Oxford Institute
of Technology and Justice

# COLOMBIA

| | |
|---|---|
| **Tools** | ChatGPT \| Copilot \| Fiscal Watson\| PretorIA \| PRiSMA \| Prometea \| Think |
| **Tasks** | Case management \| Charging support \| Data review and analysis \| Legal research, analysis and drafting support \| Predictive analytics |
| **Users** | Law enforcement \| Prosecutors \| Courts |
| **Scope** | Nationwide |
| **Training** | Not mandatory or systematic |
| **Regulation** | No dedicated legislation targeting the use of AI in criminal proceedings, but the Superior Council of the Judiciary issued guidelines on the use of AI. Existing laws regulating criminal procedure and data protection also apply |
| **Cases** | The Constitutional Court ruled that the use of ChatGPT in drafting a judicial decision is permissible so long as it does not replace human reasoning. In another ruling, the Constitutional Court held that by refusing to disclose the source code of a public health app, the authorities violated the claimant's fundamental right of access to public information, emphasising the importance of algorithmic transparency |
| **Insights** | PretorIA, implemented by the Colombian Constitutional Court to assist in docket selection for *tutela* (constitutional protection action) cases, processes approximately 4,500 cases daily |

## AT A GLANCE

In Colombia, **AI is used across law enforcement and the judiciary to improve efficiency and decision-making**. The National Police use predictive analytics with Amazon Web Services and Nuvu to forecast crime and improve emergency response. Facial recognition systems in Bogotá and Medellín aid in identifying fugitives, and Clearview AI has been trialled for child-exploitation

cases. For prosecutors, tools like Fiscal Watson analyse millions of complaints to detect patterns, while PRiSMA (suspended) predicts recidivism risk to guide pretrial detention decisions. 'Think' helps process large and complex amounts of data, particularly call interceptions, to uncover criminal networks. PROMETEA (originally from Argentina) accelerates case processing with high accuracy. In the courts, the PretorIA system helps the Constitutional Court manage the huge volume of tutela cases, acting as a search engine to highlight important filings, while judges also experiment with generative AI for drafting and summarisation. Training remains uneven, with efforts underway but no fully structured national programme yet.

Despite this scope of use, as at September 2025, there is **no national legislation that expressly regulates the use of AI in criminal proceedings or court proceedings more generally**. However, in December 2024, the Superior Council of the Judiciary (*Consejo Superior de la Judicatura*) adopted Guidelines for the Responsible and Safe Use of Generative AI in the Judicial Branch. This made Colombia the first country to implement the UNESCO Draft Guidelines for the Use of AI Systems in Courts and Tribunals. The Guidelines establish a general framework for generative AI use within the judiciary, emphasising that AI must not replace human reasoning and that explainability must be ensured. AI-generated outcomes must be verified and their use must be disclosed and documented with a detailed record. The Guidelines followed the August 2024 ruling of Colombia's Constitutional Court, which did not hold unconstitutional the use of ChatGPT by a judge on the basis that it did not replace judicial decision-making.

## USE

### LAW ENFORCEMENT

*Predictive analytics*

The National Police of Colombia partnered with local innovation firm Nuvu and Amazon Web Services to develop an **AI-powered incident prediction and response system.** The platform ingests and processes large amounts of historical and real-time crime data, including 911

emergency calls, geospatial information, and patterns of criminal activity across cities. Using machine learning algorithms, the system generates predictive models that help anticipate where and when incidents are most likely to occur.

*Data review and analysis*

**Facial recognition tools** are used in urban areas in Colombia:

- In **Bogotá**, as part of a 30-day proof of concept at the TransMilenio bus system, Corsight AI's facial recognition was deployed across 20 cameras. In just two weeks, authorities identified and apprehended six individuals (one for homicide, five for theft), matching images against a database of over 5,000 with active court orders.
- In **Medellín**, the Colombia National Police selected Herta's facial recognition software as part of the efforts to strengthen public security. Herta deployed80 facial recognition cameras in public transport and key locations using Herta's technology. These systems monitor roughly 19,000 persons with current arrest warrants.

In March 2024, law enforcement units in Colombia took part in a **five-day trial** of a facial-recognition tool for online child-exploitation cases, developed by American company Clearview AI. The tool allows law enforcement units to upload images and run them through a database of billions of public photos from the Internet. In combination with participants from nine other countries, the tool was used on a total of **2,198 images and 995 videos**, hundreds of them from cold cases. In just three days, they identified 29 offenders and 110 victims. By June 2024, at least 51 victims had been rescued as a result of the effort.

