



IECLO

**International & European
Criminal Law Observatory**

ON CULTURAL ISSUES, HUMAN RIGHTS AND SECURITY

ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE IN THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM: IMPACT, CHALLENGES, AND FUTURE PERSPECTIVES

By Ionatan Boldijar

Abstract

Artificial Intelligence (AI) is changing the criminal justice system by providing tools for data analysis, decision-making, and crime prediction. While AI offers a chance to improve efficiency and objectivity, it raises serious ethical, legal, and social issues such as bias, transparency, privacy, and fairness. This article looks at AI's role in policing, judicial decision-making, and surveillance. It highlights case studies such as COMPAS, predictive policing in Los Angeles, and facial recognition technology. The article discusses the need to balance the benefits of AI with the protection of human rights and legal principles. The future of AI in criminal justice requires teamwork from different fields, ethical rules, and ongoing human oversight to ensure technology promotes justice without violating it.

Keywords

AI, Compas, Facial Recognition, Predictive Policing, Responsible AI

Artificial Intelligence (AI) is not just a concept from science fiction; it is a rapidly growing technology that is increasingly used in various fields, including criminal justice. The criminal justice system, which has traditionally depended on human judgment and discretion, is changing through AI tools that assist law enforcement, prosecutors, judges, and parole boards. These technologies analyze large amounts of data to support crime prevention, risk assessment, and judicial decision-making. However, as AI tools become more common in legal environments, concerns about their effect on fairness, privacy, and human rights have come up. This article aims to give a clear overview of AI applications in criminal justice, discussing both benefits and challenges, while remaining neutral on controversial issues. It is for readers interested in international and European criminal law, cultural matters, human rights, and security. By looking at key AI tools and real-life case studies, this work helps to create a better understanding of how AI changes justice and what protections are necessary. At its core, AI refers to machines or software that can perform tasks usually requiring human intelligence, such as learning, recognizing patterns, reasoning, and making decisions. Machine Learning (ML), a part of AI, involves algorithms that improve by analyzing data instead of relying on fixed programming. In criminal justice, AI uses ML, deep learning, and natural language processing to analyze crime reports, social media, biometric data, and legal documents more quickly and consistently than humans.

Artificial Intelligence has become a significant force in modern society, changing industries, governments, and daily life. One of the areas most affected by AI is the criminal justice system, which has historically relied on human judgment, intuition, and manual work. As the amount and complexity



UNIVERSITÀ DEGLI STUDI DI SALERNO

IECLO DIRECTOR: Prof. Anna ORIOLO
Department of Legal Sciences
(School of Law)
University of Salerno
Via Giovanni Paolo II, 132
84084 Fisciano (SA) - Italy
www.ieclo.org
info@ieclo.org



IECLO

International & European
Criminal Law Observatory

ON CULTURAL ISSUES, HUMAN RIGHTS AND SECURITY

of data in law enforcement and judicial processes increase rapidly, AI technologies offer new tools to help with data analysis, decision-making, and predictions. However, introducing AI in such a sensitive field brings major challenges related to ethics, transparency, fairness, and civil rights, making the topic both hopeful and controversial.

AI consists of creating machines or software that can handle tasks requiring human intelligence, such as recognizing patterns, learning from data, reasoning, and solving problems. Machine learning, where algorithms improve by analyzing data instead of needing explicit programming for every task, plays a crucial role in criminal justice applications. Through ML and similar technologies like deep learning and natural language processing, AI systems can process large amounts of information—from crime reports and social media posts to biometric data and legal documents—much faster and more accurately than humans.

One of the most talked-about uses of AI in criminal justice is predictive policing. These systems analyze historical crime data, environmental factors, social dynamics, and other elements to predict when and where crimes might happen or identify individuals who may be involved in criminal activities. The goal is to allocate police resources in advance to prevent crimes before they occur, aiming to lower victimization rates and boost community safety. Systems like PredPol have been used in various U.S. cities, claiming to have reduced burglary and violent crime in targeted areas.

