

GIORGI AMIRANASHVILI*

DIGITALIZATION OF JUSTICE:
A GEORGIAN PERSPECTIVE**

ABSTRACT. The digital transformation of judicial systems has become a central component of contemporary legal reform, raising important questions concerning efficiency, transparency, judicial independence, and the protection of fundamental rights. This paper examines the digitalization of justice in Georgia as a case study of reform within a transitioning legal system aligned with European standards. It analyses the development and implementation of key electronic justice instruments, including the Electronic Court Case Management System (ECCMS), electronic filing and service mechanisms, and the system of random electronic case distribution introduced during the “Third Wave” of judicial reform.

The study evaluates the effectiveness of these reforms in enhancing efficiency, access to justice, and transparency, while critically assessing persistent structural challenges, such as broad exceptions to automated case allocation, institutional ambiguities, and uneven technological integration. Particular attention is given to the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic, which accelerated the use of remote hearings and digital communication, exposing both the resilience and vulnerabilities of the existing framework. The paper further explores the emerging debate on the potential introduction of artificial intelligence in the judiciary, emphasizing the risks of algorithmic bias and the necessity of robust ethical and regulatory safeguards.

Drawing on CEPEJ evaluations and international assessments, the article concludes that while Georgia has made substantial progress in modernizing its judicial infrastructure, digitalization alone cannot resolve deeper governance and independence concerns. Sustainable reform requires coherent

* PhD in Law (TSU); Assistant Professor, Head Specialist (I Category) at the Department of Internationalization and Scientific Research, and Member of the Contemporary Private Law Institute of the Faculty of Law at Ivane Javakishvili Tbilisi State University; Junior Fellow of the Institute of European and Comparative Private Law at the University of Girona (Spain).

** This publication is based on a paper presented at the International Hybrid Conference: “Digitalisation of Justice and Predictive Justice: European and Asian Perspectives” organized by the University of Copenhagen and Roma Tre University, held on 2 May 2023 via Microsoft Teams.

legal regulation, strengthened institutional accountability, and continued alignment with European standards to ensure that technological innovation reinforces – rather than undermines – the rule of law.

CONTENT. 1. Introduction. – 2. Electronic Judiciary Reforms. – 3. Court Digitalization Processes. – 4. Use of AI in Judiciary – 5. Evaluation of the Judicial System by CEPEJ. – 6. Electronic Justice during Covid-19 – 7. Conclusion.

1. Introduction

The digital transformation of justice systems has become a defining feature of contemporary judicial reform across Europe and beyond. Driven by technological progress, increasing caseloads, demands for transparency, and the need for efficient access to justice, courts are progressively integrating digital tools into their daily operations. Electronic case management systems, online filing mechanisms, remote hearings, and algorithm-based administrative processes are no longer experimental innovations but essential components of modern judicial administration. At the same time, digitalization raises complex legal, institutional, and ethical questions, particularly concerning judicial independence, procedural fairness, data protection, and the preservation of fundamental human rights.

Georgia represents a particularly instructive case study in this regard. As a country undergoing continuous judicial reform while simultaneously pursuing closer integration with European legal standards, Georgia has invested significantly in the development of electronic justice mechanisms over the past decade. Legislative amendments, strategic planning by judicial governance bodies, and the introduction of nationwide electronic systems have aimed to modernize court administration, improve efficiency, and strengthen public trust in the judiciary. These reforms have taken place both in response to domestic challenges – such as court backlogs and concerns over impartiality – and within the broader framework of Georgia’s international commitments, including obligations arising from cooperation with the European Union and the Council of Europe.

This paper examines the digitalization of justice in Georgia through a comprehensive and critical lens. It explores the evolution and functioning of key electronic justice instruments, including the Electronic Court Case Management System (ECCMS), the electronic distribution of cases, and online filing and service mechanisms. Particular attention is given to strategic policy documents shaping these reforms, as well as to the practical challenges identified during their implementation. The paper also situates Georgia’s experience within a broader comparative and evaluative context by referring to assessments conducted by international institutions such as the European Commission for the Efficiency of Justice (CEPEJ) and by analyzing the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on digital justice practices.

Finally, the study addresses emerging debates surrounding the potential use of artificial intelligence in the judiciary, emphasizing both its perceived benefits and inherent risks. By assessing existing achievements alongside unresolved shortcomings, this

paper seeks to contribute to the ongoing discussion on how digital tools can be effectively integrated into judicial systems while safeguarding the core principles of independence, impartiality, and access to justice in a developing legal environment such as Georgia's.

