Information and Communication Technologies and the Law: Some Concrete Boundaries

Fernando Galindo Ayuda*

Philosophy of Law, University of Zaragoza, Spain

Abstract: Laws and regulations are crucial in governing technology, especially in regards to its development and use in society. While it is undeniable that technology, specifically information and communication technologies (ICTs), has a relationship with the law, this relationship should be restricted to the actions of judges and lawyers rather than being exercised directly or indirectly by ICTs themselves. There are various proposals that contradict this idea and pose a threat to the rule of law. This article aims to address this issue and provide concrete examples and references to illustrate the importance of avoiding such attitudes.

Keywords: Technologies, information and communication technologies, legal activities, the rule of law, democratic political systems.

I. PREFACE

This article does not aim to address the entire range of relationships between technology and law, or even the relationships between information and communication technologies (ICTs) and law. Its focus is more specific: to question the idea that judges, lawyers, and other legal professionals can use ICTs applications as tools in their work without proper caution. These applications may not always align with the dynamics prescribed by the rules that make up the rule of law, which are based on the principles of democratic societies. This idea has been prevalent since the liberal revolutions, and it is supported by the studies of those who have proposed it as a proper mode of action for legal professionals.

This article aims to emphasize the active role that legal professionals must play in the application of standards in the exercise of their activities, as prescribed by democratic legal systems. This is particularly important now that legal professionals are regular users of ICTs in their professional work. The importance of this approach is demonstrated by briefly outlining some of the problems that have arisen from various initiatives promoting the use of ICTs in the administration of justice in many countries. The article primarily references specific experiences in Spain and the European Union as examples, and the context is always a continental legal perspective.

The following actions are taken for the purposes described in this article:

*Address correspondence to this author at the Philosophy of Law, University of Zaragoza, Spain; Tel: 34679200814; E-mail: cfa@unizar.es

First, in Chapter II, we provide a brief review of some of the most significant legal reflection proposals from the last two centuries, which outline the characteristics of legal activities in a democratic rule of law state. These proposals are based on an examination of the legal activities as they were understood at the time the proposals were made, based on the current state of scientific and philosophical knowledge.

Second, in Chapter III, we present several examples of how these legal proposals are being ignored today, with some arguing that legal activities in a rule of law state can be superseded by computer programs, particularly artificial intelligence, which can complement or replace human activities.

Third, in Chapter IV, we provide other examples and information showing the limits that automated and ICT systems must adhere to in order to complement, rather than replace, the activities of legal professionals in a democratic society.

Finally, we offer a conclusion in Chapter V.

II. DEMOCRATIC DEMANDS ON THE PRACTICE OF LEGAL ACTIVITIES

Given these widespread views, it is proposed here that the significance of the proposed hypotheses requires that legal professionals not simply accept them, but also fulfill all the demands that democratic principles place on their activities, not just the principle of efficiency. In other words, it is important to remember that a democratic system today is one that is organized to guarantee and promote the following mechanisms [1]:

- The fundamental legal principles, recognized in the constitutions and laws, as well as in the daily reality of the countries where legal professionals operate
- Compliance with prerequisites for the exercise of these mechanisms and principles, such as access to information
- The main policy or philosophy guiding the activities of public authorities, including the principles of democratic participation and access to information, as well as the protection of personal data, intellectual property, and information systems security

To do this, we must remember the proposals of the Philosophy of Law that establish, today, through the concept of the communicative theory of law, the complex scope of action for legal professionals in an ICT society[1].

These proposals argue, essentially, that an efficient, formal, positivist style of action or policy should not prevent authorities from acting in a manner that is compatible with democracy. This is because democratic principles, by legal mandate, govern the activity of public authorities. In other words, democratic rules govern all the activities that fall under their jurisdiction according to the rule of law, while legal professionals are active agents in the social and political life of the knowledge society.

