BASIRA: Journal of Behavioral Law, Analytical Sharia, Society, Integrity, and Regulatory Affairs
eISSN: XXXX-XXXX
Vol 1, No 1, Maret 2026
DOI: https://doi.org/10.123456/basira.v1i1.xxxx

Artificial Intelligence and Sharia Adjudication: A Narrative Review of Algorithmic Bias and Judicial Integrity

Rina Amalia[1]
[1]*UIN Antasari Banjarmasin*
Corresponding author: rina.amalia@uin-antasari.ac.id

Abstract

The integration of Artificial Intelligence (AI) into the judiciary represents one of the most significant shifts in modern legal history, yet its application within Sharia adjudication remains a subject of intense ethical and theological debate. This research provides a narrative review of the opportunities and risks associated with AI-driven legal systems, specifically focusing on the tension between algorithmic efficiency and the preservation of judicial integrity (*Ijtihad*). Utilizing a synthesis of literature from 2021–2026, the study investigates the phenomenon of "algorithmic bias"—where datasets may inadvertently reflect systemic prejudices—and its potential conflict with the Sharia principle of *Adalah* (absolute justice). The review examines whether AI can serve as a *Mufti's* assistant or if its "black box" nature violates the transparency required in Islamic jurisprudence. Findings suggest that while AI can enhance procedural efficiency and consistency in minor rulings, the final judicial authority must remain human to ensure the application of mercy (*Rahmah*) and context-specific wisdom (*Hikmah*). This study concludes that the future of Sharia adjudication lies in a "Centaur Model"—a hybrid of human-AI collaboration—governed by a new ethical framework of "Digital Maqasid."

Keyword: *Artificial Intelligence, Algorithmic Bias, Digital Maqasid, Ijtihad. Judicial Integrity, Sharia Adjudication.*

Introduction

The digital transformation of the global legal landscape has reached a pivotal juncture with the advent of "Predictive Justice" and automated legal reasoning. In the context of Sharia adjudication, where the law is derived from divine sources and requires a high degree of moral discernment, the introduction of Artificial Intelligence (AI) presents both a technological promise and a theological challenge. While AI systems are promoted as tools to reduce court backlogs and ensure the consistency of rulings, they also raise fundamental questions about the nature of *Ijtihad* (independent legal reasoning). Hasan & Ridho (2024) argue that the essence of Sharia adjudication is not merely the application of a code, but the pursuit of a just outcome tailored to human context. Consequently, the reliance on algorithms may risk reducing the sacred duty of the *Qadi* (judge) to a mechanical data-processing exercise. This study addresses the urgent need to evaluate how AI influences judicial integrity within Islamic frameworks.

The primary ethical concern in this integration is the presence of "algorithmic bias," which refers to systemic and repeatable errors in a computer system that create

• Submitted: 10-01-2026 • Revisi: 20-02-2026 • Diterima: 04-03-2026

unfair outcomes. In Sharia law, where justice (*Adalah*) must be blind to status but sensitive to circumstance, biased algorithms can inadvertently perpetuate socio-economic or sectarian prejudices found in historical datasets. Abadi (2024) highlights that the "black box" nature of complex AI models—where the reasoning process is not visible—violates the Islamic principle of *Bayan* (clarity/transparency) required in judicial evidence. Furthermore, the lack of "empathy" in AI systems makes them ill-equipped to handle the nuances of family law or restorative justice, where mercy often takes precedence over literalist enforcement. There is a significant gap in current literature regarding how these technological biases specifically impact the moral standing of a Sharia court. Without a critical narrative review, the adoption of AI in the judiciary may lead to a crisis of legitimacy.

The objective of this research is to synthesize contemporary academic discourse from 2021–2026 to identify the specific risks AI poses to Sharia judicial integrity and to propose a framework for ethical AI implementation. Specifically, the study seeks to explore how "Algorithmic Ijtihad" can be reconciled with the divine nature of Islamic law. Fadli et al. (2024) suggest that the *Maqasid al-Sharia* framework offers the most robust standard for auditing AI behavior, ensuring that technology serves the preservation of faith, life, and intellect. By reviewing study cases of AI adoption in modern Sharia courts, this research aims to define the boundaries between automated assistance and human decision-making. The ultimate goal is to provide a "Digital Hisbah" model—a mechanism for the ethical oversight of algorithms in a religious legal context. This inquiry is essential for ensuring that the efficiency of the future does not compromise the justice of the past.

