Oxford Institute
of Technology and Justice

CHINA

Tools	Criminal Trial Supervision Intelligent Assistance System | DeepSeek | Fa Xiaotao | Fazin Zhitui | Integrated Joint Operations Platform | Little Judge Bao | National Judicial AI Platform | Public Security Assessment and Warning System | Sharp Eyes | Skynet | Specialised systems | Xiao Baogong Intelligent Sentencing Prediction System | 206 System
Tasks	Administrative support | Case management | Charging support | Data review and analysis | Decision-making support | Legal research, analysis and drafting support | Operational support | Predictive analytics |
Users	Law enforcement | Prosecutors | Courts | Defence
Scope	Nationwide
Training	Not mandatory or systematic
Regulation	There is no dedicated legislation on the use of AI in criminal proceedings, but the Supreme People's Court issued AI guidance ("Opinions on Regulating and Strengthening the Applications of AI in Judicial Fields") in 2022. Existing criminal procedure rules and data protection legislation also apply.
Cases	In 2025, the Maritime Court of Xiamen issued a ruling addressing lawyer's use of AI in civil proceedings, requiring them to fully disclose the use of AI. Following this ruling, the Xiamen Maritime Court issued 'Guidelines for Litigation Participants' Use of Artificial Intelligence (For Trial)'.
Insights	Since its adoption of an AI system to assist in drafting written judgments, the Hainan High People's Court has enabled judgments to be produced in 50% less time, with written judgments taking 70% less time and all procedural documents seeing a 90% reduction in drafting time.

Oxford Institute
of Technology and Justice

AT A GLANCE

China has integrated AI across its criminal justice system, spanning law enforcement, prosecution, courts, and defence. **It is an early adopter among States, having used AI in its criminal judicial system since 2006.** In terms of law enforcement, The Supreme People's Court has that declared by the end of 2025, every court will be using AI tools to support judicial functions, and by 2030, AI will be fully embedded in the judicial process. Kunpeng AI Police Team deploys hundreds of AI models for fraud detection, crime prevention, and case investigation, while systems such as IJOP in Xinjiang and Zhejiang's Police Cloud drive predictive policing. Nationwide projects such as Skynet and Sharp Eyes combine facial recognition and participatory surveillance, with private firms like Hikvision running key infrastructures. Prosecutors use tools like Fiscal AI systems in Anhui for dossier review, drafting, and inconsistency detection, and platforms like Xiao Baogong for sentencing recommendations. Courts employ the 206 System and similar platforms to analyse facts, standardise evidence checks, and propose sentencing ranges, while smart courts initiatives digitise filings and case management. Defence lawyers use tools such as Fa Xiaotao for case research and outcome prediction. Training remains fragmented, but AI is consistently framed as an aid to efficiency, not a replacement for judicial discretion.

The latter is also reaffirmed in the Supreme People's Court "Opinions on Regulating and Strengthening the Applications of AI in Judicial Fields" - the principal guidance on the use of AI within the judiciary as of August 2025. In addition, AI-related regulations and policies that are not specific to criminal proceedings, as well as existing laws – such as criminal procedure rules and data protection legislation – also apply or offer guidance on the use of AI in criminal proceedings or courts, more broadly.

USE

AI has been used in China's criminal justice system since as early as 2006, when the Zichuan District People's Court in Zibo, Shandong Province, introduced a computer-based **sentencing software** co-developed with a high-tech company.

LAW ENFORCEMENT

Operational support

Local police forces in China have experimented with AI in operational practice. In May 2023, an '**AI Police**' unit ((鲲鹏战队, *Kunpeng Team*) was created in Kunshan, Jiangsu Province, to apply AI in detecting suspicious behaviour, preventing crimes, and combatting fraud.

> "In the past, some activities were challenging to detect and gather evidence about. However, the AI police were able to promptly identify and recognise suspicious activities, effectively issued warnings and swiftly assisted in many aspects."
>
> *Xu Chenbo, Officer (China Daily, 2024)*

The *Kunpeng Team* (鲲鹏战队) of the Kunshan Public Security Bureau has developed over220 AI-powered models based on a decade of accumulated data. These models are applied across multiple domains, including crime investigation, telecommunications fraud prevention, public order maintenance, and community services. In one case, the system blocked a fraudulent transfer of 500,000 yuan within ten minutes, traced 87 linked accounts, and helped to arrest nine suspects within three days. Normally, such work would require a dedicated team of five to six officers working continuously for two weeks.