This is particularly true in the application of the law, which must be carried out in a complex way [3] in the judicial process [4], through mechanisms such as weighting ("Abwägung" [5]), empathy ("Empathie" [6-8]), participation [9], and consensus [10], as typical of democratic governance. This is in contrast to the "automatic," positivist, and superficial application promoted by the paralegal movement ("LegalTECH", as mentioned infra in Chapter III) and proposed by political authorities as effective solutions in an ICT society. These statements are generally recognized by legal professionals, for example, in Brazil: [11, 12].

To this end, we propose using the content of the communicative theory of law as an effective auxiliary tool for the implementation of the aforementioned revocatory invocation. We will see in Chapter IV that the use of this theory is useful because it is offered as an appropriate means of legal reflection for the purpose of understanding, respecting, and ensuring the professional qualities of lawyers and other legal professionals when participating in the resolution of a case presented to the administration of justice, such as judges and courts, in a democratic system.

III. HUMAN PRACTICES, ICTS AND JUDICIAL ACTIVITIES

1. Introduction

On the contrary to what has been expressed so far, at the present time, and even some time ago, the extension of the following assessment is noted: it is not the achievement of the right, ultimately the realization of justice, but the use of ICTs is the end and the means to reform the Administration of Justice. This is because, according to this belief, they have become the effective tool to achieve the objective of efficiency of the Administration of Justice. It is not, however, to take into account the proper purpose of the communicative theory of law: to accept that its achievement lies in considering that law, democratically speaking, is the resolution of cases by judges, and that ICTs contribute to achieving this end if they are indeed an instrument that supports their realization in the manner established by the rule of law. In such a way that if they do not provide it, it cannot be said that they pursue the obtaining of law and justice. Here are, summarized, the problems to overcome that we refer to in the title of this article and of which we speak in this chapter.

That is why we specify below what we have just expressed by showing several examples that can be considered a sample of the proliferation of initiatives and expressions, in the form of facts (section 2), and even regulations (section 3), aimed at promoting the recognition and implementation of the idea that ICTs are the same as legal innovation given their beneficial virtuosities that are produced both by their use in the industrial field and (by what not!) in the judicial field.

2. Facts

There have been longstanding proposals advocating the use of ICTs as unquestionable tools for

[1]This is explained repeatedly in [2]. Significantly this book (953 pages) bears the subtitle: *Part Three.- Theory of Legal Decisions*. Indeed, the work studies legal decisions in all areas in which they occur in the rule of law, taking into account that the exemplary legal decision is the judicial one because it is the one that resolves cases. In other paper the author says: "The communicational theory of law is so called because it adopts the perspective of communication, and therefore of language, to study the legal phenomenon. It does not proclaim that Law is language, which would imply an ontological position, but affirms that Law, everything that is covered with this word, *manifests itself* through language. Language thus constitutes the starting point of research", Robles, G., Cinco estudios de teoría comunicacional del derecho. Santiago de Chile: Ediciones Olejnik; 2018:19-20.

producing progress in law through their use. This is based on the belief that the mere use of legally promulgated texts and scientific methods can lead to a better development of any law, with a positive, positivist, and analytical vision of "ontologized" or "formalized" law in promulgated texts or dogmas.

This position is reflected in two types of initiatives: 1) those that focus on producing studies, mainly academic, on ICTs in law, and 2) those that advocate for the development and education in the use of programs or applications for professional legal practice. In the following paragraphs, we provide some specific examples for these two types of initiatives.

The most significant example of the first initiative is the "International Legal Informatics Symposium (IRIS)" organized for 25 years (1997-2022) in Salzburg, Austria, by the Research Group on Legal Informatics at the University of Vienna[2]. The group is part of the Department of Public International Law and International Relations at the University of Vienna. The IRIS meetings discuss doctrinal positions on "ICTs and law," or "Legal Informatics," from technical and legal[3] perspectives, primarily within the context of continental law.

In recent years, initiatives promoting the dissemination of computer programs or applications for use in professional legal fields, known as "Legal Tech," have proliferated worldwide. These initiatives have a more practical orientation than the first type of initiatives, focusing on proposing ways to modernize the work of law firms and adapt their practices to those of other professional firms that have a greater tradition of using ICTs in their professional practice[4].

