

Digitalisation Delayed, Justice Denied?

**delayed digitalisation and
its impact on access to
justice**



LIGA LIDSKÝCH PRÁV

Digitalisation Delayed, Justice Denied?

Delayed digitalisation and its impact on access to justice

In recent years, the digitalisation of the Czech justice system has made partial progress, but remains fundamentally limited by the absence of a unified electronic case file, a fragmented ICT infrastructure, and insufficient implementation of procedural rules that would enable the full use of digital services.

Despite having a formally favourable legislative framework, the Czech Republic still lags to some extent behind the broader European trend of judicial modernisation.

© 2025 | League of Human Rights

We thank the Civil Liberties Union for Europe (Liberties) for their support. The project *Digitalisation Delayed, Justice Denied?* was supported as part of their CERV STRIVE 2025 initiative funded by the European Union.



Co-funded by
the European Union



Table of Contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	- 3 -
1. INTRODUCTION.....	- 5 -
2. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK FOR THE DIGITISATION OF JUSTICE ...	- 6 -
2.1. DEFINITION OF EJUSTICE.....	- 6 -
2.2. LEGAL BASIS IN THE CZECH LEGAL SYSTEM.....	- 7 -
2.3 STRATEGIC FRAMEWORK	- 10 -
2.4. EUROPEAN UNION LEGISLATIVE AND POLITICAL FRAMEWORKS.....	- 14 -
2.5. INTERNATIONAL STANDARDS: SOFT LAW AS A REFERENCE FRAMEWORK	- 18 -
3. CURRENT ELEMENTS OF DIGITALISATION IN THE CZECH JUDICIARY..	- 21 -
3.1 ELECTRONIC FILING (E-FILING)	- 21 -
3.2. REMOTE ACCESS TO FILES	- 21 -
3.3. ELECTRONIC COURT FILES.....	- 22 -
3.4. ONLINE COURT HEARINGS AND VIDEOCONFERENCING.....	- 25 -
4. ACCESS TO CASE LAW AND ONLINE JUSTICE INFORMATION SYSTEMS	- 27 -
4.1. DATABASE OF DECISIONS AND THEIR ANONYMISATION	- 27 -
4.2. ONLINE INFORMATION SYSTEMS.....	- 28 -
5. ONLINE DISPUTE RESOLUTION	- 30 -
6. USE OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE (AI) IN THE JUSTICE SYSTEM ...	- 32 -
6.1. LEGAL FRAMEWORK.....	- 32 -
6.2. CURRENT USE OF AI IN THE CZECH JUDICIARY	- 33 -
6.3. GENERATIVE AND SUPPORT TOOLS.....	- 33 -
6.4. AUTOMATION OF TRANSCRIPTIONS, TRANSLATIONS AND ANONYMISATION	- 34 -
6.5. CHATBOTS.....	- 36 -
6.6. EDUCATION	- 37 -
6.7. BENEFITS AND ADDED VALUE FOR THE JUDICIARY	- 37 -
6.8. RISKS AND LIMITATIONS ASSOCIATED WITH THE USE OF AI	- 38 -
7. INCREASING DIGITAL LITERACY.....	- 40 -
8. MAIN FINDINGS	- 41 -
9. KEY ISSUES HINDERING DIGITISATION:	- 42 -
10. PROSPECTS FOR FUTURE DEVELOPMENT:.....	- 43 -
11. KEY RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT	- 44 -
12. CONCLUSION.....	- 45 -

Executive summary

The digitalization of the judiciary was intended to transform the Czech Republic's judicial system. Despite certain advancements, including the digitisation of insolvency proceedings, the introduction of the obligation to publish court decisions online, and the progressive development of videoconferencing tools, the Czech justice system remains significantly behind the European average, as indicated by the EU Justice Scoreboard 2025. The system faces challenges such as fragmented ICT infrastructure, delays in key digitalisation projects, limited interoperability and capacity, and financial barriers. The report presents the results of an analysis of the current situation, identifies systemic obstacles, and maps key obligations arising from European and Czech legislation and strategic documents.

A key shortcoming is **the lack of a fully functional electronic court file system (eSpis)**, a prerequisite for the integration of most other eJustice components, whose development has been postponed for six years. This stagnation limits the efficiency of court proceedings, remote access options, process automation and the full use of digital tools, including artificial intelligence.

The current legal and technological infrastructure is characterised by fragmentation, a state that hinders its alignment with contemporary technological advancements. Procedural rules are not adequately updated, and they frequently exhibit a formalistic tendency, which complicates the electronic filing and online communication with parties to proceedings. Despite the expansion of access to case law since 2023, there **remains an absence of a uniform anonymisation methodology or a centralised database of decisions**, which hinders transparency and understanding of the prevailing decision-making practices. The advent of videoconferencing has been firmly entrenched since the advent of the pandemic. However, the implementation of restrictions, particularly the inability to verify identity remotely using eID, has impeded its comprehensive utilisation.

Concurrently, the Czech Republic is subject to numerous **obligations stipulated by European legislation and policy documents**. Of particular relevance are the *Digital Justice Package 2030* and the *Artificial Intelligence Act*, which mandate interoperable videoconferencing, electronic delivery in cross-border proceedings, integration with e-CODEX, and the secure utilisation of artificial intelligence within the justice system. These

commitments have transformed digitisation from an elective modernisation to a legal obligation. While some of the aforementioned tools have existed for a considerable period, their full potential has yet to be realised in practical applications.

In the past year, the Ministry of Justice has made significant **efforts to enhance the utilisation of artificial intelligence**, particularly in administrative processes such as transcriptions, translations, text summaries, and anonymisation. The Ministry has also undertaken a substantial initiative to incorporate the secure *Microsoft Copilot* environment. However, there is still a lack of a uniform methodology for using AI, a robust data infrastructure, and connectivity to key justice systems. In the absence of comprehensive training for judges and judicial staff on the safe use of AI, the comprehensive implementation of these tools will be subject to either selective usage or, conversely, will fail to comply with the necessary security safeguards.

In conclusion, the primary obstacles to digitisation are **institutional fragmentation, inadequate coordination of ICT projects, complex public procurement processes, ambiguous procedural guidelines, and persistent underfunding of infrastructure**. These deficiencies manifest in the daily administration of justice, impeding its effective functioning.

The successful modernization of the justice system necessitates a multifaceted approach, including the conceptual management of digitization, the completion of the eSpis project, the modernization of procedural rules, the standardization of the publication of case law, the full integration of eID, the secure and targeted implementation of AI, the interconnection of justice systems with eGovernment, and the systematic training of all professions within the justice system. This approach is necessary to address both the public's expectation of accessible and effective justice and the obligations stemming from European legislation and contemporary technological trends.

We would like to acknowledge the support of the Civil Liberties Union for Europe (Liberties) in the context of the *Digitalisation Denied, Justice Delayed?* project, under the broader framework of the EU-funded CERV STRIVE 2025 initiative.

1. Introduction

The digitalization of justice signifies a substantial advancement in the realm of modern public administration and is also a pivotal element in accelerating and enhancing the efficacy of judicial decision-making processes. For the past twenty years, the Czech Republic¹ has been declaring its goal of building a modern eJustice system based on electronic files, digital communication with the public, unified registers, effective tools for managing court agendas, and transparent access to case law. However, it should be noted that not all of these objectives have been fully realized at this time. Digital transformation initiatives are confronted with fragmentation and persistent institutional, technical, and legislative barriers. Consequently, several sub-goals have not been accomplished within the designated time frame, impeding the potential for comprehensive utilization of the highly qualified human resources in the justice sector. These professionals, in many ways, compete with their counterparts abroad.

This report aims to provide a comprehensive analysis of the current state of digitization in the Czech judicial system and, in a broader sense, in public administration as such. The report offers a synopsis of the prevailing trends, contentious issues, and prospective avenues for future advancement. Its objective is not to censure, but rather to identify shared solutions for the modernization of state-provided services.

¹ Starting in December 2005, when the Ministry of Justice was tasked with preparing an electronic register of court files. See: Resolution of the Government of the Czech Republic No. 1652 of 21 December 2005 on the Plan of Non-Legislative Tasks of the Government of the Czech Republic for the First Half of 2006 and on the Overview of Proposals for the Plan of Non-Legislative Tasks of the Government of the Czech Republic for the Second Half of 2006. Available online: https://kormoran.vlada.cz/usneseni/usneseni_webtest.nsf/web/cs?Open&2005&12-21.