> "AI police have assisted in resolving 609 cases of telecommunications fraud, recovering over 32.4 million yuan for victims, and increasing efficiency more than fivefold."
>
> *He Yongliang, Deputy Captain of Kunshan's Criminal Investigation Brigade (Xinhua, 2025)*

China's police are also increasingly integrating large-model AI such as **'DeepSeek'** into everyday criminal justice work. These systems are applied to rapidly process massive datasets; enabling suspect tracking and fraud ring detection in a fraction of the former time; to connect related cases and generate analytical reports that enhance investigative insights; and to audit case files for evidentiary gaps or legal misapplications; improving document quality and reducing case return rates.

Predictive analytics

The use of large-model AI (such as DeepSeek) in China's police forces (discussed above) has also extended to predictive analytics. For example, in **Yunnan**, drawing on multi-source data encompassing historical incidents, population flows, and critical venues, the police leverage DeepSeek to develop an advanced public safety risk prediction model. Based on the early warnings, police rapidly recalibrate force deployment and reinforce patrol operations in high-risk zones. For instance, during major holiday periods, the model forecasts an elevated theft risk around a commercial district, enabling police's proactive intervention. In **Hubei**, the police feed various data sources into the DeepSeek-enabled system, creating a comprehensive 'big data resource pool' (a centralised collection of computing, storage, and networking resources). The system aggregates daily police-collected information, citizen complaints (such as those via government hotlines), public concerns and trending issues, historical incident reports and case files to identify hidden risks and allow police to intervene at the earliest possible stage.

In Xinjiang, law enforcement units use the '**Integrated Joint Operations Platform**' (一体化联合作战平台) (IJOP), an AI-driven surveillance system that automatically flags individuals as 'suspicious' based on personal and behavioural data, including for example, the use of a VPN or having too many children, or having an unusual amount of fuel in a vehicle. These algorithmic alerts are transmitted directly to the police and used as grounds for detentions.

A regional hotspot for the application of big data and predictive policing is Zhejiang province, particularly its capital Hangzhou. Since 2016, local authorities have worked to establish a '**Public Security Assessment and Warning system**' (社会治安评估预警), which relies on quantitative

analysis of police intelligence and crime occurrence data to identify hidden security risks. At the core of this effort is the '**Police Cloud**' (警务云), a data infrastructure that by late 2019 contained more than 600 distinct data categories and over 1.6 trillion data points, continuously updated by nearly 250 cloud-based services across the province. The system was first tested during the 2016 G20 Summit in Hangzhou, where it enabled security forces to retrieve and cross-reference vast amounts of personal information linked to national ID numbers (**身份证号码**), including medical records, delivery histories, hotel stays, and travel companions.

Data review and analysis

China has developed an artificial intelligence infrastructure for data review and analysis in law enforcement. At the core of this system are two nationwide projects: '**Skynet**' (天网工程, Tianwang Gongcheng), deployed primarily in urban centers such as Beijing, Shenzhen, and Chengdu, and '**Sharp Eyes**' (雪亮工程, Xueliang Gongcheng), which since 2015 has been rolled out in rural and semi-urban provinces, including Hunan, Henan, Sichuan, and Guizhou. While Skynet provides high-precision facial recognition and automated tracking of suspects, Sharp Eyes integrates not only street-level but also private household cameras into centralized monitoring platforms. In some areas, these platforms are even made accessible to local residents, creating a model of 'participatory surveillance'.

🔍 Closer look

A notable case study is the city of Xi'an, where **Hikvision** (杭州海康威视), the world's largest supplier of surveillance equipment, has taken on a direct role in implementing Sharp Eyes. Its subsidiary, Hikvision Xi'an Sharp Eyes Project Management Co. Ltd., established in 2018, operates as the exclusive public security video system management unit in the city. The company is responsible for investment, design, construction, maintenance, and operation of the Sharp Eyes platform. In practice, this means that a private company has assured core functions of law enforcement infrastructure, including video surveillance, early warning, and data analytics.

