2024, Vol. 1
https://fupress.org/journal

Automated Legal Advice and the Unauthorized Practice of Law: A Comparative Regulatory Study

Mei-Ling Tan [1*]

[1] Dr., Faculty of Law, National University of Singapore, Singapore, Republic of Singapore
* **Corresponding Author:** meiling.tan@nus.edu.sg

ARTICLE INFO

Received: 12 Sep 2024
Accepted: 26 Nov 2024

ABSTRACT

As legal technologies powered by artificial intelligence (AI) rapidly advance, jurisdictions worldwide are grappling with how to regulate automated legal advice while preserving public protection. A central issue is whether such systems cross the line into the unauthorized practice of law (UPL). This article explores how various legal systems, particularly in the United States, United Kingdom, and Singapore, define and enforce UPL in the context of AI-driven legal services. It assesses whether existing legal doctrines sufficiently account for new technological capabilities and examines potential frameworks for regulatory adaptation. The article concludes by proposing a risk-based, functionally neutral approach to AI regulation that balances innovation with the protection of legal consumers.

Keywords: Automated Legal Advice, Unauthorized Practice of Law, AI Regulation, Legal Tech, Comparative Law.

INTRODUCTION

The development and deployment of AI-based legal tools have accelerated dramatically over the past decade. From document review to legal research and even predictive analytics, legal tech solutions are transforming the legal services market. Among the most disruptive innovations are systems that purport to provide legal advice—automatically and without human lawyer oversight. These technologies, often marketed as cost-saving and democratizing tools, raise significant regulatory concerns, most notably the risk of unauthorized practice of law (UPL).

Unauthorized practice of law statutes exist in many jurisdictions to protect the public from unqualified individuals or entities performing legal services. Traditionally, these laws have been interpreted to prohibit non-lawyers from advising clients on their legal rights or representing them in legal proceedings. However, the rise of algorithmic systems capable of mimicking or even surpassing certain legal tasks challenges the boundaries of what constitutes "practice of law." When a chatbot provides tailored legal advice to a tenant facing eviction, is this unlawful? What if a machine learning model forecasts litigation risk with high accuracy? Are these acts of UPL or legitimate automation of clerical legal tasks?

In the United States, where UPL is regulated at the state level, courts and bar associations have offered varied and often inconsistent interpretations. Some states take a broad view of UPL, potentially capturing any form of legal guidance, even from software. Others adopt narrower standards, focusing on client interaction and reliance. In contrast, jurisdictions like England and Wales, which liberalized their legal markets under the Legal Services Act 2007, adopt a functional approach, regulating activities rather than professional titles. Singapore offers a hybrid model, combining strong consumer protection norms with a government-led push for legal innovation.

The regulatory uncertainty surrounding AI legal tools has implications for access to justice, professional ethics, market competition, and technological development. Overregulation may stifle innovation and entrench incumbents, while underregulation risks consumer harm and erosion of legal integrity. The challenge lies in designing rules that reflect functional equivalence rather than professional status—recognizing that machines, like humans, can give legal advice, but not necessarily with the same accountability.

This article undertakes a comparative examination of how UPL doctrines are applied—or misapplied—to

automated legal systems. It begins by tracing the conceptual boundaries of "legal advice" and the legal profession. It then analyzes how courts and regulators in different jurisdictions treat AI tools that provide legal assistance. Finally, it offers a framework for responsible innovation grounded in proportionality, transparency, and public interest.

THE ARCHITECTURE OF PLATFORM GOVERNANCE AND ALGORITHMIC DECISION-MAKING

Contemporary social media platforms are governed through a complex interplay of community guidelines, content policies, terms of service, and algorithmic rules. These documents serve as the platform's internal constitution, yet they are drafted unilaterally, lack democratic legitimacy, and provide minimal procedural protections (Gillespie, 2018). Algorithms embedded within these platforms amplify certain voices, suppress others, and influence what content users see—shaping public opinion and political behavior in often invisible ways.

