



PASTE IN HASTE:

The ARDC's Guide to Preventing AI Misuse in Court Filings

By Mary F. Andreoni

This article explores why AI hallucinations and misattributions happen and how to avoid them in legal work. It also highlights the ARDC's October 2025 release of *The Illinois Attorney's Guide to Implementing AI*, a timely resource to help Illinois lawyers better understand and use AI ethically and effectively in their law practice. The *Guide* is a must-read for any legal professional looking to use AI wisely—and ethically. To download a copy, go to the ARDC website (www.iardc.org).

AI False Citation Fallout

AI misuse in court filings continues despite courts' issuance of standing orders and local rules to prevent and punish it. Bar associations have issued advisory opinions, including the American Bar Association (*see* ABA Formal Opinion 512 *Generative Artificial Intelligence Tools*, July 29, 2024), and the Illinois Supreme Court adopted one of the first detailed, judiciary-wide AI policies in the country. Relying on AI to draft motions or briefs without rigorously fact-checking the output now risks more than embarrassment, as courts no longer treat AI misuse as an isolated mistake but as raising very real questions about a lawyer's competency and candor.

The consequences are also becoming more severe, ranging from monetary sanctions to case dismissal and referrals to disciplinary authorities. That shift is clear in the first published Illinois appellate decision sanctioning a lawyer for submitting

AI-generated fictitious cases. *In re Baby Boy*, 2025 IL App (4th) 241427. The court stressed that although AI use is permitted, lawyers remain fully responsible for its accuracy. Citing the Illinois Supreme Court's new AI Policy and Rules of Professional Conduct 1.1, 3.1, 3.3, and 8.4(c), the court held that relying on AI-generated citations without verification violates these duties. Even absent an intent to deceive, intentionally generating briefs with AI and intentionally failing to check the citations before filing can constitute sanctionable misconduct.

“Relying on AI to draft motions or briefs without rigorously fact-checking the output now risks more than embarrassment, as courts no longer treat AI misuse as an isolated mistake but as raising very real questions about a lawyer's competency and candor.”

Recent cases show how far courts will go to hold lawyers accountable. In one, a federal judge ordered a lawyer to read every case cited in the court's opinion and submit summaries within 30 days. In another, the court imposed monetary sanctions, issued a disciplinary referral, and required the lawyer to provide the 18-page sanction order to every judge presiding over the lawyer's cases for the next year.

Long before AI arrived, we all learned in law school to track the history and treatment of each case cited to ensure that the case that we were relying on was still "good law." Legal research fundamentals haven't changed, only the tools have. In a profession that requires precision and accuracy, a modern twist on an old proverb applies—paste in haste, repent at leisure. Even judges aren't immune: two federal judges recently withdrew rulings after acknowledging that their staff used AI tools that produced fabricated citations.

The year 2023 brought a pivotal moment in legal tech history. The first widely reported case of a lawyer sanctioned for citing fake AI-generated case law was *Mata v. Avianca, Inc.*, 678 F.Supp.3d 443 (S.D.N.Y. 2023). But rather than standing as a cautionary tale, the number of cases since *Mata* has only increased (see the global database that catalogs AI hallucinations in court cases, AI Hallucination Cases, <https://www.damiencharlotin.com/hallucinations>, maintained by French lawyer and data scientist Damien Charlotin).

While most cases so far have involved court-imposed sanctions, it was only a matter of time before the disciplinary authorities became involved. Recently, the Massachusetts Board of Bar Overseers publicly reprimanded a lawyer for submitting court pleadings containing fictitious case citations generated by an AI tool. This was in addition to the \$2,000 fine previously imposed in the related civil matter.

Why AI Hallucinations Happen

Despite growing awareness and stricter court response, many lawyers continue

to fall into the trap of misusing generative AI. Avoiding these pitfalls begins with understanding how these tools work before applying them in practice.

Generative AI is only as reliable as the data it was trained on and the clarity of the prompt it receives. If the training data is outdated, biased, or incomplete, or if the system misinterprets the user's intent, the output can be misleading or outright false.

To understand why these hallucinations happen, it helps to know how AI "thinks." AI doesn't possess factual knowledge in the traditional sense. It's trained to predict the next word based on patterns in massive datasets. That means it may invent citations or details that sound plausible but are entirely fabricated. Also, AI rarely admits uncertainty. Instead of saying "I don't know," it will typically generate an answer even if that answer is wrong. Finally, because these systems are built on data that may be biased, incomplete, or outdated, especially in a constantly changing area such as the law, AI's outputs can reflect those flaws.

New ARDC Guide to Using Generative AI

The ARDC released *The Illinois Attorney's Guide to Implementing AI* (Oct. 2025), a practical resource for navigating the ethical use of AI in legal work. While tailored for solo and small firm lawyers, its insights apply to any lawyer or judge who is using, or considering using, AI in their legal work.

The *Guide* aligns with the Illinois Supreme Court's Policy on Artificial Intelligence, which permits AI use as long as lawyers uphold existing professional responsibilities. The Court's policy sets the foundation; the *Guide* focuses on how to integrate AI tools safely and ethically into legal practice. It explains how generative AI systems operate and presents a practical framework for assessing their appropriate use.

The framework centers on three essential steps:

1. **Classifying the information being handled.** The *Guide* defines four categories of information sensitivity, from

general (nonconfidential data entirely unrelated to any client matter) to sensitive personal data (financial, health, and other legally protected information).