Skynet is powered by Face++ (developed by Megvii Technology), a leading global facial-recognition platform that detects and analyses up to 106 facial landmarks with millisecond-precision. *Face* is an open platform that allows developers to build applications using its algorithms, though the systems are targeted, as computing power is insufficient to support a non-targeted model.

China's police authorities are also beginning to use AI to transform **digital forensics**, shifting from traditional manual code reading of electronic data to automated semantic parsing and rapid extraction of evidence. AI tools are now able to parse complex system files, such as those on smartphones, in minutes rather than days, greatly improving the efficiency of handling electronic evidence in criminal investigations.

PROSECUTORS

Case management

In April 2025, the procuratorates of Anhui Province formally launched an deployed province-wide **AI-assisted case-handling system**. Built around criminal prosecution and big-data legal supervision, it integrates ten application scenarios, including intelligent dossier review, document drafting assistance, automated case-card completion, supervision of investigation procedures, inconsistency detection, and statute recommendation. Official reports state that the system has already been used in thousands of criminal cases, significantly reducing review time and improving efficiency.

From December 2022 to June 2023, under the organisation of the Supreme People's Procuratorate, nine pilot procuratorates (including Beijing) operated a '**Criminal Trial Supervision Intelligent Assistance System**'. The system was able to intelligently identify potential issues from criminal judgments and identify potential grounds for trial supervision, thereby expanding the sources and improving the quality of conducting such procedures.

Charging support

'Xiao Baogong Intelligent Sentencing Prediction System' (*Xiao System*), an AI legal platform, is used by prosecutors. The system is able to suggest penalties based on big data analysis of case information and prior judgments from similar cases. Prosecutors have liberty to ignore or reject the suggestions for criminal punishments.

Legal research, analysis and drafting support

The AI-assisted case-handing system in the Anhui Province (mentioned above) provides document drafting assistance, inconsistency detection, and statute recommendation.

COURTS

China has a '**Smart Courts**' strategy, under which many courts have now rolled out websites and mobile apps to allow 'the masses to do fewer errands', by letting them electronically file cases, submit and receive court documents online, and get updates about ongoing litigation. Another goal of China's smart court strategy is to better monitor both judges and society.

According to the Supreme People's Court *Opinions on Regulating and Strengthening the Applications of AI in Judicial Fields* (discussed below), China's judiciary aims to have all courts deploy AI to support external judicial services and internal management by the end of 2025, and by 2030, to have AI fully operational and providing high-level support for judicial processes.

> "Unlike in other aspects of legal practice, there are very few foreign experiences Chinese judiciary can learn from. They had to integrate AI and other emerging technologies mostly on their own. Because new technologies developed rapidly in China on the one hand, and on the other hand, when the new technologies have permeated into every corner of the society, law and justice had to respond to this development. Therefore, the overall approach of the Chinese judiciary to integrating AI and emerging technologies is "cross the river by feeling the stones", which is a Chinese old saying and means making experiment in small scales and correct and improve the practice by learning lessons from the experiment."
>
> *He Yongliang, Deputy Captain of Kunshan's Criminal Investigation Brigade (Xinhua, 2025)*

Legal research, analysis and drafting support

The '**Intelligent Auxiliary System of Criminal Case Handling' (206 System)** (also known as the 'Shanghai Criminal Case Intelligent Assistance System'), developed by the Shanghai High People's Court and iFlyTek, is an AI-assisted system that supports judges in criminal trials by analysing case facts, identifying relevant legal issues, and recommending applicable laws and sentencing guidelines. It is now in its fourth iteration. The system aims to enhance consistency and efficiency in criminal adjudication.

During the development of the system, more than 400 officials were assigned from the courts, the procuratorate, and the police to advise approximately 300iFlyTek staff on the legal standards that should inform the computer code and the functionality of the software. The project initially focused on standardising outcomes in criminal cases. One mechanism for doing so was introducing automated checks to make sure each required piece of evidence was submitted. Official media reports on the launch of the system noted that it was designed to address the three major causes of incorrectly-decided criminal cases: weak or illegal evidence, insufficient examination of evidence, and differences among judicial personnel handling criminal cases. One 2019 report quoted a Shanghai police officer stating that the software made it impossible for the police to create false evidence or omit evidence. The system also learns from past cases to give sentencing predictions and recommendations. The 206 System pulls from criminal case documents data about statutory punishments, benchmark punishment, and declared punishment. It also extracts information about sentencing circumstances, discretionary factors, and historical factors to create a training set for machine learning.