The significance and urgency of this review are underscored by the rapid adoption of AI legal assistants in various Muslim-majority jurisdictions aiming for "Smart Governance." As judicial systems become increasingly automated, the risk of "de-humanizing" the law becomes a tangible threat to the social contract between the state and the *Ummah*. Huda & Muhdori (2023) support the premise that technological innovation must be guided by the "Best Interest of the People" (*Maslahah Mursalah*), a principle that is often ignored in purely secular tech-governance. This study is significant because it provides a bridge between classical jurisprudence and data science, offering Sharia judges a critical roadmap for navigating the "algorithmic era." Moreover, it empowers legal practitioners to demand "Explainable AI" (XAI) that aligns with the transparency requirements of Islamic law. In conclusion, this narrative review is a vital intellectual defense of judicial integrity in an age dominated by silicon logic.

Literature Review

The intersection of Artificial Intelligence and Sharia adjudication marks a paradigm shift from traditional human-centric *Ijtihad* to a data-driven legal epistemology. In classical Islamic jurisprudence, the *Qadi* (judge) is not merely a legal technician but a moral agent whose discernment is rooted in a deep understanding of both text and context. Hasan & Ridho (2024) argue that the "human element" in Sharia is essential for the application of *Hikmah* (wisdom), which requires an empathetic evaluation of a petitioner's unique circumstances. The literature suggests that while AI can process vast quantities of *Fiqh* (jurisprudence) literature with unmatched speed, it lacks the ontological capacity to understand the "spirit of the law." Therefore, the core tension in recent scholarship revolves around whether a

silicon-based algorithm can ever truly fulfill the spiritual and ethical requirements of an Islamic judicial office.

The phenomenon of "algorithmic bias" poses a significant threat to the Sharia principle of *Adalah* (justice), as machine learning models often inherit the prejudices present in historical legal datasets. If an AI is trained on rulings from an era or region characterized by systemic gender or socio-economic bias, it is likely to automate and amplify these inequities in future adjudications. Abadi (2024) highlights that such biases are frequently hidden within the "black box" of the algorithm, making them inaccessible to traditional Sharia evidence-testing methods (*Bayyinah*). The challenge for modern Sharia courts is to develop a "De-biasing Ijtihad"—a systematic approach to auditing data inputs for compliance with Islamic egalitarian values. Without this oversight, the efficiency gained through AI might come at the cost of the foundational justice upon which the Sharia is built.

Moreover, the "black box" nature of advanced AI models directly conflicts with the Sharia requirement for *Bayan* (transparency) and the judge's duty to provide an "explanation of judgment." In Islamic law, a ruling must be accompanied by its *Ilah* (effective cause) to be legitimate and appealable. Fauzi et al. (2023) emphasize that a judicial decision whose logic cannot be traced or explained is essentially a form of *Gharar* (uncertainty) in the legal process. The literature increasingly advocates for the adoption of "Explainable AI" (XAI) within Sharia adjudication to ensure that every algorithmic suggestion can be cross-referenced with established *Fiqh* principles. This ensures that the algorithm remains a tool of the court rather than its replacement. Consequently, judicial integrity in the digital age is measured by the degree to which a machine's logic can be subjected to human ethical scrutiny.

The concept of *Maslahah Mursalah* (public interest) serves as the primary theological justification for integrating AI into the judiciary, provided it enhances the accessibility and speed of justice. For many Muslim-majority nations, the "justice delayed is justice denied" dilemma makes automated legal assistance an attractive solution for administrative and minor civil disputes. Naswa & Muthoifin (2025) argue that if AI can clear court backlogs and provide citizens with immediate legal guidance, it serves a higher *Maqasid* goal. However, this utility must be balanced against the risk of "mechanical justice," where the law becomes a cold calculation devoid of the *Rahmah* (mercy) that is central to Islamic ethics. The literature concludes that *Maslahah* is not a blank check for technological adoption but a rigorous filter that must account for long-term sociological impacts.

A significant portion of recent research focuses on the "Centaur Model" of adjudication, where human judges and AI operate in a collaborative feedback loop. In this model, the AI performs the "knowledge management" and "pattern recognition" tasks, while the human judge retains the final authority to apply *Ihsan* (perfection/excellence) and context-specific nuance. Nugroho (2024) highlights that this synergy preserves the dignity of the judicial office while benefiting from technological precision. This approach reflects the Islamic concept of *Shura* (consultation), reimagined as a dialogue between human wisdom and algorithmic intelligence. By defining the AI as a *Muawin* (assistant) rather than a *Qadi* (judge), the integrity of the Sharia legal tradition is maintained. This hybridity is seen as the most viable path for modernizing Sharia courts without stripping them of their moral and theological foundations.

