

# Who Writes the Judgment—and Who Cares?

## Public Assessments of the Advantages and Challenges in LLM-Assisted Judgment Writing

Yixiao Wen<sup>1</sup>, Sinong Lu<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Shanghai University, Faculty of law <sup>2</sup>University of Macau, Faculty of Science and Technology

<sup>1</sup>rie004x@gmail.com <sup>2</sup>lsn001102@gmail.com



### Introduction

**Trend:** Courts have begun experimenting with LLM-assisted systems to generate judicial opinions, a core stage of Judicial Decision-Making (JDM).  
**Concern:** This shift challenges the judicial duty to state reasons in theory and has sparked emerging empirical research on the implications of LLM involvement in JDM.  
**Gap:** However, it remains empirically unclear whether the public trusts judicial judgments generated with LLM assistance.

### Research Question

**RQ:** How do people assess the advantages and challenges of LLM involvement in judgment writing?

### Method

**Interviews:** 7 semi-structured interviews with adults possessing experience in legal proceedings, judgment reading, and LLM-based legal content generation.

### Findings

Table 1: Summary of perceived advantages and challenges of LLM-generated judicial opinions across four evaluation dimensions.

Dimension	Advantages	Challenges
Fairness	Impartial Reasoning Unaffected by Personal Emotions Enriched Reasoning Inspired by LLM-Provided Information	Fairness Risks from Inconsistent or Biased Training Data
Factual Accuracy		Inaccurate Facts Caused by Hallucinations Case-mixing and unreliable citations
Professional Form	More Rigorous and Formal Legal Language	Limitations in Meeting Legal Form Requirements

### Discussion

- 1.Factors shaping public perceptions of LLM-Generated Judicial Opinions: Conceptualization of LLMs/Experience with Output Quality/Variance in Legal Expertise
- 2.The Unique Nature of Judicial Opinions and the Distinct Challenges Faced by LLMs: a)Significantly higher sensitivity regarding fairness due to its tight connection with individual rights and interests; b)A specialized demand for both high levels of domain-specific legal expertise and broad accessibility for diverse users.
- 3.Design Implications: a)Transparent and Curated Data Inclusion Mechanisms; b)Scenario-Specific Model Design

### Conclusion & Future Work

This study offers an initial understanding of how people assess LLM involvement in judgment writing. Future work should pursue empirical co-design efforts to ensure judicial LLM fairness and accuracy, integrating scenario specific models, optimized workflows, and intuitive interfaces.