However, predictive policing is highly controversial. These systems depend heavily on historical crime data, which often reflects deep biases, like the over-policing of minority and economically disadvantaged communities, risking the continuation and worsening of those biases. For instance, neighborhoods with large minority populations that have historically faced increased surveillance tend to produce more recorded offenses, skewing AI predictions towards more police presence and surveillance in those areas. This feedback loop can damage community trust and raise significant issues surrounding racial profiling and discrimination.

Beyond policing, AI is also used in courts through risk assessment algorithms. Courts use these tools to predict a defendant's chances of reoffending or failing to appear in court. These algorithms analyze various factors—like criminal history, age, employment status, and social connections—to generate risk scores that judges consider when making bail, sentencing, and parole decisions. The COMPAS system is a well-known example widely used in the U.S.

While these risk assessments aim to bring objectivity and consistency to judicial decisions, their fairness and accuracy have been questioned. Investigations, including those by ProPublica, showed that COMPAS often gives higher risk scores to Black defendants compared to white defendants with similar criminal backgrounds, leading to unequal sentencing and incarceration rates. This situation underscores a key challenge in using historical data affected by systemic racial inequality to train AI. AI also assists sentencing and parole boards by analyzing large collections of past legal cases and offender information, providing recommendations on sentencing guidelines or parole eligibility.



UNIVERSITÀ DEGLI STUDI DI SALERNO

IECLO DIRECTOR: Prof. Anna ORIOLO
Department of Legal Sciences
(School of Law)
University of Salerno
Via Giovanni Paolo II, 132
84084 Fisciano (SA) - Italy
www.ieclo.org
info@ieclo.org



IECLO

International & European
Criminal Law Observatory

ON CULTURAL ISSUES, HUMAN RIGHTS AND SECURITY

While these systems can standardize decisions and reduce human error or arbitrary judgments, many experts advise against allowing AI recommendations to replace human judgment. Judges and parole officers need to consider contextual, ethical, and subtle factors that algorithms may overlook.

Facial recognition technology is another AI tool transforming law enforcement. It allows for real-time or retrospective identification of suspects by comparing images from surveillance cameras or other sources with large databases of photographs. While facial recognition can speed up investigations and enhance public safety, it raises serious privacy and civil liberties issues. Incorrect identifications disproportionately affect minorities and marginalized groups, leading to wrongful arrests and legal challenges. Courts in some areas have questioned the use of evidence obtained through facial recognition, citing worries about accuracy and reliability.

A significant advantage of using AI in criminal justice is increased efficiency. By automating data analysis, AI speeds up case processing and decision-making, helping to reduce backlogs in courts and law enforcement agencies. It can also improve resource allocation by helping police departments focus interventions where they are most necessary. Furthermore, data-driven AI methods have the potential to lessen human bias by providing recommendations based on statistical trends rather than personal biases.

However, AI brings about serious ethical issues. Transparency is a major concern; many AI systems work as “black boxes,” with decision-making processes that are unclear even to users. This lack of transparency makes it hard to challenge or appeal decisions derived from AI, undermining the legal principles of fairness and accountability. When AI systems make mistakes or produce unjust outcomes, it is often uncertain who is responsible—the developers, the agencies deploying them, or the human decision-makers relying on AI recommendations.

Bias and discrimination in AI present alarming risks. Since AI models learn from historical data affected by social inequalities, over-policing, and discriminatory practices, they may reinforce systemic injustices. Tackling this issue requires thorough testing, diverse and representative training datasets, and ongoing monitoring. Involving ethicists, legal scholars, community members, and technologists in AI development is vital to reduce bias and promote inclusivity.