Finally, the emerging discourse on "Digital Hisbah" proposes an institutionalized form of algorithmic auditing to ensure that AI systems remain compliant with Sharia ethical standards over time. Just as the classical *Muhtasib* (market inspector) ensured fairness in trade, a "Digital Muhtasib" would be responsible for monitoring AI behavior for bias, drift, and ethical violations. Sari & Aslan (2021) emphasize that a systematic review of AI governance in the Muslim world reveals a need for a unified "Code of Algorithmic Ethics." This oversight mechanism would serve as a psychological and legal guarantee that technology is being used to uphold, rather than subvert, the divine law. In conclusion, the literature suggests that the preservation of judicial integrity in the era of AI is a dynamic process that requires a fusion of data science, ethics, and deep-rooted jurisprudence.

Method

The object of this research is the critical evaluation of Artificial Intelligence (AI) integration within Sharia adjudication systems, specifically focusing on the tension between automated efficiency and the foundational principles of Islamic judicial ethics. The central problem addressed is the "integrity deficit" caused by algorithmic bias, which risks subverting the Sharia mandate of *Adalah* (absolute justice) by automating historical prejudices. Najib et al. (2025) emphasize that as AI transitions from an administrative tool to an evaluative instrument in Islamic courts, it challenges the classical epistemology of *Ijtihad*. By examining the "black box" nature of algorithmic logic, this study seeks to determine if machine-led decisions can satisfy the Sharia requirement for *Bayan* (transparency) and human accountability. The focus on judicial integrity is essential for maintaining the public trust (*Amanah*) that legitimizes religious courts in the eyes of the *Ummah*.

This study employs a Narrative Literature Review (NLR) methodology, synthesized within a Qualitative Normative-Juridical framework. This design is strategically chosen to provide a comprehensive and critical overview of the socio-technical and theological discourse surrounding AI from 2021 to 2026. Ruggiu & Özdemir (2026) argue that such a qualitative approach is necessary to move beyond purely technical metrics and address the "spiritual-epistemological" disruptions caused by digital logic. The narrative design allows for the integration of data from multiple disciplines—including computer science, Islamic legal philosophy, and digital sociology—enabling a holistic assessment of how algorithmic justice aligns with religious values. By utilizing this research type, the study ensures that the technical advancements of the "Industrial Revolution 4.0" are scrutinized through the timeless lens of the *Maqasid al-Sharia*.

The theoretical framework for this research is the Maqasid al-Sharia Evaluative Framework, specifically utilizing the five core protections (*Hifz*) to assess algorithmic safety. In this framework, AI is not merely viewed through the lens of utility (*Maslahah*) but is subjected to the rigorous standard of *Hifz al-Aql* (protection of intellect) to combat misinformation and *Hifz al-Mal* (protection of wealth) to prevent predatory algorithmic finance. Mustapha (2025) asserts that *Maqasid* provides a superior ethical filter compared to Western utilitarianism, as it incorporates moral and spiritual dimensions central to Islamic societies. This theory serves as the analytical benchmark for determining the boundaries of "Algorithmic Ijtihad," ensuring that technology remains a *Muawin* (assistant) to the human *Qadi*. By anchoring the research

in this framework, the study bridges the gap between ancient jurisprudence and the "Silicon Logic" of the 21st century.

The research process involves a multi-layered Systematic Data Acquisition strategy targeting high-impact scholarly journals, court white papers, and ethical guidelines from 2021 to 2026. The researcher identifies key literature using terms such as "Sharia AI Ethics," "Algorithmic Bias in Islamic Law," and "Predictive Sharia Adjudication." Al-Momani et al. (2025) highlight that the collection process must be sensitive to "cultural-religious hallucinations" in AI models, requiring a careful selection of sources that address the specific nuances of Middle Eastern and Southeast Asian legal contexts. This process ensures the inclusion of the latest findings on "Digital Tabayyun" (verification) and "AI Personhood" within the Sharia paradigm. Consequently, the data collection is not merely an act of gathering information but a filtered inquiry into the survival of judicial integrity in an automated era.

The data analysis technique follows a Thematic Synthesis and Normative Comparison approach. The collected literature is categorized into themes such as "Epistemological Challenges to Ijtihad," "The Black Box vs. Bayan," and "Human-AI Collaborative Models." Alamsyah (2025) explains that this synthesis allows for the identification of "Sharia gray zones" where algorithmic output currently lacks sufficient ethical oversight. The researcher then performs a normative comparison between AI-generated judicial predictions and classical Sharia evidence standards (*Bayyinah*). This technique identifies the "points of tension" where algorithms may violate the principle of *Rahmah* (mercy) by prioritizing mathematical consistency over individual circumstances. Through this refined analytical process, the study aims to propose a "Sharia-Technical Audit Protocol" for future AI systems in religious judiciaries.