Analogous **criminal case management systems** designed by iFLYTEK have been adopted by judicial institutions in Anhui, Shanxi, Guizhou, Zinjuang, Shenzhen, Henan, Qinghai, and other provinces. But not all courts in the country are equivalently equipped.

Other courts have developed their own AI systems to assist with legal research, analysis and drafting:

Case recommendation systems	The Supreme People's Court National Judicial AI Platform is an infrastructure built on massive, authoritative and high-quality judicial data, having gathered 320 million pieces of legal information including court rulings, cases and legal opinions. The platform can integrate vast information and quickly generate content in accordance with a user's requirements, as it is able to understand legal terms and logical reasoning. The platform can analyse and compare information from a large number of electronic files, with a quicker response to catch key points and extract outlines. Based on currently available public information, it remains uncertain whether this system will be deployed across all courts nationwide, though other courts have adopted similar models. The Shenzhen Intermediate Court's AI-Assisted Trial System Version 1.0, launched in 2024, uses the Supreme People's Court's AI model as its underlying infrastructure, while also incorporating its own research and development. China's Supreme People's Court has implemented an AI-driven 'similar cases intelligent recommendation system' that supports judges by automatically identifying and suggesting past decisions relevant to the case at hand.

AI-driven warning platform	Jiangsu High People's Court's AI warning platformcomprises five functional modules: 1. Similar case recommendation 2. Legal knowledge references 3. Intelligent assistance in sentencing 4. Intelligent error correction 5. Warning of sentence deviation. The platform automatically captures case file materials and calculates a deviance ratio by comparing the predicted and actual sentence. A warning is triggered when the deviance ratio exceeds a fixed threshold.
Case summarisation and extraction	The High People's Court of Inner Mongolia employs Faxin Zhitui, a system that automatically extracts and mines the summary and basic facts of an input case to produce a report of similar cases, relevant legal provisions, prior or pending cases involving the same parties, and serial cases. Fazin Zhitui reportedly scours over 120 million judgments, 120 million items of legal scholarship and data on around 230 million cases to generate this information. The Hainan High People's Court implemented AI systems using natural language processing, knowledge graphs, and deep learning to automatically extract key facts from a case and assist in drafting written judgments. This system draws on previous rulings, helping to standardise

	sentencing and legal reasoning. Since its implementation, the system has accelerated judicial workflows significantly. Judgments are produced in over 50% less time; written judgments take 70% less time, and all procedural documentation sees up to a 90% reduction in drafting time.
Legal research systems	The Yili Kazakh Autonomous Prefecture Branch of the Zingjiang Uygur Autonomous Region High People's Court uses a system featuring three search modalities in the form of a desktop site, a mobile app, and a word processor plug-in. The desktop site allows the judge to specify a number of search criteria, including the pertinent document sections and the logical relationship between keywords. The mobile app, by contrast, automatically extracts key information from an input document; judges do not have to enter any search terms and need only select from the machine-generated tags to obtain relevant results.

Decision-making support

AI has been used in China's criminal justice system as early as 2006, when the Zichuan District People's Court in Zibo, Shandong Province, introduced a computer-based sentencing software co-developed with a high-tech company, marking the first attempt to apply AI-like technology in sentencing. Since then, several other local courts have developed their own sentencing assistance systems.

Projects in places as diverse as Shanghai, Hainan, and Guangzhou are introducing software capable of analysing past cases with similar fact patterns to **recommend sentences to judges**. In a drunk-driving case, for example, a judge would select a list of factors (such as blood alcohol level or amount of damages caused), and the software would display the average sentence in past 'similar' cases. The judge retains discretion to disregard the recommended sentence.

One example, used in the Qinyang Qincheng District Procuratorate in Guangdong Province since 2022, is '**Little Judge Bao**', which predicts sentences based on legislative interpretations, judicial interpretations, and precedent cases. Little Judge Bao is now in service in various other courts and is also consulted by other political-legal organs.