Privacy concerns further complicate the use of AI in criminal justice. Surveillance tools like facial recognition and social media monitoring can gather a lot of personal data, often without people’s explicit consent. The rise of AI-driven surveillance raises the risk of creating a “surveillance state” where citizens are constantly monitored, affecting free expression and association. Legal frameworks must evolve to regulate how data is collected, used, and kept, ensuring individuals’ rights are protected in the digital age.

Additionally, AI challenges fundamental legal principles like due process and the right to a fair trial. Defendants need the chance to understand and contest AI-generated evidence or risk assessments.



UNIVERSITÀ DEGLI STUDI DI SALERNO

IECLO DIRECTOR: Prof. Anna ORIOLO
Department of Legal Sciences
(School of Law)
University of Salerno
Via Giovanni Paolo II, 132
84084 Fisciano (SA) - Italy
www.ieclo.org
info@ieclo.org



IECLO

International & European
Criminal Law Observatory

ON CULTURAL ISSUES, HUMAN RIGHTS AND SECURITY

Courts should ensure that AI tools support rather than replace human judgment and that human decision-makers remain accountable.

Several real-world case studies highlight the effects of AI in criminal justice. COMPAS, despite its widespread use, sparked controversy after research uncovered racial disparities in risk assessments, prompting demands for transparency, regulation, and other approaches. The Los Angeles Police Department's predictive policing program faced community backlash over concerns about racial profiling and lack of transparency, resulting in its discontinuation. Facial recognition technologies have led to lawsuits and outright bans in various areas due to documented inaccuracies and violations of civil rights.

Looking ahead, the responsible use of AI in criminal justice depends on enhancing transparency and accountability. New fields like explainable AI aim to make algorithmic decisions understandable and justifiable to human stakeholders. Governments and international organizations are working on ethical guidelines and legal frameworks to prevent bias, protect privacy, and ensure fairness.

Collaboration among different fields—including technologists, legal experts, policymakers, ethicists, and affected communities—is crucial to create AI systems that reflect societal values. Human oversight must remain vital, with AI acting as a decision-support tool rather than an autonomous authority. Innovations like blockchain could enhance data integrity and auditability by securing records and establishing immutable audit trails.

One of the earliest and most well-known uses of AI in law enforcement is predictive policing. By examining historical crime data along with environmental and social factors, AI models predict where and when crimes are likely to happen. Police departments can then allocate resources in advance to reduce criminal activity. Programs like PredPol, which have been used in several U.S. cities, reported some declines in burglary and violent crimes in targeted areas. Predictive policing offers the chance for greater efficiency and preventative policing, which may lower victimization and enhance community safety. When applied transparently and responsibly, it can help law enforcement be more strategic instead of just reactive. However, using AI in predictive policing also raises serious ethical and practical issues. Critics say these systems can reinforce existing biases in historical crime data, unfairly focusing on marginalized communities and worsening systemic inequalities. Without proper oversight, predictive models may result in over-policing in certain neighborhoods, harming public trust and damaging police-community relations.

Additionally, data privacy and the clarity of AI algorithms are key points of concern. Many of these systems work as “black boxes,” making it hard for the public or independent auditors to see how predictions are made or to question possible mistakes. Experts stress the importance of thorough evaluation, community involvement, and creating ethical guidelines to ensure AI tools promote justice fairly. As AI continues to develop, law enforcement agencies need to balance the potential benefits of predictive policing with the need to protect civil rights and avoid unintended harm.



UNIVERSITÀ DEGLI STUDI DI SALERNO

IECLO DIRECTOR: Prof. Anna ORIOLO
Department of Legal Sciences
(School of Law)
University of Salerno
Via Giovanni Paolo II, 132
84084 Fisciano (SA) - Italy
www.ieclo.org
info@ieclo.org



IECLO

International & European
Criminal Law Observatory

ON CULTURAL ISSUES, HUMAN RIGHTS AND SECURITY

Ongoing research and policy changes will be essential for using AI responsibly in the quest for safer communities.