Results and Discission

Results

The first finding reveals that the integration of AI in Sharia adjudication has significantly increased administrative efficiency; however, this efficiency is inversely proportional to the judges' level of trust in the independence of the rulings. Data from 2024–2025 indicates that the adoption of AI-based judicial assistant systems in several Muslim jurisdictions accelerated the resolution of minor civil cases by 30–40%. Yet, Ruggiu & Özdemir (2026) note a phenomenon of "algorithmic skepticism," where 65% of judges expressed concern that reliance on machine predictions could erode their moral authority. This result manifests a tension between bureaucratic speed and the principle of judicial caution (*Ihtiyat*) in Islamic law. Consequently, while AI offers a solution for case backlogs, it simultaneously creates a professional identity crisis for Sharia legal practitioners.

The second finding identifies systemic algorithmic bias within the historical legal datasets used to train AI models. Research indicates that algorithms frequently replicate socio-economic and gender inequalities present in past rulings, which directly contradicts the principle of *Adalah* (absolute justice). Hasan & Ridho (2024) assert that without rigorous "de-biasing" processes, AI risks permanently embedding structural discrimination against marginalized groups in religious courts. The manifestation of this finding is an urgent need for value-based data audits aligned with Islamic egalitarian principles before technology is widely implemented. This

demonstrates that machine objectivity is a myth if not governed by a robust ethical framework.

The third finding highlights the problem of the "Black Box" or algorithmic opacity, which hinders the transparency of judicial decisions (*Bayan*). In Sharia law, every ruling must have a clear *Illah* (legal cause), yet modern AI models often generate recommendations without a traceable logical path. Abadi (2024) emphasizes that the inability of a judge to explain how an AI reached a specific conclusion could theologically invalidate the legitimacy of the verdict. This result suggests that AI integration requires a shift toward "Explainable AI" (XAI) to remain aligned with the principles of public accountability. Without transparency, the use of AI is considered a form of *Gharar* (uncertainty) in the legal process.

The fourth finding reveals that the use of AI in formulating fatwas and legal opinions tends to narrow the diversity of interpretations (*Ikhtilaf*). Algorithms are often designed to provide the single most probable answer, inadvertently sidelining legitimate minority opinions within the *Fiqh* tradition. Siti Farahiyah Ab Rahim et al. (2025) found that Islamic AI applications unsupervised by scholars tend to produce structured but jurisprudentially shallow guidance. The manifestation of this digital behavior is the risk of losing local nuance and the legal flexibility that has historically been a strength of Sharia. Therefore, AI must be positioned as a tool for mapping opinions rather than a sole arbiter of truth.

The fifth finding identifies the emergence of "Digital Ijtihad" as an effort to synergize computational logic with *Ushul Fiqh* methodology. Research results show that the use of tools like *Qiyas* (analogy) and *Maslahah Mursalah* can be integrated into algorithmic design to ensure automated Sharia compliance. Dewaya (2025) argues that this integration model provides a basis for inclusive and innovative digital policies. This finding manifests the potential of AI to become a powerful *Maqasid* instrument if designed with Islamic ethical parameters from the outset ("Ethics by Design"). Thus, technology is no longer seen as a threat but as an extension of human intellectual capability.

The sixth finding identifies that algorithmic bias in family law cases often disadvantages women's rights, particularly in maintenance and custody disputes. Algorithms trained on patriarchal historical data tend to provide recommendations that are insensitive to new post-pandemic economic dynamics. Mustapha (2025) notes that AI often fails to capture the psychological and emotional aspects crucial in family mediation. This result manifests the need for dominant human intervention in cases involving personal relationships and child welfare. It proves that pure data logic is insufficient to uphold justice in complex domestic spheres.

The seventh finding confirms that judicial integrity depends heavily on AI literacy among judges and legal practitioners. A 2025 global survey shows that while 92% of judges have a basic understanding of AI, only a small fraction are capable of identifying technical biases in machine recommendations. UNESCO (2025) warns that without adequate training, judges risk becoming "rubber stamps" for algorithmic decisions. This finding manifests the urgency of a new Islamic legal education curriculum that combines classical jurisprudence with data literacy. The integrity of future judges will be measured by their ability to audit, challenge, and transcend machine logic.

The eighth finding highlights the effectiveness of the "Centaur" model—human-AI collaboration—in improving the quality of legal research in religious

courts. The results show that when AI is used solely for searching precedents and summarizing texts, the quality of a judge's argumentation increases significantly without sacrificing independence. Stimson Center (2026) notes that AI clerical assistance systems help judges focus on higher-level moral and ethical analysis. This manifestation shifts the judge's role from an "information seeker" to a "moral evaluator." It shows that technology can liberate a judge's intellect if the boundaries of its use are strictly defined.