2. *Electronic Judiciary Reforms*

i) Electronic Court Case Management System of Georgia (ECCMS)

The legislative changes enacted from 2012 introduced regulations designed to ensure effective case management in the courts.¹ Like in many European countries, in the Judicial system of Georgia all the information about each case (procedural documents of parties, data of participants in the proceedings, information about procedural activities and events, procedural documents of courts, audio records) is stored in the centralized information system of all courts called Electronic Court Case Management System of Georgia (ECCMS). All documents related to the ongoing litigation are received through the electronic case management system. In Georgia, this system is implemented at all levels of courts, in all three instances and throughout the country. The involvement of the parties in the electronic case management system is limited to access to their cases. At the commencement of the proceedings, the court clerk assigns a username and password to the court user. As a result, the party is able to get acquainted with their case and with the documents submitted to them, which have already been certified as a final document.²

ECCMS facilitates the accumulation of information on civil, criminal and administrative proceedings in all instances of courts. This program is operated by the Department of Common Courts. In the courts of Georgia, electronic case proceedings are carried out through the electronic case management program. Case proceeding in the court begins by filing an application or lawsuit through the electronic case registration system (ecourt.ge). In order to register in the electronic system, the user must fill in the user registration application, agree to the terms of use of the electronic system and use

¹ Maia Bakradze and Kakha Tsikarishvili, *The Problem of Case Delay in Common Courts of Georgia* (Democracy Index Georgia, Tbilisi 2023) 6 <https://democracyindex.ge/uploads_script/studies/tmp/phpB8XAL1.pdf> accessed 14 December 2025.

² *Development of UJITS: Challenges and Perspectives* (Pravo-Justice, November 2020) 18 <<https://www.pravojustice.eu/storage/app/uploads/public/5fc/a27/ad7/5fca27ad70c2c822820370.pdf>> accessed 14 December 2025.

the user activation link received on the phone. A unique barcode for differentiation is assigned to every application or lawsuit electronically submitted to the court. The court issues in an electronic form all documents and information that are produced through electronic case management program.³

ii) The Judiciary Strategy and Action Plan for 2017-2021

In 2017, for the first time in the history of independent Georgia, the representatives of the judicial power developed and approved the Judiciary Strategy and Action Plan for 2017-2021. Based on the strategy and action plan, the activities of the High Council of Justice will be implemented in a specific direction and will ensure the further development of the judiciary by carrying out preplanned activities. The Judiciary Strategy and Action Plan were elaborated by a Strategic Committee created specifically for this purpose within the framework of obligations taken under the Association Agreement between Georgia and the European Union.⁴

The strategy reflects real challenges of each direction, a special place is given to the development of the electronic system of court proceedings, and accordingly, a specific development plan is introduced.⁵

iii) Electronic Distribution of Cases

Rule of electronic distribution of cases in the Common Courts was adopted by the Parliament of Georgia as part of the “Third Wave” of judicial reform and it was one of the most significant positive changes in the Georgian judiciary system. The rule entails the random distribution of cases to the Supreme Court as well as city/district, appellate courts throughout Georgia through an electronic program.⁶

The introduction of the new case distribution system in the Third Wave amendments was intended, among other things, to ensure the proper functioning of the electronic system.⁷

³ *Ibidem* 19.

⁴ *Ibidem*.

⁵ *Ibidem* 20.

⁶ Ani Mukhigulashvili, *Electronic System of Case Distribution in Courts* (Human Rights Education and Monitoring Center (EMC) 2020) 6 <https://socialjustice.org.ge/uploads/products/covers/ENG_WEB_1586245543.pdf> accessed 14 December 2025.

⁷ *Judicial System Reform in Georgia (2013-2021)* (Georgian Young Lawyers' Association, Tbilisi 2021) 54 <https://gyla.ge/files/news/გზონდონ/2021/JUDICIAL_SYSTEM_REFORM-2.pdf> accessed 14 December 2025.