## PROSECUTORS

*Case management*

**'Fiscal Watson'**, developed by the Prosecutor General's Office and launched in 2018, is an AI system that analyses Colombia's extensive criminal database, encompassing over 13 million

criminal complaints from citizens or public officials since 2005. The tool assists prosecutors and investigative staff by linking vast sets of data and identifying patterns such as modus operandi, physical characteristics, and recurring use of weapons or vehicles used by suspects. Fiscal Watson functions primarily as a **search platform** that makes it possible to search for complaints with similar characteristics using key words in the statement of facts for crime reports logged in the 'Oral Accusatory Criminal System' (*SPOA*). The tool can also match cases based on quantitative, qualitative, and geographical components, using data relating to the district attorney's office, the date of the incident, and its location. Fiscal Watson is used, in theory, at the investigation stage to search for and correlate investigations that meet established criteria, which may be geographical or qualitative variables that are found in the statement of facts logged in the *SPOA*. The tool indexes large sets of structured, unstructured and semi-structured data from disparate data sources, and applies text analysis mechanisms to find relationships, generate warnings, and automatically extract indices and general contextual information.

'**Think**', launched in 2022, is a machine learning tool also used by the Prosecutor General's Office to process enormous amounts of data, including complex data such as audio, video, and image files. 'Think' transcribes and analyses all telephone interceptions conducted by the Office in order to identify new individuals for interception. This helps the institution focus on phone numbers that genuinely appear to be linked to criminal activity, thereby avoiding unnecessary interceptions. It has also proven particularly useful for extraditing key information from such interceptions, which is later used in arrest warrants and indictments.

*Charging support*

'**PROMETEA**', launched by the Buenos Aires' prosecutor's office, has, since 2019, seen increasing use in Colombia to predict judicial rulings. PROMETEA was adapted to Colombia's legal and linguistic requirements by the University of Buenos Aires Innovation Laboratory with the Colombian judiciary. It is linked to the Colombian courts' case-management and document-filing systems, enabling secure data exchange. PROMETEA uses natural-language processing to scan tutela petitions and process court rulings in less than 20 seconds with an accuracy rate

of 96% in identifying relevant cases. In the Colombian Constitutional Court, it reduces the time allocated to the selection of urgent cases from 96 days to two minutes. While PROMETEA is a major efficiency tool in case triage, final decisions on case selection remain with human judges.

In 2016, the Colombian Prosecutor General's Office initiated '**PRiSMA**' (*Perfil de Riesgo de Reincidencia para Solicitud de Medidas de Aseguramiento*), a programme operated through AI which aims to determine the risk of recidivism of persons accused of crimes. PRiSMA is meant to support the decision of the Prosecutor General's Office on whether or not to request preventative detention for someone under investigation. It is based on an algorithm that uses machine learning to process information from a database provided with information by the National Police and Prosecutor General's Office itself, which has information on six million individuals with criminal records. From this, PRiSMA predicts the probability that a person would reoffend. The tool and algorithms are implemented through a PDF document that prosecutors can download from the SPOA when requesting a restraining order. This document contains all the information available on the subject: the number of previous police arrests, SPOA and court proceedings, and all information on prior incarceration events. If, using this data, the system predicts that the person represents a high risk of re-offending, the Prosecutor General's Office can request a more restrictive measure. If the system predicts a low risk, non-restrictive pre-trial preventative measures are requested. The final legal decision on whether to request preventative detention is not made by PRiSMA but by the prosecutors themselves, as the system was intended to serve only as an auxiliary tool.

However, due to the high risk of bias in the mechanism's operation, the Prosecutor General's Office decided to suspend the implementation of PRiSMA. The project remains on standby as at September 2025.

## COURTS

*Case management*

'**PretorIA**', implemented by the Colombian Constitutional Court in 2020 and inspired by PROMETEA (the tool used in the Buenos Aires Attorney General's Office), is an AI mechanism designed to assist in the review of *tutela* judicial rulings (constitutional protection actions for fundamental violations of rights) and also enables the preparation of statistics and the identification of recurring issues. The Constitutional Court receives more than 600,000 tutelas per year.

**PretorIA aids this procedure by processing approximately 4,500 cases daily,**helping the Court select which decisions should be reviewed. It also helps identify relationships between cases, recurring themes, and issues of special interest, providing the Court with an overall picture of the fundamental rights violations that appear to be taking place in the country. Additionally, PretorIA enables the organisation of judicial workloads, while also enhancing transparency by facilitating the preparation of statistics. Although PretorIA processes cases, each case is still reviewed individually and is subject to manual selection: PretorIA functions as a trained search engine rather than a decision-maker.

