

# Human Centered AI for Indian Legal Text Analytics

Sudipto Ghosh<sup>1</sup>, Devanshu Verma<sup>1</sup>, Balaji Ganesan<sup>2</sup>,  
Purnima Bindal<sup>1</sup>, Vikas Kumar<sup>1</sup> and Vasudha Bhatnagar<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Computer Science, University of Delhi

<sup>2</sup>IBM Research

{sudipto.mcs22, dverma, pbindal, vikas, vbhatnagar}@cs.du.ac.in,  
bganesa1@in.ibm.com

## Abstract

Legal research is a crucial task in the practice of law. It requires intense human effort and intellectual prudence to research a legal case and prepare arguments. Recent boom in generative AI has not translated to proportionate rise in impactful legal applications, because of low trustworthiness and the scarcity of specialized datasets for training Large Language Models (LLMs). This position paper explores the potential of LLMs within Legal Text Analytics (LTA), highlighting specific areas where the integration of human expertise can significantly enhance their performance to match that of experts. We introduce a novel dataset and describe a human centered, compound AI system that principally incorporates human inputs for performing LTA tasks with LLMs.

## 1 Introduction

Shneiderman [2022] defines Human-Centered AI (HCAI) as a collection of successful technologies that amplify, augment, empower, and enhance human performance.

In the evolving field of human-centered computing, the focus is increasingly on harnessing computing technologies that are not just advanced but also intuitively aligned with human experiences and needs. Within the realm of open-source large language models (LLMs), this perspective becomes crucial as we explore ways to blend the computational might of AI systems with the nuanced understanding and contextual judgment that humans bring to the table.

One particular area that can benefit from HCAI is justice delivery in our court systems. In many countries, the legal system is overwhelmed by a backlog of cases, especially in the lower judiciary. While there are legislations like speedy justice acts, the legal processes are inherently time consuming. AI can help automate legal analytics tasks using Legal Text Analytics (LTA) and speed up justice delivery.

Zaharia *et al.* [2024] calls for a shift from models to compound AI systems. We propose creating a human centered, compound AI system comprising of large language models to perform various LTA tasks which deliberately and principally elicit human input.




Figure 1: Human computer interaction can bring down information asymmetry in the justice delivery system

Figure 1 shows a compound AI system, with possible points of interaction between human actors including law professionals and common citizens. Additionally, law students and researchers, petitioners, law activists, etc., also interact with AI-driven LTA services and platforms. Legal experts may use the LTA services for improved efficiency in legal research and help speed up justice delivery. Citizens who are not well versed in legalese can use the services to understand legal documents, do basic research for drafting petitions and be able to submit better responses to the judicial system after taking help from LTA services.

The motivation for a human centered, compound AI system involving models and humans is our observation that the recent boom in Generative AI has not translated to proportionate rise in impactful applications. The reasons for this are low trustworthiness, lack of focus on the common citizens, and general unavailability of resources which deteriorates in domains that directly touch human lives.

In this position paper, we identify few prominent legal text analytics tasks undertaken by legal researchers and self-represented litigants and comment on the performance of ex-

isting models on these tasks. We introduce a new dataset and describe how large language models, eliciting human inputs at all levels, can better serve the needs of the people.

Our paper is organised as follows. In Section 2, we survey related work in Legal Text Analytics. In Section 3, we introduce a new dataset for the human centered AI system that we propose. In Section 4, we discuss existing problems and how human input can help improve AI systems and in Section 5, we briefly discuss our future work, a large language model to be built incorporating HCAI principles.

## 2 Related Work

In this section, we present a non-exhaustive survey of the recent works in tasks relevant for legal text analytics.

### Legal Knowledge Graph

Automatic Knowledge Graph Construction (AKBC) has been popularized since the Knowledge Base Population track Ji *et al.* [2010] organized by TAC. Domain specific knowledge graphs (Abu-Salih [2021]) remain an ongoing research area. Dhani *et al.* [2021] and Jain *et al.* [2022] discuss creating legal knowledge graphs using judgements and related documents from Indian courts. The role of human annotations in knowledge graph construction is also a well researched area. Chiticariu *et al.* [2010] proposed a system to extract domain specific entities and relationships from documents. Vannur *et al.* [2021] discussed fairness in personal knowledge base construction. We can characterize all the methods as based on rule-based or rule-assisted knowledge base construction.

### Question Answering on Indian Judgements

Although question answering is a well-studied problem Pramanik *et al.* [2021], QA systems in the legal domain are not commonly available. Automatic question answering systems not only provide consultancy to litigants who are typically chartering unfamiliar grounds of the legal domain, but are equally beneficial to legal professionals. Ganesan *et al.* [2020] presented a question answering system that leverages domain specific knowledge graphs.