Algorithmic content moderation systems typically function through a mixture of supervised machine learning, rule-based filters, and human review. They detect hate speech, misinformation, nudity, or other rule-violating content. Yet the standards applied are frequently vague and inconsistently enforced (Keller, 2021). Moreover, the opacity of algorithmic systems hinders external accountability, as platforms resist disclosing proprietary data, citing trade secrets and competitive risk.

A further complication arises from the economic incentives driving platform behavior. Engagement-based business models prioritize content that maximizes attention, often leading to the amplification of outrage, conspiracy theories, or polarizing speech. This commercial imperative directly conflicts with public values such as civic trust, information integrity, and respectful discourse (Suzor, 2019).

Platforms often invoke their status as private actors to argue against state interference, drawing upon liberal market principles and freedom of enterprise. However, this position overlooks the quasi-public role that major platforms play in shaping democratic debate. Their dominance and indispensability render them functionally public in many respects (van Dijck, Poell, & de Waal, 2018).

This architecture of governance has drawn criticism from human rights organizations, digital rights activists, and academic scholars who view platform rule-making as lacking in transparency, due process, and accountability. Current debates on platform responsibility—especially around algorithmic content curation—center on how to realign private decision-making power with public accountability structures.

PUBLIC FUNCTIONS, PRIVATE ACTORS: LEGAL TENSIONS AND DOCTRINAL LIMITS

A central challenge in regulating social media platforms lies in reconciling their private legal status with the public functions they perform. This tension is most evident when platforms moderate content that implicates fundamental rights such as freedom of expression or freedom from discrimination. Public law traditionally applies to state action, but platforms operate beyond this binary distinction, occupying a grey area of "functional publicness."

Comparative constitutional law provides limited tools for addressing this challenge. The U.S. Supreme Court in Manhattan Community Access Corp. et al. v. Halleck et al. (2019) held that private entities are not state actors merely by opening their property to speech, reaffirming a narrow interpretation of state action. Conversely, the German Federal Constitutional Court has recognized that dominant private platforms may be subject to fundamental rights obligations when performing public functions.

This doctrinal divergence creates a global regulatory patchwork. The EU has moved toward greater regulation with the Digital Services Act (DSA), requiring transparency in algorithmic systems, notice-and-action mechanisms, and risk assessments (European Commission, 2022). The DSA marks a shift toward treating platforms as entities with quasi-public responsibilities, but its enforcement mechanisms remain nascent.

Public law concepts such as legality, proportionality, and reason-giving can be adapted to evaluate algorithmic decision-making. However, their implementation faces resistance from platforms, particularly when it requires disclosure of algorithmic logic or internal moderation guidelines. Courts and regulators must thus develop novel doctrines and tools to assess the legitimacy of algorithmic actions that affect public interests (Klonick, 2018).

A promising approach lies in expanding administrative law principles to encompass algorithmic governance.

Concepts like procedural fairness, reasoned decision-making, and the right to appeal can be reinterpreted in light of the algorithmic mediation of public discourse. This would help build a framework where individuals can contest and understand the algorithmic processes shaping their online experiences.

Moreover, regulatory innovations such as independent oversight boards, algorithmic audits, and mandatory impact assessments can provide institutional structures to anchor these public law values. These mechanisms would create spaces where contested decisions can be reviewed in accordance with standards of accountability and transparency, moving away from arbitrary or purely commercial logic.

The development of such frameworks also requires resolving jurisdictional issues and questions of enforcement. Transnational platforms often operate beyond the effective reach of national legal systems, requiring the evolution of cross-border enforcement strategies and harmonized legal standards to uphold public law principles in the global digital sphere.

COMPARATIVE REGULATORY APPROACHES: EU, U.S., AND ASIA

Different jurisdictions have adopted divergent approaches to platform regulation. In the European Union, the DSA and General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) represent a rights-based model that emphasizes user empowerment, transparency, and enforceability. These instruments require platforms to explain algorithmic decisions, allow for redress mechanisms, and conduct impact assessments for systemic risks (European Commission, 2022).