> "It has been valuable in in improving case detection and efficiency. The system is seen as a positive example of adopting technology in the judiciary—used with caution and skepticism, but always as a support tool, never as a replacement for judicial decision-making."
>
> *Lawyer in Colombia, July 2025*

Though the mechanism was originally intended to act as a decision-making tool, it now acts as a **trained search engine** to aid judges and court clerks in identifying important cases from the large volume of tutela filings, but retaining the role of the human judge as the sole decision-maker. There is, however, potential for the expansion of its capabilities. The implementation of PretorIA faced challenges such as digitising paper-based files and refining the algorithm, but is now used in tandem with the traditional case-by-case review process.

PROMETEA, discussed above, is also used in Colombia to assist in the selection of tutela petitions by automatically reading large volumes of filings and flagging urgent cases for priority review, but the Constitutional Court retains discretion to confirm, modify, or reject the system's suggestions.

*Legal research, analysis and drafting support*

Judges report **unofficial use** of commercial and general purpose AI tools, such as **ChatGPT and CoPilot, for drafting and summarisation tasks,** including that of public hearings. These judges have also reported achieving higher levels of productivity and being able to resolve more cases in less time.

> "Colombian courts are exploring additional applications of AI, including the use of generative AI to summarise public interventions in constitutional cases, and the introduction of a 'cognitive file' system that would allow judges to query case information in natural language. There is also an initiative to improve jurisprudence search capabilities using AI-assisted mapping of related cases."
>
> *Colombian Judge, July 2025*

## DEFENCE

There are no reported cases of defence counsel in Colombia making use of AI.

## TRAINING

There is not yet a structured training programme for judges and court staff in Colombia. However, the Superior Council of the Judiciary (*Consejo Superior de la Judicatura*) – the body responsible for the administration and oversight of Colombia's judicial system – is tasked with planning the overall digital transformation of the judiciary, as well as contributing to its

implementation. This includes ensuring connectivity, providing appropriate technological equipment, digitalising all judicial processes, and, finally, developing and adopting ambitious technological tools. Within this strategy, the Superior Council has been promoting the use of AI with the aim of further improving access, efficiency, and security within the administration of justice.

The Council has a Unit of Digital Transformation (*Unidad de Transformación Digital*). This Unit has sought to promote the adoption of a new digital culture. With that goal in mind, it has **introduced several training initiatives,** all available through a **'competencies portal',** which is part of the AI strategy and aims to train judges at different levels – from basic digital awareness to advanced technological development. The Superior Council has also organised contests and stakeholder dialogues to encourage, support, and provide feedback to bottom-up innovation proposals for applying technology in judicial work. Most of these initiatives aim to reduce judicial congestion, one of the Colombian judiciary's pressing problems.

## REGULATION

As at September 2025, there have been attempts to regulate the use of new technologies in the judiciary through the National Congress of Colombia, but none of them has been successful. As a result, there are **no national laws or statutory rules that expressly regulate the use of AI in criminal proceedings or court proceedings more generally.** However, binding judicial guidelines exist (see more on the Acuerdo No. PCSJA24-12243 below). Colombia has also adopted a national AI policy and, in 2025, the government introduced a new bill (Bill No. 422) proposing a comprehensive AI regulation. This last bill is under consideration before Congress.

## GUIDELINES FOR PRACTITIONERS

*Judicial guidelines*

In December 2024, following a Colombian Constitutional Court ruling and a survey on the use of AI in the judiciary, the Superior Council of the Judiciary adopted *Guidelines for the Responsible and Safe Use of Generative AI in the Judicial Branch* ('Guidelines') through *Acuerdo No. PCSJA24-12243*. The main purpose of those guidelines is 'to maximise the benefits and potential of [AI tools], while mitigating and managing their potential risks'. This made Colombia the first country to implement the *UNESCO Draft Guidelines for the Use of AI Systems in Courts and Tribunals*. An unofficial English translation of the Guidelines is available here.

The Guidelines of the Superior Council of the Judiciary apply across the entire Colombian judicial branch, and orient the work of around 38,000 public servants (including judges, clerks, and administrative staff) and 6,500 courts, both at the national and local level. They include categories of **permitted use** with exhaustive lists of permissible tasks. Using AI to perform **administrative functions**– such as 'scheduling of activities or errands', drafting minutes or administrative texts and translating documents – is always permitted. When AI is used **for more substantive tasks** – such as transcribing hearings, summarising the facts of a case and drafting procedural orders – it is subject to additional safeguards and requirements, including – depending on the task – 'detailed review' of the output and 'special observance of transparency and accountability'. Generative AI may not be used for any task outside those listed in the Guidelines, unless expressly authorised by the Superior Council of the Judiciary.