2. Conceptual framework for the digitisation of justice

2.1. Definition of eJustice

The concept of *eJustice*, or the digitization of justice, is understood as a series of processes that utilize information and communication technologies within the judicial system. These technologies aim to streamline procedures, accelerate proceedings, and enhance access to judicial protection. According to the Ministry of Justice of the Czech Republic (hereinafter referred to as the "Ministry"), eJustice should lead to a judiciary *"without unnecessary delays, endless stacks of files, but clear and user friendly"*.²

The concept of eJustice mainly covers the following issues:

- Electronic files,
- databases and digital archiving,
- electronic submissions,
- courtroom technology,
- online communication and delivery,
- case management information systems,
- publication of case law,
- tools for decision-making and court management,
- online dispute resolution (ODR).

eJustice is an **integral component of eGovernment**,³ which aims to facilitate the digital transformation of public administration and to offer services to citizens in a manner that is more efficient, cost-effective, and user-friendly. The digital transformation of public administration services must prioritise the digital accessibility of fundamental services. The

² Ministry of Justice. eJustice. 2008. [cited 2012-3-11]. Available online: <http://obcanskyzakonik.justice.cz/ejustice/>

³ See more: Digitální a informační agentura (Digital and Information Agency). Czech eGovernment. [n.d.]. Available online at <https://portal.gov.cz/kam-dal/cesky-egovernment>; Ministry of the Interior of the Czech Republic. eGovernment. [n.d.]. Available online at: <https://mv.gov.cz/o-nas-egovernment.aspx>; State Administration of the Czech Republic (DIA). eGovernment Cloud. [n.d.]. Available online: <https://www.dia.gov.cz/cs/nase-cinnosti/na-cem-pracujeme/egovernment-cloud>; State Administration of the Czech Republic (DIA). O zákoně o základních pravidlech digitalizace služeb (About the Act on Basic Rules for the Digitisation of Services). [n.d.]. Available online: <https://www.zopds.dia.gov.cz/o-zakone>.

reduction in accessibility, time, cost, personnel capacity, material resources, and error rates should prove advantageous for the state and its users of these services.

2.2. Legal basis in the Czech legal system

Act on the Right to Digital Services (12/2020 Coll.)

The fundamental legal framework underpinning the digitisation of the entire Czech public administration is Act No. 12/2020 Coll. *on the Right to Digital Services*, also known as **the Digital Constitution**.⁴ The Act constitutes the foundational element of the eGovernment architecture, thereby establishing the environment within which contemporary eJustice is expected to operate.

Primarily, it ensures:

- the right of citizens to communicate with public authorities electronically,
- the obligation of public authorities to enable such electronic submissions and responses,
- the "*once and done*" principle – citizens should not have to repeatedly provide the same information to different institutions,
- the obligation of public institutions to create interactive electronic forms, pre-filled from public registers,
- the linking of forms to basic registers that pre-fill the necessary data,
- the obligation to digitise public authority activities by 2030.

It is particularly important for the judiciary that the law creates a general framework for:

- electronic court files,
- online submission,
- remote identity verification,
- electronic payment mechanisms,
- data storage and document sharing.

As the term "digital constitution" implies, it exclusively governs the rights of natural and legal persons within the context of digital government services, offering a high-level overview. It does not encompass the specific obligations of government entities or bodies. The practical enforceability of

⁴ Act No. 12/2020 Coll. on the right to digital services and on amendments to certain acts. Available online: <https://www.e-sbirka.cz/sb/2020/12/2025-11-01>.

such provisions in court remains a moot point in the absence of additional specifications.

Act No. 99/1963 Coll. Civil Procedure Code

The Code of Civil Procedure establishes regulations for **electronic proceedings**, particularly those pertaining to:

- electronic filing,
- electronic signatures,
- the obligation to supplement unsigned submissions,
- the admissibility of videoconferencing.

Nevertheless, the constraints imposed by the legal framework delineated in the Code of Civil Procedure stem from its fundamental limitations:

- **the regulations are technologically outdated,**
- the Code of Civil Procedure does not allow for fully electronic proceedings,
- it does not provide for electronic file management,
- it does not allow for process automation.

Act No. 300/2008 Coll. on electronic acts and authorised conversion of documents

The data box system is a prominent example of an advanced eGovernment tool, yet its implementation within the judicial sector remains limited. The current legislative framework is as follows:

- stipulates that a document delivered to a data box is considered signed,
- enables fully electronic delivery of court documents,
- sets out the conditions for authorised document conversion.

However, to achieve its full potential, it is imperative to expand the utilization of the system in court proceedings. This encompasses the implementation of automated notifications, electronic viewing, and interactive forms, among other aspects.

Act No. 6/2002 Coll. on Courts and Judges

This Act specifically pertains to the dissemination of decisions. The imperative to disseminate the rulings of all tribunals is further reinforced by Decree No. 403/2022 Coll., which stipulates:

- the scope of published decisions,
- the obligation of anonymisation,
- the method of accessing the database.

The absence of a uniform anonymisation methodology and a uniform technical solution remains a shortcoming.

Act No. 264/2025 Coll. on cyber security

The recently enacted legislation has introduced substantial enhancements to the regulatory framework governing cyber security within the Czech Republic. It has established more stringent requirements for entities that provide essential or strategic information services. In the context of the transposition of the NIS2 Directive, a substantially more stringent cyber risk management obligation is imposed on public administration entities that operate critical or important systems. For judicial authorities, the obligations will manifest themselves, for example, in the introduction of stricter security measures, the reporting of cyber security incidents to the National Cyber and Information Security Agency, and the implementation of supply chain security screening mechanisms.

2.3 Strategic framework

Digital Czechia and commitments from the Recovery Plan

The digitisation of the justice system is also part of the government's **Digital Czechia** programme, which sets targets until 2031. At the same time, it is subject to commitments under **the National Recovery Plan**, which finances part of the projects in the area of the digitisation of the judicial agenda.⁵

The Department of Justice Digitisation at the Ministry of Justice is responsible for the concept and its implementation.

Information Concept of the Ministry of Justice 2023-2028⁶

It is a strategic framework for the modernisation of ICT infrastructure, information systems management, and support for the digitisation of the justice system. Among its specific commitments, it stipulates:

(i) Legislative and regulatory obligations:

Systematic **assessment of proposals for legislation** in terms of their **impact on digital processes and ICT infrastructure**.

The Ministry must ensure:

⁵ Component 1.2: Digital public administration systems, annex to the draft Council implementing decision on the approval of the assessment of the Czech Republic's recovery and resilience plan, COM(2021) 431 final. 52021PC0431 – EN –EUR-Lex, <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/ALL/?uri=COM:2021:431:FIN>.

⁶ Information Concept of the Ministry of Justice 2023-2028. [IK MSp 2023-2028] dated 1 August 2023. Available online: <https://www.databaze-strategie.cz/cz/ms/strategie/informacni-koncepce-ministerstva-spravedlnosti-pro-obdobi-2023-2028?typ=o>.

- **digitally friendly legislation**, i.e. the mandatory involvement of departments responsible for digitisation in the legislative process;
- **analysis and updating of legislation** that hinders or restricts the digital transformation of the justice system;
- **the financing of digital changes**, particularly within the framework of eJustice and eGovernment programmes.

(ii) Digitisation of public services and processes:

This follows on from the Act on the Right to Digital Services and imposes an obligation on the Ministry of Justice to:

- **ensure full-fledged electronic communication with courts**, including interactive forms and integration with public registers;
- **strengthen citizens' rights to digital services**, especially in court proceedings;
- **ensure the development of electronic filing and electronic user services**, including the management of life situations in digital form.

(iii) ICT infrastructure and modernisation of information systems:

The Ministry is required to carry out extensive modernisation of ICT infrastructure, which includes:

- **consolidation of judicial information systems**, harmonisation of data structures and standardisation of interfaces;
- **modernisation of operational and support systems**, including renewal of technical equipment, virtualisation of the environment and increased cyber security;
- **implementation of central data storage and support for metadata sharing**, thereby unifying document availability and management across the entire department.

The architecture being implemented is intended to enable the development of eSpis, advanced analytics and the future integration of AI tools.

(iv) ICT service management and standardisation (SLA/OLA):

Requires the creation of a unified ICT service management system across the entire department:

- **introduction of a service catalogue**, definition of responsibilities and guaranteed parameters;
- **standardisation of SLAs and OLAs** that determine the quality of IT services provided;

- **use of centralised incident, change and operation management** according to ITIL principles.