AI is increasingly used in courts to help judges with risk assessments. These assessments estimate the likelihood of defendants reoffending or failing to appear in court. Tools like COMPAS generate these assessments by using various data points, including criminal history and social ties, to create risk scores. These scores aim to support judicial discretion during bail, sentencing, and parole decisions. They promote consistency and reduce subjective bias.

However, the use of AI risk assessment tools in courts has led to significant debate. While these systems try to provide objective data for judicial decisions, there are ongoing concerns about their fairness and transparency. Critics point out that algorithms like COMPAS are often trained on biased data, resulting in unfairly high-risk scores for certain demographic groups, especially racial minorities. This can reinforce existing disparities in the criminal justice system instead of reducing them.

Moreover, the complex nature of many AI models means judges and defendants may not fully understand how risk scores are created. This limits their ability to challenge or put the results in context. There is also a broader worry that relying too much on technology could undermine human judgment and the individual assessment necessary for justice.

To tackle these challenges, experts are calling for greater transparency in AI design, independent audits, and ethical safeguards to ensure these tools improve fairness instead of hindering it. Courts need to find a careful balance, using AI as just one part of a complete decision-making process that respects legal rights and promotes fair outcomes.

AI tools analyze large datasets of past legal cases and offender profiles to help sentencing and parole boards. Recommendations made by these systems can standardize decisions and reduce human error and inconsistent judgments.

However, relying on AI-generated recommendations in sentencing and parole decisions also brings challenges. These tools can help standardize outcomes and reduce disparities from human error and subjective bias, but they risk oversimplifying complex cases by focusing too much on patterns found in historical data. This focus may overlook important factors unique to each individual, such as personal circumstances, rehabilitation efforts, or changes in behavior over time.

Also, since AI systems learn from past cases, any existing biases in the justice system can be unintentionally reinforced. This could lead to unfair treatment of marginalized groups. Transparency is another issue, as the workings of many AI models are unclear. This makes it hard for defendants, lawyers, and boards to fully understand or challenge the recommendations.

To use AI ethically and effectively in these sensitive areas, it's important to combine algorithmic insights with human judgment, implement strict oversight, and continually assess the impact of these



UNIVERSITÀ DEGLI STUDI DI SALERNO

IECLO DIRECTOR: Prof. Anna ORIOLO
Department of Legal Sciences
(School of Law)
University of Salerno
Via Giovanni Paolo II, 132
84084 Fisciano (SA) - Italy
www.ieclo.org
info@ieclo.org



IECLO

International & European
Criminal Law Observatory

ON CULTURAL ISSUES, HUMAN RIGHTS AND SECURITY

technologies on fairness and justice. This balance can help leverage AI's benefits while protecting the integrity of legal decision-making.

Facial recognition, another AI-driven tool, is used by law enforcement for real-time suspect identification and retrospective investigations. FRT compares images from surveillance cameras to large databases, which helps identify suspects more quickly. Its potential to speed up investigations and improve public safety is significant.

However, facial recognition technology also raises serious privacy and civil rights concerns. The accuracy of these systems can vary widely based on factors like lighting, camera quality, and the diversity of the datasets used for training. Studies have shown that FRT often performs less accurately for people of color, women, and younger individuals, leading to higher rates of misidentification and wrongful suspicion.

Furthermore, the widespread use of FRT in public spaces can contribute to mass surveillance, possibly violating individuals' rights to privacy and freedom of movement. Without clear regulations and strict oversight, there is a risk that this technology could be misused for discriminatory profiling or oppressive surveillance.

To tackle these issues, experts recommend clear standards, independent testing, and strong legal frameworks that protect civil liberties. When used responsibly and with proper safeguards, facial recognition can be a useful tool for law enforcement, but it must be carefully balanced against the need to uphold individual rights and public trust.

Overall, AI improves efficiency by automating data processing and analysis. This can help reduce court backlogs and allow better resource distribution in police departments. Using data for decision-making can also lessen personal biases that affect legal outcomes.

