

AI and the Future of Legal Work: Augmentation, Not Automation

By Michael C. Maschke, Sharon D. Nelson, Esq., and John W. Simek

Every few months, headlines claim that artificial intelligence will soon replace lawyers. However, the reality is more nuanced and intriguing. Despite significant progress, current AI systems still struggle with deep legal reasoning, judgment, and innovative problem-solving. They can summarize information, organize data, and draft documents, but they often struggle to think like a lawyer.

Meanwhile, law firms are heavily investing in AI leadership and infrastructure. They are hiring chief AI officers, bringing in technologists from outside the legal field, and creating dedicated AI teams. At first glance, this might seem like panic; in reality, it's a strategic move.

These two trends aren't at odds. Instead, they show where AI truly fits within legal practice today.

AI Is Not Replacing Lawyers

AI is not replacing lawyers because it cannot reliably perform the core work that defines the profession. Complex legal analysis requires context, experience, ethical judgment, and strategic reasoning. Even the most advanced models still hallucinate, misapply precedent, and fail when confronted with genuinely hard legal questions. That is not a recipe for trusted advocacy.

Most lawyers see this firsthand. AI can help review documents, draft outlines, or flag issues, but its output almost always requires significant human correction. Clients still expect their lawyers to explain risks, negotiate outcomes, persuade decision makers, and stand behind the advice they give. That responsibility has not changed.

Why Law Firms Are Betting on AI Anyway

So why are law firms racing to build AI capabilities?

Because while AI is not good enough to replace lawyers, it is already good enough to change how legal services are delivered. Firms that understand this are not trying to automate judgment. They are trying to remove friction.

Law firms are appointing AI leaders to incorporate tools into their workflows, set governance standards, train lawyers to use AI responsibly, and develop proprietary

systems aligned with their legal practices. These roles focus on enhancing productivity, ensuring consistency, and maintaining competitive advantage, rather than mere experimentation. AI significantly reduces time spent on routine tasks such as research, discovery, document comparison, and initial drafts, allowing lawyers to dedicate more time to strategy, counseling, and advocacy. This results in faster turnaround times, better client experience, and improved profit margins. Some firms even permit associates to count AI training as part of their billable hours, highlighting AI literacy as a key aspect of professional competence. Lawyers who lack an understanding of these tools and their limitations will find it challenging to supervise their use effectively.

The Real Model: Co-Pilot, Not Replacement

The current reality is not about replacement. It is about partnership.

AI today functions more like a co-pilot (not to be confused with Microsoft's Copilot AI product) than a decision-maker. It handles well-defined, repeatable tasks efficiently. Lawyers remain firmly in control of interpretation, judgment, and accountability. That division of labor is not a weakness. It is exactly how complex professional systems evolve.

The real risk for lawyers is not that AI will take their jobs. It is that other lawyers will use AI better than they do.

Competitive Risk, Not Job Panic

Companies that prioritize investment in leadership, governance, and training will advance more quickly, price projects more competitively, and produce more reliable results. Conversely, firms that dismiss AI as a mere trend or prohibit its use entirely risk lagging, not necessarily because machines are more intelligent, but because their competitors operate more efficiently.

Clients are already inquiring about AI in proposals and projects. They want assurance on confidentiality, output validation, and accountability. These questions are persistent and will become commonplace.

The Bottom Line

The future of legal work is not fully automated, nor is it unchanged. It is augmented.

Lawyers who understand AI's strengths and limits will thrive. They will use technology to handle volume while reserving human expertise for the moments that matter most. Lawyers who ignore AI or fear it outright will find themselves explaining why routine work takes longer and costs more than it should.

AI is not coming for lawyers' jobs. It is coming for inefficiency, complacency, and firms without a plan. And that is a much more uncomfortable reality.

Michael C. Maschke is the President and Chief Executive Officer of Sensei Enterprises, Inc. Mr. Maschke is an EnCase Certified Examiner (EnCE), a Certified Computer Examiner (CCE #744), an AccessData Certified Examiner (ACE), a Certified Ethical Hacker (CEH), and a Certified Information Systems Security Professional (CISSP). He is a frequent speaker on IT, cybersecurity, and digital forensics, and he has co-authored 14 books published by the American Bar Association. He can be reached at mmaschke@senseient.com.

Sharon D. Nelson is the co-founder of and consultant to Sensei Enterprises, Inc. She is a past president of the Virginia State Bar, the Fairfax Bar Association, and the Fairfax Law Foundation. She is a co-author of 18 books published by the ABA. snelson@senseient.com.

John W. Simek is the co-founder of and consultant to Sensei Enterprises, Inc. He holds multiple technical certifications and is a nationally known digital forensics expert. He is a co-author of 18 books published by the American Bar Association. jsimek@senseient.com.