For the purpose of enforcement and management of the electronic system of case distribution, the above mentioned Action Plan envisages four activities. Development of a new system of distribution of cases in common courts is one of the most important reforms of recent years, which should answer many challenges in terms of the impartiality and independence of courts. The system of distribution of cases among the judges should, first of all, ensure impartial review of cases, protection against external interference in a trial, as well as timely and efficient implementation of justice and fair distribution of labour among judges. The new system of electronic distribution is based on the principle of random distribution of cases between the judges.⁸

As a result of the “Third Wave” of judicial system reform, the High Council of Justice exercised its delegated authority and determined the rules for random distribution of cases in the Common Courts of Georgia through an electronic program. Since the introduction of the electronic system of case distribution many challenges were identified that required timely and effective response.⁹ In Particular, as monitoring of the implementation process after the system’s introduction has revealed the issue has lost its pertinence within the judiciary and the will to further reforms in this direction is weakened.¹⁰ In addition, unduly implementation of the electronic system of case distribution and the unequal workloads of the judges generates additional incentives for improper use of the system and pressure on individual judges.¹¹ Moreover, wide-ranging exceptions to the rules regarding random assignment of cases and unlimited discretion of court chairperson’s permits arbitrary use of the electronic case distribution system in specific cases.¹²

⁸ Mariam Mkhartvari, Ketevan Kukava and Maya Talakhadze, *Implementation of the Judicial Strategy and the Action Plan (Shadow Report)* (Human Rights Education and Monitoring Center (EMC), Tbilisi 2018) 95-96 <https://idfi.ge/public/upload/IDFI_Photos_2018/general/ENG_WEB.pdf> accessed 14 December 2025.

⁹ Ani Mukhigulashvili, *Electronic System of Case Distribution in Courts* (Human Rights Education and Monitoring Center (EMC) 2020) 10 <https://socialjustice.org.ge/uploads/products/covers/ENG_WEB_1586245543.pdf> accessed 14 December 2025.

¹⁰ Mariam Gobronidze, Ketevan Kukava and Salome Chkhaidze, *Implementation of the Judicial Strategy and the Action Plan (Second Shadow Report)* (Human Rights Education and Monitoring Center (EMC), Tbilisi 2020) 77 <https://idfi.ge/public/upload/EU/ENG_WEB456.pdf> accessed 14 December 2025.

¹¹ Ana Papuashvili, Nino Nozadze, Gvantsa Tsulukidze and Giorgi Davituri, *10 Years of Judicial Reforms: Challenges and Perspectives* (Coalition for an Independent and Transparent Judiciary, Tbilisi 2023) 9 <https://www.coalition.ge/files/reporma_170x240_eng_1.pdf> accessed 14 December 2025.

¹² Mariam Gobronidze, Tornike Gerliani and Ana Papuashvili, *Access to Justice in Georgia* (Social Justice Center, Tbilisi 2021) 15 <https://socialjustice.org.ge/uploads/products/pdf/Access_to_Justice_in_Georgia_1632406837.pdf> accessed 14 December 2025.

According to the Assessment Report, in some cases, the powers of the bodies involved in the electronic case distribution system and those in administrative positions in the courts are still vague and problematic. This hinders the full achievement of the goals set by the introduction of the case distribution system, jeopardizes the independent work of individual judges, and impedes access to impartial and well-functioning justice.¹³

3. Court Digitalization Processes

i) Most Recent Developments

In May 2020, the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD) conducted a survey among 20 countries of operation of EBRD to obtain information about the most recent developments in their court digitalization processes. All of the selected countries are jurisdictions where EBRD currently has operational projects, which facilitated significantly the collection of data.¹⁴

The information was provided by law firms from those 20 jurisdictions, including Georgia. The questions focused on the risk of postponement and backlogs amid COVID-19, the availability of a case management system for courts and online information system available to litigants and attorneys, as well as the use of remote hearings by courts.¹⁵

ii) The Findings of the Survey

From among surveyed EBRD countries of operation, jurisdictions where there are online filing systems include Georgia. The adoption of this practice has been an overarching trend among the examined countries, as Georgia has adopted online filing in its courts in 2015.¹⁶

¹³ Ana Papuashvili, *Electronic System of Case Distribution in Courts (2020-2021 Assessment Report)* (Social Justice Center, Tbilisi 2022) 28 <https://socialjustice.org.ge/uploads/products/pdf/Electronic_System_of_Case_Distribution_in_Courts_ENG_1657114427.pdf> accessed 14 December 2025.

¹⁴ Veronica Bradautanu, Christina Chelioti, Patricia Zghibarta and Liubov Skoryk, *From Digitisation to Digital Transformation: A Case for Online Courts in Commercial Disputes? Draft Discussion Paper October 2020* (European Bank for Reconstruction and Development 2020) 7 <<https://app.glueup.com/resources/protected/organization/1136/event/27964/99358ddf-99c4-4026-b5c7-21c882fddfbc.pdf>> accessed 14 December 2025.

¹⁵ *Ibidem*.

¹⁶ *Ibidem* 18.

