MARLUC

CASE STUDY · MARLUC SYNOPSIS

Brazil Supreme Federal Court: Victor appeal screening and later AI tools

IMPLEMENTED 2018–2025 · GOVERNMENT AND PUBLIC SERVICES · BRAZIL · BAND C · CLAIMED ONLY

VERSION 1.0 · PUBLISHED 15 NOVEMBER 2026 · UPDATED 15 NOVEMBER 2026 · FACTS CHECKED 15 NOVEMBER 2026

Since 2018 Brazil's Supreme Federal Court has used machine-learning tools, starting with Victor, to sort incoming extraordinary appeals and link them to general repercussion themes. In December 2024 it added MARIA, a generative AI drafting tool. The court says people review all output; independent measurement of the effect is limited.

ABOUT THIS SYNOPSIS

This is MarLuc's summary and grading of publicly available sources, for information only. It is not investment, legal, financial or professional advice, and should not be relied on for any decision. Readers must validate it against the original sources and, where appropriate, challenge its conclusions.

Facts and figures are as reported by the sources listed below, which may be incomplete, self-reported or out of date. Check the original source before relying on any figure.

The impact band, proof marker and SEAM view are MarLuc's opinion. The organisation is not a MarLuc client and has not reviewed or endorsed this synopsis. Names and trademarks belong to their owners.

NOTICE WORDING LAST UPDATED 16 NOVEMBER 2026

AT A GLANCE

AI used: Machine-learning classification (Victor, RAFA 2030, VitorIA) and a generative AI drafting tool (MARIA).

Implemented: 2018–2025. Grade: band C, Process change, Claimed only.

Headline result, as reported: Court's tools sort appeals and draft reports with human review; speed and accuracy figures come from an academic article, not an independent test

1 · The case

The facts, as reported by the 5 sources listed at the end. Where a source is silent, the field says "Not reported".

Organisation

Supremo Tribunal Federal (Brazil). Brazil's highest constitutional court. Victor is one of four AI tools the court describes: Victor, RAFA 2030, VitorIA and MARIA. Canvas block: 4. Operations and process. Also 8. Governance and risk.

Business challenge

The challenge. The academic article describes a large backlog in the superior courts and says appeals arrive from lower courts without a standard format, so court secretariats separated the key documents by hand before any analysis of general repercussion could begin.

How it was addressed. The court built Victor with the University of Brasilia to classify the types of document in incoming case files and to link extraordinary appeals to general repercussion themes. The court says it created Victor in 2018 to support screening of appeals. It added RAFA 2030 in 2022 to classify cases by UN Sustainable Development Goals and VitorIA in 2023 to group cases by textual similarity. After a public call that began in November 2023 and drew more than 20 companies, it launched MARIA on 16 December 2024. MARIA generates draft summaries (ementas), reports in extraordinary appeals, and a first analysis of constitutional complaints (reclamações). [1] [2] [3] [4] [5]

Who implemented it

University of Brasilia (University or research lab): Developed Victor with the court under a cooperation agreement, with students of law, software engineering and computer science..
EloGroup (Software vendor): Supplied the prototype behind MARIA's report function and transferred the source code and rights to the court..
Microsoft (Model or cloud provider): Supported EloGroup during the proof of concept, per the court..
In-house (In-house): Built the ementa and complaint-analysis functions, integrated MARIA into STF Digital and now develop it..

Technology (SEAM pillar E)

SEAM types: T8 Predictive / ML models. Deployment: Not reported. Vendors and products: EloGroup, Microsoft, Victor, RAFA 2030, VitorIA, MARIA.

Where it was built in: Built into STF Digital, the court's electronic case system, per the court. Victor was developed with the University of Brasilia; MARIA grew from a prototype by EloGroup, which gave the court the source code.

What changed

Before: staff separated case documents and checked appeals against themes by hand. After: Victor does the document separation and theme matching, and MARIA drafts reports inside STF Digital for staff and ministers to review. By September 2025 MARIA also covered more case types and offered grammar review and a combined precedent search. [1] [2] [3] [4] [5]

What it cost

Not reported. The court says it will install open-source language models on its own servers to reduce costs; no figures are given.

What it saved

An academic article reports that Victor could sort appeals by theme in 5 seconds, a task taking human staff 44 minutes, and that a human check of its document separation found about 93 per cent accuracy. These are secondary figures; the court's own releases give no time or cost savings.

Governance and control

The court says AI works only as a support tool and all output is reviewed by a person; the minister who launched MARIA said nothing done to speed up the court removes the judge's work and responsibility. The court's secretary-general said in 2025 that no tool yet produces or suggests a decision. An academic article names risks of bias and of over-simplified summaries of decisions, and proposes recording Victor's involvement in each case file.

S2 · Accountable owner · Claimed
Court president Luís Roberto Barroso said responsibility for the texts remains with ministers and court staff. [1]

A1 · Safe use · Claimed
The court says the aim is more productivity without giving up human review and data protection. [2]

A2 · Human in the loop · Claimed
The court says AI never acts autonomously and that everything done with it needs human supervision and review; an academic article warns that without a final human check on theme-tagging, over-simplified legal theses could be applied wrongly. [2] [3]

A3 · Monitoring and assurance · Claimed
A human check of Victor's document sorting reported about 93 per cent accuracy; the article authors cite calls for the court to publish clearer information on how Victor is used. No audit of MARIA is reported. [3]

A4 · Vendor AI · Claimed
The court transferred EloGroup's source code and rights to its own team, and is installing open-source language models on its own servers to gain autonomy and data security, per the court. [1] [2]

A5 · Agent controls · Not reported
No agents are described.