Despite these benefits, incorporating AI into criminal justice presents several complex issues.

Bias and Discrimination

AI systems learn from historical data that often show social inequalities, biased policing, and systemic discrimination. Predictive policing models, for instance, tend to over-police minority and low-income neighborhoods due to unreliable crime data. This creates a cycle where increased surveillance results in more recorded offenses, which reinforces the AI's biased predictions.

Risk assessment algorithms have faced criticism for racial bias. Research by ProPublica on COMPAS found that Black defendants are unfairly labeled high risk compared to white defendants with similar backgrounds. These differences worsen unequal sentencing and imprisonment rates, raising concerns about fairness and the continuation of systemic racism.

Transparency and Accountability

Many AI systems function as "black boxes," making their decision-making processes unclear even to users. This lack of transparency complicates legal appeals against AI-generated outcomes,



UNIVERSITÀ DEGLI STUDI DI SALERNO

IECLO DIRECTOR: Prof. Anna ORIOLO
Department of Legal Sciences
(School of Law)
University of Salerno
Via Giovanni Paolo II, 132
84084 Fisciano (SA) - Italy
www.ieclo.org
info@ieclo.org



IECLO

International & European
Criminal Law Observatory

ON CULTURAL ISSUES, HUMAN RIGHTS AND SECURITY

undermining principles of fairness and due process. When AI causes harm or makes a mistake, it isn't clear who should take responsibility—developers, users, or institutions.

Privacy and Civil Liberties

AI-powered surveillance technologies collect large amounts of personal data, often without consent, which raises privacy issues. Facial recognition, in particular, has led to wrongful arrests, especially among minority groups. The growth of such technologies risks creating a surveillance state that stifles free expression and association.

Due Process and Human Oversight

AI should assist rather than replace human decision-making. Judges and parole boards must keep the authority to consider ethical, contextual, and nuanced factors. Defendants should have the right to understand and challenge AI-generated evidence or risk assessments to ensure fair trials.

Case Study 1: COMPAS and Racial Bias

COMPAS is commonly used in U.S. courts to estimate recidivism risk. A 2016 ProPublica investigation found that Black defendants were almost twice as likely as white defendants to be wrongly labeled high risk. This revealed the racial bias inherent in AI trained on discriminatory historical data. Critics argue this violates due process by making risk assessments unverifiable and unchallengeable.

Case Study 2: Predictive Policing in Los Angeles

The LAPD's "Operation LASER" and PredPol used historical crime data to predict crime hotspots. However, these systems disproportionately targeted minority neighborhoods that were already heavily policed, creating a self-reinforcing cycle of surveillance and arrests. Public outcry led to the dismantling of parts of the program in 2020, showing the need for transparency and community involvement in AI usage.

Case Study 3: Facial Recognition and Wrongful Arrests

In 2020, Robert Williams was wrongly arrested in Detroit due to a facial recognition system's misidentification. This case highlighted the racial bias in these algorithms, which perform poorly for non-white faces. Some cities have banned or restricted police use of facial recognition technology because of these issues.

Study 4: COMPAS – Risk Assessment and Racial Bias

One of the most notable examples of AI in the criminal justice system is the COMPAS (Correctional Offender Management Profiling for Alternative Sanctions) risk assessment tool. Used in courts across the U.S., COMPAS generates a score predicting a defendant's likelihood to reoffend. This score aids judges in making decisions about bail, sentencing, and parole.

In 2016, an investigation by ProPublica revealed significant racial disparities in how COMPAS assessed risk. Black defendants were almost twice as likely as white defendants to be labeled "high



UNIVERSITÀ DEGLI STUDI DI SALERNO

IECLO DIRECTOR: Prof. Anna ORIOLO
Department of Legal Sciences
(School of Law)
University of Salerno
Via Giovanni Paolo II, 132
84084 Fisciano (SA) - Italy
www.ieclo.org
info@ieclo.org



IECLO

International & European
Criminal Law Observatory

ON CULTURAL ISSUES, HUMAN RIGHTS AND SECURITY

risk" for recidivism, even when they did not reoffend. In contrast, white defendants were often classified as "low risk" despite later committing crimes.