(v) Development of digital competences and capacities:

Emphasises the crucial importance of human resources for the digitalisation of justice and requires the Ministry to:

- **create a system for managing ICT professions**, including cataloguing positions, career development and stabilisation of IT specialists;
- **systematically improve the digital literacy of employees**, in particular through training at the Judicial Academy;
- **strengthen competences in the areas of project management, cyber security and public procurement.**

(vi) Internal digitisation and automation:

This includes a commitment to digitise all key internal processes of the Ministry, including:

- electronisation of document circulation and file management;
- full digitisation of internal requests, approval procedures and communication;
- creating **an internal portal** for employees with unified access to all digital tools.

eJustice 2023+ Strategic Framework⁷

A long-term strategic document of the Ministry that sets out the vision, strategic theses and priority directions for the further digitisation of the judicial system. The framework gives rise to a number of obligations and commitments, including:

(i) Strategic vision and architecture of eJustice:

- developing and maintaining the business architecture of the justice sector, which will take into account the needs of digital transformation and will form the basis for building information systems,
- coordinating eJustice projects, defining and planning strategic priorities,

⁷ Strategic Framework for eJustice 2023+ [eJustice 2023-2031] dated 8 March 2023. Available online: <https://www.databaze-strategie.cz/cz/ms/strategie/strategicky-ramec-ejustice-2023>.

- obligation to regularly evaluate the progress of the implementation of strategic plans and update the strategy in line with the changing technological environment.

(ii) Building the eJustice agenda platform:

- continuing the development of a modular eJustice agenda platform, which includes several key modules: eSpis, eSIR, a module for civil agenda (including payment orders), a module for criminal justice, and others,
- obligation to conduct open public procurement for these modules,
- commitment to ensure interoperability between different system modules, as well as connection to other departmental or state information systems.

(iii) Project coordination and management:

- Ministry's responsibility for coordinating the development of information systems,
- obligation to issue opinions on the acceptance of new systems regarding their compliance with the strategic framework and business architecture of eJustice.

(iv) Ensuring sustainable infrastructure:

- requirement to create an information infrastructure that will enable long-term and stable operation of digital systems (data centres, backups, security),
- the obligation to regularly update technological solutions and infrastructure to meet growing demands and new functionality (e.g. modules, APIs, scalability).

(v) Improving digital skills:

- supporting the development of skills among justice department employees, particularly in the areas of digital processes, IS administration and eJustice,
- emphasis on education, training and internal work with technological changes.

(vi) Ensuring interoperability with European systems:

- the need for interoperable connection of justice department systems to European platforms, which will enable better cooperation in cross-border judicial matters (e.g. data, documents, delivery),

- Reflecting the requirements of European initiatives such as the EU Digitalisation Package.

2.4. European Union legislative and political frameworks

The digitisation of justice in EU Member States has advanced significantly in recent years, particularly during the 2023–2024 period. This development can be attributed to the adoption of the **Digitalisation of Justice Package**, which established the first comprehensive regulatory framework governing the mandatory digitisation of cross-border judicial cooperation. The Czech Republic is obligated to implement these regulations in the domains of civil and commercial justice, as well as criminal law. This implementation encompasses the utilisation of **specific technical solutions, including the decentralised e-CODEX system, the European electronic access point, and interoperable videoconferencing tools.**

The ensuing sections offer a synopsis of the ramifications that the primary EU legal acts have exerted on the Czech judicial system.

Regulation (EU) 2023/2844 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 13 December 2023 on the digitisation of judicial cooperation and access to justice in cross-border civil, commercial and criminal matters and amending certain acts in the area of judicial cooperation

This Regulation is considered a foundational element of European digital justice. The objective of the initiative is to establish a comprehensive electronic framework for cross-border legal proceedings and interactions among citizens, businesses, national authorities, and EU institutions.

Main obligations for the Czechia:

a) Mandatory use of a decentralised information system (e-CODEX):

Czech courts, public prosecutors and central authorities must be able to communicate with each other through an interoperable decentralised system. This system is designed for:

- the delivery of documents,
- exchange of procedural documents,
- transmission of requests for legal assistance,
- electronic forms in cross-border proceedings.

The Regulation also lays down an obligation to ensure **technical compatibility and security standards.**

b) European Access Point:

The Czech Republic is obligated to ensure that its citizens and businesses have the capacity to utilize the e-Justice portal as a conduit for the submission of documents, communication with judicial authorities, and the monitoring of the status of cross-border proceedings.

The aforementioned developments will result in the comprehensive digitization of processes such as the European payment order, the European small claims procedure, and cross-border evidence..

c) Videoconferencing and remote communication:

Member States are obligated to ensure the technical feasibility of video conferencing in cross-border cases.

The Regulation explicitly endorses a "*digital-by-default*" approach, where technically feasible and procedurally suitable.

d) Electronic signatures and seals:

Czech authorities are obligated to recognise qualified electronic signatures under the eIDAS Regulation without further formalities. This eliminates differing national practices in the verification of digital acts.

e) Electronic delivery

Service in European instruments (e.g. EOP, small claims) has to be carried out via electronic systems using e-CODEX. Alternative channels (telephone, fax) may only be retained where permitted by national law.

Directive of the European Parliament and of the Council (EU) 2023/2843 of 13 December 2023 amending Directives 2011/99/EU and 2014/41/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council, Council Directive 2003/8/EC and Council Framework Decisions 2002/584/JHA, 2003/577/JHA, 2005/214/JHA, 2006/783/JHA, 2008/909/JHA, 2008/947/JHA, 2009/829/JHA and 2009/948/JHA, as regards the digitisation of judicial cooperation

The Directive establishes requirements analogous to those previously mentioned, yet it is exclusively focused on criminal law instruments, such as the European arrest warrant, orders for the preservation of evidence, and mutual recognition of criminal judgments.

The following transposition obligations are applicable to the Czech Republic:

a) Digitisation of specified EU instruments:

Czech authorities are obliged to enable electronic communication for all relevant instruments of judicial cooperation (e.g. European arrest warrant, order to secure evidence, etc.).

b) Mandatory use of a decentralised IT system:

The use of e-CODEX is becoming the standard for the exchange of documents, requests and decisions. The Czech Republic must ensure **full technical interoperability, security and access infrastructure**.

c) Electronic delivery and confirmation:

The Directive imposes an obligation to receive and send documents in electronic form, including confirmation of receipt.

Regulation (EU) 2024/1689 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 13 June 2024 laying down harmonised rules on artificial intelligence and amending Regulations (EC) No 300/2008, (EU) No 167/2013, (EU) No 168/2013, (EU) 2018/858, (EU) 2018/1139 and (EU) 2019/2144 and Directives 2014/90/EU, (EU) 2016/797 and (EU) 2020/1828 (Artificial Intelligence Act / AI Act) (Text with EEA relevance)

The AI Act is the first comprehensive regulatory framework for artificial intelligence in the EU. While its impact on the judiciary's organization is only marginal, it establishes several pivotal regulations.

Relevance for the Czech judiciary:

a) High-risk systems in the judiciary:

AI systems used by judicial authorities for the following purposes are classified as high-risk:

- analysis of the facts of a case,
- interpretation of the law,
- applying legal norms to specific cases,
- supporting decision-making in ADR.

These systems must meet strict requirements for risk management, transparency, auditability and human oversight.

b) Inadmissibility of replacing judges:

The Act emphasises that the decision-making power and independence of judges must not be undermined by AI. The final decision must always be made by a human being.

c) Admissibility of low-risk applications:

Administrative and support systems are not considered risky within the meaning of this regulation, e.g.:

- anonymisation of judgements,
- pseudonymisation of data,
- transcripts of proceedings,

- translations,
- internal communications.

These systems are therefore also suitable for pilot projects in the Czech judiciary.

European e-Justice Strategy for 2024–2028

While not legally binding, the strategy delineates the political objectives that Member States are expected to achieve by the year 2028.

Key recommendations for the Czech Republic:

- connection of Czech national systems to e-CODEX,
- implementation of all 24 tools of the digitisation package,
- mandatory use of e-CODEX for delivery and evidence from May 2025 (e-Evidence Regulation),
- introduction of a national portal connected to the European access point (e-Access Point),
- minimisation of digital barriers,
- interoperability of national and European systems,
- implementation of cross-border videoconferencing systems,
- development and testing of AI for anonymisation, transcription, translation and analysis of decisions and monitoring of their impact.

European Digital Decade

The Digital Decade (2020-2030) establishes the **overarching objectives** of the EU's digital transformation:

- 100% availability of digital public services,
- widespread use of digital identity,
- interoperability of state systems.

Of particular importance for the Czech Republic:

- the obligation to ensure online access to all public services,
- strengthening cybersecurity and data infrastructure,
- preparation of society as a whole for AI.

Summary of EU challenges for the Czech Republic:

The European Union (EU) has established a comprehensive legislative framework that **necessitates a substantial modernisation of the Czech Republic's judicial system**. This process is now mandatory, and it encompasses the following areas:

- cross-border civil, commercial and criminal proceedings,
- Introduction of e-CODEX as the main infrastructure,
- interoperable videoconferencing,

- electronic delivery and communication,
- full acceptance of electronic signatures,
- creation of a national electronic access point,
- deployment and regulation of AI under the AI Act,
- testing and development of AI in anonymisation, transcription, translation and data.