### Judgment Summarization

Automatic summarization of judgements, and preparation of *headnotes* (highlighting the point-of-law) help law professionals to locate discussion of a legal issue in lengthy judgements. There have been works in different countries that have addressed this including SALOMON Uyttendaele *et al.* [1998] in Belgium, Letsum Farzindar and Lapalme [2004] in Canada, Case summarizer Polesley *et al.* [2016] in Australia. Yizhen *et al.* [2021] summarizes contents of Chinese civil judgments. Kanapala *et al.* [2019] presented a survey of works in legal text summarization. OpenNyAI Kalamkar *et al.* [2022] released annotated Indian court judgments and models for tasks such as automatic structuring of judgments using rhetorical roles and extractive summarization.

### Legal Datasets

Guha *et al.* [2023] introduced LegalBench, a benchmark for measuring legal reasoning in large language models. The

Indian Legal Document Corpus published by Malik *et al.* [2021] contains 35,000 Indian court judgments and gold standard explanations for the Court Judgment Prediction and Explanation task. We introduce a dataset annotated for tasks like question answering, summarization and petition drafting, which help self-represented litigants to access justice.

### Knowledge Infusion

Chalkidis *et al.* [2020] introduced the LegalBERT model that continues to be used for tasks on the legal data including our experiments in this work. Paul *et al.* [2022] have introduced InLegalBERT which is trained on Indian legal documents. Infusing knowledge into large language models has been discussed in several works. Two survey papers by Wei *et al.* [2021] and Yang *et al.* [2021] present different methods to infuse knowledge into large language models. Islam *et al.* [2021] consumes a knowledge graph for the entity generation task.

Agarwal *et al.* [2020] created a method to translate knowledge graph triples into sentences for enhancing LLM pre-training. Moiseev *et al.* [2022] and Agarwal *et al.* [2023] then directly integrated these triples into LLMs and T5 models, respectively, showing two effective paths for knowledge integration—via natural language or directly from triples. Vasisht *et al.* [2023] took a different approach by using contextual text for embedding knowledge into models. Santos *et al.* [2022] developed *Knowledge Prompts* for frequent Wikidata entities, refined to aid in triple prediction. Diao *et al.* [2023] uses adapters for efficient knowledge infusion into large language models.

### Retrieval Augmented Generation

Text-to-SQL field has seen significant interest with the application of large language models (LLMs) for generating queries. Our focus is on querying case related information for retrieval augmented generation with LLMs. CRUSH4SQL by Kothiyari *et al.* [2023] employs a retrieval-based method where an LLM generates a simplified schema for query refinement. DIN-SQL by Pourreza and Rafiei [2023] uses a series of prompts to translate natural language into SQL, proving effective on benchmarks like BIRD Li *et al.* [2023] and Spider Yu *et al.* [2018], surpassing even fine-tuned models.

### Resources and Tools

Services such as *Rocket Lawyer* and *LegalZoom* provide users with the means to create legal documents including pleas, wills, and contracts. *DoNotPay* guides users through various legal processes, offering support from contesting parking tickets to drafting legal documents. Similarly, platforms like *Avvo* and *LawGuru* allow individuals to seek legal advice by posing questions and receiving answers from experienced lawyers, offering invaluable insights for document preparation. Legal aid societies and non-profit organizations like *Pro Bono Net* provide legal assistance support to those with limited resources.

Many court and government websites offer interactive forms and templates to assist self-represented litigants in creating their legal documents with ease. Legal education websites like Nolo expand access to legal information through

extensive guides, DIY resources, books, and articles, making legal processes and document preparation more accessible to non-lawyers. Highlighting the intersection of AI and legal aid, Barale [2022] proposes an innovative approach to designing ethical human-AI reasoning support systems for decision-makers in specialized legal areas, such as refugee law, underscoring the potential of AI to augment human capabilities in the legal domain. Joshi *et al.* [2016] proposes a method for legal cognitive assistance.

### 3 Dataset

In this section, we describe resources that we have created for enabling legal text analytics. These resources also include human annotations and mechanisms to interact with experts and lawyers. We build on some existing resources from the literature.

#### Legal Knowledge Graph

A legal knowledge graph can help students familiarize with the legal terms and concepts. Such knowledge graphs can also be used to infuse knowledge into or fine tune large language models (LLMs) to fill gaps in such models where they may not have sufficient domain specific knowledge.

We build on Dhani *et al.* [2021] and Jain *et al.* [2022] to create a legal knowledge graph by scraping the web for court cases, judgements, laws and other cases cited from the judgements etc. In particular, we use court repositories and other public sources in the Indian court system. We further annotate these documents using manually curated dictionaries as described in Vannur *et al.* [2021]. We process the original documents using Stanza (Qi *et al.* [2020]) and extract entities and relations using SystemT (Chiticariu *et al.* [2010]). We also use ground truth labels for citations and similarity from IndianKanoon Sinha [2008] and Casemine Yadav [2013].

We represent the knowledge graph in triples format comprising of subject, object and predicate. Table 1 shows the details about the created knowledge graph. This knowledge graph along with other annotations will be made publicly available by us.

