Open Access

EURASIAN EXPERIMENT JOURNAL OF HUMANITIES ANDSOCIAL SCIENCES (EEJHSS)ISSN: 2992-4111

©EEJHSS Publications

Volume 6 Issue 2 2025

Page | 39

E-Discovery and the Language of Digital Evidence

Kato Nabirye H.

Faculty of Business, Kampala International University, Uganda

ABSTRACT

E-discovery is the process of identifying, collecting, preserving, reviewing, and producing digital evidence in legal proceedings. With the increasing integration of digital technologies in both personal and professional spheres, the volume and complexity of digital data in legal matters are growing. This paper examines the role of e-discovery in modern litigation, with a focus on the legal frameworks, ethical considerations, and technological tools that shape its implementation. E-discovery plays a crucial role in civil, criminal, and regulatory proceedings, as digital evidence such as emails, documents, metadata, and social media content can significantly influence legal outcomes. However, the process is fraught with challenges, including the vast amount of data, diverse formats, and issues related to privacy and ethical practices. The paper also highlights advancements in e-discovery tools such as keyword search, predictive coding, and machine learning algorithms that assist legal professionals in efficiently handling digital evidence. By analyzing the intersection of law, technology, and ethical considerations, this study provides a comprehensive overview of the evolving landscape of e-discovery and its critical role in the legal process.

Keywords: E-discovery, digital evidence, legal proceedings, data privacy, predictive coding, ethical considerations, legal framework.

INTRODUCTION

E-discovery, short for electronic discovery, is broadly understood as the process of identifying, locating, preserving, collecting, and reviewing electronically stored and other predominantly, if not exclusively, digital information that is relevant to a civil, criminal, or regulatory legal case. Some information security professionals have also called attention to the overlap between the fields of e-discovery and cyber forensics, or so-called "cyber discovery." To locate, recover, or review electronic information and evidence requires a basic understanding of the machine and programming languages, as well as the interface between software and hardware. For practitioners, it means having policy and legal guidelines for infrastructure planning and hardware and software purchases to allow for software security updates, patches, and impact assessment of changes on evidence discovery. The volatile nature of the digital world means that knowledge of local, state, and federal rules of evidence, along with state public records exceptions, is fundamental to the legal process $\lceil 1, 2 \rceil$. The ease of use, coupled with the data storage capabilities of personal digital assistants (PDAs), cell phones, thumb drives, and online cloud storage solutions, makes electronic discovery relevant in nearly any legal matter. The author has been working on the Language of E-discovery (LED), which is designed to provide a rudimentary and practical understanding of the law, policy, and fundamental technologies necessary for any digital evidence investigation [3, 4].

Definition and Scope

E-discovery refers to the process of identifying, collecting, preserving, reviewing, and producing digital evidence for use in a legal proceeding, whether it is undertaken by a law enforcement agency or in the context of a formal litigation process. Digital evidence may include but is not limited to emails, emails with attachments, calendars, other address books or contact lists, Internet history records, computer system logs, password files, encryption keys, electronic documents that may pertain to a case, network

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited

Open Access

traffic, chat room logs, or instant message logs. Due to the evolving nature of digital data, the evidentiary realm continues to grow as communication becomes more and more digital. Given this trend, electronic evidence should be presumed to play a critical role in an increasing percentage of legal matters [5, 6]. In litigation, e-discovery is the first formal step of evidence gathering and combines elements of both formal and informal knowledge gathering. On one hand, e-discovery actions may be formalized within legal processes and court rules. On the other hand, one of the primary goals of e-discovery is to move preliminary information-gathering processes outside of the formalized legal process and into the informal pretrial discovery process, where attorneys hope to gather useful information before it is officially "into the record." This paper of the report is intended to provide a basic understanding of the e-discovery process, its role in litigation, and the parties involved. Attorneys, expert witnesses, or the discovery consultant representing attorneys in the context of retained litigation support are all potential stakeholders in the e-discovery process [6, 7].

