



SUPERIOR COURT OF QUÉBEC

Artificial Intelligence

Pilot Project

Summary of Results

A Pioneering Project in the Judicial Sector

The Superior Court of Québec is the province's court of original general jurisdiction. Its judges handle thousands of civil, family, commercial, and criminal cases every year. As in many other sectors, generative artificial intelligence (AI) opens new possibilities for supporting this voluminous preparatory work.

As early as 2024, judges expressed interest in these tools, several already using them personally, without institutional oversight. Rather than letting this use evolve in an unstructured way, the Court chose to act: to create, itself, the conditions for experimenting with AI in a rigorous, secure, and supervised manner.

The pilot project ran from December 8, 2025, to March 16, 2026 — 98 days. It involved 22 volunteer judges, selected to be as representative as possible of the Court's diversity: areas of law, regions, and levels of technological comfort.

What exactly was this project?

Intelligent assistants were made available to 22 Superior Court judges to help them with their preparatory tasks: revising a text, translating it, finding a statutory provision, correcting a legal citation, or obtaining technical support. These tools were not authorized to draft judgments or to interpret the law. Decision-making remained entirely in the judge's hands.

How Did the Project Work?

Specialized agents, not a general-purpose tool

Nine distinct AI agents were deployed, each designed for a specific type of task. Rather than a single tool that does everything, this modular approach makes it easier to control what the AI can and cannot do in each context.

Agent	What it does
Writing Assistant	Revision, reformulation, and improvement of texts
Translator	French-English translation of legal passages
Civil Code of Québec AI	Searching for and locating provisions of the Civil Code
Code of Civil Procedure AI	Research into the rules of civil procedure
Criminal Code AI	Research in the Criminal Code
Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act AI	Research in insolvency law
Citation Agent	Verification and formatting of legal citations
IT Technician AI	Support for issues with digital tools
Blue Book 2.0	Consultation of the internal family law compendium

A secure and supervised environment

The agents were deployed in the Microsoft 365 environment of the Ministère de la Justice du Québec, validated by cybersecurity experts. Each judge fed their agent manually by submitting excerpts or questions: the agents had no automatic access to any file. Conversations were not shared between users, and the agents could neither browse the web nor draw on unvalidated sources.

Throughout the project, the participating judges met weekly to share their experiences, discover new uses, and receive training on the risks associated with AI. This weekly support is, to our knowledge, a distinctive feature of this project compared with other similar initiatives in the public sector.

Results at a Glance

The Court gathered results through three channels: surveys administered to the judges (baseline, two-month evaluation, and final survey), automatic platform data (number of sessions, usage rates), and a structured evaluation of the quality of agent responses using 90 synthetic questions prepared internally.

Adoption: the numbers speak for themselves

893 total usage sessions	479 sessions for the Writing Assistant alone	94% average engagement rate on the platform
84% consider AI compatible with the judicial function	89% wish to continue using these tools	63% recommend a broader deployment

What judges used most

The most-used agents were the Writing Assistant (used by 100% of respondents), the Translator (71%), the legal research agents (53%), and the family law Blue Book (41%). Judges also discovered unanticipated uses: transcribing digitized handwritten notes, converting a text into a presentation, or generating summary tables with references. These discoveries emerged through the weekly meetings.

Response quality

The 90 structured evaluations reveal generally high results, with nuances across agents. The writing and translation agents obtained the best scores (9.3 to 9.8 out of 10). The legal research agents ranged between 7.8 and 9.0 out of 10, with greater variability for the Criminal Code, whose questions are often more complex. The evaluation also detected a hallucination in the Citation Agent, which confirms the importance of always verifying AI responses.

What the judges thought

The final survey (respondents: 19 of 22 judges) paints a positive but nuanced picture. The vast majority of participants felt that the tools helped them without undermining their independence. The limitations identified, notably the risk of errors and the need to always verify responses, are well understood and perceived as manageable.

- 89% felt that the agents' limitations were understandable and manageable
- 84% state that their professional autonomy was preserved
- 79% would like the project to be expanded in some form
- No judge reports that AI influenced a judicial decision

An unexpected finding

Judges who received access later in the project (Group C) achieved results nearly identical to those of the group with access from the start (Group A). By contrast, judges whose access was withdrawn partway through (Group B) had a markedly less positive experience. The lesson: continuity of access matters, not when it begins.

What This Project Taught Us

AI can help judges, under conditions

The results demonstrate that AI tools can be integrated into judicial work without compromising judges' independence or impartiality, provided strict rules are followed: specialized rather than general-purpose agents, a secure technological environment, adequate training, and systematic verification of responses.

Trust is built through governance, not enthusiasm

The fact that judges were using these tools in a controlled institutional environment was repeatedly cited as a decisive advantage over general-public commercial tools. This confirms the importance of institutional AI governance rather than unstructured individual adoption.

AI agents are “living” tools

Mid-project, an update to the Microsoft platform changed the agents' behaviour, forcing the team to retest everything before continuing. AI agents are not static resources: they evolve, and their maintenance requires dedicated human resources and the capacity to intervene quickly.

Support makes the difference

The most interesting uses were discovered collectively, over the course of the weekly meetings. Without this space for sharing, many possibilities would have remained unexplored. For any similar project, providing structured support is not a luxury: it is a condition of success.

What about confidentiality?

Protecting judicial information was at the heart of the project's design. Judges received clear directives instructing them never to submit confidential information to the agents. Conversations are private, accessible neither to the Court's leadership nor to the Ministère de la Justice. Despite these measures, it was not possible to guarantee one hundred percent that the data would remain on Canadian soil: this limitation was communicated explicitly to participants.

What Comes Next?

The results of this pilot project provide a solid basis for guiding institutional decisions on AI. The Court sets out several directions for the next steps:

- Make the most-used agents permanent and improve them continuously, taking judges' feedback into account
- Develop dedicated internal technical expertise in AI, in order to reduce dependence on outside partners and properly support judges, in keeping with judicial independence
- Update the governance framework to define precisely which uses are permitted and prohibited
- Share the lessons of this project with other interested courts in Canada
- Assess the possibility of a broader deployment, to all judges of the Court

Closing Remarks

This project demonstrates that it is possible to introduce artificial intelligence into a judicial institution in a serious, prudent, and supervised manner. The goal was not to replace judges' judgment, but to offer them better tools for the tasks that precede the decision. The results are encouraging, and the lessons learned will make it possible to go further, with even greater rigour.

The Court extends its warm thanks to the 22 judges who agreed to take part in this experience, to Mtre Guillaume Bourgeois, Executive Legal Officer to the Office of the Chief Justice, who initiated and coordinated the project, and to the CINTIA unit of the Ministère de la Justice du Québec for its support throughout the project.

[Read our AI Governance Framework](#)

coursuperieuredubec.ca

[Read the full AI Pilot Project report](#)

coursuperieuredubec.ca