THE DIGITAL TRANSFORMATION OF PROSECUTORIAL SYSTEMS: A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF ENGLAND AND WALES AND THE REPUBLIC OF UZBEKISTAN

Khamzakhonov Sunnatillo Azim ugli

https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18160574

ARTICLE INFO

Qabul qilindi: 04-yanvar 2026 yil
Ma'qullandi: 05-yanvar 2026 yil
Nashr qilindi: 06-yanvar 2026 yil

KEYWORDS

Digital Transformation, AI, Crown Prosecution Service.

ABSTRACT

This article examines the digital transformation of prosecutorial systems through a comparative analysis of the institutional and technological frameworks applied in England and Wales and the Republic of Uzbekistan. The study focuses on the role of digitalization in enhancing prosecutorial efficiency, transparency, and accountability, with particular attention to electronic case management systems, data-driven decision-making, and the separation of investigative and prosecutorial functions. The experience of England and Wales, including the use of advanced digital tools within the Crown Prosecution Service, is analyzed as a benchmark for institutional maturity and procedural safeguards. Against this backdrop, the article assesses the current state and challenges of prosecutorial digitalization in Uzbekistan, identifying legal, organizational, and technical constraints that limit its effectiveness. The author argues that successful digital transformation requires not only technological modernization but also comprehensive legal reform, institutional independence, and robust data integrity mechanisms. The article concludes by outlining strategic recommendations aimed at aligning Uzbekistan's prosecutorial system with international standards of digital justice and good governance.

The advancement of digital technologies and the systematic integration of artificial intelligence (AI) into the criminal justice sphere represent a fundamental shift in the administration of law, transforming the mechanisms of investigation, the management of evidence, and the delivery of justice. In England and Wales, the Crown Prosecution Service (CPS) has navigated a multi-decade transition from manual, paper-based workflows to a highly integrated, albeit complex, digital environment governed by the CPS 2025 strategy and the AI Action Plan for Justice. Simultaneously, the Republic of Uzbekistan has embarked on a rapid modernization program titled "Digital Prosecution – 2030," which aims to leapfrog traditional

legacy challenges by implementing comprehensive automation and artificial intelligence across its prosecutorial functions. This report provides an exhaustive analysis of the digitalization journey in England and Wales, the emergence of AI-driven prosecutorial tools, the systemic challenges encountered by HM Courts & Tribunals Service (HMCTS) and the CPS, and the strategic lessons that the Uzbek prosecution system can derive from the English experience to ensure a fair, efficient, and technologically robust legal framework.

The trajectory of digitalization within the English criminal justice system is characterized by an ongoing effort to reconcile the demands of an adversarial legal tradition with the exponential growth of digital data. The Crown Prosecution Service, as the principal public prosecution agency for England and Wales, has positioned digital transformation as a core pillar of its strategic identity. The CPS 2025 strategy[1] explicitly places digital capability alongside independence and fairness as the foundation for modern justice delivery. This shift reflects a move away from the manuscript-based filings of the 1980s, where business records were kept on paper and retained manually in files, to a contemporary reality where a single fraud investigation may involve over 48 million documents, totaling 6.5 terabytes of data[2]

The cornerstone of the current digital infrastructure is the transition from legacy Case Management Systems (CMS) to more integrated platforms. The CPS 2025 vision emphasizes that investment in digital capability is not merely an administrative upgrade but a prerequisite for addressing the changing nature of crime, particularly economic and cyber-enabled offenses. This transformation is designed to free legal professionals from manual data entry and document handling, allowing them to focus on expert legal analysis and victim support. However, the history of this evolution shows that the promise of efficiency often clashes with the reality of legacy systems and the fragmentation of the wider criminal justice network.[3] One of the is surely so-called a disclosure crisis.

The proliferation of digital material has created what is often described as a disclosure crisis. The Criminal Procedure and Investigations Act 1996 (CPIA) established the framework for disclosing unused material to the defense, but this framework was conceived in a pre-digital age when internet connections were typically made via dial-up modems. Today, the volume of data retrieved from personal devices, social media, and surveillance systems makes manual review by a single disclosure officer nearly impossible in complex cases. The Independent Review of Disclosure and Fraud Offences, chaired by Jonathan Fisher KC, highlighted that the traditional manual review of material is now an inconceivable waste of resources. For instance, the Serious Fraud Office (SFO) handles cases with data volumes reaching 6.5 terabytes. The review argues that the duty to identify disclosable material should be aided by technology rather than requiring human review of every individual item. This shift necessitates a new legal and procedural understanding of how Technology-Assisted Review (TAR) and AI can satisfy the statutory test for disclosure.