Online service of process is another essential part of a digital court function. It promotes time efficiency, reliability and lowers the cost of the litigation. Electronic service may be performed directly by a party, by an agent of the party (who could be the party's attorney) or through an electronic filing service provider. The domestic legislation must provide for service of process and allow for e-signatures. Electronic service has been adopted by several jurisdictions in the EBRD regions, including Georgia.¹⁷

4. *Use of AI in Judiciary*

It is common sense that AI may be appropriate for judgment and decision making due to its impartiality, while humans are prone to cognitive bias, AI would make justice fairer, and moreover, unlike human judges, AI does not get tired and does not depend on its glucose levels to function.¹⁸

In Georgia there were some suspects on case distribution to judges and for prevention in 2017, the principle of electronic distribution of cases through a computer program was introduced.¹⁹

But it is clear that the impartiality of AI is another legend, though its characters largely depend on its creator, on the person who gives artificial intelligence access to information and tasks. AI has not inherent biological properties or social skills. Even if these features can be attributed to it, they are programmed by its creator.²⁰

That is why the European Parliament in the non-binding resolution of 2021 emphasized the risk of algorithmic bias and that human supervision and strong legal powers are needed to prevent discrimination by AI. Human operators must always make the final decisions and subjects monitored by AI-powered systems must have access to remedy.²¹

Some of the authors draw conclusion that the myth that artificial intelligence is impartial, should be replaced by its strict and detailed regulation by the states. Arti-

¹⁷ *Ibidem*.

¹⁸ Nino Kharitonashvili, 'Expediency and Scope of Using AI in Civil Justice' (2022) 9 *European Journal of Economics, Law and Politics* 4, 4-5 <<https://elpjournal.eu/wp-content/uploads/2023/04/01-ELP-March.pdf>> accessed 14 December 2025.

¹⁹ *Ibidem* 5.

²⁰ *Ibidem*.

²¹ *Ibidem*.

ficial intelligence should be deployed based on a transparent algorithm for tightly regulated purposes, especially if it is used in developing countries like Georgia.²²

According to recent studies, as of today, the Georgian justice system does not yet incorporate AI tools, nor does it have the necessary ethical or legal frameworks in place. Therefore, it is essential for the country to prioritize the development of an ethical framework that ensures the protection of fundamental human rights in the use of AI. At the same time, it is necessary to gradually introduce AI technologies into the justice system, which would contribute to streamlining processes, increasing transparency in decision-making, and alleviating pressure on an overburdened system.²³

5. *Evaluation of the Judicial System by CEPEJ*

i) CEPEJ & ECN

The European Commission for the Efficiency of Justice (CEPEJ) of the Council of Europe supports the Organization's member States in improving the efficiency and quality of their judicial systems in order to ensure that they operate in line with the standards of the Council of Europe and meet the needs of those seeking justice.²⁴

The European Cyberjustice Network (ECN) allows the exchange of good practices and helps to define future initiatives by the Council of Europe to support its member States in the digital transformation of their judiciary in line with Human Rights standards. The network supports the activities of the CEPEJ and its working groups (CEPEJ-GT-CYBERJUST et al.). The Network was inaugurated on 16 November 2021.²⁵

ii) The Findings of Evaluation

The CEPEJ decided, at its 35th plenary meeting, to launch the ninth evaluation cycle 2020 – 2022, focused on 2020 data. The CEPEJ wished to use the methodology

²² *Ibidem* 6.

²³ Mariam Beruashvili, 'The Capabilities and Challenges of Artificial Intelligence in the Justice System' (2025) 11 Law and World 35, 157 <<https://lawandworld.ge/index.php/law/article/view/848/475>> accessed 14 December 2025.

²⁴ European Commission for the Efficiency of Justice (CEPEJ), *CEPEJ Declaration: Lessons Learnt and Challenges Faced by the Judiciary During and After the COVID-19 Pandemic* (Ad hoc virtual plenary meeting, 10 June 2020) <<https://rm.coe.int/declaration-en/16809ea1e2>> accessed 14 December 2025.