Legal Framework for E-Discovery

In the United States, the collection and use of digital evidence is subject to institutional guidelines, driven by procedural and substantive laws that provide mechanisms to ensure its proper discovery and delivery into evidence. The discovery of electronic data, or e-discovery, is a relatively new component of court procedures. Digital evidence was primarily the domain of criminal law until the late 1990s when the judiciary's recognition of a critical need to establish procedural guidelines caught up with this revolutionary new medium of proof. The Federal Rules of Civil Procedure were amended in 2006 and impose responsibilities on parties and procedures for the requesting party to obtain digital evidence from an opponent. These changes in the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure demonstrate the growing recognition of the increased importance of digital evidence in legal proceedings [8, 9]. Complexities of digital evidence in the context of civil law in the United States combine federal, state, and procedural guidelines. Indeed, individual states may have their own rules and case law that pertain to e-discovery. These rules and decisions may help to shape the development of best practices or argue against certain legal approaches. Finally, individual case law decisions on the discovery of email and social media evidence can address specific issues under already existing laws enacted both before and after the turn of the century. The rapid changes in technology and policy, both in criminal law and in e-discovery, underline the difficulty and complexity of both exercising rights and responsibilities in the rapidly advancing cyberphysical environment $\lceil 10, 11 \rceil$.

Relevance of Digital Evidence in Legal Proceedings

In today's digital age, digital evidence has become increasingly relevant in numerous legal proceedings and has, in some cases, resulted in shifting the outcomes of court cases, often undermining one side's arguments and strengthening the other's. The rigor of policing is at a steady incline, which has helped to increase the number of convictions. In addition, technological advancements in video recording devices and other audio and video surveillance equipment have been brought to bear in proving the guilt of individual criminals or have been used in proving the guilt of groups or organizations that are engaging in illegal activities such as fraud, terrorism, and drugs. Digital evidence has been used for a variety of legal disputes, ranging from fraud suits to personal injury claims. Though less common, digital evidence has also been used to get a conviction in a homicide case as well. Whether used for criminal or civil proceedings, the examination of digital evidence can become a significant issue at trial [12, 4]. The importance of digital evidence is significant; however, life could irreparably change for those involved if the electronic evidence is not guarded diligently. The admissibility of digital evidence has been a frequently contested issue in many cases. This is because of the special authentication and retention needs that apply specifically to electronic records. Moreover, electronic records are frowned upon by some courts. Doubts about the possibility of manipulating an electronic record may exist in the mind of the judge regarding both the content of a record and how the record was created in the first place. Despite these concerns, an increasing number of electronic evidence continues to be presented in court for numerous legal cases. Several relevant digital evidence cases are reported daily in the media. The fields of digital evidence and electronic discovery are rapidly becoming part of the mainstream of legal disputes. Twenty years ago, most attorneys, judges, and juries had not even heard the term "e-mail." An individual might get away with a casual handling of these materials back then. We no longer inhabit such a world. Failure to properly manage exhibit data can now provide litigious ammunition to an adversary lawyer in the discovery process. The inclusion of any electronic data in the discovery process in the 21st century can result in a tremendous addition of time and expense; time delays; sanctions, hearings, and court

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited

orders, deflation of bargaining positions, and generalized chaos in your law firm and the complex venue of cyber litigants [13, 14].

Challenges In E-Discovery

The amount of data available today is staggering. In 2002, a storage company announced that, for the first time, produced information would surpass the amount of available storage. Matters have only gotten worse since then. The average legal matter produces 40 GB of data, equivalent to 20,000 four-drawer filing cabinets. Everything that is on your computer, smartphone, or online can be gathered up and used for evidence in a legal matter, whether a court case, a regulatory audit, or some other process. Just 15% of our information exists in discrete physical forms such as paper, books, letters, or photographs. The other 85% consists of electronic files residing on hard drives, servers, and cell towers [15, 16]. E-discovery encompasses a wide variety of digital information, including emails, word-processing files, spreadsheets, databases, websites, instant messages, text messages, files, and the metadata collected from those files. Furthermore, this data is stored on an almost limitless array of devices, including desktop and laptop computers, backup tapes, pagers, smartphones, and PDAs. It is also possible that these files may be encrypted, and the storage devices themselves contain a variety of file systems that may or may not be accessible by technology that reads other types of files. By some reports, up to 95% of organizations do not know all of the different types of data they have stored. Courts are also struggling to implement standards of document production for the digital age, telescoping the costs associated with discovery as litigants are faced with the prospect of reviewing more documents than have ever been generated in human history. All of this requires judges to be much more hands-on than they have been accustomed to traditionally. Electronic discovery can represent 40-70% of the total cost of litigation. Government agencies can be equally affected to the point of being rendered functionally hamstrung as they are hit with the cost of compliance much more acutely due to the public's right to know. Staffing all of this can be even more complicated and expensive in cases of criminal investigations, where federal agencies lean heavily on higher-skilled personnel. There are close to 60,000 pieces of electronic equipment awaiting examination as a part of criminal investigations at a Cyber Crimes Center alone, and 41.3% of the most timeconsuming part of each new criminal case is electronic discovery in some form. Given the depth and intrigue of computer systems and communications, becoming an expert in the field is a moving target as technology and data management practices continually evolve [17, 18].