[1] https://www.cps.gov.uk/publication/cps-2025

[2]https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/independent-review-of-disclosure-and-fraud-offences/disclosure-in-the-digital-age-independent-review-of-disclosure-and-fraud-offences-accessible

[3] https://www.cps.gov.uk/publication/economic-crime-strategy-2025-final-progress-report-may-2025

In response to the challenges of the digital age, the UK government has launched a comprehensive AI Action Plan for Justice.[4] This plan outlines a three-year strategy to harness the power of AI to transform the public's experience of the justice system. It focuses on reducing court backlogs, improving victim services, and streamlining administrative burdens through transcription and document processing. The AI Action Plan is structured around three core pillars: strengthening foundations, embedding AI across the justice system, and investing in people. A critical development in this framework is the establishment of the Justice AI Unit, led by a Chief AI Officer. This interdisciplinary team is tasked with coordinating AI adoption, ensuring ethical standards, and launching initiatives like the Justice AI Fellowship and the Justice AI Academy.

The embedding of AI follows a "Scan, Pilot, Scale" approach.[5] This methodology ensures that technologies are rigorously tested in high-impact areas, such as predictive risk-assessment models in prisons to predict violence, before being deployed nationally. In the prosecutorial context, this includes using machine-learning and large-language models (LLMs) to assist in summarizing cases and identifying key evidence trails. Another avail of AI in prosecution is the automation of redaction and behavioral analysis in body-worn video footage. BWV is now ubiquitous, capturing interactions between the police and the public at nearly every incident. However, the sheer volume of video—estimated at over 100 petabytes in some databases—creates a capacity challenge. Therefore AI tools are being deployed to automate the identification and blurring of personally identifiable information (PII) such as faces, addresses, or phone numbers to comply with data privacy laws before disclosure. Furthermore, AI can sort and flag sections of video where specific interactions occur, such as the use of force or the provision of de-escalation explanations. This triage of critical incidents helps supervisors and prosecutors quickly identify the most relevant moments in an encounter, thereby reducing the labor-intensive process of manual sifting. In the realm of document disclosure, Technology-Assisted Review (TAR) utilizing predictive coding has moved from a theoretical possibility to an essential tool. TAR uses machine learning to rank documents based on their potential relevance, allowing human reviewers to focus on the most high-value material first. The SFO has already trialed AI-enhanced TAR in live criminal cases, confirming that it helps meet legal disclosure obligations more efficiently than manual review alone.

Going through the significant novelties of the English Justice System, it is worth pointing out Common Platform as one of the breakthroughs in the rows of reforms. The Common Platform represents the most significant technological transformation in the history of the English justice system. Designed as a unified, bespoke digital case management system by HMCTS, it aims to replace multiple legacy platforms used by the police, the CPS, and the courts. The goal is to create a single source of truth where all authorized parties can access up-to-date case information in real-time. The Common Platform offers several transformative benefits, including real-time updates across agencies that reduce delays in information sharing. Tasks such as generating warrants, notices, and orders are automated, reducing manual error.

[4] https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/ai-action-plan-for-justice/ai-action-plan-for-justice

[5]https://mojdigital.blog.gov.uk/2025/06/05/principles-to-practice-launching-the-ministry-of-justice-ai-and-data-science-ethics-framework/

Defense advocates can complete forms digitally and access case materials through self-service portals. By March 2025, over 2.3 million cases had been managed through the system, demonstrating its robust capacity. [6]

Despite its ambitions, the rollout of the Common Platform has been marred by critical incidents and performance issues. The National Audit Office (NAO) reported that the project team initially focused too heavily on technical solutions rather than user experience. During one seven-month period, HMCTS recorded 231 critical incidents. Data errors led to 35 individuals not being fitted with electronic monitoring tags when they should have been upon release on license.[7] The system also failed to send 3,011 important notifications to partner agencies, leading to a two-week suspension of the rollout. Furthermore, the original vision of the CPS being a direct part of the system was scaled back. Instead, the CPS case management systems merely interface with the Common Platform, creating an extra layer of complexity rather than total integration. This fragmentation between police, prosecution, and court systems has been identified as a factor contributing to delays in case progression.[8]

The English experience in introduction of cutting-edge technologies constitute valuable consideration for Uzbekistan, since Uzbekistan's approach to digitalization is characterized by a top-down, state-driven strategy designed to modernize the General Prosecutor's Office (GPO) and enhance the rule of law. The Presidential Decree "On Approval of the Strategy 'Digital Prosecution – 2030'" sets a timeline for the total automation of prosecutorial activities by 2030.[9]