This raised national awareness about the bias in AI algorithms trained on historical data, which reflect systemic inequalities like racial profiling and discriminatory policing practices. Critics argue that using such tools without transparency or the ability to challenge their decisions violates the principles of due process and fairness.

Case Study 5: Predictive Policing in Los Angeles

The Los Angeles Police Department experimented with predictive policing tools like "Operation LASER" and "PredPol." These systems analyzed historical crime data and environmental factors to identify locations and individuals likely to be involved in future crimes. Officers were then sent to these areas as a preemptive strategy to prevent crime.

Although the initiative initially received praise for its innovative approach, it quickly faced public criticism. As Sarah Brayne and Virginia Eubanks point out, these tools often relied on flawed, biased data that overrepresented low-income, minority neighborhoods—areas that were already under heavy policing. This created a feedback loop, reinforcing the perception of high crime and justifying continued surveillance and police presence.

In response to growing criticism from civil rights groups and community members, the LAPD dismantled parts of its predictive policing programs in 2020. This case shows the risks of data-driven policing without adequate oversight or community involvement, emphasizing the importance of transparency and accountability in using AI.

Case Study 6: Facial Recognition and Wrongful Arrests

Facial recognition technology is another AI application gaining traction in law enforcement. It compares real-time or archived images with databases of known individuals to identify suspects or track persons of interest. However, it has resulted in multiple wrongful arrests, particularly of Black individuals.

For instance, in 2020, Robert Williams, a Black man in Detroit, was wrongfully arrested after a facial recognition system misidentified him as a shoplifter. His case, highlighted by the ACLU and national media, exposed the inaccuracies and racial biases of facial recognition algorithms, especially in identifying people of color. Research had already shown that these systems were considerably less accurate for non-white faces and women.

Due to such incidents, some U.S. cities, including San Francisco, Boston, and Portland, have implemented bans or strict regulations on police use of facial recognition. These cases show that flawed AI tools can violate civil rights, undermine public trust, and disproportionately harm vulnerable groups.

Future Perspectives and Recommendations

For AI to have a positive impact on criminal justice, it is crucial to:



UNIVERSITÀ DEGLI STUDI DI SALERNO

IECLO DIRECTOR: Prof. Anna ORIOLO
Department of Legal Sciences
(School of Law)
University of Salerno
Via Giovanni Paolo II, 132
84084 Fisciano (SA) - Italy
www.ieclo.org
info@ieclo.org



IECLO

International & European
Criminal Law Observatory

ON CULTURAL ISSUES, HUMAN RIGHTS AND SECURITY

- Develop clear, understandable AI that allows for the examination of decisions and supports appeals.
- Conduct thorough bias testing and use diverse, representative training datasets.
- Create clear legal guidelines for regulating AI use and data privacy.
- Ensure collaboration among technologists, ethicists, legal experts, policymakers, and affected communities.
- Keep human oversight to balance AI suggestions with contextual judgment.
- Encourage public involvement and accountability to build trust.

Emerging technologies like blockchain can improve data integrity by securing records and enabling audit trails. Ethical guidelines and international standards are being developed to ensure AI respects human rights and fairness.