Volume and Complexity of Digital Data

The progressive shift of business and personal activity to digital media, coupled with the ubiquity of digital devices comprising multiple communication fronts and data storage sources, has resulted in a data explosion. The digital universe is doubling every two years and is expected to reach 175 zettabytes by 2025. Users generated 306 billion emails per day in 2020, and this number is predicted to increase to 376 billion by 2025. Social media users are equally productive, generating an estimated 317,000 status updates and 54,000 links shared on their profiles every 60 seconds. Forty-eight hours' worth of video is uploaded to platforms every minute. It is this deluge of electronic data that has become the bedrock for modern ediscovery. Moreover, when data resides in the cloud, the approach to handling such data, collection and access rights, managing the e-discovery process, and the proper scheduling of protocol delivery changes [19, 20]. The sheer size of the digital information flood can lead to complexity in identifying a manageable amount of relevant evidence. The complexity does not stem solely from the volume, but also from the greater variety, velocity, and veracity of electronic data. Email is the most commonly requested form of digital communication content in e-discovery. However, text is no longer the primary form of communication across many social, web, and messaging platforms. Social media posts are predominantly multimedia-capable, combining images, text, video, and audio. Modern messaging services have similarly become multimedia-carrying chat applications, where participants can send text, images, emojis, stickers, voice, or videos to one another. ESI may reside in computers owned by employees and contractors who do actual data processing on behalf of the business organization. Data can reside in various media such as USB keys, backup storage, memory cards, optical media, and large proprietary storage. This same data may reside in internal protected systems called intranets, extranets, and portals or on the business side as hosted services, cloud storage, or be mirrored on various handheld computing devices. Many legal reviewers have no tech understanding, let alone training or experience, to appreciate any of the document retrieval and search capabilities now at their command. Ninety to 95 percent of collected data holdings are not potentially relevant to any legal case now or in the future. The challenge with the rise in the size of data holdings is that irrelevant information is worth less but known to cost more. In an environment of

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited

Open Access

largely irrelevant data, continuing to imbibe discovery processes developed for paper to retrieve relevant evidence is not only inefficient but also an unjustifiable waste of resources [21, 22]. The volume of data alone presents a challenge in terms of collecting and presenting relevant evidence. Traditional search and indexing are no longer reliable. Just printing documents can be a giant hassle and has its drawbacks. A proper legal and judicial demand for digital material will enhance the collection of ESI. Legal professionals today need to understand how and what data should be managed and, when necessary, the role of outside providers. Even data management itself is quickly evolving with transitory data such as messaging applications that may be created expressly to destroy it when its brief utility period ends. Social media network preservation may now have to be a part of the range of retention periods for company data. Misunderstanding of technology can have a substantial effect on legal proceedings. Current practice, validated by most cases to date, typically sides with those who provide the most credible evidence, even when this is not accurate scientific information. The task remains to sell judges labor-saving, innovative, effective solutions without going overboard into permanent evidence distortion [23, 24].