Xiao Baogong Intelligent Sentencing Prediction System, discussed above, is also used by judges to suggest penalties based on big data analysis of case information and prior judgments from similar cases. Judges have liberty to ignore or reject the suggestions for criminal punishments. While the system appears to be operational in the criminal law context, details on specific jurisdictions or case types remain limited.

The **206 System**, discussed above, also generates sentencing recommendations for the reference of judges and prosecutors.

DEFENCE

Administrative support

The '**National Judicial AI Platform**', discussed above, will provide public legal services after the platform is further trained and optimised. It will, for example, answer non-professional queries on legal issues, allowing individuals to access legal services and consultations more easily.

Legal research, analysis and drafting support

'**Fa Xiaotao**' is an AI software that can assist lawyers in the preliminary search and analysis of a case. Based on the description of the facts of the case, it can analyse and calculate the proportion of winning or losing for similar cases, the number of similar cases involved, the number of similar cases handled in different courts, and the number of similar cases that were successful or unsuccessful and their judgments. Fa Xiaotao uses AI to identify the case, and uses big data to retrieve and feedback the above information.

TRAINING

Although there is **no unified national training session** for criminal justice actors at this stage, judges may receive training organised by their respective local courts, prosecutors by their local procuratorates, and defence counsel by their law firms or local lawyers' associations. Such training varies by region and is generally optional. Based on **publicly reported** training sessions (see also **here**), the content often includes familiarisation with AI-assisted tools in judicial practice, awareness of their limitations, and emphasis on the principle that AI may support but not replace decision-making.

REGULATION

As at August 2025, **there is no nationwide regulation expressly governing the use of AI in criminal or court proceedings in China,** but the Supreme People's Court issued guidance on the development, deployment, and use of AI within the judiciary. In addition, AI-related regulations and policies that are not specific to criminal proceedings, as well as existing laws – such as criminal procedure rules and data protection legislation – apply or offer guidance on the use of AI in criminal proceedings or courts, more broadly.

AI REGULATIONS

While there is **no single, comprehensive AI regulation**, China has issued a series of AI-related policies and regulations which may provide guidance for AI use in criminal proceedings.

The **most significant measure is the Interim Measures for the Management of Generative Artificial Intelligence Services (2023)**, which regulates 'services that utilise generative artificial intelligence technology to provide content such as text, images, audio, and video to the public within China', requiring providers of such services to conduct security assessments, ensure data quality, respect intellectual property, and prevent discrimination and misinformation. Before that, China introduced the Provisions on the Administration of Algorithm Recommendation of Internet Information Services (2022), which apply to companies offering algorithm-driven services, including content recommendation, ranking, and personalised feeds. In addition, the Provisions

on the Administration of Deep Synthesis of Internet-Based Information Services (2023) regulate so-called 'deep synthesis' technologies such as deepfakes and voice synthesis. Moreover, the 'Labelling Rules' that came into effect on 1 September 2025 make it mandatory for AI-generated content to be labelled.

GUIDELINES FOR PRACTITIONERS

Judicial Guidelines

In 2022, the Supreme People's Court – the highest judicial organ in China – released the ***Opinions on Regulating and Strengthening the Applications of AI in Judicial Fields***, encouraging the 'in-depth integration' of AI to improve the functioning of the judicial system, including with regard to 'adjudication and enforcement, litigation service, court management, as well as social governance facilitation'; to 'deepen the construction of small courts' and to 'achieve a higher level of digital justice'. In this publication, the Supreme People's Court provides guidance on how AI may be developed, deployed, and supervised within the judiciary.

The guidance encourages the following **use cases**:

- **AI-assistance in the entire case-handling process**: including 'applications on evidence guidance and review'; 'adjudication assistance for all causes of action' as well as AI-assisted drafting and review of judicial documents.
- **Administrative support**: including e-file classification; 'case-information crawling'; automatic triage of simple vs. complex cases; automated generation of judicial records; AI-assisted property investigation/seizure; automatic e-filing.
- **Judicial management:** including 'applications forewarning the deviation of adjudicative criteria'; inspection of judicial irregularities; corruption prevention.
- **Dispute resolution and social governance**: 'applications for judicial resolution recommendations'; litigation predictions and early warning of social governance risk.