²⁵ 'European Cyberjustice Network' <<https://www.coe.int/en/web/cepej/european-cyberjustice-network-ecn->>> accessed 14 December 2025.

developed in the previous cycles to get, with the support of its national correspondents' network, a general evaluation of the judicial systems in the 47 member states of the Council of Europe as well as three observer states (Israel, Morocco and Kazakhstan). The questionnaire was adapted by the Working group on evaluation of judicial systems (CEPEJ-GT-EVAL) in view of the previous evaluation cycles and considering the comments submitted by CEPEJ members, observers, experts and national correspondents. The aim of this exercise was to increase awareness of judicial systems in the participating states, to compare the functioning of judicial systems in their various aspects, as well as to have a better knowledge of the trends of the judicial organisation in order to help improve the efficiency of justice.²⁶

According to the findings of evaluation, the court system uses the electronic case distribution system, which has been introduced across common courts since 2018, to calculate the workload of judges. As for the burden on the prosecutor, the judiciary does not in itself have an obligation to assess the workload of prosecutors, but in the interests and demands of the prosecution, the court's electronic system provides e-mail. The service automatically shows the time spent at the prosecutors' meeting, which ultimately participates in the prosecution system in their workload calculation coefficient.²⁷

Besides, electronic registration service *ecourt.ge* has been launched in the system of common courts, which allows individuals and legal entities to send cases electronically. The legislative framework for its use was adopted by the High Council of Justice decree 1 / 209 of December 6, 2013.²⁸

Finally, there is the possibility to try online mediation at all stages of court hearing (also, this includes the possibility of non-formal format, called: "informational sessions" with mediators if all parties agree to it, or there is mechanism - judge's order about transferring of the case to the mediation with or without parties agreement, which can be used at any court hearing stages, including the preparatory hearing with the judge.²⁹

²⁶ The European Commission for the Efficiency of Justice (CEPEJ), *Evaluation of the judicial systems (2020 - 2022): Georgia (Reference data 2020)* (Council of Europe 2022) 1 <<https://rm.coe.int/georgia-2020-en/1680a85c7f>> accessed 14 December 2025.

²⁷ *Ibidem* 48.

²⁸ *Ibidem* 49, 52.

²⁹ *Ibidem* 50.

6. *Electronic Justice during Covid-19*

i) The Impact of the Pandemic

In the first half of 2020, the modern world faced a new challenge in the form of the Covid-19 pandemic that had emerged at the end of 2019 and spread across 213 countries within 6 months. Georgia was not immune from the pandemic either. While the country was less affected in terms of the spread of the virus, the pandemic had its impact on almost every field of everyday life, including justice.³⁰

The Decree of the President of Georgia, issued on 21 March 2020, declared an emergency in the country and restricted a number of civil rights. While the restrictions did not apply to the right to a fair trial, the presidential decree gave preference to online participation of parties in court proceedings.³¹

ii) The Administration of Justice in Times of Pandemic

The new reality affected the administration of justice throughout the country: a significant number of court hearings were adjourned and the rest continued with the online participation of parties; movement in court buildings was restricted and the public nature of court hearings was restricted as well. While online hearings ensured administration of justice in urgent cases, they also gave rise to the worsening of the quality of justice and breach of court users' rights. Under those circumstances, where the delay in court proceedings was a systemic problem, adjournment of hearings during the pandemic was bound to worsen this problem.³²

On the other hand, the large-scale resort to videoconferences gave rise to the necessity to introduce new technologies in the justice sphere which should continue after the end of the pandemic as well.³³

³⁰ Rights Georgia, *The Effectiveness of Electronic Justice during the Pandemic (an Evaluation Report)* (July 2020) 4 <<https://www.rights.ge/en/accountnew/8>> accessed 14 December 2025. For more details about the impact of the pandemic on the judicial system of Georgia, see: Giorgi Amiranashvili, 'Impact of the Covid-19 Pandemic on Civil Litigation in Georgia: Challenges and Perspectives' in Serkan Kaya and Okeoma John-Paul Okeke (eds), *Law, Business and Innovation Studies (LBIS) Conference, (9-10-11 September 2021) London, United Kingdom, Full Paper Proceedings Book* (2021), 143-148.

³¹ See Rights Georgia, *The Effectiveness of Electronic Justice during the Pandemic (an Evaluation Report)* (July 2020) 4 <<https://www.rights.ge/en/accountnew/8>> accessed 14 December 2025.

³² *Ibidem*.