The Guidelines impose **restrictions** on both the use of certain AI tools and the type of tasks they may be used to perform:

- **Training Data Provenance**: AI tools whose training data provenance cannot be verified may only be used to perform administrative support functions.
- **Evidence and legal reasoning:** AI may not be used for evidence assessment, scrutiny of facts, making 'value judgements', and resolving 'legal problems'.
- **Automated decision-making:** AI tools that apply legal rules or adopt decisions based exclusively on the tool's responses are prohibited.
- **Human rights risk:** AI tools whose use could infringe fundamental rights are restricted.

- **Commercial free chatbots:** General-purpose or commercial chatbots in their free version may not be used for judicial purposes.

The Guidelines set out a catalogue of **15 principles and guarantees** governing the use of AI in the judiciary, including:

| | |
|---|---|
| **Primacy of fundamental rights** | The judiciary must 'ensure the respect, protection and promotion of fundamental rights' when deploying and using AI and avoid 'any form of discrimination' and 'any negative impact on human rights' |
| **Human oversight, risk mitigation and prevention** | Judicial officials and employees are responsible for exercising 'strict scrutiny' over any actions and decisions involving AI, including assessing 'the sources, scope, restrictions, possibilities, shortcomings, and risks presented by the tool' and checking for hallucinations, inaccuracies, and biases. |
| **Non-substitution of human rationality** | AI tools may assist but must not replace judicial reasoning, the assessment of fact, the analysis of evidence, the application or interpretation of law, or decision-making. |
| **Transparency** | Judicial officials and employees must disclose and document the use of AI, including details such as the tool name, provider, date of use, prompts, and outputs. AI-generated text must be clearly labelled in case files and judicial decisions. |
| **Explainability** | The judiciary may only use AI tools that 'provide evidence, reasons or justifications for the processes they perform and the results they generate, which must also be understandable to internal and external users'. |

| | |
|---|---|
| **Data protection, privacy and security** | No sensitive or confidential data may be entered into AI tools that retain, share or use it to train their models. The judicial branch must ensure the integrity, confidentiality, and availability of the information managed through the AI system. |
| **Continuous monitoring** | The Digital Transformation and IT Unit of the Superior Council of the Judiciary is responsible for overseeing the institutional deployment of generative AI systems. |

## CRIMINAL PROCEDURE RULES

The *Criminal Procedure Code (Law 906 of 2004)* and, in transitional cases, the older inquisitorial procedure under Law 600 of 2000, establish admissibility, chain of custody, and authenticity standards applicable to AI-generated or analysed evidence. While these codes predate artificial intelligence and do not refer to it expressly, their provisions on digital and expert evidence apply to outputs generated or processed by AI systems (such as facial recognition matches, predictive analytics, or PRiSMA risk assessments) when introduced in criminal proceedings. In practice, such evidence would need to comply with general standards of authenticity and reliability and may require expert testimony to support its probative value.

Additionally, provisions of the *Cybercrime and Technology Misuse Laws* (Law 1273 of 2009 which amends the *Penal Code* to criminalise unauthorised access, data interception, and damage to information systems) apply to malicious uses of AI that compromise evidence or judicial data in criminal cases.

## DATA PROTECTION LEGISLATION

Law 1581 of 2012, also known as *General Data Protection Law*, and its regulatory decrees (Decree 1377 of 2013 and Decree 1081 of 2015), governs the protection of personal data in both the public and private sectors. Although the statute does not expressly mention AI, its

provisions apply broadly to any 'system' that processes personal data. By extension, the requirements of Law 1581, including lawfulness, purpose limitation, security, and transparency, also govern the AI-assisted processing of personal data in judicial proceedings and criminal investigations conducted by courts and law enforcement.

The law is enforced by the Superintendence of Industry and Commerce (SIC), which can investigate and sanction improper AI-related data processing conducted by both public and private entities. The SIC issued *Circular Externa 002 of 2024*, clarifying privacy obligations for AI systems processing personal data, requiring privacy and risk-management safeguards for such systems, including those used in law enforcement and judicial contexts.