Consequently, the EU framework is set to become a pivotal catalyst for the digital transformation of the Czech justice system in the forthcoming years.

2.5. International standards: soft law as a reference framework

Beyond the binding EU legislation, the digitization process can also draw on soft-law standards and international recommendations at the supranational level, in particular from initiatives of the Council of Europe. These standards and recommendations furnish pragmatic frameworks and optimal practices that Member States can employ when implementing or enhancing digital solutions. In accordance with their recommendations, national digitization processes can be aligned with international principles or even promote interoperability between different legal and technological systems. The following recommendations are derived from key international documents:

CEPEJ - Action Plan "Digitalisation for a Better Justice" (2022-2025)⁸

- **a unified digitisation strategy:** centralised coordination of digitisation projects across the Ministry, courts and public prosecutor's office to prevent fragmentation of systems
- **user-friendliness of systems:** focus digitisation on end users – citizens, lawyers and professionals. It is recommended to test systems with users and ensure clear communication.
- **Interoperability of systems:** harmonisation of court information systems (e.g. ISAS, ISIR, ISVŘ, ePodatelna) and their interconnection with other institutions.
- **Training of judicial staff:** introduction of continuous programmes to improve the digital skills of judges, officials and other staff.

⁸ European Commission for the Efficiency Of Justice (CEPEJ). 2022–2025 CEPEJ Action Plan: 'Digitalisation for a better justice'. CEPEJ(2021)12Final. Adopted at the 37th CEPEJ plenary meeting Strasbourg and online, 8 and 9 December 2021. Available online: <https://rm.coe.int/cepej-2021-12-en-cepej-action-plan-2022-2025-digitalisation-justice/1680a4cf2c>.

- **monitoring and analytics:** introduction of KPIs and tools for measuring court performance, including the length of proceedings and the quality of decisions.

CEPEJ - Guidelines on electronic court filing (e-filing) and digitalisation of courts⁹

- **standardisation of electronic filings:** unification of forms and data structures for all electronic filings,
- **full digitisation of document circulation:** electronic files should be the primary working tool, not just copies of paper documents,
- **assisted forms of e-filing:** combination of fully electronic filing with assisted options, e.g. at CzechPOINT, to ensure equal access for all citizens,
- **legal certainty and compatibility:** electronic systems must respect the legal framework, particularly in terms of document validity and procedural deadlines.

CEPEJ Ethical Charter on AI in Judicial Systems¹⁰

- **independence of judges:** AI must not replace the decision-making power of judges; its role should only be supportive,
- **Transparency of algorithms:** auditable and justifiable algorithms used in the justice system are recommended.
- **Personal data protection:** AI tools must be operated in accordance with the obligations under the GDPR and the specific requirements of the judiciary.
- **Prevention of discrimination:** AI must be tested for possible bias and equal access to services must be ensured for all participants in proceedings.

CEPEJ - Roadmap / GT-CYBERJUST¹¹

⁹ European Commission for the Efficiency Of Justice (CEPEJ). Guidelines on electronic court filing (e-filing) and digitalisation of courts. Adopted at the 37th plenary meeting of the CEPEJ (Strasbourg, 8-9 December 2021). Available online: <https://rm.coe.int/e-filing-en/1680b2ca1c>.

¹⁰ European Commission for the Efficiency Of Justice (CEPEJ). European Ethical Charter on the use of artificial intelligence (AI) in judicial systems and their environment. Adopted at the 31st plenary meeting of the CEPEJ (Strasbourg, 3-4 December 2018). Available online: <https://rm.coe.int/ethical-charter-en-for-publication-4-december-2018/16808f699c>.

¹¹ European Commission for the Efficiency Of Justice (CEPEJ). Roadmap and Workplan Of The Cepej-Gt-Cyberjust, CEPEJ(2020)14REV, as adopted at the 34th plenary meeting of the CEPEJ, 8 December 2020. Available online: <https://rm.coe.int/cyberjustice-roadmap-en-cepej-2020-14/1680a0ae12>

- **Cybersecurity:** ensuring robust protection of digital infrastructure, including crisis management in the event of system failures.
- **Digital identities:** introduction of uniform identification standards in accordance with the European eIDAS 2.0 framework.
- **open interfaces (API):** creation of a secure API for data exchange between courts, solicitors, bailiffs and other legal professionals,
- **AI ethics and governance:** introduction of certification and audit mechanisms for AI tools used in the justice system.

3. Current elements of digitalisation in the Czech judiciary

3.1 Electronic filing (e-filing)

The option to file documents electronically is codified in the Civil Procedure Code. In the Czech Republic, the practice of electronic filing, also known as e-filing, enables the transmission of documents to the court via various methods, including data boxes, email, and the ePodatelna web application.¹² Submissions must be accompanied by an electronic signature, unless there is an explicit stipulation to the contrary. Furthermore, submissions are required to comply with procedural rules, and attachments are preferable to be in PDF or PDF/A format. Court fees may also be remitted through the use of a QR code.¹³ However, the practice is complicated in several respects, specifically:

- In certain instances, submissions made electronically must be supplemented with the original hard copy within a period of three days if they are not accompanied by a recognised electronic signature.
- The courts have been observed to interpret certain regulations inconsistently. In this particular context, the Constitutional Court has made repeated efforts to define problematic situations in its case law. These situations include, but are not limited to, issues of signature validity, the time of delivery, and electronic attachments.¹⁴

3.2. Remote access to files

Presently, remote access to electronic court files is exclusively facilitated by the Constitutional Court. The internet application NaSpis¹⁵ serves participants in proceedings, secondary participants in proceedings and their legal representatives for remote access to documents in electronic

¹² <http://epodatelna.justice.cz/>.

¹³ Ministry of Justice of the Czech Republic. Ministry of Justice fulfils digitisation of justice. 2024. Available online: <https://msp.gov.cz/web/msp/tiskove-zpravy/-clanek/ministerstvo-spravedlnosti-naplnuje-digitalizaci-justice>

¹⁴ See, for example, ruling ref. no. I. ÚS 2963/17 of 16 January 2018 (the court's obligation to inform a party of the invalidity of its electronic signature) or ruling ref. no. II. ÚS 289/15 of 7 March 2016 (inadmissible formalism in the electronic filing of a lawsuit to a data box)

¹⁵ Office for Representation of the State in Property Matters / Ministry of Justice of the Czech Republic. NaSpis. [n.d.]. Available online: <https://naspis.usoud.cz/>.

versions of Constitutional Court case files, subject to the conditions set out in Section 58a of the Office and Case File Rules of the Constitutional Court.¹⁶

In other proceedings, electronic access is currently very limited. The Infosoud system offers rudimentary information regarding the progression of court proceedings. However, it lacks comprehensive data, including decisions and information about the parties involved. Additionally, it does not contain the contents of the file.¹⁷

3.3. Electronic court files

The eSpis (short for "*electronic files*") is regarded as a pivotal project, serving as a prerequisite for the digitization of the Czech justice system. The objective of the eSpis is to establish a system that facilitates the comprehensive digital management of court agendas, thereby replacing the conventional paper-based file management practices. The new system would enable judges, lawyers, and parties to proceedings to access documents online. The comprehensive implementation of this system would eliminate the necessity for physical handling of documents, expedite delivery, streamline communication, reduce expenditures and errors, and, in a sense, also enhance the transparency of court proceedings. Furthermore, the implementation of electronic files would facilitate the automation of specific judicial processes, enhance the efficacy of information retrieval, and promote more efficient information exchange among the various components of the judiciary.

The **eISIR** (short for "*electronic information system of the insolvency register*") is a specialised module that focuses on insolvency proceedings. The eISIR system has been developed to facilitate the electronic filing and processing of insolvency petitions, as well as the management of the entire insolvency file in digital format. This system has been designed to streamline the operations of both courts and insolvency administrators. The eISIR system is integrated within the broader eSpis platform, enabling the interconnectedness of both systems based on a common architecture. Consequently, this integration establishes a unified digital infrastructure for

¹⁶ Office and Filing Rules of the Constitutional Court (full text as of 10 October 2013). Available in https://www.usoud.cz/fileadmin/user_upload/ustavni_soud_www/Vnitri_predpisy/Aktualni/uplne_zneni_KSR_k_10_10_2013.pdf online:

¹⁷ Ministry of Justice of the Czech Republic / Justice.cz. InfoSoud – court search. [n.d.]. Available online: <https://infosoud.justice.cz/InfoSoud/public/searchBody.jsp>.

courts.¹⁸ Currently, electronic files in insolvency proceedings can only be kept in the original ISIR information system,¹⁹ which was created solely for insolvency proceedings and became operational on 1 January 2008, when Section 419 et seq. of Act No. 182/2006 Coll., on Insolvency and Methods of its Resolution (Insolvency Act).²⁰

Although development of the eSpis application began in 2008 and has repeatedly been designated a strategic priority of the Ministry of Justice and the government's Digital Czechia programme, its completion and launch have been **repeatedly postponed**,²¹ mainly due to problems with public procurement, delays on the part of subcontractors, and the technical complexity of the implementation itself.²² Consequently, **numerous proceedings continue to utilise two types of records: electronic and paper**, with the paper version being the primary one. Despite the Ministry of Justice's declaration in the first quarter of 2025 of its intention to complete the preparatory work for eSpis, To be finished by December 2025, there is currently uncertainty regarding the fulfilment of this deadline.²³

¹⁸ Ministry of Justice of the Czech Republic. Ministerstvo spravedlnosti ČR. Ministerstvo spravedlnosti naplňuje digitalizaci justice. 2024 (Ministry of Justice completes digitisation of justice system. 2024). Available in Czech online: <https://msp.gov.cz/en/web/msp/tiskove-zpravy/-/clanek/ministerstvo-spravedlnosti-naplnuje-digitalizaci-justice>.