3. Norms and Standards

Such facts give rise to problems of a different magnitude, specifically the emergence of norms or guidelines that mandate or promote the adoption of ICTs in judicial administration based on their perceived effectiveness, regardless of whether or not the Constitution, justice, or democratic principles call for it[5]. This is because many of the regulations that allow for the use of ICTs in the activities of the Administration of Justice are primarily focused on increasing the efficiency of this Administration. According to political authorities, this is the goal to be achieved through the use of technologies, including artificial intelligence programs[6].

IV. DEMOCRATIC SOCIETY AND THE USE OF AUTOMATED SYSTEMS THAT COMPLEMENT JUDICIAL ACTIVITIES

In this chapter, we demonstrate (section 1) how the approaches discussed in chapter III undermine compliance with the principles of democratic rule of law. We also highlight the need to consider the proposals on law made by the communicative theory when using ICTs in the judicial field (section 2). Finally, we outline three ambitious initiatives that are following these recommendations (section 3).

1. Proposals for Legal Reform in Spain: A Brief Summary from a Technological Perspective

Since the 1980s, after the adoption and implementation of the 1978 Constitution, the autonomous communities in Spain have been established as organizations that promote democratic principles through elections, the organization of political power at the state level, and the implementation of

[2]https://rechtsinformatik.univie.ac.at/team/

[3]The main theme of the next meeting (IRIS23), which will take place in Salzburg between 22 and 25 February 2023, is: Legal Informatics as Legal Methodology. See about it: https://iris-conferences.eu/iris23. Each meeting has generated posts and discussions on the Internet. One of the last volumes published is: Schweighofer, E., Kummer, F., Saarenpää, A., Eder, S., Hanke, P., eds., Cybergovernance, Proceedings of the 24th International Legal Informatics Symposium, IRIS 2021. Bern: Weblaw: 2021. There are numerous publications of this type made between 1980 and 2022 around the world. Another recent example of such publications, in the field of "common law", is the following: Katz, D., Dolin, R., Bommarito, M., eds., Legal Informatics. Cambridge: University Press: 2021.

[4]Products of these initiatives are, for example, in Spain: 1) the publication (in Spanish) Barrio Andres, M., ed., Legal Tech. The digital transformation of the legal profession. Madrid: Wolters Kluwer: 2019, and 2) the collection of programs and applications included in the Legaltech Guide. Analysis of tools and platforms to transform the legal professions. Madrid: Derecho Práctico Media, S.L.: 2022, accessible (in Spanish) at: http://www.derechopractico.es/guialegaltech/. These initiatives are widely spread all over the world, for example in Brazil: Associação Brasileira de Lawtechs e Legaltechs. Manual on ideas, methodologies and investments in startups. 2014, accessible in: https://ab2l.org.br/ecossistema/sobre/. The Association has existed since 2017.

[5]This is the case in Brazil. In numerous judicial and doctrinal texts it is often mentioned, as a commonplace, that: " No caso brasileiro, de modo específico o Poder Judiciário, o que se espera é que a IA [Inteligencia Artificial] possa contribuir, em especial, para a superação de seu enorme acervo de processos (casos) para solução, bem como para imprimir maior celeridade na sua tramitação." See: Inteligência Artificial No Poder Judiciário Brasileiro. Brasilia: Conselho Nacional de Justiça: 2019;10. Accessible in: https://www.cnj.jus.br/wp-content/uploads/2020/05/Inteligencia_artificial_no_poder_judiciario_brasileiro_2019-11-22.pdf. This is indicative of something real: that there are numerous experiences on the application of Artificial Intelligence programs in the activities of the Federal Courts of Justice and the Superior Courts of the different Brazilian States. To this end, the Report is of interest to: Salomão, L., F., (coord.) Artificial intelligence. Tecnologia aplicada à gestão dos conflitos no âmbito do poder judiciário brasileiro. Rio de Janeiro: Getulio Vargas Foundation, 2022. See the report at: https://ciapj.fgv.br/sites/ciapj.fgv.br/files/relatorio_ia_2fase.pdf.