Table 1: Details of the legal knowledge graph

Documents	2,286
Sentences	895,398
Triples	801,604
Entities	329,179
Relations	43

#### Question Answering

We present a legal question answering dataset **for law students**, which has been automatically constructed using the `gpt-3.5-turbo` model by OpenAI. We download 45 judgements from the Delhi High Court and extract 1740 paragraphs containing **meaningful** legal text such as paragraphs containing major text as quotation or references from other judgements, names of petitioners, respondents, judges, organizations etc. were discarded. The average paragraph length is

158.91 words. These paragraphs serve as the context for generating the QA dataset.

We use the LangChain (Chase [2022]) framework to create a QA generation pipeline. To guide the generation process, we employ few-shot prompting technique, prompt template is shown in figure 2. We use a publicly available short question-answering dataset for the Indian legal system to serve as examples. The dataset comprises of 150 question-answers pairs with questions pertaining to the Indian Constitution, judiciary, legislative, and various socio-political issues in India. For each curated context, we select 10 question-answers pairs using maximum marginal relevance criterion such that the questions of the pair are most similar to the context at hand while maintaining the diversity in these selected questions. The selected QA pairs and the context are placed into the prompt (Figure 2) and the model is queried.

```
[System message]
<Examples>
[ top 10 examples
  Context:
  Question:
]
</Examples>
<Provided Context>
[context from paragraph]
</Provided Context>
[formatting instruction]
[Instruction for generating questions]
```

Figure 2: Prompt template for question-answers generation




Figure 3: Distribution of question lengths in our Question Answering dataset

The pipeline generates the response (questions and corresponding answers) as *JSON* objects. We analyse the length distribution of generated questions and plot it in Figure 3.

#### Text2SQL

For the `text2sql` dataset, that has applications in retrieval augmented generation for petition drafting among other tasks, we extend the question answering dataset described above. We use ideas from Kothiyari *et al.* [2023] to make the models to hallucinate a database schema required for a query and put them together into a sufficiently large dataset.




Figure 4: Tasks in Legal Text Analytics

## 4 Tasks

In this section, we present several tasks in Legal Text Analytics that benefit from human interaction either with additional annotations or feedback. We also discuss tasks like petition drafting which is inherently a human activity that draws from peoples’ lives. Each of these tasks has been discussed in the literature, where supervised methods have been proposed earlier. We believe annotating samples for training supervised models is not necessarily scalable for building human-centered AI. Instead, we need to leverage Large Language Models and tailor them to the needs of Legal Text Analytics. With this motivation, we have looked at several tasks, supervised methods currently available for them, and how LLMs can compete and outperform these supervised methods with human intervention. Figure 4 shows the legal tasks at different levels, from low-level nlp tasks to downstream tasks.

### 4.1 Case Similarity

Dhani *et al.* [2021] [present] a case similarity solution using Graph Neural Networks (GNNs), that can help law practitioners to find similar cases that could lead to early settlements, better case documents, and faster judgements. Following Vannur *et al.* [2021], the authors construct a legal knowledge graph using human curated dictionaries to extract entities and relations from documents. The judgements and acts used in that work are from IndianKanoon Sinha [2008], a search engine API and Casemine Yadav [2013], a resource that provides similar judgements among other features. The authors report manually annotating each judgement as containing a law point or otherwise. They use these annotations as 27 features with one-hot encoding.

Like in Dhani *et al.* [2021], we extract entities and relations from legal documents, using methods described in Chiticariu

*et al.* [2010], Ganesan *et al.* [2020] and Qi *et al.* [2020]. This case similarity dataset has 2286 legal documents with citations from IndianKanoon Sinha [2008] and similar cases as recommended by Casemine (Yadav [2013]).

Compared to the vanilla RGCN Schlichtkrull *et al.* [2018] baseline, they report that the law points identified by legal experts, when used as handcrafted features in addition to the features provide better results. They also compare their method with an RGCN version where the node features are encoded with LegalBERT Chalkidis *et al.* [2020].

We conjecture that this task can be performed with Large Language Models, by presenting similar and dissimilar cases, and asking it to predict if two judgements are similar or otherwise. We use the LLaMA-2 70B Chat model and do few-shot prompting, taking a few examples comprising of pairs of document excerpts. We take 1,313 similar pairs from the dataset used by the authors in Dhani *et al.* [2021] and an equal number of random pairs. We then ask the LLM if a pair is similar by giving a one word response. We prompt the language model with these 2,626 target pairs of document excerpts taken from the 958 unique judgments in the dataset.

Model	Case Similarity
RGCN baseline	0.513
RGCN + handcrafted features	0.556
RGCN + LegalBERT	0.550
LLaMA-2-70B-Chat	<b>0.566</b>

Table 2: Performance of different models using ROC-AUC scores

The case similarity output from the model also has the

reasoning behind the Yes-No response and contained 37.62 tokens on average. The performance of the LLaMA-2 chat model (Touvron *et al.* [2023]) is compared with the supervised RGCN model on the Case Similarity task as shown in Table 2. We report the ROC-AUC scores as in Dhani *et al.* [2021]. Their model with handcrafted features performed better than the vanilla version with 0.556 ROC-AUC for case similarity. Encoding the features with LegalBERT did not seem to improve performance. LLaMA-2-70B-Chat yields a ROC-AUC score of 0.56626 on the same task.