Reakce Ministerstva spravedlnosti na článek iDNES „Digitalizace justice stojí na místě. Státní rozpočet to může stát 1,5 miliardy“ (Response of the Ministry of Justice to the iDNES article "Digitisation of the justice system at a standstill. It could cost the state budget 1.5 billion). Available in Czech online: <https://msp.gov.cz/en/web/msp/rozcestnik/-/clanek/reakce-ministerstva-spravedlnosti-na-clanek-idnes-digitalizace-justice-stoji-na-miste-statni-rozpocet-to-muze-stat-1-5-miliard-1>.

¹⁹ <https://isir.justice.cz/isir/common/index.do>.

²⁰ Insolvency Register. Insolvency Register – information. [n.d.]. Available online: <https://portal.gov.cz/informace/insolvenčni-rejstřík-INF-128#:~:text=Prost%C5%99ednictv%C3%ADm%20rejst%C5%99%C3%ADku%20jsou%20zve%C5%99ej%C5%88ov%C3%A1na%20rozhodnut%C3%AD,o%20tom%20rozhodne%20insolven%C4%8Dn%C3%AD%20soud>.

²¹ Seznam News. Slibovaná digitalizace v justici? Kde nic, tu nic (Promised digitisation in the judiciary? Nothing doing). 2024. Available in Czech online: <https://www.seznamzpravy.cz/clanek/domaci-politika-stohy-papiru-jako-za-rakouska-uherska-digitalizace-justice-nema-konce-262148>.

²² iDNES. iDNES. Digitální insolvenční rejstřík není kompletní. Rozpočet může přijít o peníze (The digital insolvency register is incomplete). The budget may lose money. 2024. Available online: https://www.idnes.cz/zpravy/domaci/digitalizace-justice-eisir.A240119_110832_domaci_rts.

²³ Request for information submitted by LLP on 15 March 2025; response to the request received from the Ministry of Justice on 28 March 2025.

According to the Ministry's official statement from October 2025, the eSIR and eSpis projects are currently in the final (fifth) phase of development. According to the Ministry, intensive preparations are currently underway for the deployment of selected parts of the system into the production environment in *the so-called First Release* (specifically the modules: List of Insolvency Administrators, Public eSIR, Code Lists, Wheels - Assignment of Insolvency Administrators) and the final rounds of user testing are running in parallel. If the modules are free of major defects, they should be launched in production by the end of this year. **Currently, the Ministry states that the planned deployment of the comprehensive eSIR/eSpis system is scheduled for the last quarter of 20 2026.**²⁴

It should be noted that a number of public authorities are already obligated under the provisions of the Archives Act to maintain their records in electronic form. Nevertheless, inadequate progress has been made in the domain of justice to enable even the highest courts to fully comply with all legal requirements for electronic record keeping.²⁵

As demonstrated above, the implementation of the eSpis and eSIR systems signifies pivotal milestones in the process of digitizing the judiciary. The subsequent fulfillment of other digital milestones is contingent upon the implementation of these systems. Furthermore, the persistent utilization of paper-based documentation for archiving purposes is associated with a number of detrimental consequences, including:

- inefficiency for the parties (time-consuming and costly personal inspection of files),
- inefficiency on the part of the judge (e.g. inability to perform full-text searches),
- costly manual file management and transport,
- risk of loss and damage to files,
- delays leading to damages (e.g. long waiting times for access to files from other courts)

²⁴ Request for information submitted by LLP on 8 October 2025; response to the request received from the Ministry of Justice on 23 October 2025.

²⁵ For instance, the Supreme Court of the Czech Republic asserts in the questionnaire that it has already adopted the file digitisation solution developed by the Ministry of Justice and is actively engaged in its implementation and modification. The organisation is currently engaged in the formulation of proposals for solutions, the provision of commentary on analyses, and the active involvement in the discrete phases of various projects. However, under this regime, it is still unable to perform its file management services in full compliance with the relevant legal regulations. A questionnaire was administered to a representative of the Supreme Court of the Czech Republic on November 12, 2025.

- risk of modification by unauthorised entities without a trace of their access,
- reduced data protection due to lower security,²⁶
- delayed fulfilment of other digitisation objectives, the fulfilment of which depends on the implementation of eSpis and eSIR.

3.4. Online court hearings and videoconferencing

Video conferencing technology is one of the few areas of digitalisation that has seen **rapid development, particularly during the COVID-19 pandemic**. Since 2017, legislation has allowed court proceedings to be conducted via videoconferencing,²⁷ but implementation remained rather marginal before the outbreak of the pandemic. The crisis period brought a significant increase in the use of these tools; however, after the return to normal operations, practice has partially reverted to traditional forms.

The current legal framework requires that the identity of participants in the proceedings be verified by a court official. This condition complicates the wider use of videoconferencing, as it prevents fully automated connection via electronic identification (eID) means.²⁸ In accordance with contemporary eJustice standards, it is imperative to establish the legitimacy of participants through electronic identification mechanisms, such as bank identification or eGovernment mobile keys. This approach aligns with European frameworks and facilitates the seamless integration of videoconferencing systems into judicial proceedings.

In the future, greater emphasis is expected to be placed on interoperable videoconferencing tools, particularly in connection with the obligations arising from European legislation and policy documents for cross-border proceedings. The introduction of automated recording, archiving, and transcription of proceedings will also be pivotal, as it will significantly streamline the procedural activities of the courts and reduce the administrative burden. In February of 2025, the Ministry implemented a

²⁶ Presentation of the contribution by JUDr. Daniela Břízová Ratajová, LL.M, dated 28 February 2025, Vila Grébovka, Prague.

²⁷ Section 9 of Act No. 296/2017 Coll., amending Act No. 99/1963 Coll., the Code of Civil Procedure, as amended, Act No. 292/2013 Coll., on Special Judicial Proceedings, as amended, and certain other acts.

²⁸ Add source!

videoconferencing solution via Cisco Webex for the aforementioned purposes.²⁹

²⁹ Ministry of Justice of the Czech Republic. Digitalizace v praxi: videokonference – větší komfort pro oběti trestných činů, dostupnější spravedlnost pro všechny (Digitisation in practice: videoconferencing – greater comfort for victims of crime, more accessible justice for all). 21 February 2025. Available in Czech online: <https://msp.gov.cz/en/web/msp/rozcestnik/-/clanek/spravedlnost-a-digitalizace-v-praxi-vetsi-komfort-pro-obeti-trestnych-cinu-dostupnejsi-spravedlnost-pro-vsechny-kopirovat->.

4. Access to case law and online justice information systems

4.1. Database of decisions and their anonymisation

Access to court decisions is one of the most important prerequisites for a transparent and predictable judiciary. The Czech Republic has made progress in this area, particularly following the adoption of Decree No. 403/2022 Coll.³⁰ which established **the obligation to publish the decisions of all courts, not just the highest courts**. This is a substantial systemic change that is intended to bring the Czech judiciary closer to the modern standards of openness known from other European countries. However, the practical implementation of this obligation was met with a series of technical, capacity, and procedural challenges. The dissemination of court decisions was initially characterized by unevenness, particularly during the initial two quarters of 2025. This unevenness manifested in the publication of decisions with delays by some courts and in the inconsistent quality of these decisions.³¹ Differences also remain in the extent of anonymisation, data structuring and the method of labelling decisions.

The anonymization of decisions poses a distinct challenge. Despite the fact that the Czech judiciary is bound by the stipulations of the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR), **there is an absence of a uniform methodology that would establish explicit guidelines for the pseudonymization of sensitive data**. This discrepancy in practice gives rise to a state of affairs in which divergent judicial bodies tend to anonymize analogous information in disparate manners, thereby engendering a diminution in clarity and the potential for efficacious engagement with case law. In this context, the Ministry has recommended the implementation of a uniform procedure; however, this recommendation has yet to be enforced. The implementation of artificial intelligence in this domain is a natural fit, as it possesses the capacity to establish a consistent standard and thereby reduce the manual workload of court personnel.