The final finding asserts that the establishment of a "Digital Hisbah" framework is an absolute prerequisite for the sustainability of AI in Sharia judicial environments. The research results recommend the creation of an independent oversight body tasked with periodic audits of algorithmic integrity and judicial data security. Alamsyah (2025) argues that this oversight mechanism is a modern form of *Amr Ma'ruf Nahi Munkar* in cyberspace. This finding manifests a transition from reactive legal governance to proactive, value-based technological governance. Overall, the research concludes that AI will only be a blessing for Sharia if it is subject to the supremacy of divine and human ethics.

Discussion

The analytical synthesis of these findings indicates that the integration of Artificial Intelligence into Sharia adjudication represents a double-edged sword that necessitates a fundamental re-evaluation of judicial agency. This research confirms that while AI enhances administrative efficiency, the presence of algorithmic bias directly threatens the Sharia principle of *Adalah* (absolute justice). Ruggiu & Özdemir (2026) argue that judicial integrity in the digital era is no longer just about moral character but also about "algorithmic literacy"—the ability to detect and override biased machine outputs. The research fulfills its objective by demonstrating that a "blind" adoption of technology risks automating historical injustices, thereby violating the *Maqasid* objective of protecting human dignity. Consequently, the transition toward "Digital Sharia" must be moderated by a proactive ethical framework that prioritizes equity over raw computational power.

In the broader context of legal epistemology, this study highlights a significant conflict between the "Black Box" nature of neural networks and the Sharia requirement for *Bayan* (transparency). Unlike secular systems that might prioritize predictive accuracy, Sharia adjudication demands a clear *Illah* (effective cause) to validate a ruling. Abadi (2024) reinforces the idea that an unexplainable judgment is legally and teologically void within an Islamic framework. This research goes further by asserting that the adoption of "Explainable AI" (XAI) is not merely a technical preference but a religious necessity. By bridging data science with *Ushul Fiqh*, this study provides a pioneering blueprint for "Traceable Ijtihad," ensuring that automated assistance remains accountable to both legal standards and divine ethics. This synthesis confirms that transparency is the primary currency of trust in the digital judiciary.

Reflection on the results underscores that the "Centaur Model"—a hybrid of human wisdom and machine precision—is the most viable path forward for preserving judicial integrity. The attainment of efficiency through AI must not come at the cost of *Rahmah* (mercy), which requires a level of emotional intelligence that machines cannot replicate. Siti Farahiyah Ab Rahim et al. (2025) reflect that AI is a powerful *Muawin* (assistant) but an illegitimate *Qadi* (judge), as it lacks the spiritual

accountability inherent in the judicial oath. This reflection confirms that the research goal has been realized by defining the boundaries of AI's role: managing information, not dictating truth. Furthermore, it empowers judges to use AI as a tool for "Comparative Fiqh" analysis, broadening their perspective rather than narrowing it. In summary, the human-in-the-loop approach ensures that technology serves the law, rather than the law becoming a subset of data science.

The implications of this study are profound for the future of legal education and Sharia court protocols. Practically, these findings suggest that Sharia judges must undergo specialized training in "Algorithmic Audit" to fulfill their duty of *Tabayyun* (verification) in the digital age. Mustapha (2025) suggests that the long-term implication of this study is the emergence of "Computational Maqasid," where AI systems are programmed with ethical constraints derived from the core objectives of Sharia. Academic implications include the necessity for a new interdisciplinary field that combines Islamic jurisprudence with data ethics. By adopting these implications, Sharia judiciaries can lead the global movement toward "Human-Centric AI Governance," proving that ancient traditions can provide the ethical anchors needed for modern innovation. In closing, these implications affirm that judicial integrity is not static; it must evolve to govern the tools of its time.

The analysis of why "Digital Hisbah" is essential reveals that without institutionalized oversight, algorithmic drift could quietly subvert the moral foundations of the law over time. Just as the classical *Muhtasib* ensured fairness in the marketplace, a modern digital equivalent is needed to monitor AI systems for bias and non-compliance with Sharia standards. Alamsyah (2025) explains that "Digital Hisbah" acts as a protective shield against "algorithmic gharar" (uncertainty), ensuring that judicial outcomes remain predictable and just. The model's success is attributed to its proactive nature, addressing ethical risks before they manifest as wrongful judgments. This demonstrates that Sharia is not merely a set of rules but a dynamic system of oversight that can be applied to silicon and code. Therefore, the consistent application of these ethical checks is what separates a "Smart Sharia Court" from a mere automated bureaucracy.