A6 · Standards and regulation · Claimed
The court's secretary-general said a forthcoming court resolution will set ethical guidelines for AI in judging. The National Council of Justice issued Resolution 615/2025 for the judiciary; the sources do not say how it applies to the court itself. [4] [5]

What worked, what did not, what is unproven

WORKED

– Victor classified case documents with about 93 per cent accuracy in the separation stage, per an academic article.

– The court kept the work in-house after taking over EloGroup's code and now develops MARIA itself.

– MARIA's scope grew between December 2024 and September 2025 from three functions to a wider list of case types.

DID NOT

– The academic article notes problems such as inadequate summaries of decisions and warns of implicit bias from over-simplifying legal theses.

– The article recommends that the court record in each electronic case file when Victor was used, so that parties can seek review. Whether the court did so is Not reported.

UNPROVEN

– Time and cost savings from MARIA: Not reported.

– Whether Victor's speed and accuracy figures hold in current use: no independent evaluation

– How the National Council of Justice's AI rules apply to the court itself.

Timeline

2018 Victor created to support screening of extraordinary appeals and linking cases to general repercussion themes [2]

Aug 2020 National Council of Justice Resolution 332 on AI in the judiciary issued (cited as related legislation to Resolution 615) [5]

2022 RAFA 2030 launched to classify cases by the UN Sustainable Development Goals [2]

2023 VitorIA enters operation, grouping cases by textual similarity [2]

Nov 2023 Court opens a public call for companies to submit AI prototypes for reports in appeal cases [1]

Dec 2024 MARIA launched: first generative AI tool at the court [1]

Mar 2025 National Council of Justice issues Resolution 615 on development, use and governance of AI in the judiciary [5]

Aug 2025 Court's secretary-general says AI is still far from use in decisions [4]

Sept 2025 MARIA extended to more case types, with grammar review and a precedent search; open-source language models being installed in the court's data centre [2]

2 · Grade and SEAM assessment

MarLuc's opinion, made on the evidence above. How cases are graded: marluc.co.uk/case-studies/how-we-rate

Level of change and impact

Claimed: Not applicable. Grade: C, Process change. Proof: Claimed only. Level of change: Process change.

Process change (Level 2, band C) at stage level. The court describes support tools with human review, and its own secretary-general says AI is not yet used for decisions.

A defined stage of appeal processing, sorting and classifying incoming papers, is now done by software with human checks, and MARIA drafts reports inside the court's case system. That is a process change at stage level (band C). The court's own figures, and an academic article that repeats them, are the only evidence of effect, so the marker is Claimed only. The court does not claim transformation, and its secretary-general says AI is not yet used to reach decisions.

The SEAM view and lessons learnt

The court has built a family of tools over several years and has taken the generative AI work in-house by owning the code. The gaps are in measurement and transparency: the public record shows capability and intent, not independent checks of accuracy or time saved. For a large public body, the transferable points are to own the source, keep a person responsible for every output, and publish how each tool is used and measured.

1. Keep a named person responsible for every AI-drafted output.
2. Record in the case file when AI was used so decisions can be reviewed.

Evidence

Score 2 of 4. Court releases plus a peer-reviewed academic analysis of Victor. The speed and accuracy figures are cited from other sources and not independently tested.

Evaluation method. Court news releases (primary), an academic article analysing Victor (secondary), a press interview with the court's secretary-general, and the National Council of Justice resolution. Portuguese sources; quotes translated for this synopsis.

Sources disagree. The court says Victor was created in 2018; the sources opened do not give a go-live date or any current Victor usage figures. The court's releases give no time-saving figures; the 5 seconds and 44 minutes figures come only from the academic article.

Status. In use and expanding: MARIA extended in September 2025; open-source language models being installed. A court resolution on AI use was announced as forthcoming in August 2025; its status is Not reported.

3 · Original sources

Read these in full. To challenge a fact or a grade, use the contact form at marluc.co.uk or the link on https://marluc.co.uk/case-studies/stf-victor-appeal-screening-ai

[1] Supremo Tribunal Federal: STF lança MARIA, ferramenta de inteligência artificial que dará mais agilidade aos serviços do Tribunal (16 December 2024)
https://noticias.stf.jus.br/postsnoticias/stf-lanca-maria-ferramenta-de-inteligencia-artificial-que-dara-mais-agilidade-aos-servicos-do-tribunal/

[2] Supremo Tribunal Federal: STF amplia uso de inteligência artificial em apoio à atividade jurisdicional (25 September 2025)
https://noticias.stf.jus.br/postsnoticias/stf-amplia-uso-de-inteligencia-artificial-em-apoio-a-atividade-jurisdicional/

[3] Revista de Investigações Constitucionais: Decisão judicial assistida por inteligência artificial e o Sistema Victor do Supremo Tribunal Federal (Valle, Fuentes i Gasó, Ajus, 2023)
https://www.scielo.br/j/rinc/a/YKZfQPLJqT7F3P445KkmwnC/?lang=pt

[4] Consultor Jurídico (ConJur): Ainda estamos longe de usar IA em decisões, diz secretária-geral do STF (13 August 2025)
https://www.conjur.com.br/2025-ago-13/ainda-estamos-longe-de-usar-ia-em-decisoes-diz-secretaria-geral-do-stf/

[5] Conselho Nacional de Justiça: Resolução nº 615, de 11 de março de 2025 (AI in the Judiciary)
https://atos.cnj.jus.br/atos/detalhar/6001

Supremo Tribunal Federal (Brazil) website: https://portal.stf.jus.br

Version 1.0 · Published 15 November 2026 · Updated 15 November 2026 · Facts checked against sources 15 November 2026 · Downloaded 27 November 2026. This PDF may be out of date: the latest version, and a way to report an error or a better source, is at https://marluc.co.uk/case-studies/stf-victor-appeal-screening-ai

VERSION HISTORY

v1.0 15 November 2026 First published