## 4.2 Judgment Summarization

Judgement summarization is an important task in legal research. Since judgments typically run into tens of pages, stakeholders including law professionals, activists and common public, require the gist of the document to make sense out of it. Generic and abstractive summarization of judgments is typically useful for common citizens and law students, who are not familiar with legal jargon and prefer summaries in a language that is understandable. Contrastingly, law professionals and legal researchers require aspect-based summaries that meet their personal information needs. Law professionals usually prefer inclusion of legal terms in the summary, thereby necessitating extractive summaries covering the research dimension that is important for the law professionals at that point of time. Thus both approaches, *abstractive* and *extractive*, for judgement summarization are essential and require considerable attention for adoption of AI-driven LTA services.

Recent advancements in LTA have led to introduction of several state-of-the-art extractive judgment summarizers. Bhattacharya *et al.* [2021] propose DELSumm, an extractive summarizer that systematically infuses domain expertise, elucidating the essential information that should ideally be present in the summary of a judgment. Bindal *et al.* [2023] summarize landmark judgments based on the references in citing judgments. Recently, Dal Pont *et al.* [2023] used state-of-the-art LLM GPT4 with prompt engineering to generate extractive summary and report human evaluation results. Extractive summarizers are comprehensible to seasoned professionals as legal judgments feature long sentences and intricate legal terminology.

Abstractive summarization for legal judgements has been practiced using several approaches. Legal-LED and Legal-Pegasus are fine-tuned versions of pre-trained language models LED and Pegasus respectively. Both models are fine-tuned on publicly available legal data from the American judicial system. Shukla *et al.* [2022]; Bindal *et al.* [2023] report evaluation results for summarization of same set of Indian legal judgements using semantics-based metrics and ROUGE scores. Dal Pont *et al.* [2023] report human evaluation of abstractive summaries for Italian legal documents using GPT3 and GPT4. Feijo and Moreira [2023] generate abstractive summaries by chunking the source text, training summarization models to generate independent versions of summaries, and applying entailment module to mitigate hallucination. The method is evaluated for Brazilian Supreme Court Rulings using ROUGE metric.

We delve deep into the results reported in Shukla *et al.*

[2022] and Bindal *et al.* [2023] for Legal-LED and Legal-Pegasus on the IN-Ext dataset published by the former. The ROUGE scores for the two semantics-based metrics are reasonably good and a end-user may not suspect any risk in believing the summaries. However an expert analysis of a summary with highest semantic similarity shows a number of problems in the summary.

The cutting-edge models for abstractive judgment summarization, which might have seen some text as part of training data, tend to generate it verbatim in the summary overlooking the context. Resulting inaccuracies, alterations in proper nouns, locations and numbers lead to significant deviations from the original content, which is unacceptable in judgment summaries. Dal Pont *et al.* [2023] explicitly caution that abstractive summarization may pose the risk of misleading the readers by generating content absent in the original document. Even a subtle shift in the order of a single word can alter the meaning, as exemplified by the stark difference between "**accepted** an appeal that had been **denied**" and "**denied** an appeal that had been **accepted**" [Feijo and Moreira, 2023]. Superiority of *extractive* legal summaries over *abstractive* ones is well established in some recent studies [Shukla *et al.*, 2022; Feijo and Moreira, 2023; Dal Pont *et al.*, 2023; Bindal *et al.*, 2023].

Despite its current caveats, moderating research and development of abstractive techniques for judgment summarization is myopic. We argue that *abstractive* approach has strong potential for making the long judgment intelligible to a lay person. Ergo, development of reliable and trustworthy summarization methods that unscramble the complex legal language is fundamental for democratizing legal knowledge and ease of access to justice.

Judiciously integrating knowledge graph, legal dictionary, ontology and other external knowledge sources with LLMs can not only alleviate introduction of foreign entities and facts in the summary, but also unravel long and complex legal concepts in judgments. Recognizing the prowess of SOTA LLMs for generating confident, yet simple language, we press for blending sanitation strategies for fact-hygiene and paraphrasing the legal concepts to generate *lay-summaries* of the judgments. Human-centred abstractive summarization of legal judgments is vital for societal good and improved legal-awareness in public.

## 4.3 Petition Drafting

Petition drafting - the LLM should ask questions that the petitioner can answer. These additional information should strengthen the petition.

Petition drafting is a task, that is inherently human centered, especially in the context of Indian court system. Indian courts have the concept of Public Interest Litigations (PILs), using which, any citizen can approach a court of law to seek relief on issues concerning the people. There are, of course, much larger number of people approaching the courts seeking redressal of their grievances.