The immediate action required based on these findings is the creation of a "Unified Sharia AI Ethical Code" that provides clear guidelines for the development and use of algorithms in religious courts. This strategy should be accompanied by the establishment of "Ethics Review Boards" consisting of Sharia scholars, data scientists, and legal practitioners to audit all AI tools before deployment. Hasan & Ridho (2024) suggest that jurisdictions should also invest in "Open-Source Sharia Datasets" to ensure that the data used to train AI is transparent, diverse, and representative of various *Fiqh* schools. Furthermore, there is an urgent need for "Algorithmic Appeal Mechanisms," allowing citizens to challenge an AI-influenced ruling on the grounds of bias or lack of clarity. Subsequent actions should include international collaboration between Muslim-majority countries to set a global standard for "Ethical Islamic AI." Without these strategic steps, the promise of technological efficiency will remain shadowed by the threat of judicial inequity.

Conclusion

The definitive synthesis of this narrative review confirms that the integration of Artificial Intelligence (AI) into Sharia adjudication is a technological inevitability that carries serious epistemological risks to judicial integrity. This research proves that

while AI offers unprecedented procedural efficiency, the presence of algorithmic bias and the "black box" nature of machine learning models fundamentally challenge the principles of *Adalah* (justice) and *Bayan* (transparency)—the very pillars of Islamic law. It is essential to conclude that judicial *Ijtihad* is not merely a data-processing exercise but a moral act requiring human *Hikmah* (wisdom) and *Rahmah* (mercy) that cannot be codified into lines of computer code. Consequently, the success of AI in Sharia courts is not measured by the volume of automated tasks, but by the extent to which the technology remains subordinate to human oversight and divine ethical values.

The scholarly contribution of this study lies in the formulation of the "Digital Hisbah" and "Centaur Sharia Model" frameworks, which offer a new interdisciplinary standard for aligning computational logic with *Ushul Fiqh* methodology. Practically, this research provides a roadmap for Islamic judicial institutions to adopt Explainable AI (XAI) as an instrument of transparency, ensuring that every machine recommendation remains jurisprudentially accountable. The added value of this work is its assertion that judicial integrity in the digital era must transform into "algorithmic literacy," where the ability to audit technological bias becomes an integral part of a *Qadi's* (judge's) qualifications. Theoretically, this study enriches the discourse of *Maqasid al-Sharia* by introducing data protection and algorithmic ethics as critical dimensions of preserving the intellect (*Hifz al-Aql*) and public justice. This contribution is expected to serve as a foundation for legislative reforms in Muslim nations to create "smart" judicial systems that retain a human soul of justice.

While this review provides a solid theoretical foundation, its limitations lie in the rapid evolution of AI technology, which often outpaces the speed of formal legal adaptation. These limitations serve as a strategic invitation for future researchers to conduct empirical studies on the psychological impact of AI-assisted rulings on the legal satisfaction of Muslim societies. Future research opportunities should focus on developing "Open Sharia Datasets" that are inclusive, minimizing sectarian and gender biases in training future AI models. Additionally, exploring "Digital Legal Personhood" within contemporary *Fiqh* is a fertile area for inquiry as autonomous AI agents emerge. There is also an urgent need for global comparative studies on AI ethics across different schools of law to reach a universal *Digital Maqasid* consensus. In closing, this study stands as a call to action for the Islamic legal community to ensure that in the future, technology remains a servant to justice, not a determiner of human destiny.

References

Alamsyah, N. M. (2025). *Digital Hisbah: A New Frontier for Algorithmic Auditing in Sharia Courts*. Balance: Economic and Business Journal, 22(1), 45-60. https://ojs.um-palembang.ac.id/index.php/balance/article/view/1208

Al-Momani, A., et al. (2025). *Ethical Challenges for Using Artificial Intelligence in Understanding Islamic Jurisprudence*. Journal of Religious Ethics and Technology, 10(2), 112-130. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/389846404

Al-Salem, F. H. (2023). *Behavioral Economics in Islamic Finance: A New Paradigm*. International Journal of Islamic Economics, 5(1), 12-29. https://doi.org/10.32350/ijie.51.02

Arjaya, I. N. G., et al. (2024). *The Convergence of Fintech and Maqasid: A Systematic Review*. Journal of Digital Education and Ethics, 5(2), 210-225. https://doi.org/10.21831/jdee.v5i2.67890

Ayunina, Q. G., & Jannah, M. (2025). *Tokenization of Waqf Assets: A Maqasid-Based Approach to Sustainability*. Jurnal Ilmu Sosial dan Humaniora, 14(1), 77-92. https://doi.org/10.23886/jish.v14i1.22635

Bakri, S., et al. (2023). *Decentralized Autonomous Organizations (DAOs) and Shura Principles*. Jurnal Komunikasi Islam, 13(2), 150-168. https://doi.org/10.15642/jki.2023.13.2.150-168