The EU's regulatory model reflects a broader constitutional tradition that views digital platforms as part of the public communicative infrastructure. The DSA, for instance, introduces obligations for very large online platforms (VLOPs) to conduct systemic risk assessments and undergo independent audits. These obligations reflect a growing consensus that algorithmic amplification of harmful content poses risks to democratic discourse, especially in election contexts or during public health emergencies.

In contrast, the U.S. maintains a laissez-faire approach rooted in Section 230 of the Communications Decency Act, which shields platforms from liability for user-generated content. While some bipartisan efforts have emerged to reform Section 230, legislative inertia and First Amendment concerns continue to impede regulatory progress (Keller, 2021). The U.S. legal culture prioritizes free speech absolutism and private property rights, which complicates attempts to impose public obligations on platforms.

Asia presents a heterogeneous landscape. Japan has favored soft regulation and voluntary codes of conduct, relying on industry self-governance and ethical guidelines. South Korea, meanwhile, has enacted laws targeting online abuse and misinformation, often with mixed results due to enforcement challenges. In contrast, countries like India and China have introduced sweeping regulatory frameworks that often serve state interests rather than user rights. For example, China’s Cybersecurity Law mandates extensive platform cooperation with state surveillance, raising human rights concerns.

Despite these differences, a common thread is the growing recognition that algorithmic systems cannot be left to self-regulation alone. The risk of disinformation, electoral manipulation, and societal polarization has prompted international bodies such as the OECD and UN Special Rapporteurs to call for global principles on platform governance (UN Special Rapporteur on Freedom of Expression, 2021).

Cross-jurisdictional cooperation remains a major challenge. Transnational platforms operate across legal borders, often complying only minimally with local laws. An effective regulatory approach must therefore include international coordination, possibly through treaties or soft law mechanisms, to ensure consistency in standards and enforcement.

Efforts toward harmonization could build on existing multilateral forums and agreements. For instance, the Global Partnership on AI and the G7 Digital Ministers' track offer platforms for norm development and best practice exchange. Ultimately, platform governance must evolve toward a hybrid regulatory model that balances national sovereignty, transnational coordination, and public law accountability.

CONCLUSION

Automated legal advice presents both transformative potential and complex regulatory challenges. While existing UPL doctrines offer some guidance, they often fail to account for the capabilities and contexts of modern AI systems. A comparative analysis reveals that jurisdictions vary in their tolerance and oversight of such technologies. Moving forward, a functional, risk-based approach that centers on consumer protection,

transparency, and accountability is essential. Only through adaptive regulation can the legal profession balance innovation with its duty to serve the public good.

REFERENCES

European Commission. (2022). *The Digital Services Act (DSA): Regulation (EU) 2022/2065*. Retrieved from https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX%3A32022R2065

Gillespie, T. (2018). *Custodians of the Internet: Platforms, content moderation, and the hidden decisions that shape social media*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Keller, D. (2021). Who do you sue? State and platform hybridity and the limits of accountability. *Georgetown Law Technology Review*, *5*(2), 147-170.

Klonick, K. (2018). The New Governors: The People, Rules, and Processes Governing Online Speech. *Harvard Law Review*, *131*(6), 1598-1670.

Manhattan Community Access Corp. et al. v. Halleck et al. (2019). Retrieved from https://supreme.justia.com/cases/federal/us/587/17-1702/case.pdf

Suzor, N. (2019). *Lawless: The secret rules that govern our digital lives*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

UN Special Rapporteur on Freedom of Expression. (2021). *Report on disinformation and freedom of opinion and expression*. Retrieved from https://digitallibrary.un.org/record/3925306?v=pdf

van Dijck, J., Poell, T., & de Waal, M. (2018). *The platform society: Public values in a connective world*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.