The guidance sets out the following **key principles** that should govern the deployment and use of AI:

Human oversight and accountability: The guidance 'affirm[s] the supportive role of AI in adjudication, and the user's rights to decision-making'. It further states that 'AI shall not make judicial decisions substituting for the judge in any case, disregarding technological advancement' and that 'all judicial powers [must be] administered by adjudicative authorities, and all judicial accountability ultimately falls on the decision-maker'. Users have the right to opt out of interactions with judicial AI services.

Fairness and justice: The guidance provides that AI must uphold the fairness of the court process and avoid discrimination and prejudice. Courts must follow 'fundamental judicial rules', 'serve [...] judicial fairness', and provide adequate 'necessary assistance to communities in difficulties and people with special needs to participate in judicial activities [ensuring] universal inclusion of all groups of users with equal opportunities'.

Transparency and credibility: Courts must ensure 'the transparency of technology development, product applications, and service operation'. Data 'collection and management patterns', 'the process of legal cognitive semantics processing', and 'the logic of assisting judicial presumptions' must be open 'to examination, evaluation and registration with the relevant authoritative entities' and be interpretable, testable, and verifiable. The capabilities as well as limitations of 'judicial AI products' must be 'instructed and identified in a manner that can be easily understood . . . to ensure that the procedure and outcome of applications are predictable, traceable, and credible'. The guidance does not specify whether the use of AI must be disclosed to the parties concerned (e.g., litigants).

Security and legality: the use of 'illegal AI technologies and products' is prohibited. AI systems must be developed and operated legally, protecting state secrets, network security, data security and data privacy.

Abiding by public order and good customs: 'Core Socialist Values' must be infused 'into the whole process of technology development, product application and operation of judicial AI' and a risk management system must be established to 'resolve possible moral and ethical risks'.

Moreover, courts are required to put in place top-level design and standards, data infrastructure, research and development priorities, security operations, and oversight and compliance mechanisms to ensure safe and effective deployment of judicial AI. '[T]hrough mechanisms such as Judicial AI Ethics Council, People's courts shall comprehensively adopt methods, including ethical reviews, compliance reviews, and security assessments, to prevent and mitigate cybersecurity risks in judicial AI applications.'

The Supreme People's Court's guidance is not an enforceable regulation, functioning primarily as a policy guideline for courts nationwide. Although the guidance does not address the question of non-compliance, judges are subject to the *Judges Law*, which prescribes sanctions for improper conduct. In the absence of specific rules, these general provisions would apply to, for example, the misuse of AI. Within the judicial administration, there are internal disciplinary proceedings. Every court establishes judge evaluation committees to assess its own judges. These assessments examine judicial performance, professional ethics, expertise, work capabilities, and judicial conduct. Additionally, the Supreme People's Court and courts at the provincial level establish disciplinary committees that determine whether judges have 'deliberately violated laws and regulations when handling cases' or 'caused serious consequences through gross negligence leading to erroneous judgments'.

The 2022 guidance followed earlier opinions by the Supreme People's Court, promoting the construction and accelerated implementation of smart courts. In July 2025, the Supreme People's Court delivered a high-level lecture on AI integration in judicial proceedings. According to publicly available reports, the Supreme People's Court highlighted 'AI's role in advancing [the] rule of law in the digital era' and modernising China's legal system as well as the 'importance of judicial safeguards in AI application… and the challenges that come with AI-powered administration of justice'.

In September 2025, the Xiamen Maritime Court launched *Guidelines for Litigation Participants' Use of Artificial Intelligence (For Trial)*, following its landmark ruling on counsel's use of AI in preparing briefs and exhibits in civil litigation. While the original text of the guidelines does not appear to have been published yet, the guidelines reportedlyprovide that: (1) while litigants are generally permitted to use AI, its use to generate, fabricate, alter, tamper with evidence, or distort factual circumstances is strictly prohibited; (2) litigants must validate all AI-assisted documents and assume full responsibility for the authenticity and accuracy of materials submitted to the court; and (3) when litigants employ AI tools in connection with evidence, material facts, or matters potentially affecting adjudicatory outcomes, they must proactively disclose the precise AI-generated content portions, along with comprehensive details, including AI tool specifications, usage parameters, input data and prompts, and the verification methodologies and procedures.

