

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

DISTRICT OF KANSAS

IN RE:)
) STANDING ORDER 26-01
USE OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE (“AI”))
IN PREPARING COURT FILINGS)

Courts are seeing an increasing number of filings that include false statements of fact or law, including citations to fabricated or incorrect legal authority. It is possible that such filings have been generated by using artificial intelligence (“AI”). Although AI can assist the legal system in advancing the goal of furthering the “just, speedy, and inexpensive” resolution of cases, see FED. R. CIV. P. 1, AI tools can produce false statements of fact or law, including citations to fabricated or incorrect legal authority. This can waste judicial and party resources and undermine the integrity of the proceedings.

The court therefore reminds and cautions all lawyers and parties, including pro se litigants, that they may not make a false or misleading statement of fact or law to the Court or fail to correct a false or misleading statement of material fact or law previously made to the Court. Litigants are responsible for the content of their own filings and for complying with all applicable procedural rules and duties of candor even when they use AI to generate all or portions of court filings. Litigants are therefore responsible for reviewing and verifying the accuracy of all content filed with this court that was drafted or assisted by an AI tool. This includes citations to legal authority, quotations, paraphrased assertions, legal analysis, factual and procedural backgrounds, and the like.

If the court has reason to believe that a litigant has not reviewed and verified the accuracy of the content in any court filing, the court may impose a range of sanctions. First and foremost, the court may sua sponte strike any filing that appears to violate the standards mentioned above— with or without prejudice to refile. Upon notice, the court may also impose more significant sanctions depending on the facts and circumstances of particular violations, such as imposing monetary sanctions, referring counsel to disciplinary authorities, disqualifying counsel, imposing filing restrictions, or dismissing a party’s case.

The court also has broad discretion to require a party in any case to include a sworn statement in all filings disclosing the extent to which AI was used to generate the filing, naming the AI tool used, identifying which portion of the filing includes AI-generated content, and/or certifying that the filer personally reviewed and verified the accuracy of each legal authority cited therein.

This order will remain in effect until further order of the Court.

IT IS SO ORDERED this 28th day of January, 2026.

s/ John W. Broomes
John W. Broomes
Chief United States District Judge