[6]On the problems and possibilities of the use of Artificial Intelligence in the activities of the jurists see (in Spanish): Galindo, F., Artificial Intelligence and Law? Yes, but how?. Democracia Digital e Governo Eletrônico 2019; 2, 18: 36-57.

reforms to the judicial administration in these communities. The values of democracy and efficiency were used as a reference for legal and administrative activities. At this time, ICT technologies were seen as potential tools to assist in the democratic reform of the Administration of Justice, mainly through the introduction of text-processing programs.

In 1983, a book (in Spanish) titled "Automated Management in the Field of Justice" was published[7], which outlined in detail a strategy for introducing programs, systems, and computers into the daily operations of courts and tribunals as a means of improving office work. The book featured proposals from judges and officials of various justice administrations and was representative of the ideals of an era in which computers were beginning to be used extensively to assist with office work. These proposals helped to pave the way for the widespread use of ICTs in the 1980s.

In the 1990s, the development of communications, particularly the Internet, electronic commerce, electronic signatures, and the reform of public administrations led to the use of other types of ICT by the Administration of Justice. Technology played a central role in the development of the judicial sphere, with expressions such as "electronic commerce," "electronic government," "electronic signature," and "electronic justice" being used to refer to various programs and applications that were being implemented in the field. These terms also began to appear in cases that were brought before judges and courts, often involving issues related to the regulation of these systems.

This situation was not unique to a single country, but rather was seen globally.

These technologies were implemented in the judicial field in Spain starting in 2009 through the establishment of judicial communication systems, the implementation of a reform to the judicial organization, and the development of a new judicial office. The reforms have occurred in phases, including the transformation of clerks into "lawyers" or "lawyers" of the judicial organization, and the separation of functions between judges and other officials to focus solely on case resolution. The implementation of reforms in the judicial system has occurred in several phases. One of these phases involved the transformation of clerks into "lawyers" or "attorneys" within the judicial organization, as well as the modification of the roles and responsibilities of other officials such as officers and assistants. Judges also saw a separation of their traditional functions, with their new responsibilities being limited to the resolution of cases. The establishment of the new judicial office is planned to be completed through measures such as the abolition of justices of the peace. These changes are outlined in the Digital Efficiency Bill of the Public Service of Justice, which was submitted to the courts by the government as a bill in July 2022[8].

2. Implementation of Reforms of the Judicial System, some Details (from a Communicative Perspective)

In the period of computerization of the Spanish courts and tribunals between 1980 and 2022, several significant changes were made to the judicial institutions. As we have seen in the previous section 2, these changes were motivated by the introduction of ICTs and were aimed at improving the efficiency and effectiveness of the judicial system. However, it is important to note that these changes were not only driven by technological advancements, but also by the need to adapt to the changing legal and societal context.

To understand these changes, it is useful to consider theories that view law as communication, which goes beyond the formal study of law and considers the language and context in which it is used[9]. These theories suggest that the normative, institutional, and functional changes in the administration of justice have been designed to provide the necessary texts, structures, and organizational infrastructures to resolve "problematic cases or situations" by judges. Before whom their decision is submitted, once it is only they who "have a legal answer",[10] which does not imply introducing new developments in what the judges

[7]Gestión automatizada en el ámbito de la Justicia. Barcelona: CREI, Departament de Justicia, Generalitat de Catalunya; 1983: 713 ps.

[8]The text is located at: https://www.mjusticia.gob.es/es/AreaTematica/Legislativeactivity/Documents/1%20Project%20de%20Ley%20Eficiency%Di20gital.pdf

[9]In coherence with the communicative approach, the monograph was elaborated: Galindo, F., Acceso a textos jurídicos. Introducción práctica a la Filosofía del Derecho. Zaragoza: Mira Editores; 1993. From the contributions of this monograph is developed the methodological or instrumental work: Galindo, F., The Communicative Concept of Law. The Journal of Legal Pluralism and Unofficial Law. 1998; 30:41:111-129.

[10]Robles, G., Teoría del derecho. Fundamentos de teoría comunicacional del derecho, vol III . Pamplona: Thomson Reuters; 2021: 461.

require of society and democratic[11] legal systems. These demands must be concretized, as we do next, in Spanish judicial regulation.