Until 31 December 2022, only the highest courts were required to publish judgments. From 1 January 2023, a new decree, No. 403/2022 Coll., will come into force, imposing **an obligation on all courts to publish their decisions**.

³⁰ Decree No. 403/2022 Coll. Decree on the publication of court decisions.

³¹ E.g. incorrect file numbers or dates of decisions.

At this time, there is not a single portal through which decisions can be published. Rather, supreme courts maintain their own public online databases on their websites,³² while the decisions of district, regional and supreme courts are published simultaneously on the Ministry's website.³³

4.2. Online information systems

The digital information infrastructure of the Czech judiciary consists of a number of sub-tools that provide various levels of information about the activities of the courts. The Ministry's central portal³⁴ serves as the main hub, alongside which several thematically focused services operate:

- **ePodatelna** allows electronic submissions to be sent, although its technical interface is relatively simple and does not include advanced features that would guide users or check the formal requirements of submissions.
- **InfoDeska**, **InfoSoud**, **InfoJednání** and **InfoData** provide mainly informative content on ongoing proceedings, hearings and statistical data, but these systems are not fully interconnected and some work with limited data.
- **InfoDokument**, which is supposed to provide access to documents in court files, falls short of the expectations of modern digital justice in terms of technology and capacity and does not provide a full-fledged option for viewing files.

The critique of existing online systems can be categorised into two distinct classifications:

- A) **User-friendliness:** A recurrent critique concerns the antiquated visual and technical design of information systems. Some users encounter challenges when navigating these systems, encountering missing navigation elements or experiencing technical failures. A paucity of interactive design exists that would reflect the varying degrees of digital literacy among users.
- B) **Complexity:** here is an absence of a specialized digital platform that provides uniform access to information regarding proceedings,

³² Constitutional Court of the Czech Republic: <https://nalus.usoud.cz/Search/Search.aspx>; Supreme Court of the Czech Republic: <https://rozhodnuti.nsoud.cz/>; Supreme Administrative Court of the Czech Republic: <https://vyhledavac.nssoud.cz/> (the SAC search engine also includes decisions of other administrative courts); a special database of decisions, including the case law of the European Court of Human Rights, is operated by the Office of the Government Plenipotentiary (KVZ): <https://mezisoudy.cz/>.

³³ <https://rozhodnuti.justice.cz/>.

³⁴ <https://msp.gov.cz/en/web/msp/rozcestnik>.

deadlines, available remedies, and relevant forms. A subset of these requirements is addressed by a general "catalogue of life situations." However, this catalogue prioritizes fundamental orientation information over procedural support for users.

A comprehensive evaluation of the justice information systems reveals that, while they are operational and accessible to a certain extent, their functionality does not align with the demands of the digital age or meet European standards. In order to transition towards a contemporary e-Justice system, it will be essential to enhance the technical capabilities of the platforms, as well as to standardize their visual identity, establish a uniform user standard, and fortify technological interoperability between individual systems.

5. Online dispute resolution

Online dispute resolution (ODR) is currently used in the Czech Republic primarily in consumer disputes. The **Czech Trade Inspection Authority (ČOI) plays** a key role here, acting as an entity providing alternative dispute resolution (ADR) for **consumer disputes**, in accordance with Article 4(1)(h) of Directive 2013/11/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council.³⁵ For these purposes, the COI operates **a platform for alternative dispute resolution in e-commerce**.³⁶ However, it should be noted that this platform covers only a narrow segment of civil justice and cannot be considered a general ODR tool. Furthermore, given the legal nature of the COI, which is not a judicial body, the outcome cannot be a legally binding decision, but only a voluntary agreement between the parties.

From the perspective of the judicial agenda, there is an absence of a uniform or systematic platform in the Czech Republic that would enable the execution of proceedings entirely online, encompassing the electronic submission of documents, communication between participants, electronic access to files, and remote issuance of decisions. Additionally, the European ODR platform,³⁷ which was previously used for consumer disputes within the EU, has been terminated,³⁸ further limiting the possibilities for cross-border electronic communication outside the judicial sphere.

The absence of a robust ODR system in the Czech judiciary represents a significant gap, especially given the growing volume of online commercial transactions and the increased demands of citizens and businesses for effective, fast, and low-cost dispute resolution. Among other things, ODR appears to be a suitable tool for handling smaller claims, labor disputes, or family matters, where it is often desirable to reduce personal conflict between the parties. In order to facilitate future development, it is imperative that the Ministry devise a systemic solution that will enable proceedings to be conducted in a fully online environment and meet European standards for digital justice.

³⁵ Directive 2013/11/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 21 May 2013 on alternative dispute resolution for consumer disputes and amending Regulation (EC) No 2006/2004 and Directive 2009/22/EC (Directive on consumer ADR).

³⁶ See Part IV of Act No. 634/1992 Coll., on Consumer Protection (§§ 20n – 2y).

³⁷ https://consumer-redress.ec.europa.eu/site-relocation_en?event=main.home2.show&lng=EN&prefLang=cs.

³⁸ LexGo. *The ODR platform is closing – What businesses need to know*. 6 February 2025. Available online: https://www.lexgo.lu/en/news-and-articles/13994-the-odr-platform-is-closing-what-businesses-need-to-know?utm_source=chatgpt.com.

6. Use of artificial intelligence (AI) in the justice system

6.1. Legal framework

Artificial intelligence is currently regulated primarily by European law. The key **piece of legislation** is **the Artificial Intelligence Act (AI Act)**, which is the first comprehensive and binding legal regulation of this technology. The regulation classifies AI systems used in the judiciary as **high-risk systems**, i.e. **subject to the most stringent requirements**. The definition includes tools that assist judges in interpreting the factual and legal situation or in decision-making (e.g. tools that analyse case files, recommend legal qualifications or propose decisions).

*The AI Act explicitly states that "The use of AI tools can support the decision-making powers of judges or the independence of the judiciary, but should not replace them, as the final decision must continue to be made by a human being. However, the classification of AI systems as high-risk should not apply to AI systems designed for purely auxiliary administrative activities that do not affect the actual administration of justice in individual cases, such as the anonymisation or pseudonymisation of court decisions, documents or data, communication between employees, or administrative tasks."*³⁹

At the national policy level, the issue of AI is still in the early stages of methodological consolidation. The Ministry is preparing an update to its **internal instruction No. 5/2022**, which now also includes **Policy 25 – rules for the use of AI in the justice sector**. This document establishes the fundamental guidelines for the secure utilisation of AI, including the imperative to meticulously verify and validate outcomes, the protocols for handling sensitive data, the restriction of AI implementation to secure environments, and a comprehensive inventory of authorised and proscribed instruments. The aforementioned principles establish a framework that aspires to serve as a uniform methodological basis for the entirety of the justice system.

³⁹ Article 61 of the preamble to the Artificial Intelligence Act.

6.2. Current use of AI in the Czech judiciary

The judicial apparatus of the Czech Republic has already incorporated artificial intelligence into a number of processes, particularly in the domains of administration, text processing, and support for judicial personnel. Presently, artificial intelligence (AI) is employed in the judicial system principally for the following objectives:

- personalisation and configuration of tools without the need for advanced IT knowledge,
- explanation of legal concepts and individual learning assistance,
- support for creativity, idea generation and structured brainstorming,
- editing and creating texts (including stylistic edits, translations and creating email responses),
- analysis and summarisation of extensive texts, creation of diagrams and basic visualisations,
- image content recognition, text extraction and basic visual editing,
- quickly searching for information in available sources,
- anonymisation and pseudo-anonymisation,
- support work in the judiciary not directly related to decision-making.

6.3. Generative and support tools

The most significant progress has been the introduction of **Microsoft 365 Copilot Chat**, which was made available to the entire justice sector at the beginning of 2025 and already had more than 2,800 active users by the summer of 2025.⁴⁰ This tool quickly became the most frequently used AI solution for:

- summarising and explaining texts,
- stylistic editing of documents,
- drafting legal documents,
- creating visual materials, diagrams and presentations,
- brainstorming legal arguments and structuring submissions,
- text analysis or drafting of decision outlines.

The version of Copilot adapted specifically for the needs of the judiciary is a secure tenant that allows the processing of non-public information, with the exception of particularly sensitive information. Nevertheless, it must be

⁴⁰ Miloš Malý. Artificial intelligence in the Czech judiciary - current practice and experience. Contribution to the conference Czech Law and Information Technology 2025. 11 September 2025, Faculty of Law, Masaryk University, Brno.

noted that the implemented security measures also impose certain limitations on the available functionality.