Enabling people or their lawyers to write well-written petitions can go a long way in getting them access to justice. Given the backlog and the volume of petitions disposed by courts in India and in many other countries, poorly written

**FORMAT OF WRIT PETITION**

**A SYNOPSIS AND LIST OF DATES (Specimen enclosed)**

**B FROM NEXT PAGE**

**IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA  
ORIGINAL JURISDICTION**

**CIVIL WRIT PETITION NO. \_\_\_\_\_ OF 2005**

**IN THE MATTER OF**

.....Petitioner

versus

....Respondents

**PETITION UNDER ARTICLE \_\_\_\_\_ OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA FOR ISSUANCE OF A WRIT IN THE NATURE OF \_\_\_\_\_ UNDER ARTICLE \_\_\_\_\_ OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA.**

To

**Hon'ble The Chief Justice of India and His Lordship's Companion Justices of the Supreme Court of India. The Humble petition of the Petitioner abovenamed.**

**MOST RESPECTFULLY SHEWETH :**

1. Facts of the case
2. Question(s) of Law
3. Grounds
4. Averment:-

**That the present petitioner has not filed any other petition in any High Court or the Supreme Court of India on the subject matter of the present petition.**

**PRAYER**

In the above premises, it is prayed that this Hon'ble Court may be pleased:

- (i) .....
- (ii) to pass such other orders and further orders as may be deemed necessary on the facts and in the circumstances of the case.

**FOR WHICH ACT OF KINDNESS, THE PETITIONER SHALL AS INDUTY BOUND, EVER PRAY.**

**FILED BY:**

**PETITIONER-IN-PERSON**

**DRAWN:**

**FILED ON:**

Figure 5: Format of a Writ petition to be filed in the Supreme Court of India. An LLM based solution for assisting self-representing litigants should elicit information to draft such a petition.

petitions can add significant cost to both individuals and the society as a whole. Among other things, poorly written petitions could be those that leave out important pieces of information, addressed to the wrong courts or authorities, risk being dismissed as frivolous when infact they are not. Figure 5 illustrates the format of a writ petition to be filed in SCI.

We propose using LLMs to identify missing information in a petition. This is a qualitatively a much harder task than writing petition which focus on the writing style and presentation. Our task involves making LLMs to identify missing information that should typically be present in the petition. This can be designed as a conversational question answering task. This is closely related to the factuality related work in LLMs, since we do not want the model to ask trivial questions. The model needs to be able to identify salient information in a petition and prompt the user to furnish any missing information.

For example, in a petition about a missing person which is a very sensitive but important judicial function, the petition is expected to provide the time when the person was last seen by a member of the public or a CCTV camera. While we expect this to be a multi-turn conversation similar to Trivedi *et al.* [2023], we currently focus on putting together a question answering dataset and evaluating our LLaMA-2 model on the question answering task.

#### 4.4 Question Answering

Question Answering is an important application to impart legal knowledge to students and answer questions of self-

Model	Hits@1 ↑	Hits@5 ↑	Hits@10 ↑
Legal-BERT-base-uncased	0.000	0.000	0.005
InLegalBERT-ft-corpus	0.005	0.005	0.015
InLegalBERT-ft-triples	0.225	0.350	0.395
LLaMA-2-34B-Instruct	0.520	0.556	0.617

Table 3: Comparison of model performance on relation/tail prediction, on a subset of the Legal KG triples

represented litigants in the court system. Considering large language models are often evaluated on the question answering task, they can be used in this legal context too.

Vasisht *et al.* [2023] compare the performance of an InLegalBERT model trained on Indian judgments and additionally fine-tuned on the corpus, with LegalBERT which hasn't seen the corpus. We report their numbers for reference and compare the performance of a LLaMA-2 model on the task, with and without human inputs.

The dataset consists of 4129 question answer pairs from our Indian court judgements dataset. This dataset can be used for different question answering tasks including closed-book QA tasks where a model is expected to answer the question without any further context or external knowledge. We believe models created to assist in petition drafting should be

**Question:** Which court passed the judgement in the case of “Shri Satyendra Singh vs Ghaziabad Development Authority” on 28 February 2018?

**Answer:** The Supreme Court

Figure 6: Example Question and Answer in our Indian Court Judgements dataset.

able to do well in this task. We expect such models to be pre-trained with legal documents or triples or fine-tuned as appropriate. In-context learning where the external knowledge is provided as triples or as text Vasisht *et al.* [2023] can also be considered.

However, currently we do not have models infused with legal judgements that can perform this closed-book question answering. We expect most LLMs to perform on the reading comprehension task but we do not believe that capability is particularly useful for the tasks in Legal Text Analytics. In petition drafting, we need the model to analyze the petition and ask question to fill missing information, like the date on which a particular judgement was delivered.

We believe providing knowledge graph triples or results from a SQL query to be more promising approaches. Our question answering dataset described in Section B of the Supplementary Material gives examples of question answer pairs along with related knowledge graph triples that have been extracted from a judgement. We expect the user to be able to upload a judgement or point to a URL, after which we can generate these triples to be provided as context.

#### 4.5 Text2SQL

In the context of legal text analytics, we consider Text2SQL to be predominantly useful for petition drafting and legal research, though other analytics use-cases exist. Generating relevant information about past cases can be helpful to cite judgements, as well as establish facts in a written faction. For example, the date on which a particular judgement was delivered is not part of citation prediction datasets, where as it is required while writing a petition. We propose a retrieval augmented generation (RAG) solution to this problem, where relevant facts of a case can be queried using a Text2SQL model.