In the 1980s, the main focus of the regulation was to implement the provisions of the Constitution, particularly through the establishment of the General Council of the Judiciary and the creation of judicial organizations in the different autonomous communities. This process also involved the approval of the corresponding Statutes of Autonomy and the designation of the powers of the executive branch responsible for the administration of justice in the different regions. One of the key regulatory developments during this period was the adoption of the Organic Law for the Judiciary in 1985, which replaced a law from the 19th century (from 1870). The latter (the Organic Law for the Judiciary) would not be adopted until 1985[12]. It was later amended by Organic Law 7/2015 of 21 July. Luis María Valcárcel, a member of the General Council of the Judiciary, referred to some of the basic legal problems of this regulation in the book "Automated Management in the Field of Justice," mentioned above, in 1983[13].

Later, in 1994, the Organic Law 16/1994 was introduced, which amended the Organic Law 6/1985 and allowed for the use of technical means in the activity and exercise of the functions of courts and tribunals. This legislation aimed to modernize the operation of the judicial system, which had already been reformed in 1988 through the Law 38/1988 on the Demarcation and Judicial Plant[14].

This law established a new model of the judicial office, which was further developed through the Law 13/2009 on procedural legislation for the implementation of the new Judicial Office[15] and the Organic Law 1/2009, which amended the Organic Law 6/1985.

Overall, the process of modernizing the administration of justice in Spain has been ongoing, with the main objective of providing citizens with better access to justice and improving the efficiency and effectiveness of the judicial system. The introduction of ICTs has played a significant role in this process, allowing for the automation of many tasks and enabling the use of electronic communication and the creation of electronic databases. However, it is important to note that these technological advancements have not been the only driving force behind the reforms, but rather have been part of a broader effort to adapt to changing legal and societal circumstances.

In 1988, Law 38/1988 on the Demarcation and Judicial Plant was passed[16], which established a new model of the judicial office as outlined in the Organic Law on the Judiciary. This law ensured the balanced distribution of jurisdiction among the different orders, making the principle of jurisdictional unity a reality. It also reaffirmed the expansive nature of the civil judicial order, the principle of protecting fundamental rights in criminal law, and the commitment of the executive branch to ensure effective judicial review of its administrative actions in the area of administrative litigation and to provide effective protection of claims in the social sphere

Law 1/2000 on Civil Procedure summarized the previous provisions and the substantive law enacted in accordance with the Constitution, specifying the procedural actions and procedures[17].

The previous regulation was completed with the establishment of a new model of the judicial office through the Law 13/2009 on procedural legislation for the implementation of the new Judicial Office and the Organic Law 1/2009, which amended the Organic Law 6/1985[18].

The process of modernizing the administration of justice in order to provide citizens with quality justice that satisfies the Constitution and the requirements of a democratic society has been ongoing, with the judicial office being one of the driving forces behind this change. Let's take a closer look at how this office is set up

[11] This is also laid down in the European Convention on Human Rights, in Article 6, in which summarizes the content of the "Right to a fair trial" by stating: "In the determination of his civil rights and obligations or of any criminal charge against him, everyone is entitled to a fair and public hearing within a reasonable time by an independent and impartial tribunal established by law. Judgment shall be pronounced publicly but the press and public may be excluded from all or part of the trial in the interests of morals, public order or national security in a democratic society, where the interests of juveniles or the protection of the private life of the parties so require, or to the extent strictly necessary in the opinion of the court in special circumstances where publicity would prejudice the interests of justice." See the Convention in: https://www.echr.coe.int/Documents/Convention_ENG.pdf

[12] See the Law in: https://www.boe.es/eli/es/lo/1985/07/01/6/con

[13] Díaz Valcárcel, L. M., Constitución, Poder Judicial y Estatuto de Autonomía, in Gestión automatizada en el ámbito de la Justicia, cit.: 9-22.