Technological Tools For E-Discovery

Given the vast amount of electronic data that corporations and other organizations produce, as well as the increasing complexity and sophistication of that data, e-discovery within the distinct and complex law of discovery has become almost impossible to manage without technological tools. To cope with the vast and rapidly evolving body of data constituting digital evidence, technological tools have been developed to assist in identifying potentially relevant electronic information, collecting that information, and conducting early analyses. While a range of software systems and other tools have been crafted to perform at least one of these tasks, the following programs and systems have, to date, been particularly important [25, 9]. Tools exist for searching vast quantities of information using keywords, for efficiently reviewing documents for relevance and privilege, and for predicting whether unreviewed documents meet a relevance standard or contain privileged communications. Keywords are terms or phrases that the parties or the courts have identified as being indicative of a party's claims and defenses. Therefore, this approach to searching offers the advantage of generating a precise result set. Newer software systems use predictive coding to find documents that meet a relevant standard. These searches are based on machine learning that calibrates the probability of a document's relevance against human reviewers' coding determinations. Some critics argue that technology-assisted searching is a time-consuming and complicated process that, absent proper quality control or involving an adversary, is too risky. Supporters assert that keyword searching is efficient, effective, and inexpensive, given its demonstrated success during the past decade and the economic disadvantage of requiring an adversary to review all of the relevant information to ensure accurate results. According to supporters, the various software tools only aid counsel in efficiently identifying and reviewing information $\lceil 26, 27 \rceil$.

Keyword Search and Predictive Coding

At the heart of e-discovery are the search tools. Litigation is a document-driven practice, and exploring the evidentiary documents against an adverse party can be the fight. If documents can't be found, then they are irretrievably irrelevant. While those seeking discovery are free to probe through all relevant documents to determine if they are, in fact, material, the value of that right declines exponentially with data set size. This is where search technologies like keyword search and predictive coding come into play. Most simply, e-discovery keyword search tools are an up-to-date software interface paired with a search query. The query includes terms or phrases, some of which may be combined by Boolean operators like "AND" and "OR". The search returns documents containing the query terms. Keywords are very flexible. Unlike taxonomy, there is no hierarchy and no need for training data. After the keywords and phrases are established, the searcher can comb through the results or do further analysis if needed [28]. What predictive coding does is take spaghetti to the wall. Users code a small subset of relevant and nonrelevant documents upfront, and then the predictive coding algorithm takes over. After the algorithm is "trained" on the coding decisions made for the initial set of documents, it will then go through the rest of the documents in the collection and sort them into the two coding buckets. The e-discovery from the haystack method has the potential to save vast amounts of time in cases with a large number of irrelevant documents that do not hold evidentiary value. However, it is important to note that predictive coding is not perfect, and perhaps the best way to avoid technological mistakes is to monitor the algorithms to ensure that they are selecting the best results. However, predictive coding does require techniques and know-how on the part of the e-discovery service provider. Further, the keywords should also be general

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited

enough to encompass the size and complexity of the document for the TAR process to be successful. As a result, when choosing to use TAR, such predictive coding technology and terms should be chosen by a skilled provider or else the results may entirely miss out on important information. In general, e-discovery practitioners need to stay abreast of advances in keyword search and predictive coding technology. Most importantly, technology, like any method of artificial intelligence, should be used in combination with human judgment for the best results [29].

Ethical and Privacy Considerations in E-Discovery

E-discovery possesses many ethical and privacy considerations. One of the main duties of a lawyer is to find evidence related to a case before proceeding with prescriptions on strategy. It is crucial in civil matters to know what evidence is available before deciding to sue or not. As digital evidence grows, it has created a legal area of privacy law. Many laws and court decisions are made around the concept of at what point stored information becomes owned by the largest person, such as emails, or when information entered into a public domain turns private. If an individual who engages in illegal activity has evidence with them when they are arrested, police are trained to collect the evidence that is in plain view. This same common sense applies to digital evidence, whether it be an email or a digital photograph. The larger question addressed in e-discovery is at what point government or e-discovery professionals deputized by the government should be allowed to use digital private information for an investigation and proof in a court of law? One question that is left to interpretation in several courts is how authorized in the ECPA is defined. It is ethical and legal for police officers to walk into a department store in the mall and film suspects with video security cameras. Prosecutors are also using video in child abuse cases where a live person does not go into the place of business to buy the video. One gentleman was arrested because he had hired criminals to kill his soon-to-be ex-wife. Making the public aware of surveillance equipment prevents extreme general use, but no laws are in place to regulate the use of surveillance equipment in public or the public domain. Unauthorized access to confidential information is easy in today's technology-based surveillance society. To respect privacy, some programs will mask IP addresses. Jurors can find out who they are and can view their work environment using Google Maps and ISP software. There are many civil and privacy rights associated with these issues. As more Internet users become knowledgeable of this risk in e-discovery, they are going to take stronger measures to protect their privacy. It will be more difficult for those in e-discovery to legally obtain the information that they need for their cases. E-discovery specialists need to follow ethical standards to determine the parameters in which the e-discovery process should operate. This is because, during trials, lawyers and e-discovery professionals may have access to a variety of information, including things that are about to be deleted. While doing this, the possibility of viewing a sensitive piece of data hidden in billions or trillions of files is high. This is not appropriate. However, it needs to be pursued, to ensure individuals' right to privacy. All clients and information handled are innocent until proven guilty. Data handling, especially in investigations, is often personal and can be incriminating for an individual. The level of trust the public has in law enforcement to handle this information is important. Clients will not disclose any information that they feel is going to be raped or misused. Therefore, e-discovery should have a policy that follows the correct ethical path for these types of situations [30].