However, the resources for enabling such a feature currently do not exist in the literature. We’ve created a relational database schema consisting of tables and relationships between them as provided in Section C of the supplementary material. Given the question answering dataset described in Section 4.4, and the database schema we have created, we generate text to SQL examples as shown in Figure 7.

### 5 InLegalLLaMA

In Section 4, we described the tasks in Legal Text Analytics, that are unique to the legal domain in countries like India. Based on a survey of the literature, and our observations on the performance of LLMs, we propose a large language model infused with legal knowledge and a composite system

```
SELECT court_name, judgement_date FROM
cases WHERE case_name = 'Shri Satyendra
Singh vs Ghaziabad Development Authority';
```

Figure 7: Example SQL query to fill details of a citation in a Writ Petition

that elicits knowledge from human users as a better solution for the problems in this space.

Recent work like LegalBERT (Chalkidis *et al.* [2020]), CaseLawBERT (Zheng *et al.* [2021]) and JuriBERT (Douka *et al.* [2021]) show the sustained interest of researchers in using language models for downstream legal tasks. However, these models are typically trained on European legal documents, which are structured by nature, and do not perform well in the Indian context directly where courts do not follow standardized structures when publishing legal documents. Under these circumstances, existing PLMs do not work well out of the box and need additional training on local corpora. Works such as InLegalBERT and InCaseLawBERT (Paul *et al.* [2022]) involve training the base models on Indian legal documents and achieve reasonable performance on certain tasks like legal statute identification, semantic segmentation and court judgment prediction. In Table 2, we observe that open-domain LLMs have comparable performance to RGCN models. Much work still needs to be done to make LLMs useful in LTA tasks that need human expertise.

We conjecture to pre-train a LLaMA-2 foundation model (Touvron *et al.* [2023]) on Indian legal domain corpora and instruction-tune it for a selected set of tasks in the legal domain using a concept-enhanced pre-training objective of entity-concept prediction as proposed in Wang *et al.* [2024], which might help to mitigate hallucination in domain tasks, which could have societal consequences. We aim to fine-tune the model using parameter-efficient fine-tuning methods on feasible domain tasks relevant in the Indian context, and compare its performance on multiple datasets in tandem with other state-of-the-art models, with and without fine-tuning on domain corpora.

Vasisht *et al.* [2023] propose infusing knowledge into LLMs as a general purpose way to improve model performance on documents. They use contextual text in lieu of knowledge graph triples. We propose to use a similar approach to add context to prompts when training the model on Indian legal documents. Using soft prompts and domain concepts in the training process, we will come up with a family of LLMs infused with knowledge about the Indian legal system.

## 6 Conclusion

Our observations of the existing works and applications in the domain of legal text analytics makes it amply clear that we need to develop and deploy human-centered compound Legal AI systems like the one we have described in this position paper. By principally eliciting human input, AI systems can improve the performance of large language models (LLMs) and help our communities build impactful applications, that enable common people to access justice in our court systems.