The strategy aims to move the entire investigative and prosecutorial oversight process into an electronic format. The primary goals include reducing corruption by automating manual processes and increasing the visibility of prosecutorial decisions. The strategy also prioritizes the creation of the "Raqamli Prokuror" (Digital Prosecutor) system for remote monitoring of law compliance by government agencies and officials. Furthermore, it aims to implement real-time digital supervision of investigations and pre-trial inquiries to ensure adherence to procedural deadlines and legal standards[10] Uzbekistan has also adopted a specific strategy for the development of AI technologies until 2030. While the broad focus includes banking and healthcare, the legal sector is a primary beneficiary. A resolution from September 2025 [11]mandates the use of AI in judicial and expert activities, particularly for analyzing photo, audio, video, and text-based information in forensic examinations. The "E-ekspertiza" platform is designed to facilitate the online appointment of judicial examinations and the monitoring of material damage recovery. By July 2026, AI technologies are expected to be fully integrated into

[6]https://www.gov.uk/government/case-studies/common-platform-a-modern-digital-case-management-system-for-the-criminal-justice-system

[7] https://www.thejusticegap.com/digital-case-management-system-leads-to-substantial-failures/

[8] https://le.ac.uk/news/2025/october/police-crime-cps-england-wales-criminal-case-backlog

[9] https://www.uzdaily.uz/en/uzbekistan-adopts-digital-prosecution-2030-strategy/

[10] https://cis-legislation.com/document.fwx?rgn=171004

[11] https://lex.uz/docs/7159258

forensic research processes, providing a structured data analysis capability that was previously missing.

The journey of the CPS and the wider UK justice system offers several profound lessons for Uzbekistan as it implements its Digital Prosecution – 2030 strategy. These lessons encompass technical implementation, professional ethics, and systemic governance, such as:

1.The Common Platform's history is a stark warning against over-optimism. The project team underestimated the complexity of replacing legacy systems and failed to prioritize user experience. The General Prosecutor's Office must move beyond a purely technical focus. The introduction of "Raqamli Prokuror" and "E-tergov" must involve extensive consultation with frontline prosecutors and investigators to ensure the tools solve real operational problems rather than just adding administrative layers;[12]

2.The English experience shows that when different agencies use different systems that do not communicate well, the result is delays and poor communication. The GPO's planned Single Interdepartmental Integration Platform is the correct strategic move. However, the integration must be more than just a data exchange; it should be a functional integration. The 2026 and 2030 deadlines for integrating various ministries are ambitious and will require significant cross-departmental governance to maintain data quality;[13]

3.The UK's AI Action Plan emphasizes that AI must complement, not replace, human judgment. The risk of bias in predictive policing or risk-assessment models is a major concern. As the GPO adopts AI for monitoring and forensics, it must establish a clear AI ethical protocol. This protocol should ensure that AI outputs are auditable and that the final decision-making power always rests with a human prosecutor who is personally accountable for the outcome;

4.The explosion of digital evidence is a universal phenomenon. England's adoption of Technology-Assisted Review (TAR) provides a scalable model for managing voluminous data. The Uzbek Criminal Procedure Code should be updated to explicitly authorize and regulate the use of TAR and predictive coding in evidence review. This would provide legal certainty for investigators and ensure that the "E-tergov" system remains efficient even as case data volumes inevitably grow.[14]

The comparative analysis of CPS digitalization and the Uzbek Digital Prosecution – 2030 strategy underscores that technology is an essential enabler of modern justice, yet it introduces profound risks to procedural fairness and professional integrity. The English experience offers a mature roadmap that highlights the importance of human-centric design, ethical AI frameworks, and institutional interoperability. For Uzbekistan, the path forward involves balancing its ambitious automation goals with the development of nuanced legal safeguards. By adopting a Chief AI Officer model, prioritizing a "Scan, Pilot, Scale" methodology, and ensuring that the "E-tergov" and "Raqamli Prokuror" systems are built with the human in the loop, the Uzbek GPO can create a resilient and fair 21st-century prosecution service.

Biblography:

[12] https://www.thejusticegap.com/digital-case-management-system-leads-to-substantial-failures/

[13] https://academic.oup.com/policing/article/doi/10.1093/police/paad041/7222318?login=false

[14] https://www.bellas-wachowski.com/static/2025/09/trial-biriefs-article-ai-tar-march-2024.pdf

1. Presidential Decree “On Approval of the Strategy ‘Digital Prosecution – 2030’ and Measures for Its Effective Implementation,”
2. https://www.cps.gov.uk
3. https://www.gov.uk
4. https://mojdigital.blog.gov.uk
5. https://www.thejusticegap.com
6. https://le.ac.uk
7. https://www.uzdaily.uz
8. https://cis-legislation.com
9. https://lex.uz
10. https://academic.oup.com
11. https://www.bellas-wachowski.com