[14] See the Law in: https://www.boe.es/eli/es/l/1988/12/28/38/con

[15] See the Law in: https://www.boe.es/eli/es/l/2009/11/03/13

[16] The content is (in Spanish) cited in supra footnote 14.

[17] See the content (in English) in: https://www.mjusticia.gob.es/es/AreaTematica/DocumentacionPublicaciones/Documents/Law%201-2000%20of%207%20January.pdf

[18] The content is (in Spanish) cited in supra footnote 15.

The Judicial Office is "the instrumental organization that supports and facilitates the judicial activity of judges and courts" (Organic Law 19/2003, which amended Organic Law 6/1985 on the Judiciary). According to the new organizational model of the Judicial Office, it breaks with the classic configuration of courts in order to promote a more efficient and rational organization of personal and material resources, which allows for the distribution of work in teams, standardization of tasks, and specialization of personnel. It was believed that this management system would improve the practice of judicial activity and provide an effective, agile, and efficient response to citizens. Its implementation was therefore intended to fulfill the commitment to high-quality public service in accordance with constitutional values and adapted to the current needs of citizens.

One significant change introduced by the new judicial office is reflected in the fact that a lawyer from the Administration of Justice corresponds to what was formerly called a Judicial Secretary until October 1, 2015, when the Judiciary Organization Act was amended. Article 440 of the Organic Law on the Judiciary states that "The Lawyers of the Administration of Justice are civil servants who constitute a single, national Superior Legal Body, serving the Administration of Justice, under the Ministry of Justice, and who exercise their functions in the capacity of an authority, being the head of the judicial office." Thus, a Lawyer for the Administration of Justice is characterized as a public official with their own status (different from the general regime of other public officials) and plays a key role in the administration of justice within the Judicial Office. As a result of the reform, Lawyers of the Administration of Justice have new powers. Their general functions include:

- Exercising judicial public faith exclusively and fully.
- Responsible for documentation activity.
- Procedural functions.
- Process initiators and computers.
- Directors of the Judicial Office.
- Collaborating and cooperating with other bodies and administrations.

These activities could initially be implemented with the development of telecommunications. In fact, since the promulgation of Royal Decree 84/2007 on the implementation of the telecommunications computer system in the administration of justice, the LexNET system for the submission of documents, the transmission of copies, and the performance of procedural communications by electronic means has been implemented. The expansion and generalization of the system occurred since January 1, 2016 with the entry into force of Royal Decree 1065/2015, which regulated electronic communications in the administration of justice at the territorial level of the Ministry of Justice and the LexNET system[19].

It should be noted that it was only the emergence of the COVID-19 virus that prompted the passage of Law 3/2020 on procedural and organizational measures to deal with COVID-19 in the area of the administration of justice[20]. This law promoted the implementation of judicial reforms, including organizational measures to ensure safe distances in public hearings, safeguarding the presence of the investigator or accused person in the criminal sphere or forensic medical examinations in certain cases. The law also encourages the use of measures to incorporate new technologies into proceedings and, in general, into the relations between citizens and the Administration of Justice, avoiding excessive concentrations in the courts to the extent possible. Thanks to this regulation, the use of technological measures in the administration of justice in general has become common among jurists.

As can be seen, the communicative theory of law helps to understand the changes that have occurred in the Administration of Justice between 1980 and 2022. In other words, what drives judicial reforms is the idea, as the theory suggests, that these reforms are guided by the democratic principle that judges, and only judges, have the legal authority to resolve cases. In other words, it is accepted that the innovations do not lie in the automation or robotization that the introduction of ICTs in justice processes has brought about; ICTs are merely instrumental means. The fundamental thing is the guarantee of the democratic system by establishing a procedural system that is in line with what that system requires and demands.

3. Three Notable Developments

Despite the above, there are also initiatives of ambition underway that implement the

[19]The text is located at: https://www.boe.es/eli/es/rd/2015/11/27/1065/con
[20]The text is located at: https://www.boe.es/eli/es/l/2020/09/18/3/con

recommendations outlined here. We highlight the following three:

1. CEPEJ[21] stands for the "European Commission for the Efficiency of Justice". This was an initiative of the meeting of European Justice Ministers held in London in 2000. With CEPEJ, the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe wanted to establish "an innovative body to improve the quality and efficiency of European judicial systems and strengthen the confidence of users in such systems." Among its initiatives are those aimed at discussing, from December 2020, the "Possible introduction of a mechanism to certify artificial intelligence tools and services in the field of justice and the judiciary"[22].