## References

- Bilal Abu-Salih. Domain-specific knowledge graphs: A survey. *Journal of Network and Computer Applications*, 185:103076, 2021.
- Oshin Agarwal, Heming Ge, Siamak Shakeri, and Rami Al-Rfou. Knowledge graph based synthetic corpus generation for knowledge-enhanced language model pre-training, 2020.
- Ankush Agarwal, Sakham Gawade, Sachin Channabasavarajendra, and Pushpak Bhattacharyya. There is no big brother or small brother: Knowledge infusion in language models for link prediction and question answering. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.04013*, 2023.
- Claire Barale. Human-centered computing in legal nlp—an application to refugee status determination. In *Proceedings of the Second Workshop on Bridging Human–Computer Interaction and Natural Language Processing*, 2022.
- Paheli Bhattacharya, Soham Poddar, Koustav Rudra, Kripabandhu Ghosh, and Saptarshi Ghosh. Incorporating domain knowledge for extractive summarization of legal case documents. In *Proceedings of the eighteenth international conference on artificial intelligence and law*, 2021.
- Purnima Bindal, Vikas Kumar, Vasudha Bhatnagar, Parikshet Sirohi, and Ashwini Siwal. Citation-based summarization of landmark judgments. In *Proceedings of the 20th International Conference on Natural Language Processing (ICON)*, 2023.
- Ilias Chalkidis, Manos Fergadiotis, Prodromos Malakasiotis, Nikolaos Aletras, and Ion Androutsopoulos. LEGALBERT: The muppets straight out of law school. In Trevor Cohn, Yulan He, and Yang Liu, editors, *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2020*, pages 2898–2904, Online, November 2020. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Harrison Chase. LangChain, October 2022.
- Laura Chiticariu, Rajasekar Krishnamurthy, Yunyao Li, Sriram Raghavan, Frederick Reiss, and Shivakumar Vaithyanathan. SystemT: An algebraic approach to declarative information extraction. In *Proceedings of the 48th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 128–137, 2010.
- Thiago Dal Pont, Federico Galli, Andrea Loreggia, Giuseppe Pisano, Riccardo Rovatti, and Giovanni Sartor. Legal summarisation through llms: The prodigit project. *arXiv e-prints*, pages arXiv–2308, 2023.
- Jaspreet Singh Dhani, Ruchika Bhatt, Balaji Ganesan, Parikshet Sirohi, and Vasudha Bhatnagar. Similar cases recommendation using legal knowledge graphs, 2021.
- Shizhe Diao, Tianyang Xu, Ruijia Xu, Jiawei Wang, and Tong Zhang. Mixture-of-domain-adapters: Decoupling and injecting domain knowledge to pre-trained language models memories. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.05406*, 2023.
- Cicero Nogueira dos Santos, Zhe Dong, Daniel Cer, John Nham, Siamak Shakeri, Jianmo Ni, and Yun hsuan Sung. Knowledge prompts: Injecting world knowledge into language models through soft prompts, 2022.
- Stella Douka, Hadi Abdine, Michalis Vazirgiannis, Rajaa El Hamdani, and David Restrepo Amariles. JuriBERT: A masked-language model adaptation for French legal text. In *Proceedings of the Natural Legal Language Processing Workshop 2021*, pages 95–101, 2021.
- Atefeh Farzindar and Guy Lapalme. Letsum, a text summarization system in law field. In *a THE FACE OF TEXT conference (Computer Assisted Text Analysis in the Humanities)*, pages 27–36, 2004.
- Diego de Vargas Feijo and Viviane P Moreira. Improving abstractive summarization of legal rulings through textual entailment. *Artificial intelligence and law*, 31(1), 2023.
- Balaji Ganesan, Avirup Saha, Jaydeep Sen, Matheen Ahmed Pasha, Sumit Bhatia, and Arvind Agarwal. Anu question answering system. In *ISWC 2020 Posters Demos and Industry Tracks*, volume 2721, pages 394–396, 2020.
- Neel Guha, Julian Nyarko, Daniel Ho, Christopher Ré, Adam Chilton, Aditya K, et al. LegalBench: A Collaboratively Built Benchmark for Measuring Legal Reasoning in Large Language Models. In A. Oh, T. Neumann, A. Globerson, K. Saenko, M. Hardt, and S. Levine, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 36, pages 44123–44279, 2023.
- SK Mainul Islam, Abhinav Nagpal, Balaji Ganesan, and Pranay Kumar Lohia. Fair data generation using language models with hard constraints. *CtrlGen Workshop*, 2021.
- Sarika Jain, Pooja Harde, Nandana Mihindukulasooriya, Sudipto Ghosh, Abhinav Dubey, and Ankush Bisht. Constructing a Knowledge Graph from Indian Legal Domain Corpus. In *TEXT2KG @ Extended Semantic Web Conference (ESWC 2022), CEUR Workshop Proceedings*, volume 3184, pages 80–93, 2022.
- Heng Ji, Ralph Grishman, Hoa Trang Dang, Kira Griffitt, and Joe Ellis. Overview of the tac 2010 knowledge base population track. In *Third text analysis conference (TAC 2010)*, volume 3, pages 3–3, 2010.
- Karuna P Joshi, Aditi Gupta, Sudip Mittal, Claudia Pearce, Tim Finin, et al. Alda: Cognitive assistant for legal document analytics, 2016.
- Prathamesh Kalamkar, Aman Tiwari, Ashutosh Modi, et al. Corpus for Automatic Structuring of Legal Documents. In *Proceedings of the Thirteenth Language Resources and Evaluation Conference*, pages 4420–4429, 2022.
- Ambedkar Kanapala, Sukomal Pal, and Rajendra Pamula. Text summarization from legal documents: a survey. *Artificial Intelligence Review*, 51(3):371–402, 2019.
- Mayank Kothiyari, Dhruva Dhingra, Sunita Sarawagi, and Soumen Chakrabarti. CRUSH4SQL: Collective Retrieval Using Schema Hallucination For Text2SQL. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.01173*, 2023.
- Jinyang Li, Binyuan Hui, Ge Qu, Binhua Li, Jiayi Yang, Bowen Li, Bailin Wang, Bowen Qin, Rongyu Cao, Ruiying



