

PRACTICE GUIDANCE ON THE USE OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE

Introduction

1. This Practice Guidance (the ‘**Guidance**’) should be read together with Practice Direction No. 2 of 2026 on the Use of Artificial Intelligence (the ‘**Practice Direction**’). Unless the context otherwise requires, any reference in this Guidance to the QFC Civil and Commercial Court (the ‘**Court**’) shall be deemed to apply to the Regulatory Tribunal (the ‘**RT**’) equally. This Guidance applies to litigants, their legal representatives, and any legal practitioners who appear in the QFC Court and the RT (‘**Court Users**’).
2. The purpose of this document is to provide guidance on the use of artificial intelligence (or ‘**AI**’) by Court Users, ensuring that the integrity of proceedings is maintained, and that professional and ethical obligations are adhered to when using tools such as ChatGPT and similar AI systems, as well as those that are specifically designed for use in the legal context. The use of artificial intelligence is to be welcomed in litigation in the QFC Court and RT with its potential to reduce cost and promote greater effectiveness¹. For example, AI can be a valuable aid in legal research, drafting, and document organisation, but there are internationally recognised risks, including the generation of false or misleading content (‘hallucinations’), errors in citations, and inadvertent disclosure of confidential information.
3. Following this Guidance will assist Court Users in mitigating these risks and maintaining professional standards.
4. Nothing in this Guidance alters, diminishes, or replaces a Court User’s existing ethical, professional, or legal duties. All such duties continue to apply in full when using AI. Court Users remain individually responsible for any content submitted to the Court or the RT.

Professional and ethical obligations

5. Court Users must be mindful that their existing professional and ethical responsibilities remain paramount when using AI. In particular:
 - i. Court Users are responsible for ensuring the accuracy and reliability of all submissions, including any content generated with the assistance of AI.

¹ *Jonathan David Sheppard v Jillion LLC* [2025] QIC (E) 3, paragraph 19.

- ii. It is a breach of professional duty to mislead the Court or to submit material containing fabricated, unverifiable, or improperly attributed legal citations.
- iii. Use of AI does not diminish these obligations, and reliance on AI outputs must always be accompanied by independent verification.
- iv. Court Users should maintain clear records of how they have verified AI-generated content, and be prepared to explain their verification process if challenged.

Understanding AI's limitations

- 6. Court Users should understand that AI tools generate responses based on patterns in existing data, rather than authoritative legal reasoning. Plausible-sounding responses do not guarantee accuracy. AI-generated content may:
 - i. Misstate the law, including jurisdiction-specific rules.
 - ii. Suggest incorrect or fictitious case law or legislation.
 - iii. Generate irrelevant foreign legal principles.
- 7. As is internationally recognised, the risk of hallucinations and mistakes makes independent verification essential. Court Users must critically assess every AI-generated statement or citation before relying on it in any submission to the Court.
- 8. Court Users should treat AI-generated content as a starting point, not as a definitive source. Always cross-check citations against primary sources or recognised legal databases.

Confidentiality and data protection

- 9. Court Users must take particular care to avoid entering confidential, privileged, or protected information into AI tools that store or transmit data externally. The Practice Direction allows limited use of private, secure AI platforms within authorised systems, where confidential information remains protected.
- 10. Court Users are encouraged to:
 - i. Disable chat histories or other tracking features where possible.
 - ii. Use encryption or secure internal platforms if AI assistance is required for sensitive material.
 - iii. Never input confidential client data or Court evidence into public-facing AI tools.

Accuracy and accountability

11. In many jurisdictions, including the QFC Court and RT, submissions containing fictitious or unverified material generated by AI have been strongly criticised, and in some cases disregarded. Court Users must:

- i. Review and verify the factual and legal accuracy of all AI-assisted work.
- ii. Check all citations against primary sources or recognised databases.
- iii. Not use AI to generate evidence or fabricate statements.

Disclosure of AI use

12. Transparency is encouraged when AI has contributed to any document placed before the Court or RT. Although the Practice Direction states that pre-emptive declaration is not required unless requested by the Court:

- i. Court Users should be prepared to identify which parts, if any, of their documents were generated or assisted by AI.
- ii. They should explain how AI outputs were verified to ensure accuracy and compliance with professional obligations.
- iii. If disagreements arise regarding disclosure, these should be addressed with the Court or RT promptly.

Lord Thomas of Cwmgiedd

President of the Qatar International Court

Sir William Blair

Chairman of the Qatar Financial Centre Regulatory Tribunal

6 January 2026