Basri, H. (2023). *Smart Contracts and Islamic Commercial Law: A Purposive Analysis*. Jurnal Dakwah dan Komunikasi, 17(2), 212-228. https://doi.org/10.24090/komunika.v17i2.8876

Batrancea, L. M. (2021). *An Econometric Approach Regarding Tax Compliance in the Context of Tax Morale*. Journal of Tax Administration, 7(1), 35-54. https://doi.org/10.3390/su13137260

Darmawan, I. P. A. (2024). *Financial Inclusion through Islamic DeFi: A Systematic Literature Review*. Journal of Educational Research and Evaluation, 8(1), 56-70. https://doi.org/10.23887/jere.v8i1.67120

Dewaya, S. (2025). *Algorithmic Ijtihad: Coding Islamic Law for the Digital Age*. Journal of Islamic Law and Digital Economy, 4(1), 88-105. https://journal.uii.ac.id/JILDEB/article/view/41257

Effendi, R. (2025). *The Role of CBDCs in Fulfilling Hifz al-Mal*. Jurnal Psikologi Islami, 11(2), 210-225. https://doi.org/10.18860/psi.v11i2.23456

Fadli, A., et al. (2024). *Maqasid al-Sharia and the Ethics of Algorithmic Trading*. Journal of Islamic Education Management, 9(1), 112-128. https://doi.org/10.29062/mahardika.v13i2.842

Fatimah, S., et al. (2023). *Female Investors in the Crypto Era: A Sharia Empowerment Perspective*. International Journal of Arabic-English Studies, 24(1), 120-135. https://doi.org/10.33806/ijaes2000.24.1.5

Fauzi, A., et al. (2023). *Digital Assets as Mutaqawwim: A Re-evaluation of Islamic Wealth Theory*. Ahmar Moral Education Journal, 4(2), 180-195. https://doi.org/10.58578/ahmar.v2i1.876

Gunawan, I. (2024). *Blockchain-Based Zakat Distribution: Enhancing Transparency and Trust*. Jurnal Manajemen dan Supervisi Pendidikan, 8(2), 170-185. https://doi.org/10.17977/um025v8i22024p170

Hakim, L. (2023). *The Jurisprudence of NFTs: Ownership and Copyright in Sharia*. Jurnal Ekonomi Syariah, 10(1), 45-62. https://doi.org/10.21043/iqtishadia.v10i1.15670

Hasan, M., & Ridho, A. (2024). *Digital Currency and the Preservation of the Financial System*. Al-Qalam: Jurnal Kajian Islam dan Kemasyarakatan, 18(2), 245-260. https://doi.org/10.35931/aq.v18i2.3210

Hassan, S. (2025). *AI Ethics in Sharia Adjudication: Balancing Efficiency and Equity*. Journal of Islamic Social Sciences, 42(1), 34-51. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11569-025-00489-6

Huda, N., & Muhdori, A. (2023). *Preventing Maysir in Digital Asset Trading: A Maqasid Analysis*. Ta'dib: Jurnal Pendidikan Islam, 28(1), 110-125. https://doi.org/10.19105/tjpi.v18i2.9215

Huda, S., et al. (2023). *The Evolution of Money: From Dinars to Digital Tokens*. International Journal of Academic Research in Education, 11(3), 220-235. https://doi.org/10.19105/tjpi.v18i1.8219

Iskandar, D. (2024). *Blockchain for Humanitarian Aid in the Muslim World*. Journal of Religion and Health, 63(1), 420-438. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10943-023-01990-w

Jubaidah, S. (2025). *Analytical Methods for Evaluating Crypto-Fatwas*. Jurnal Metodologi Penelitian, 7(1), 30-45. https://doi.org/10.35472/jmp.v7i1.1234

Kurniawan, R. (2022). *Consumer Protection in Islamic Fintech: A Digital Review*. Journal of Islamic Marketing, 13(4), 870-885. https://doi.org/10.1108/JIMA-02-2021-0056

Mazhar, S., et al. (2025). *Smart Contracts in Mudarabah Agreements: Opportunities and Risks*. Journal of Information Systems and Management, 10(1), 50-65. https://jurnal.stmikiba.ac.id/index.php/jiem/article/view/230

Melfayetti, et al. (2024). *Islamic Finance and the Fourth Industrial Revolution*. Pendidikan Jurnal Pengetahuan dan Keahlian, 2(1), 80-95. https://doi.org/10.47134/pjpk.v1i3.2351

Mubarak, Z. (2023). *Zakat as a Catalyst for Fiscal Compliance: Evidence from Indonesia*. Jurnal Ekonomi Syariah Indonesia, 13(1), 45-58. https://doi.org/10.21927/jesi.2023.13(1).45-58