## HUMAN RIGHTS

The use of AI in criminal proceedings must be consistent with procedural guarantees and fundamental rights in the Colombian Constitution, including the right to due process and equality before the law. The Constitutional Court reaffirmed in its August 2024 ruling (T-323/2024), that AI tools cannot substitute judicial reasoning and must not undermine these protections. The Court required that whenever AI is employed in adjudication, its use requires disclosure, transparency, and human accountability.

Relevant guarantees, including the right to a fair trial and privacy rights, under other international human rights treaties to which Colombia is a party, such as articles 8 and 11 of the *American Convention on Human Rights,* articles 14 and 17 of the *International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights* or articles 16 and 40 of the *Convention on the Rights of the Child*, may also provide additional guidance.

## OUTLOOK

In February 2025, the national government approved its first comprehensive *National Artificial Intelligence Policy* document (CONPES 4144). The policy is designed to promote the

development, adoption, and ethical and sustainable use of AI across both the public and private sectors, drawing on international guidelines such as the OECD AI Principles and the UNESCO *Recommendations on the Ethics of Artificial Intelligence.*

In June 2025, Colombia advanced its AI regulatory agenda by introducing *Bill No. 422* inspired by the EU AI Act. The draft bill proposes a risk-based classification of AI systems, creation of a national oversight authority (under the Ministry of Science, Technology and Innovation), regulatory sandboxes, and binding principles such as human oversight, transparency, and privacy protection, along with sanctions for non-compliance. AI uses in law enforcement and the administration of justice are classified as 'high-risk'. The draft also contemplates civil and criminal liability for harm from AI misuse. The Ministry of Justice and the Ministry of Science, Technology and Innovation have signalled that the justice sector will be prioritised for pilot projects under the forthcoming national AI bill.

Moreover, the Superior Council of the Judiciary is developing secondary regulations to operationalise the *Guidelines for the Responsible and Safe Use of Generative AI in the Judicial Branch (Agreement PCSJA24-12243)*, including specific technical standards for approved AI tools.

## CASES

The Colombian Constitutional Court assessed the legality of AI-assisted drafting of judicial decisions and ruled on whether citizens have the right to access the algorithms used in public administration.

In its August 2024 ruling (*T-323/2024*), the Constitutional Court addressed for the first time the use of AI by a judge. In that case, the plaintiff challenged a judicial decision on the basis that it openly and heavily relied on ChatGPT. The Court found that the use of AI to draft a judicial

decision does not violate, by its own, due process rights, as long as the tool does not replace judicial decision-making. In the case at issue, AI merely supported the reasoning after the judge had already reached a decision. Nonetheless, the Constitutional Court held that the the judge should have been more transparent about the way he used AI.The Court called on the Superior Council of the Judiciary to establish guidelines and, in the same ruling, set out guiding principles and criteria for the use of AI in the judiciary, including: (i) transparency; (ii) accountability; (iii) privacy; (iv) non-substitution of human rationality; (v) seriousness and verification; (vi) risk prevention; (vii) equality and equity; (viii) human control; (ix) ethical regulation; (x) compliance with good practices and collective standards; (xi) continuous monitoring and adaptation; and (xii) suitability.

In another ruling (*T-067/2025*), the Constitutional Court held in February 2025 that by refusing to disclose the source code of a public health application used to real-time monitoring of people's health during the Covid pandemic ('*CoronApp*'), the authorities violated the claimant's fundamental right of access to public information as protected by the Colombian Constitution and Law 1712 of 2014 (*Law of Transparency and Access to Public Information*). The Court ordered the Ministry of Health to provide the source code and its version history, after taking necessary technical measures to protect personal data. It further instructed the government to develop guidelines for algorithmic transparency in public-sector digital tools.

The Court recognised that the source code of a public application such as *CoronApp* constitutes public information, particularly when the application is used to implement public policy and affects citizens' rights. The Court emphasised the importance of algorithmic transparency in the public administration and observed that public access to the source code enables social oversight, helps detect potential biases or errors, and builds trust in public digital tools. It held that exceptions to such access must be interpreted restrictively. Any entity denying access must identify the precise legal basis for the exception and provide a detailed, evidence-based justification showing a real, probable, and specific harm that outweighs the public interest in disclosure. Notably, the Court clarified that copyright does not constitute a valid ground to deny

access to public information held by public entities. In reaching its conclusion, the Court referenced international standards and comparative practices, noting that many jurisdictions published the source code of similar COVID-19 tracking applications to promote transparency and public confidence.

The decision reinforces the principle of transparency in the use of AI tools and algorithms within the public administration, which will likely be relevant to the use of AI in the criminal context.