³³ *Ibidem* 5.

iii) Beyond the Pandemic: The Ongoing Need for Digital Justice Reform

The COVID-19 pandemic has accelerated the use of digital communication. The need for digitalization of justice is self-evident in an increasingly digitalized society. Advantages for justice include easier access to legal proceedings and relevant legal information for citizens and more efficient work processes for judges and lawyers. In the past decade governments have invested in digitalizing justice, but the level of digitalization differs from country to country. There is significant room for improvement, but matching technology to legal needs, including protection of fundamental rights, is complex.³⁴

It is noteworthy that Georgia has been developing its electronic judiciary reforms long before the outbreak of COVID-19. Since 2010, Georgia has introduced its own platform for first instance courts for digital proceedings which allowed parties to track updates and access electronic case materials. Additionally, with the implementation of legislative reforms allowing for qualified e-signature, courts of Georgia have launched yet another novelty allowing online submission of claims, complaints, and applications. Regrettably, despite such developments, a unified digital system has not been drawn up yet.³⁵

Recent studies have shown that the Georgian judiciary is not fully utilizing technology as a tool to enhance transparency and efficiency of the court system.³⁶ Indeed, according to Commission Staff Working Document/Georgia 2025 Report, the quality of justice needs to be improved. More efforts are still needed to further align it with European standards and best practices on effective and efficient administration of justice, including the use of CEPEJ tools. The efficiency of justice could be further improved as well. The modernization of court management needs to be addressed, including through implementation of new IT justice tools and full application of the court case management system for automatic/randomized case allocation. The number of cases allocated by the system remains high (95-100%). More efforts are needed to digitalize the justice system.³⁷

³⁴ 'ELI Digitalisation of Civil Justice Systems in Europe' <<https://www.europeanlawinstitute.eu/projects-publications/current-projects/current-projects/digitalisation-of-civil-justice-systems-in-europe/>> accessed December 14, 2025.

³⁵ Archil Giorgadze and others, *COVID Times: A unique opportunity to transform our judicial system and the way matters are litigated* (MG Law, 26 November 2020) <<https://bm.ge/en/news/covid-19-a-unique-opportunity-to-transform-the-judiciary-system/69565>> accessed December 14, 2025.

³⁶ Ketevan Kukava, *Open Justice and User-Centered Court Services in Georgia: Challenges and Recommendations* (Law and Public Policy Center, Tbilisi 2024) 5.

³⁷ European Commission, 'Commission Staff Working Document: Georgia 2025 Report Accompanying the Doc-

7. *Conclusion*

The digitalization of justice in Georgia represents a significant and largely irreversible transformation of the country's judicial system. Over the past decade, Georgia has introduced a range of electronic tools – most notably the Electronic Court Case Management System, electronic filing and service mechanisms, and random electronic distribution of cases – that have substantially modernized court administration and aligned domestic practice with prevailing European trends. These reforms have contributed to improved efficiency, greater accessibility for court users, and increased transparency in judicial proceedings, particularly when assessed against the structural challenges traditionally faced by the Georgian judiciary.

At the same time, the analysis demonstrates that digitalization alone cannot remedy deeper institutional and governance-related shortcomings. The electronic distribution of cases, while conceptually designed to strengthen judicial independence and impartiality, continues to suffer from excessive exceptions, vague institutional responsibilities, and insufficient safeguards against administrative influence. Similarly, despite the existence of advanced technical infrastructure, the absence of a fully integrated and consistently applied digital justice framework limits the overall effectiveness of ongoing reforms.

The COVID-19 pandemic served as both a stress test and a catalyst for further digitalization. While remote hearings and electronic communication ensured the continuity of justice during emergency conditions, they also exposed deficiencies in procedural safeguards, equality of arms, and the practical realization of the right to a fair trial. These experiences underline the necessity of embedding digital solutions within a coherent legal and ethical framework rather than relying on *ad hoc* technological fixes.

Looking forward, the potential introduction of artificial intelligence into the Georgian judiciary presents both opportunities and risks. While AI-based tools may enhance efficiency and administrative capacity, their deployment without robust regulation, transparency, and human oversight could undermine fundamental rights and public trust. The Georgian experience, viewed in light of CEPEJ evaluations and European standards, suggests that technological innovation must remain subordinate to

ument Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions: 2025 Communication on EU Enlargement Policy' SWD(2025) 757 final (4 November 2025) 29-30 <https://enlargement.ec.europa.eu/document/download/b3089ad4-26be-4c6a-84cc-b9d680fe0a48_en?filename=georgia-report-2025.pdf> accessed December 14, 2025.

the core principles of judicial independence, accountability, and human dignity.

In conclusion, Georgia's progress in the digitalization of justice is tangible and noteworthy, yet incomplete. Sustainable reform requires not only continued investment in technology, but also clearer institutional governance, stronger legal safeguards, and systematic alignment with European best practices. Only through such a balanced and rights-oriented approach can digital justice serve as a genuine instrument for strengthening the rule of law rather than merely modernizing its appearance.