CONCLUSION

As technology continues to evolve and digital evidence becomes increasingly integral to legal proceedings, the challenges of e-discovery are expected to intensify. Legal professionals must adapt to new tools and methodologies, such as predictive coding and advanced search algorithms, to manage the vast amounts of data generated. At the same time, ensuring the ethical handling of sensitive digital evidence remains paramount, with privacy concerns and proper data management practices taking center stage in the legal community. The integration of technology with legal processes must continue to be monitored to ensure that e-discovery remains effective, efficient, and fair. As the volume of digital data expands, so too will the importance of maintaining robust standards and protocols for its discovery, preservation, and use in court. The future of e-discovery lies in the delicate balance between leveraging technological advancements and respecting the rights and privacy of individuals involved in legal cases.

REFERENCES

1. Olsen SJ. OPTIMIZE E-DISCOVERY PRODUCTION: Whether you represent an individual or an entity such as a local or state government, you must know how to collect, preserve, and sort electronic data efficiently. Trial. 2021 Aug 1;57(8):34-40.

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited

Open Access

- 2. Beutler Withy M. E-Discovery-Managing the Risks to Get the Reward: Best Practices for Construction Lawyers and Their Clients. Construction Lawyer. 2021 Jul 1;41(3).
- 3. Agostini M, Benato G, Detwiler JA, Menéndez J, Vissani F. Toward the discovery of matter creation with neutrinoless β β decay. Reviews of Modern Physics. 2023 Apr 1;95(2):025002. aps.org
- 4. Omolara AE, Alabdulatif A, Abiodun OI, Alawida M, Alabdulatif A, Arshad H. The internet of things security: A survey encompassing unexplored areas and new insights. Computers & Page | 44 Security. 2022 Jan 1;112:102494. [HTML]
- Krishnan S, Shashidhar N. Interplay of digital forensics in ediscovery. International Journal of 5.Computer Science and Security (IJCSS). 2021;15(2):19. researchgate.net
- Basilio BS. A Long Way from Brady: The Impact of Digital Infrastructure & E-Discovery 6. Practices on State Discovery Obligations in Criminal Cases. Colo. Tech. LJ. 2023;22:337.
- Bauer K. Technology-Assisted Review: Changing the Discovery Game, Not the Discovery Rules. 7. Not the Discovery Rules (February 4, 2021). 2021 Feb 4.
- Stjepanovic B. Leveraging artificial intelligence in ediscovery: enhancing efficiency, accuracy, and 8. ethical considerations. Regional L. Rev. 2024:179.
- Marzano T. Regulatory Responses to Data Privacy Crises and Their Ongoing Impact on E-9. Discovery. Global Bus. L. Rev., 2021;9:157.
- 10. Gupta M, Kumar P, Mishra A. A Review of the Discussion on Digital Transformation in Higher Education. Digital Transformation in Higher Education, Part B: Cases, Examples and Good Practices. 2024 Oct 28:197-229.
- 11. Stuart AH. The Privacy Paradox in Discovery. Vand. J. Ent. & Tech. L. 2023;26:615.
- 12. Torous J, Bucci S, Bell IH, Kessing LV, Faurholt-Jepsen M, Whelan P, Carvalho AF, Keshavan M, Linardon J, Firth J. The growing field of digital psychiatry: current evidence and the future of apps, social media, chatbots, and virtual reality. World Psychiatry. 2021 Oct;20(3):318-35. wiley.com
- 13. Stoykova R. Digital evidence: Unaddressed threats to fairness and the presumption of innocence. Computer Law & Security Review. 2021 Sep 1;42:105575.
- 14. OBAMANU G. Legal issues and challenges in the admissibility of digital forensic evidence in courts in Nigeria. AJIEEL. 2023 Nov 13;8(01):96-109.