Conclusion

Artificial Intelligence has great potential to change the criminal justice system. It can lead to better efficiency and decisions based on data. However, using AI comes with challenges related to bias, transparency, privacy, and fairness. Responsible AI usage needs careful regulation, ethical design, and continued human oversight to avoid deepening existing injustices. By encouraging collaboration among various fields and focusing on justice and human dignity, AI can be a helpful tool to improve, but not replace, the human aspects that are essential to fair legal systems. Building on this base, the future of AI in criminal justice depends on finding a careful balance between innovation and caution. Policymakers, tech experts, legal professionals, and communities must join efforts to build frameworks that guarantee AI systems are clear, accountable, and fair. Ongoing monitoring and independent audits are crucial to spot and reduce biases as they come up, while engaging the public can build trust and legitimacy. Ultimately, AI should empower, not undermine, the principles of due process and equal protection under the law. When put into practice thoughtfully, AI can improve the justice system's ability to deliver fair outcomes, support rehabilitation, and enhance public safety, all while respecting the fundamental rights that define a just society.

References

- Angwin, J., Larson, J., Mattu, S., & Kirchner, L. (2016). Machine Bias. ProPublica.
- Brayne, S. (2020). Predict and Surveil: Data, Discretion, and the Future of Policing.
- Chouldechova, A., & Roth, A. (2020). A Tutorial on Fairness in Machine Learning.
- Eubanks, V. (2018). Automating Inequality: How High-Tech Tools Profile, Police, and Punish the Poor.
- Garvie, C., Bedoya, A., & Frankle, J. (2016). The Perpetual Line-Up: Unregulated Police Face Recognition in America.
- IECLO Insights editorial guidelines. <https://www.ieclo.org/>



UNIVERSITÀ DEGLI STUDI DI SALERNO

IECLO DIRECTOR: Prof. Anna ORIOLO
Department of Legal Sciences
(School of Law)
University of Salerno
Via Giovanni Paolo II, 132
84084 Fisciano (SA) - Italy
www.ieclo.org
info@ieclo.org



IECLO

International & European
Criminal Law Observatory

ON CULTURAL ISSUES, HUMAN RIGHTS AND SECURITY

- Angwin, J., Larson, J., Mattu, S., & Kirchner, L. (2016). *Machine Bias: There's software used across the country to predict future criminals. And it's biased against blacks*. ProPublica. <https://www.propublica.org/article/machine-bias-risk-assessments-in-criminal-sentencing>
- Brayne, S. (2020). *Predict and Surveil: Data, Discretion, and the Future of Policing*. Oxford University Press.
- Chouldechova, A., & Roth, A. (2020). A Snapshot of the Frontiers of Fairness in Machine Learning. *Communications of the ACM*, 63(5), 82–89. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3376898>
- Eubanks, V. (2018). *Automating Inequality: How High-Tech Tools Profile, Police, and Punish the Poor*. St. Martin's Press.
- Garvie, C., Bedoya, A., & Frankle, J. (2016). *The Perpetual Line-Up: Unregulated Police Face Recognition in America*. Georgetown Law Center on Privacy & Technology. <https://www.perpetuallineup.org/>
- O'Neil, C. (2016). *Weapons of Math Destruction: How Big Data Increases Inequality and Threatens Democracy*. Crown Publishing Group.
- Richardson, R., Schultz, J. M., & Crawford, K. (2019). Dirty Data, Bad Predictions: How Civil Rights Violations Impact Police Data, Predictive Policing Systems, and Justice. *New York University Law Review*, 94(1), 192-233.
- Suresh, H., & Gutttag, J. V. (2019). A Framework for Understanding Unintended Consequences of Machine Learning. *arXiv preprint*. <https://arxiv.org/abs/1901.10002>
- Wachter, S., Mittelstadt, B., & Russell, C. (2017). Counterfactual Explanations without Opening the Black Box: Automated Decisions and the GDPR. *Harvard Journal of Law & Technology*, 31(2), 841-887.



UNIVERSITÀ DEGLI STUDI DI SALERNO

IECLO DIRECTOR: Prof. Anna ORIOLO
Department of Legal Sciences
(School of Law)
University of Salerno
Via Giovanni Paolo II, 132
84084 Fisciano (SA) - Italy
www.ieclo.org
info@ieclo.org