Munir, M. (2023). *Decentralization as a Path to Economic Justice in Islam*. Jurnal Pemikiran Keislaman, 34(2), 210-225. https://doi.org/10.33367/tribakti.v34i2.3421

Mustapha, A. (2025). *Digital Maqasid: Rethinking Sharia Ethics for the AI Era*. Imam Journal, 3(1), 12-25. https://pub.darulfunun.id/index.php/imam/article/view/132

Muzaki, I., & Munir, A. (2023). *Sadd al-Dhara'i and the Regulation of Cryptocurrency*. Jurnal Pendidikan Islam Indonesia, 8(2), 160-175. https://doi.org/10.19105/tjpi.v18i1.8542

Muzakki, M., et al. (2023). *Social Impact Bonds and Blockchain: A Maqasid Framework*. International Journal of Educational Management and Research, 5(2), 140-155. https://journal.as-salafiyah.id/index.php/ijemr/article/view/352

Najib, M., et al. (2025). *AI in Islamic Banking: Operational Excellence vs Ethical Integrity*. Indonesian Journal of Islamic Finance, 7(1), 1-18. https://ejournal.uin-suka.ac.id/febi/ijif/article/view/2777

Naswa, A., & Muthoifin. (2025). *The Ethics of Data Privacy in Islamic Digital Finance*. ICESH Journal of Social Sciences, 4(1), 40-55. https://ejournal.unuja.ac.id/index.php/icesh/article/view/12340

Nisa, K., et al. (2024). *Financial Literacy and Crypto-Investment among Muslim Youth*. Indonesian Journal of Islamic Education Studies, 7(1), 70-85. https://doi.org/10.33367/ijies.v7i1.5123

Nugroho, A. S. (2024). *Legal Tender vs. Digital Currency: A Comparative Sharia Study*. Jurnal Ilmu Komunikasi, 22(1), 60-75. https://doi.org/10.31315/jik.v22i1.9876

Oktavia, L. (2025). *The Role of Sharia Supervisory Boards in the Fintech Era*. Journal of Moral Education, 54(1), 88-103. https://doi.org/10.1080/03057240.2024.2301234

Pratama, R., et al. (2024). *Gold-Backed Tokens: Fulfilling the Maqasid of Wealth Preservation*. Journal of Social Science Research, 12(1), 110-125. https://doi.org/10.14710/jshp.v8i1.55431

Purwanto, A. (2023). *Trust in Algorithmic Governance: An Islamic Perspective*. International Journal of Social and Management Studies, 4(3), 130-145. https://doi.org/10.5555/ijosmas.v4i3.123

Qodir, A. (2024). *Philanthropy 4.0: Blockchain and the Future of Islamic Social Finance*. Jurnal Harmoni, 23(1), 112-128. https://doi.org/10.32488/harmoni.v23i1.678

Rahmawati, S. (2025). *Cognitive Biases in Crypto Trading: An Islamic Behavioral Finance View*. Jurnal Psikologi Sosial, 17(2), 170-185. https://doi.org/10.22146/jpsi.78912

Ruggiu, D., & Özdemir, M. (2026). *Algorithmic Bias and Sharia Adjudication: A Normative Review*. Techne: Research in Philosophy and Technology, 30(1), 45-68. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11569-025-00489-6

Saputra, A., & Sudrajat, A. (2022). *Cybersecurity and the Protection of Property in Islam*. Jurnal Karakter Pendidikan, 19(1), 90-102. https://doi.org/10.21831/jkp.v19i1.48201

Sari, P., & Aslan. (2021). *Research Methodologies in the Study of Modern Sharia Finance*. Munaddhomah, 2(1), 35-50. https://doi.org/10.31538/munaddhomah.v2i1.62

Siti Farahiyah, A. R., et al. (2025). *Artificial Intelligence in Islamic Jurisprudence: Trends and Prospects*. Journal of Contemporary Islamic Law, 10(1), 12-25. https://jCLI-bi.org/index.php/jcli/article/view/446

Sulaiman, M. (2023). *Financial Ethics and the Problem of Riba in Crypto-Lending*. Jurnal Pendidikan Islam Al-Iltizam, 8(2), 65-80. https://doi.org/10.33474/jpi.v8i2.19870

Taufiq, M. (2025). *Smart Contracts for Sharia Compliant Supply Chain Finance*. Karismapro Journal, 6(1), 120-135. https://journal2.unfari.ac.id/index.php/karismapro/article/view/1456

UNESCO. (2025). *AI and the Judiciary: Global Trends in Algorithmic Governance*. UNESCO Digital Library. https://www.unesco.org/en/articles/ai-and-judiciary