CRIMINAL PROCEDURE RULES

The *Criminal Procedure Law* establishes standards for evidence admissibility (e.g., requiring that evidence is authentic, relevant, and legally obtained) which would also apply to AI-generated or AI-analysed evidence.

Similarly, the *Rules of Criminal Procedure for the People's Procuratorates* (requiring that investigations and prosecutions comply with procedural legality and evidentiary rules); the *Provisions on the Procedures for the Handling of Criminal Cases by Public Security Authorities* (setting standards for law enforcement's evidence collection and handling) and the All-China Lawyers Association's *Rules for the Handling of Criminal Cases by Lawyers*(including obligations of confidentiality, diligence, and independence) would also extend to the use of AI.

DATA PROTECTION LEGISLATION

The *Personal Information Protection Law* (2021) requires that personal information be processed on a lawful, justified, and necessary basis, with safeguards such as data minimisation and security protections, allowing certain exceptions for state organs performing statutory functions, including in criminal procedure. These would also apply to AI tools used in criminal cases to process sensitive data.

Similarly, the *Data Security Law* (2021) mandates classification, protection, and security assessment of data, especially 'important data'. Criminal case files and evidence processed by AI systems may fall within this scope, meaning such systems must operate under strict security and governance obligations. These requirements apply both to parties in criminal proceedings handling judicial data and to third-party technology providers involved in processing such data through AI applications.

The *Artificial Intelligence Security Governance Framework* may also provide high-level guidance for AI use in criminal proceedings. Appendix 2 of this guideline, for example, requires that a human control system should be established at critical stages of AI systems to ensure that humans retain the final decision-making authority. Measures include designing safety control thresholds, and reserving an effective window for human intervention, so that AI systems can achieve intended human objectives and do not operate uncontrollably without human oversight.

OTHER REGULATION

The regulatory framework on AI is still evolving. The Standing Committee of the National People's Congress's 2024 legislative plan included the 'healthy development of artificial intelligence'. The *Global Artificial Intelligence Governance Initiative*, which was released in October 2023, includes suggestions to 'gradually establish and improve relevant laws, regulations and rules, and ensure personal privacy and data security in the R&D and application of AI'.

OUTLOOK

The regulatory framework on AI is still evolving. The Standing Committee of the National People's Congress's 2024 legislative plan included the 'healthy development of artificial intelligence'. The *Global Artificial Intelligence Governance Initiative*, which was released in October 2023, includes suggestions to 'gradually establish and improve relevant laws, regulations and rules, and ensure personal privacy and data security in the R&D and application of AI'.

CASES

In 2025, **reportedly for the first time in Chinese judicial practice**, a regional court addressed counsel's use of AI in preparing briefs and exhibits in civil litigation, requiring them to fully disclose the use. This landmark ruling may also influence AI applications in criminal proceedings.

The Xiamen Maritime Court had to determine the validity of an arbitration agreement and noted that claimant's counsel may have used AI when preparing the court submission. Drawing on the Chartered Institute of Arbitrator Guideline on the Use of AI in Arbitration (2025), the Court emphasised the importance of disclosing AI usage to ensure fairness, transparency and the integrity of the proceedings, and held that when AI intervention may materially impact case substance – including evidence and arguments – users must provide full disclosure to the court. The Court required counsel to disclose:

1. the specific AI tools used;
2. the scope the AI use (such as evidence summarisation, legal research, document drafting) as well as the intended purpose;
3. the documentation of the use (with precise identification the portions of evidence, legal arguments, or other litigation documents AI was used for);
4. assurances that all AI-assisted materials have undergone final review and verification by the lawyer or appropriately qualified personnel; as well as

5. a commitment to strict adherence to all applicable laws and regulations governing data security, personal information protection, and confidentiality obligations throughout AI use.

This ruling of the Xiamen Maritime Court directly catalysed this court's launch of the (mentioned above) *Guidelines for Litigation Participants' Use of Artificial Intelligence (For Trial)* in September 2025.