

Cari lettori,

oramai tutti conosciamo i rischi che corriamo quando chiediamo aiuto all'intelligenza artificiale per trattare un problema giuridico, massimamente quando trasfondiamo in un atto giudiziario il risultato di una ricerca condotta dall'intelligenza artificiale: si tratta delle cosiddette "allucinazioni" e cioè di riferimenti a fonti giurisprudenziali inesistenti oppure esistenti, ma che hanno diverso contenuto da quello che risulta dall'esito della ricerca condotta dall'intelligenza artificiale.

Il tema è stato oggetto di pronunce giurisprudenziali e di provvedimenti dei consigli degli ordini degli avvocati tanto all'estero che in Italia; di recente, c'è stato un caso nel Mississippi in cui entrambe le parti avevano depositato atti contenenti allucinazioni e il giudice ha interdetto tutti gli avvocati dall'esercizio professionale per due anni:

<https://www.businessinsider.com/mississippi-judge-removes-lawyers-lawsuit-ai-hallucinations-court-filings-2026-6>

Tuttavia, nessuno poteva immaginarsi che uno fra i maggiori studi legali del mondo, Sullivan & Cromwell, con uffici in tutti i continenti, avrebbe depositato atti difensivi viziati da riferimenti legali inesistenti.

Attenzione, quindi, a non abbassare mai la guardia: anche se il vostro avversario è uno studio legale di grande reputazione le allucinazioni sono sempre in agguato!

Il sito nel quale trovate un quadro completo delle pronunce giudiziarie in materia è <https://www.damiencharlotin.com/hallucinations/>: vi consiglio di visitarlo.

Inoltre, Vi accludo un articolo del New York Times sul caso Sullivan & Cromwell e Vi saluto cordialmente.

Maurizio Lupoi

A.I. ‘Hallucinations’ Created Errors in Court Filing, Top Law Firm Says

Sullivan & Cromwell apologized for submitting a court document that had fake citations created by artificial intelligence.



Lawyers for Sullivan & Cromwell apologized for submitting a court filing that had fake citations created by artificial intelligence. Credit...John Taggart for The New York Times



By [Santul Nerkar](#)

April 21, 2026

An elite Wall Street law firm has apologized to a federal judge for submitting a court filing replete with errors created by artificial intelligence, including “hallucinations” that fabricated case citations.

The A.I.-generated errors came in a recent motion in U.S. Bankruptcy Court in Manhattan and were discovered by lawyers from an opposing firm, Andrew Dietderich, a partner at Sullivan & Cromwell, wrote in a letter to Judge Martin Glenn on April 18.

“We deeply regret that this has occurred,” Mr. Dieterich wrote.

The firm provided a ledger of the errors, which spanned three pages and totaled around three dozen. A number of them involved the citation of seemingly imagined passages from real cases. Some were clerical errors that the firm said were not A.I.-related.

Sullivan & Cromwell is one of the oldest and most prestigious law firms in the country. It is representing President Trump in several appeals, including his criminal conviction in 2024 in a case that stemmed from a [hush-money payment to a porn star](#). Jay Clayton, now the U.S. attorney for the Southern District of New York, was of counsel and formerly a partner at the firm.

The apology revealed the latest embarrassing blunder for lawyers found to have used A.I. in crafting erroneous arguments. The legal profession is undergoing a reckoning over the growing and widespread use of A.I., which is luring lawyers dealing with voluminous research even as it has a propensity to spit out legal falsehoods.

A [spate](#) of cases in recent years has illuminated the dangers that using A.I. poses to lawyers. In 2023, a federal judge in Manhattan [fined](#) two lawyers \$5,000 after they submitted a brief of made-up cases, concocted by ChatGPT.

The American Bar Association has [instructed](#) lawyers to exercise caution when posing prompts to A.I. models or retrieving results. Mr. Dieterich wrote in his letter that the firm’s policies governing the use of A.I. were “not followed” in preparing the motion.

It is not clear which A.I. tools or program were used by Sullivan & Cromwell in generating the errors. A spokesman for the firm declined to comment. The news of the letter was [reported](#) earlier by Reuters.

The hallucinations filed by Sullivan & Cromwell came about in a case involving the Prince Group, a Cambodian conglomerate whose founder, Chen Zhi, was indicted in Federal District Court in Brooklyn last year on charges that he operated a global scam operation.

His lawyers and representatives have denied the charges. Mr. Chen, who was not in the United States when the indictment was announced, was extradited from Cambodia to China in January.

On April 8, a number of business entities associated with the Prince Group that were incorporated in the British Virgin Islands filed for bankruptcy in Manhattan. Sullivan & Cromwell is representing a group of people appointed by the authorities in the British Virgin Islands to oversee the Prince Group’s liquidated assets in that territory.

Some of the errors were identified by lawyers from Boies Schiller Flexner, the law firm representing the Prince Group, in a public filing. A spokesman for the firm declined to comment. After learning of the errors, Mr. Dieterich wrote, the firm conducted a review of all other filings in the case. The A.I. hallucinations were contained to the single filing, he wrote.

According to Mr. Dietderich's letter, Sullivan & Cromwell requires its lawyers to take a training course before gaining access to A.I. tools. Among the training's exhortations, Mr. Dietderich wrote, is to "trust nothing and verify everything."

[Santul Nerkar](#) is a Times reporter covering federal courts in Brooklyn.