- Geng, et al. Can llm already serve as a database interface? a big bench for large-scale database grounded text-to-sqls. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.03111*, 2023.
- Vijit Malik, Rishabh Sanjay, Shubham Kumar Nigam, Kripabandhu Ghosh, Shouvik Kumar Guha, Arnab Bhat-tacharya, and Ashutosh Modi. ILDC for CJPE: Indian Legal Documents Corpus for Court Judgment Prediction and Explanation. In *Proceedings of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 4046–4062, 2021.
- Fedor Moiseev, Zhe Dong, Enrique Alfonseca, and Martin Jaggi. Skill: Structured knowledge infusion for large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.08184*, 2022.
- Shounak Paul, Arpan Mandal, Pawan Goyal, and Saptarshi Ghosh. Pre-training transformers on indian legal text. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2209.06049*, 2022.
- Seth Polsley, Pooja Jhunjhunwala, and Ruihong Huang. Casummarizer: a system for automated summarization of legal texts. In *Proceedings of COLING 2016, the 26th international conference on Computational Linguistics: System Demonstrations*, pages 258–262, 2016.
- Mohammadreza Pourreza and Davood Rafiei. Din-sql: Decomposed in-context learning of text-to-sql with self-correction. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.11015*, 2023.
- Soumajit Pramanik, Jesujoba Alabi, Rishiraj Saha Roy, and Gerhard Weikum. Uniqorn: unified question answering over rdf knowledge graphs and natural language text. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2108.08614*, 2021.
- Peng Qi, Yuhao Zhang, Yuhui Zhang, Jason Bolton, and Christopher D Manning. Stanza: A python natural language processing toolkit for many human languages. In *Association for Computational Linguistics (ACL) System Demonstrations*. 2020., 2020.
- Michael Schlichtkrull, Thomas N Kipf, Peter Bloem, Rianne Van Den Berg, Ivan Titov, and Max Welling. Modeling relational data with graph convolutional networks. In *The Semantic Web: 15th International Conference, ESWC 2018, Heraklion, Crete, Greece, June 3–7, 2018, Proceedings 15*, pages 593–607, 2018.
- Ben Shneiderman. *Human-centered AI*. Oxford University Press, 2022.
- Abhay Shukla, Paheli Bhattacharya, Soham Poddar, Rajdeep Mukherjee, Kripabandhu Ghosh, Pawan Goyal, and Saptarshi Ghosh. Legal case document summarization: Extractive and abstractive methods and their evaluation. In *The 2nd Conference of the Asia-Pacific Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 12th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing*, 2022.
- Sushant Sinha. IndianKanoon: Search Engine for Indian Law, 2008.
- Hugo Touvron, Louis Martin, Kevin R. Stone, Peter Albert, Amjad Almahairi, et al. Llama 2: Open Foundation and Fine-Tuned Chat Models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.09288*, 2023.
- Harsh Trivedi, Niranjan Balasubramanian, Tushar Khot, and Ashish Sabharwal. Interleaving retrieval with chain-of-thought reasoning for knowledge-intensive multi-step questions, 2023.
- Caroline Uyttendaele, Marie-Francine Moens, and Jos Dumortier. Salomon: automatic abstracting of legal cases for effective access to court decisions. *Artificial Intelligence and Law*, 6(1):59–79, 1998.
- Lingraj S Vannur, Balaji Ganesan, Lokesh Nagalapatti, Hima Patel, and MN Tippeswamy. Data augmentation for fairness in personal knowledge base population. In *Trends and Applications in Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining: PAKDD 2021 Workshops, 2021 Proceedings 25*, volume 12705, pages 143–152, New Delhi, India, 2021.
- Kinshuk Vasisht, Balaji Ganesan, Vikas Kumar, and Vasudha Bhatnagar. Infusing knowledge into large language models with contextual prompts, 2023.
- Xintao Wang, Zhouhong Gu, Jiaqing Liang, Dakuan Lu, Yanghua Xiao, and Wei Wang. ConcEPT: Concept-Enhanced Pre-Training for Language Models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.05669*, 2024.
- Xiaokai Wei, Shen Wang, Dejiao Zhang, Parminder Bhatia, and Andrew Arnold. Knowledge enhanced pretrained language models: A comprehensive survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.08455*, 2021.
- Aniruddha Yadav. Casemine: A granular mapping of indian case law, 2013.
- Jian Yang, Gang Xiao, Yulong Shen, Wei Jiang, Xinyu Hu, Ying Zhang, and Jinghui Peng. A survey of knowledge enhanced pre-trained models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.00269*, 2021.
- Wang Yizhen, Ou Shiyan, and Chen Jinju. Automatic abstracting civil judgment documents with two-stage procedure. *Data Analysis and Knowledge Discovery*, 5(5):104–114, 2021.
- Tao Yu, Rui Zhang, Kai Yang, Michihiro Yasunaga, Dongxu Wang, Zifan Li, James Ma, Irene Li, Qingning Yao, Shanelle Roman, Zilin Zhang, and Dragomir Radev. Spider: A large-scale human-labeled dataset for complex and cross-domain semantic parsing and text-to-SQL task. In Ellen Riloff, David Chiang, Julia Hockenmaier, and Jun’ichi Tsujii, editors, *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 3911–3921, 2018.
- Matei Zaharia, Omar Khattab, Lingjiao Chen, Davis, Heather Jared Quincy, Miller, Chris Potts, James Zou, Michael Carbin, Jonathan Frankle, Naveen Rao, and Ali Ghodsi. The shift from models to compound ai systems. <https://bair.berkeley.edu/blog/2024/02/18/compound-ai-systems/>, 2024.
- Lucia Zheng, Neel Guha, Brandon R. Anderson, Peter Henderson, and Daniel E. Ho. When does pretraining help? assessing self-supervised learning for law and the casehold dataset. In *Proceedings of the 18th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Law*. Association for Computing Machinery, 2021.