2. **Assessing the AI tool's security level.**

The *Guide* categorizes AI tools into four security levels based on eight AI safeguards, from public (minimal to no data protection); consumer-grade (some protection from basic controls like opt-outs from model training); business-class (stronger safeguards, though may lack advanced administrative features); and enterprise (highest protection across all safeguards). The *Guide* also includes detailed explanations and checklists to help lawyers classify virtually any AI tool they are likely to encounter.

3. **Aligning data sensitivity with tool security.** The *Guide* includes a decision matrix that helps lawyers match the level of data sensitivity with the appropriate AI tool. Confidential data should never be processed using public AI tools, even with client consent. Business-class or enterprise tools may be acceptable if clients are informed and can opt out.

To support implementation, the *Guide* also offers a Practice Resource Kit with checklists, sample policies, and communication strategies to help lawyers explain AI use to clients transparently.

Best Practices for Verifying AI-produced Citations

Whether you're using AI to brainstorm arguments or to draft entire briefs, every cited authority must be real, relevant, and accurately represented.

The following nine best practices can help ensure your AI-assisted citations are court-ready, ethically sound, and professionally defensible:

- **Cross-check with trusted legal databases:** Always verify citations using authoritative sources such as Westlaw, LexisNexis, Bloomberg Law, or PACER. If a case or statute doesn't appear in these databases, it likely doesn't exist.

- **Use citation-verification tools:** Tools such as Westlaw's CoCounsel, Lexis+ AI's Protégé, vLex/Clio's Vincent, or Bloomberg Law's Brief Analyzer are designed to flag hallucinated citations and link to verified sources.
- **Read the full text of the case:** Don't rely on summaries or quoted excerpts alone. Review the full judicial opinion to confirm the quote is accurate, the content supports your argument, and the case is still good law.
- **Verify every citation individually:** Even if the first few AI-generated citations check out, verify *every* one individually.
- **Keep a verification log:** Maintain a concise record of where and how each citation was verified. This documentation can be critical if opposing counsel or the court challenge your sources.
- **Stay current on court rules:** Review local rules and standing orders before submitting AI-assisted documents. For example, many courts now require disclosure of AI use in filings or mandate verification of all cited authorities.
- **Educate your team:** Establish clear protocols for verification before filing any AI-assisted work. Ensure that paralegals, clerks, and associates understand the risks of AI-generated citations.
- **Keep up with ethical guidance:** The legal profession is evolving rapidly in response to AI. The ARDC's *Guide* offers a framework for responsible use, including recommendations on disclosure, verification, and client communication.
- **Practice using AI.** The best way to understand how AI works is to interact with it regularly. Ask AI questions you already know the answers to. Test its limits with simple, silly, complex, or even philosophical prompts. The more you experiment, the better you'll grasp its strengths and its weaknesses.

The bottom line is to treat AI output like a first draft from a junior associate or law clerk—potentially useful but never ready for submission until you've personally verified every fact, quote, and citation.

Ethical Considerations in Using AI in Court Filings

Using AI in legal work isn't just a matter of efficiency; it also requires careful attention to the ethical responsibilities set out in the Illinois Rules of Professional Conduct.

The duty of competence (Rule 1.1) requires lawyers to understand how AI tools function, including their limitations and potential for error. The duty of candor (Rule 3.3) obligates lawyers to personally verify that every cited authority exists, is accurate, and supports the intended argument.

The duty of supervision (Rules 5.1 and 5.3) requires senior lawyers to ensure that staff and subordinate lawyers using AI tools are doing so ethically and responsibly. And the duty to make meritorious claims (Rule 3.1) requires lawyers to conduct a reasonable inquiry that what is being filed has a good-faith basis in law and fact.

At the end of the day, lawyers are still accountable for the work they submit. AI may assist with drafting or research, but it doesn't absolve a lawyer of their professional obligations.

Long-term Risks of Overreliance on AI

Overreliance on AI in legal practice can pose some serious long-term risks. One of the most concerning is the creation of fictitious case law. When AI tools generate briefs with fabricated citations, those errors can slip into the legal record, potentially influencing future rulings and undermining the judicial system's integrity.

Another growing issue is the rise of "workslop" or "AI slop"—AI-generated content that looks polished but lacks substance. These outputs often require human intervention to correct, refine, or completely redo, wasting time instead of saving it, and resulting in low-quality work product.

Poorly generated legal documents can also harm clients. Inaccuracies or omissions introduced by AI may lead to unfavorable rulings, procedural errors, or even sanctions.

Finally, as more self-represented litigants turn for help to general (nonlegal-specific) AI tools that may generate accurate-sounding but erroneous output, courts can face added strain managing flawed filings, thereby complicating case resolution and stretching already limited resources.

AI as Tool, not Master

From lawyers and self-represented litigants to judges, overreliance on AI and a lack of scrutiny around its outputs are leading to consequences that go far beyond a single brief or sanction. The legal system depends on accuracy, precedent, and trust. When AI-generated content undermines those pillars, it threatens the integrity of the justice process itself.

The path forward isn't to reject AI but to use it wisely. As AI becomes more integrated into how lawyers write, research, and create, it's essential to remember that the lawyer, not AI, is responsible for understanding the client's objectives, advocating for their best interests, and making ethical decisions.

One of the most iconic lines from the original *Star Trek* series came from Mr. Spock, the embodiment of logic, in an episode where a computer designed to replace the ship's crew goes rogue and seizes control of the *Enterprise*: "Computers make excellent and efficient servants, but I have no wish to serve under them." That episode is as relevant today as it was when it first aired in 1968. AI can assist and occasionally inspire, but no matter how efficient or precise these programs become, they must remain tools of human will, not masters of it. ■



Mary F. Andreoni is the Ethics Education Senior Counsel for the Illinois Attorney Registration and Disciplinary Commission.