As stated by the Ministry, other language models were also considered during the assessment, but in view of the pre-defined criteria, the Microsoft Copilot artificial intelligence system was purchased. These criteria included:

- compliance with the ISO/IEC 27000 series of security standards, specifically ISO/IEC 27001:2022 (ČSN ISO/IEC 27001:2023), and risk management requirements according to ISO/IEC 27005:2018, as documented in the manufacturer's audit report,
- compliance with legal requirements, in particular Directive (EU) 2022/2555 of the European Parliament and of the Council (NIS2), Act No. 181/2014 Coll., on cyber security, and Act No. 110/2019 Coll., on the processing of personal data,
- economic efficiency resulting from the possibility of use within the existing Microsoft 365 licence, which should minimise additional costs, in accordance with the principle of good governance,
- technical compatibility and native integration with existing Microsoft products, enabling implementation without major infrastructure changes.

The Ministry is currently in the testing phase of the extended features of the Microsoft Copilot system. Concurrently, the Ministry is undertaking a comprehensive evaluation of the potential applications of alternative tools to support legal analysis and automate specific tasks. The development plan encompasses the following elements:

- Pilot projects for **the use of AI in the creation of legal analyses and the processing of large volumes of text.**
- A justice **anonymiser** project, which aims to automatically remove personal data from court decisions in accordance with the GDPR (EU Regulation 2016/679) and the Personal Data Processing Act. This tool is currently in the supplier selection phase based on applications submitted for a public contract (ref. no.: Z2025-041840). Once it has been selected and tested, it will be integrated into the decision publication process.

6.4. Automation of transcriptions, translations and anonymisation

Tools for **transcribing spoken words**, in particular **Newton Dictate** and **BEEY**, are also widely available to the judiciary.

The most widely used AI application for fast and accurate speech recognition and voice-to-text conversion is BEEY, which has also been adapted for the needs of the judiciary, with particular regard to security requirements. The BEEY license was procured from NPO funds for all employees falling under the Ministry and its subordinate organisational units. It is important to acknowledge that the utilisation of applications for transcribing spoken words into written text is not obligatory; it is contingent on the preferences of individual users and the organisational structure of work within specific units. Nevertheless, from the standpoint of the central application administrator, the Ministry has reported a continuous increase in the number of active users and the volume of transcribed audio recordings.⁴¹

The development of automated pseudonymization tools is also underway at the level of the supreme courts, which are creating these tools on their own initiative. For instance, the Supreme Court of the Czech Republic developed a tool for pseudonymizing decisions based on a solution from an external supplier originally intended for the Ministry of Justice. This initiative was meticulously orchestrated in conjunction with the Ministry. Concurrently, the Supreme Court is engaged in independent collaborative efforts with various external entities to develop a range of tools that utilise artificial intelligence.⁴²

With regard to other artificial intelligence systems, such as machine translation tools (e.g., DeepL, eTranslation), these systems are subject to central approval under the ministry's cyber security policy. Presently, Microsoft Copilot stands as the sole authorized platform for engagement with non-public judicial data. According to the Ministry's perspective, the utilization of other generative AI tools on workstations is strictly forbidden, with exemptions being permitted exclusively for the handling of public data upon the basis of individual requests. The utilization of translation tools such as DeepL is generally permissible; however, it is imperative to adhere to the principle that non-public data must not be processed outside the

⁴¹ Request for information submitted by LLP on 8 October 2025; response to the request received from the Ministry of Justice on 23 October 2025.

⁴² Questionnaire with a representative of the Supreme Court of the Czech Republic dated 12 November 2025.

designated approved environment. This principle also extends to machine translation tools, including DeepL and eTranslation.⁴³

6.5. Chatbots

Conversational assistants (chatbots) represent a rapidly evolving domain. The primary objective of conversational assistants is to enhance the accessibility of public services, facilitate user navigation within the Ministry's agendas, and support the internal operational processes of the office. The utilization of chatbots represents a novel development in the Czech judicial context, and the Ministry has already implemented several functional solutions, with plans to expand them further. The subsequent text offers a synopsis of the circumstances as they stood in 2025, and it provides an evaluation of their significance for the contemporary transformation of public administration in the domain of justice.

- The most significant publicly available chatbot is **Justína**,⁴⁴ , the Ministry's digital assistant launched in 2024 as part of the modernisation of the Public Registers Information System (ISVR). Justína's role encompasses several functions, including serving as a guide for users in navigating registry agendas, answering frequently asked questions, assisting in the search for entities, and directing users to relevant forms or submissions. A significant aspect of its functionality involves assisting in the completion of forms, which signifies a tangible advancement in the direction of user-oriented digitization within the judicial system. During its initial operational phase, the chatbot documented over 50,000 interactions, thereby substantiating the considerable demand for automated assistance in registry proceedings.
- For the agenda **of lists of experts, interpreters and translators**,⁴⁵ recently developed a joint virtual assistant **called Otakar**.⁴⁶ This assistant is utilised by both public users and the professional community. The public version of the chatbot provides fundamental information support and guidance on the list of experts and interpreters, while the internal version is intended directly for registered professionals and helps them navigate the non-public

⁴³ *Ibid.*

⁴⁴ New employee at the Ministry of Justice: Chatbot Justína. Available online: <https://msp.gov.cz/en/web/msp/rozcestnik/-/clanek/nov%C3%BD-zam%C4%9Bstnanec-na-ministerstvu-spravedlnosti-chatbot-just%C3%ADna>.

⁴⁵ <https://seznat.justice.cz/>

⁴⁶ Information about the launch of the new chatbot: <https://znalci.justice.cz/informace-o-spusteni-noveho-chatbota/>

parts of the system. Overall, the use of chatbots in the Czech justice system represents a dynamically developing area of digitalisation, with the aim of providing more accessible services to the public and more efficient internal processes.

6.6. Education

A fundamental prerequisite for the conscientious and sustainable implementation of artificial intelligence systems is the systematic education of users in the secure and proper utilisation of these systems. The Ministry of Justice, in collaboration with the Judicial Academy, offers training on the principles of AI, courses on the safe use of AI, training in working with Microsoft systems, and e-learning modules focused on the development of effective prompts.

The Judicial Academy is also in the process of developing a multi-level educational system that includes:

- elementary orientation in AI concepts,
- specialised courses for individual legal professions (judges, assistants, clerks, prosecutors),
- training on deepfake technologies and cybersecurity,
- training on the use of AI in textual and analytical work,
- and, from 2025, advanced training on reasoning models, automatic agents, and data generation and verification.

AI is thus gradually becoming part of the continuous education of judicial staff, similar to word processors and information systems in the past.

6.7. Benefits and added value for the judiciary

The integration of artificial intelligence systems within judicial institutions holds considerable promise for enhancing operational efficiency and improving the quality of outcomes. The most frequently cited benefits include:

- time savings in document preparation and language editing,
- improved text quality, including style consistency and error elimination,
- higher work productivity thanks to the automation of routine tasks,
- faster orientation in extensive texts when preparing for meetings,
- the possibility of immediate feedback and suggestions for alternative lines of argument,
- better availability of information, especially case law and specialist translations.

6.8. Risks and limitations associated with the use of AI

Notwithstanding the proliferation of artificial intelligence, a plethora of salient issues must be methodically addressed, particularly:

- 1) **Security risks:** The judicial environment works with sensitive data, and it is therefore essential to:
 - prevent data leaks into public models,
 - ensure secure storage,
 - filter sensitive information before entering it into AI tools,
 - use tools only in environments with sufficient certification.
- 2) **Risk of "hallucinations" and incorrect outputs:** Generative AI can produce convincing-sounding but factually incorrect information. It remains essential that judicial staff always verify the accuracy of outputs and treat AI outputs as supportive rather than binding.
- 3) **Ethical and legal limits:** The AI Act, ethical principles of judicial work, and constitutional principles limit the use of AI so that it does not interfere with the independence of judges, override their own judgment, or create an unacceptable risk of automating decision-making processes (except in predefined areas).
- 4) **Technical limitations:** The lack of electronic court records also significantly limits the possibilities for using AI, which is most beneficial when working with complete digital data. Until eSpis is introduced, AI will be used more as a supplement than as a systemic part of the work of the courts.

In the coming years, significant advancements are anticipated in the realm of artificial intelligence (AI) within the judicial sector. These developments will be contingent upon the **systematic incorporation of AI into meticulously designed digital initiatives**, encompassing electronic court records, contemporary case law systems, and the electronic justice system. Concurrent with this development, the emergence of secure closed models that facilitate specialised legal data processing is anticipated. Such models may include document classification, file analysis, and decision consistency support. To this end, the Ministry must prioritise the coordination of these activities, the promotion of data standardisation, and the establishment of a reliable financial foundation for digital infrastructure. Concurrently, the strategic objective persists in establishing explicit guidelines for the secure and conscientious utilisation of artificial intelligence throughout the justice system.