- 15. Wang X, Zhang X, Hoo V, Shao Z, Zhang X. LegalReasoner: A Multi-Stage Framework for Legal Judgment Prediction via Large Language Models and Knowledge Integration. IEEE Access. 2024 Nov 12.
- 16. Jain D, Borah MD, Biswas A. Summarization of legal documents: Where are we now and the way forward. Computer Science Review. 2021 May 1;40:100388.
- 17. Shahid J, Ahmad R, Kiani AK, Ahmad T, Saeed S, Almuhaideb AM. Data protection and privacy of the internet of healthcare things (IoHTs). Applied Sciences. 2022 Feb 12;12(4):1927. mdpi.com
- 18. Kollnig K, Shuba A, Binns R, Van Kleek M, Shadbolt N. Are iphones really better for privacy? comparative study of ios and android apps. arXiv preprint arXiv:2109.13722. 2021 Sep 28. <u>[PDF]</u>
- 19. Khan S, Memon MA. Data revolution and statistics: Reshaping society and science. "All papers published in the PROCEEDINGS were accepted after formal peer review by the experts in the relevant field.. 2021 Jan 1:7. researchgate.net
- 20. Arbia G, Arbia G. What Do We Mean by the Term "Big Data"?. Statistics, New Empiricism and Society in the Era of Big Data. 2021:3-19. [HTML]
- 21. Mahamat-Saleh Y, Fiolet T, Rebeaud ME, Mulot M, Guihur A, El Fatouhi D, Laouali N, Peiffer-Smadja N, Aune D, Severi G. Diabetes, hypertension, body mass index, smoking and COVID-19related mortality: a systematic review and meta-analysis of observational studies. BMJ open. 2021 Oct 1;11(10):e052777. bmj.com
- 22. Thompson MG, Burgess JL, Naleway AL, Tyner H, Yoon SK, Meece J, Olsho LE, Caban-Martinez AJ, Fowlkes AL, Lutrick K, Groom HC. Prevention and attenuation of Covid-19 with the BNT162b2 and mRNA-1273 vaccines. New England Journal of Medicine. 2021 Jul 22;385(4):320-9. nejm.org
- 23. Hensen B, Mackworth-Young CR, Simwinga M, Abdelmagid N, Banda J, Mavodza C, Doyle AM, Bonell C, Weiss HA. Remote data collection for public health research in a COVID-19 era:

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited

ethical implications, challenges and opportunities. Health policy and planning. 2021 Apr 1;36(3):360-8. <u>nih.gov</u>

- 24. Ali O, Abdelbaki W, Shrestha A, Elbasi E, Alryalat MA, Dwivedi YK. A systematic literature review of artificial intelligence in the healthcare sector: Benefits, challenges, methodologies, and functionalities. Journal of Innovation & Knowledge. 2023 Jan 1;8(1):100333. <u>sciencedirect.com</u>
- 25. Mancusi MG. Attorneys, E-Discovery, and the Case for 37 (G). Notre Dame L. Rev.. 2021;97:2227.

Page | 45

- 26. Spring M, Faulconbridge J, Sarwar A. How information technology automates and augments processes: Insights from Artificial-Intelligence-based systems in professional service operations. Journal of Operations Management. 2022 Sep;68(6-7):592-618. wiley.com
- 27. Jadhav A, Kaur M, Akter F. Evolution of software development effort and cost estimation techniques: five decades study using automated text mining approach. Mathematical Problems in Engineering. 2022;2022(1):5782587. wiley.com
- 28. Magrath P. New Lamps for Old: Developing Case Law Research for a Changing World. Austl. L. Libr.. 2022;30:110.
- 29. Bokolo BG, Senol NS. The Digital Forensic Approach to eDiscovery. InBreakthroughs in Digital Biometrics and Forensics 2022 Jun 29 (pp. 129-146). Cham: Springer International Publishing.

CITE AS: Kato Nabirye H. (2025). E-Discovery and the Language of Digital Evidence. EURASIAN EXPERIMENT JOURNAL OF HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES 6(2):39-45.

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited