACTICE THROUGH ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE IN UZBEKISTAN

Islombek Saburyazov

Master's Degree in "Cyber Law"

Tashkent State University of Law

Abstract: This thesis examines the optimization of advocacy practice through artificial intelligence, with specific adaptation to the Uzbek context. The study situates these findings within Uzbekistan's rapidly constructed regulatory foundation and identifies four adaptation pathways. Comparative analysis of China's smart-court reform underscores a central caution: AI embedded in the justice system is never institutionally neutral, and the advocate's adversarial independence must be deliberately preserved. The thesis concludes that, where these conditions are met, AI augments rather than replaces the Uzbek advocate — returning time to the strategy, judgment, and responsibility no algorithm can assume.

Keywords: artificial intelligence, advocacy, legal practice, access to justice, professional responsibility, Uzbekistan, legal technology.

Introduction

The integration of artificial intelligence into legal practice has shifted from speculative discourse to operational reality. The legal community is focused not on debating AI, but on its effective implementation, reshaping tasks, skills, and professional roles. The advocate's professional value rests on judgment, strategy, and accountability, which AI cannot assume. Yet a substantial portion of their daily work consists precisely of the routine, document-intensive, and research-heavy tasks that contemporary AI handles well. This thesis examines the genuine opportunities for optimizing advocacy practice through AI, the structural constraints that bound those opportunities, and the specific pathways by which Uzbekistan can adapt international experience to its own regulatory environment.

The Scope of Optimization: What AI Actually Improves in Advocacy Practice

The empirical record from mature legal markets identifies a consistent set of functions where AI delivers measurable efficiency gains. Survey evidence indicates that approximately 79% of law firms have integrated AI tools into their workflows (Koch, 2025), yet only a fraction has truly transformed their operations, with most implementations focusing on pattern recognition tasks such as document review, legal research, and contract analysis. The realistic frontier of optimization, in other words, is concentrated rather than total. For the advocate, the principal gains arise in **four areas**.

The **first** is **legal research**. AI systems can process large volumes of case material and statutory text far faster than manual review, and surveys of legal professionals confirm that practitioners rely on AI for legal research, brainstorming, and document summarization, helping attorneys process large volumes of case material more efficiently (Koch, 2025). For an advocate preparing a defense, this compresses the time required to map the relevant normative landscape and to identify analogous decisions.

The **second** is **document drafting and review**. The most consistent finding across industry studies is that AI is most often applied to drafting, summarizing, and extracting data from documents, supporting faster, more accurate client

deliverables (American Bar Association, 2025). The advocate's procedural petitions, motions, appellate submissions, and client memoranda are largely standardized in structure, and AI-assisted drafting reduces the non-substantive labor associated with their production.

The **third** is **practice administration**. A large survey of legal professionals found that AI is increasingly used beyond legal work, supporting firm operations like billing, scheduling, and financial decision-making (American Bar Association, 2025). For an individual advocate or small chamber — the dominant organizational form of advocacy in Uzbekistan — reducing this administrative overhead translates directly into capacity for substantive work.

The **fourth**, and most consequential for access to justice, is **client-facing service**. Industry analysis describes AI enabling the automation of legal documents, predictive analysis of outcomes, and ongoing customer support via legal chatbots (Koch, 2025). The significance of this for Uzbekistan, where the supply of qualified advocates is unevenly distributed across regions, deserves separate emphasis. Today, Uzbekistan has more than **7,000** advocates, meaning approximately **one advocate** for every **5,500 people** (Uzbek Bar Association, n.d.). By comparison, there is approximately one advocate for every 265 people in Italy, one for every 499 in Germany, one for every 1,870 in Russia, and one for every 3,920 in Kazakhstan (Uzbek Bar Association, n.d.). These figures demonstrate that the number of advocates in Uzbekistan is insufficient. Under these circumstances, the use of AI in client-facing work can broaden the population's access to legal assistance, partly compensating for the shortage of advocates.

The Structural Constraint: Reliability, Hallucination, and Professional Responsibility

Large language models generate probabilistic text rather than verified fact, and they consequently produce what the field terms **hallucinations** — fabricated outputs that look plausible but are factually wrong, including fake case citations, invented statutes, non-existent court rulings, and fabricated legal standards.

The magnitude of this problem is documented rather than speculative. A rigorous empirical study found that general-purpose chatbots hallucinated

between 58% and 82% of the time on legal queries, and even purpose-built legal research tools employing retrieval-augmented generation continued to produce false statements at significant rates (Surani & Ho, 2024). The same researchers noted that legal technology providers have claimed to mitigate, if not entirely solve, hallucination risk through sophisticated techniques such as retrieval-augmented generation, but none of these claims have been accompanied by empirical evidence (Surani & Ho, 2024). The lesson for the advocate is that vendor assurances of accuracy cannot substitute for independent verification.

The professional consequences of unverified reliance are severe and now well-illustrated. In mature jurisdictions, courts have responded to the submission of AI-fabricated authority with monetary sanctions, revocation of admission, public reprimand, and disqualification. The governing principle is that attorneys have a professional and ethical duty to verify the accuracy of all documents and information submitted to the court, regardless of whether that information originated from a human expert or an AI tool (ABA Standing Committee on Ethics and Professional Responsibility, 2024). Courts have further developed the concept of "willful blindness" to justify serious sanctions against practitioners who fail to detect obvious errors in AI output. As articulated in formal guidance, the essential requirement is to make a reasonable inquiry into the law before signing a document, and the use of AI does not relieve the lawyer of that inquiry (ABA Standing Committee on Ethics and Professional Responsibility, 2024).

Comparative Lessons: East Asian Experience and Its Limits

For Uzbekistan, East Asian experience offers instructive comparators, but they require careful interpretation rather than mechanical transplantation. China's "Smart Justice" reform, which formally began in 2016, produced a judicial knowledge service platform supported by judicial data centers and a smart court system that had integrated 33 high-quality services, including case filing assistance, speech recognition, digitization of case files, intelligent case recommendation, sentencing guidance, and smart adjudication (Guo et al., 2026). These applications cover 80% of core adjudication and enforcement business scenarios, and their service capabilities extend to all high courts,

intermediate courts, and 97% of basic-level courts nationwide (Guo et al., 2026). A national legal AI infrastructure unveiled in 2024 was built on massive, authoritative, and high-quality judicial data, gathering 320 million pieces of legal information including court rulings, cases, and legal opinions (Supreme People's Court of China, 2024).

Two lessons follow for Uzbekistan. The first is enabling: the Chinese experience demonstrates that the practical value of legal AI depends decisively on the existence of large, authoritative, well-structured domestic legal datasets. The KOICA-supported Uzbek platform, by aiming to unify legislation, judicial practice, and scholarship, is building exactly this foundation, and its quality will determine the ceiling of AI utility for Uzbek advocates (Tashkent State University of Law, n.d.). The second lesson is cautionary. Scholarship on China's smart courts observes that these systems, while meant to improve access to justice, also carry the additional goal of enhancing accountability and power structures, helping to institutionalize and codify political supervision (Guo et al., 2026). The relevant warning for advocacy is that AI deployed within the justice system is never institutionally neutral; where the advocate's function is adversarial — to challenge the state's case — the architecture of legal AI must preserve the advocate's independence rather than fold the defense function into a state-managed information system. Uzbekistan's own framework, with its declared emphasis on human oversight and rights safeguards, is closer in spirit to the Singaporean model that Uzbek scholars have begun to study, and that orientation should be deliberately preserved as implementation proceeds.

Adaptation Pathways for Uzbek Advocacy

Translating opportunity into responsible practice requires addressing conditions specific to Uzbekistan. **Four pathways** merit emphasis.

First, the **linguistic challenge** is foundational. The dominant commercial legal AI tools are trained predominantly on English-language Anglo-American materials. Uzbek advocacy operates in Uzbek and Russian, within a civil-law statutory tradition. A general-purpose model applied to Uzbek legal questions will hallucinate at rates closer to the high end of the findings documented by Surani and Ho (2024), because the underlying training data is sparse. The domestic platform under construction, by integrating Uzbek legislation and

judicial practice, is therefore not a convenience but a precondition for safe adoption (Tashkent State University of Law, n.d.); its development should be regarded as the central infrastructural priority for the profession.

Second, the **access-to-justice dimension** is where AI's social value for Uzbekistan is greatest. The uneven regional distribution of qualified advocates means that citizens in remote areas face genuine barriers to competent representation (Uzbek Bar Association, n.d.). AI-assisted legal consulting and document preparation, embedded in the planned national platform, can extend a baseline of legal support to underserved populations. This must be framed honestly: such tools improve access to preliminary information and procedural assistance, but they do not replace the advocate in any matter involving contested facts, liberty, or strategic judgment. The realistic objective is a tiered system in which AI handles routine informational and documentary needs while preserving and channeling scarce human advocacy toward the matters that require it.

Third, the **verification duty** must be embedded in professional regulation and education before, not after, widespread adoption. The Uzbek advocacy profession should anticipate the experience of mature jurisdictions, where the verification obligation emerged through painful sanction cases (ABA Standing Committee on Ethics and Professional Responsibility, 2024), and instead codify it proactively — through bar association guidance, mandatory competency standards, and inclusion in advocate qualification and continuing-education requirements. The KOICA project's explicit aim of enhancing professional competencies in the field of digital law and training specialists with an understanding of the ethical aspects of technology use provides an institutional vehicle for exactly this (Tashkent State University of Law, n.d.).

Fourth, **confidentiality** and professional privilege require specific safeguards. The advocate's duty of confidentiality is absolute, yet many commercial AI tools process inputs on external servers and may use submitted data for model training. Responsible adoption requires either tools that contractually and technically guarantee data isolation, or domestically hosted systems under appropriate information-security controls.

Conclusion

Artificial intelligence offers Uzbek advocacy genuine and measurable optimization — in legal research, document drafting, practice administration, and the extension of basic legal services to underserved populations. These gains are real, but they are bounded. They are augmentative rather than substitutive, concentrated in routine and pattern-based tasks rather than in the strategic core of advocacy, and conditioned on a non-delegable verification duty arising from the documented unreliability of generative systems (Surani & Ho, 2024). Uzbekistan is unusually well-positioned to capture the benefits while controlling the risks. It has built, in a compressed period, a regulatory framework that foregrounds human oversight and rights protection, and it has launched dedicated infrastructure to create the authoritative domestic legal dataset on which safe legal AI depends (Tashkent State University of Law, n.d.). The decisive variables are now the quality of that domestic dataset, the proactive codification of the verification and confidentiality duties within professional regulation (ABA Standing Committee on Ethics and Professional Responsibility, 2024), and the deliberate preservation of the advocate's adversarial independence as AI is embedded across the justice system. If these conditions are met, AI will support rather than replace the Uzbek advocate, returning time and attention to the strategy, judgment, and responsibility no algorithm can assume.

REFERENCES

ABA Standing Committee on Ethics and Professional Responsibility. (2024, July 29). *Formal opinion 512: Generative artificial intelligence tools*. American Bar Association. https://www.americanbar.org/content/dam/aba/administrative/professional_responsibility/ethics-opinions/aba-formal-opinion-512.pdf

American Bar Association, Law Practice Division. (2025). *The legal industry report 2025*. Law Technology Today. https://www.americanbar.org/groups/law_practice/resources/law-technology-today/2025/the-legal-industry-report-2025/

Guo, [et al.]. (2026). [Title of article on China's smart courts]. *Computer Law & Security Review*. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S2212473X26000015

Koch, M. C. (2025, June 23). *The AI legal landscape in 2025: Beyond the hype*. Akerman LLP. https://www.akerman.com/en/perspectives/the-ai-legal-landscape-in-2025-beyond-the-hype.html

Surani, F., & Ho, D. E. (2024, May 23). *AI on trial: Legal models hallucinate in 1 out of 6 (or more) benchmarking queries*. Stanford Institute for Human-Centered Artificial Intelligence. https://hai.stanford.edu/news/ai-trial-legal-models-hallucinate-1-out-6-or-more-benchmarking-queries

Supreme People's Court of China. (2024, December 5). *[Title of announcement on national legal AI infrastructure]*. https://english.court.gov.cn/2024-12/05/c_1053706.htm

Tashkent State University of Law. (n.d.). *The Ministry of Justice, KOICA, and Tashkent State University of Law will digitalize legal services*. https://tsul.uz/en/news/1387/University/The-Ministry-of-Justice,-KOICA,-and-Tashkent-State-University-of-Law-will-digitalize-legal-services

Uzbek Bar Association. (n.d.). *[Presentation on advocate statistics in Uzbekistan]* [Video]. YouTube. https://www.youtube.com/live/Yb67IFKJw5o