2. The European Commission proposes new rules and actions for excellence and trust in artificial intelligence[23]. On the other hand[24], the Directorate-General for Justice (JUST) of the European Commission, responsible for EU policy on justice, consumer rights, and gender equality, is working on proposals outlined in this article.

3. In Spain, the government sent the Draft Law on Digital Efficiency of the Public Service of Justice to the Parlament on July 19, 2022[25]. It is hoped that the parliamentary discussion will be informed by the complexity of the issues identified in this paper.

V. CONCLUSION

The democratic requirements of the rule of law must be examined in the context of their judicial application in order to provide more comprehensive and complex solutions than those based on efficiency, subsumption, or formal analysis of legal texts. These contextual considerations serve as the boundaries for such propositions.

However, it is undeniable that ICTs and the internet can facilitate the implementation of democratic political systems, particularly when politicians, technicians, jurists, and citizens understand the communicative theory of law. This theory emphasizes the role of communication in the creation, interpretation, and application of laws. For legal professionals in a democratic system, it is essential to adhere to the qualities and requirements demanded by such systems, including fairness, transparency, and consistent application of the law, as well as upholding due process and the protection of individual rights.

[21]Its activities and initiatives can be consulted on the website: https://www.coe.int/en/web/cepej.
[22]See the study in: https://rm.coe.int/feasability-study-en-cepej-2020-15/1680a0adf4
[23]Note press 21 April 2021 Brussels, https://ec.europa.eu/commission/presscorner/detail/en/ip_21_1682.
[24]https://ec.europa.eu/info/departments/justice-and-consumers
[25]The text is located at: https://www.mjusticia.gob.es/es/AreaTematica/Legislativeactivity/Documents/1%20Project%20de%20Ley%20Eficiency%Di20gital.pdf

REFERENCES

[1] Carbonell, Miguel, Constitution's functionality and social rights: outline of some problems. Estudios Constitucionales 2008; 6 (2): 43-71. https://doi.org/10.4067/S0718-52002008000100018
[2] Robles, Gregorio, Teoría del derecho. Madrid: Civitas; 2010.
[3] Ehrlich, Eugen, Freie Rechtsfindung und freie Rechtswissenschaft (1903). Aalen: Scientia Verlag; 1987.
[4] Perelman, Chaïm, Logique juridique. Paris: Dalloz; 1976.
[5] Engisch, Karl, Die Idee der Konkretisierung in Recht und Rechtswissenschaft unserer Zeit. Heildelberg: Carl Winter; 1968.
[6] Esser, Josef, Grundsatz und Norm in der richterlichen Fortbildung des Privatrechts. 4th ed. Tübingen: Mohr; 1956.
[7] Gadamer, Hans-Georg, Wahrheit und Methode : Grundzüge einer philosophischen Hermeneutik. Tübingen: Mohr; 1975.
[8] Viehweg, Theodor, Topik und Jurisprudenz: ein Beitrag z. rechtswiss. Grundlagenforschung. München : Beck, 1974
[9] Maturana, Humberto, Self-consciousness: How? When? Where?. Constructivist Foundations, 2006;1, 3: 91-102.
[10] Habermas, Jürgen, Faktizität und geltung: Beiträge zur diskurstheorie des rechts und des demokratischen rechtstaats. Frankfurt am Main : Suhrkamp, 1992.
[11] Ferraz, Junior, Tercio Sampaio, Introdução ao estudo do direito: técnica, decisão, dominação. São Paulo: Atlas, 2003.
[12] Reale, Miguel, Filosofia do direito. São Paulo: Editora Saraiva, 2002.

Received on 08-11-2022 Accepted on 08-12-2022 Published on 26-12-2022