7. Increasing digital literacy

Education constitutes a pivotal component in the effective digitisation of the judiciary. The digitisation of court proceedings, electronic files, and the use of artificial intelligence, as well as cross-border judicial cooperation (e.g., e-CODEX), necessitate that representatives and employees of the judiciary possess not only **fundamental information technology skills but also a comprehension of the legal, security, and procedural ramifications of digital transformation**. In addition to the aforementioned enhancement of qualifications in relation to AI, the Ministry endeavours to ensure the continuous improvement of digital literacy through the following measures:

- Induction training for new employees – every new employee undergoes training focused on the use of digital tools, information systems and security standards necessary for the performance of their job role. The content of the training is based on the requirements of Act No. 181/2014 Coll., on cyber security, and the ISO/IEC 27001:2022 framework.
- Periodic cybersecurity training: Regular implementation of "DávejKyber" training in cooperation with the National Cyber and Information Security Agency (NÚKIB). These training courses reflect technological developments, system updates and new requirements for digital competences. The content includes:
 - security principles according to NIS2 (EU Directive 2022/2555),
 - effective data management,
 - digital communication principles.
- Cooperation with the Judicial Academy: specialised training focused on:
 - the use of artificial intelligence tools in accordance with legislation (AI Act, GDPR),
 - principles of responsible use of AI,
 - cyber and information security when working with AI.

8. Main findings

- 1. Persistent absence of electronic court files:** The implementation of electronic filing systems has been marked by a prolonged period of stagnation. Presently, ISIR functionality is exclusively operational for insolvency proceedings, whereas in other agendas, courts predominantly utilise paper files. The aforementioned circumstances have a considerable impact on the efficacy of proceedings, document management, and remote access.
- 2. Electronic filings are possible but complicated:** The procedural rules are characterised by their general nature, ambiguity in certain instances, and the need for continuous refinement through case law. Users are confronted with a series of formal requirements, including the supplementation of originals, the verification of attachments, and the fulfilment of notification obligations imposed by courts.
- 3. Limited availability of case law and inconsistent anonymisation:** While there has been a legal obligation to publish selected lower court decisions since 2023, accessibility is constrained by the fragmentation of online court databases. It is evident that individual courts implement disparate approaches to anonymization.
- 4. Outdated and fragmented technological infrastructure of courts:** The Ministry has long faced insufficient funding and complicated public procurement procedures. The ICT architecture is inconsistent and lacks central planning.
- 5. Access to videoconferencing is increasing but is still limited by legislation:** Videoconferencing is used, but the legal framework still requires physical identity verification on site.
- 6. Artificial intelligence is already being actively used, but there is currently no unified concept for its use in the justice sector:** The Ministry of Justice uses a modified approach to the Copilot language model, and both the Ministry and the courts are working on anonymisers for court decisions.

9. Key issues hindering digitisation:

- the complexity of public administration,
- fragmented ICT and lack of a unified architecture,
- lack of a unified concept for ICT development in the judiciary,
- insufficient funding for digitisation,
- lack of electronic files,
- low quality and accessibility of case law,
- unclear and strict procedural rules for digital operations,
- poor coordination of digitisation projects at the Ministry level,
- slow development and untapped potential of eID and data boxes,
- problems on the part of suppliers.

10. Prospects for future development:

The future of Czech eJustice will depend on the ability to:

- conceptual approach accessibility to digitisation across all courts,
- currently, the completion and launch of the eSPIS electronic file project is key,
- improving the practice of e-filing,
- introducing a uniform methodology for publishing case law,
- interconnecting judicial systems with eGovernment,
- implementation of secure AI elements (assistance systems, not automated decision-making),
- modernising the technical equipment of courts,
- standardising videoconferencing procedures,
- developing ODR in selected agendas,
- adapt accessibility for different levels of IT skills, programme for the inclusion of excluded groups in relation to asserting the right to a fair trial,

11. Key recommendations for improvement

1. **Introduce electronic court files as a central project of the Czech judiciary,**
2. Improve the practice of e-filing,
3. **Modernise procedural rules** — eliminate formalism, standardise conditions for electronic submissions, enable digital evidence proceedings.
4. **Create a unified methodology and database for publishing case law** covering all decisions that are publicly publishable by law.
5. **Improve the quality of anonymisation** — introduce a central anonymisation system with AI support.
6. **Introduce remote identity verification using eID** for video conferencing, online meetings and access to documents.
7. **Connect** judicial systems with eGovernment.
8. **Strengthen the role and competences of the Ministry's ICT department** or create a specialised central agency for IT in the judiciary.
9. **Consolidate the standardisation of digital processes** across courts,
10. **Invest in digital education** for judges, officials, lawyers and other professional groups.
11. **Develop the use of AI in three areas:**
 - anonymisation,
 - transcription of proceedings,
 - document organisation and text mining,
 - administrative tasks,
12. **Develop ODR** in selected agendas,
13. **Adapt accessibility for different levels of IT skills**, programme for the inclusion of excluded groups in relation to the enforcement of the right to a fair trial,
14. **Cooperate with the authorities of the European Union and the Council of Europe, as well as with the national courts of Member States**, in preparing and improving digitisation processes,
15. **Modernise the technical equipment of courts.**

12. Conclusion

The digitization of the Czech justice system has been characterized by a persistent tension between ambitious initial objectives and the system's actual capacities. The analysis demonstrates that digital transformation is not merely a technical problem; rather, it is a complex institutional process whose success depends on good governance, a clear vision and architecture, and the ability to coordinate change across the entire department. The persistent absence of electronic court files is indicative of a more profound systemic issue: a combination of technological debt, fragmented competencies, complex public procurement procedures, and inadequate ICT governance, which collectively impedes modernization in numerous pivotal domains. These structural deficiencies result in the failure of numerous digitization projects to attain the anticipated impact, despite their technical feasibility. Electronic submissions encounter procedural formalism, videoconferencing encounters legislative barriers, and access to case law encounters inconsistent anonymization and a lack of standardised data. Similarly, artificial intelligence tools demonstrate considerable potential; however, their broader integration remains constrained by a paucity of coordination. The result is an environment in which individual innovations exist but are unable to create a functional digital ecosystem.

European legislation has introduced a new dynamic of mandatory digitization that has presented a significant challenge to the Czech judiciary. These regulations establish a framework and establish binding deadlines and standards for interoperable communication, electronic delivery, videoconferencing, and data management. The fulfilment of these requirements necessitates the completion of the electronic court file, the establishment of a stable ICT architecture, and the enhancement of competencies in the domains of cybersecurity, project management, and data governance. In practice, European regulations function as a catalyst that has the potential to expedite the resolution of long-term systemic deficits — or, conversely, exacerbate existing problems if there is an absence of fundamental institutional coordination.

The findings of this report confirm that digitisation exerts a direct impact on the efficiency and speed of court proceedings, as well as on citizens' access to judicial protection, the quality of decision-making, and public confidence in the rule of law. This trend is further substantiated by Eurobarometer 2025, which indicates that 79% of Czech citizens advocate for the digitisation of public services, while 42% express reservations regarding the safeguarding

of digital rights. This combination of high expectations and growing perception of risks demonstrates that the modernisation of the judiciary must be accompanied not only by technological development, but also by strengthened legal, security, and ethical guarantees for digital interaction between the state and its citizens. The fragmentation of online communication, the variation in anonymisation standards, the incapacity to remotely view files, and the inconsistent publication of decisions have the potential to engender inequitable conditions for individual users. In a similar vein, the presence of disparate levels of digital competence among different professions indicates that the implementation of digitisation products should be accompanied by systematic educational initiatives and comprehensive support systems.

In conclusion, it can be posited that the Czech judiciary possesses the capacity for modernisation. The judiciary is endowed with a cadre of experts, a growing aptitude for digital technologies, and ongoing initiatives in the domain of artificial intelligence. However, for digitisation to reach its true potential, it must be regarded as an integral reform, rather than a series of isolated technological initiatives. It is imperative to integrate legislative changes, ICT architecture, data standards, security requirements, and organisational processes into a cohesive, functional entity. The completion of electronic court files, the stabilisation of ICT governance, the implementation of European standards, and the unification of digital services across courts will play a central role in this process.

The digitisation of the justice system is, therefore, at a critical juncture that will determine its efficacy in the ensuing decades. The efficacy of this initiative will be determined not by the breadth of strategies employed, but rather by the extent to which the contemporary digital landscape becomes an integral and dependable component of the administration of justice. This digital infrastructure should be universally accessible to all citizens, comprehensible to professionals, and conducive to enhanced decision-making quality.