

ISSN: 2583-8725

Lex Scripta Journal

Quarterly Online and Print Edition

Law & Policy

“Join the League of
National & International Scholars”



EDITORIAL TEAM

DR. AJAY BHUPENDRA JAISWAL

Professor & Former Head
Department of Law
V.S.S.D. College, Nawabganj,
(C.S.J.M. University, Kanpur)

DR. MEGHA OJHA

Associate Professor | Legal Consultant
| Author | KLEF College of Law

PROF. DR. DEEVANSHU SHRIVASTAVA

Founding Dean and Professor,
GL Bajaj Institute of Law,
Greater Noida

DR. GAURAV GUPTA

Assistant Professor,
Faculty of Law, Lucknow

MR. TUHIN MUKHARJEE

Leadership Strategist | Business Coach
| Author | Speaker

MR. PRAKARSH PANDEY

Author and
Advocate, Allahabad High Court

MR. AMARESH PATEL

Assistant Professor
at Law School,
Amity University, Patna



**LEX SCRIPTA MAGAZINE OF
LAW AND POLICY (VOL-4, ISSUE-1)**

Copyright © 2025, LexScripta

ISSN-2583-8725

Vol - IV, Issue - I

Published by INTEGRITY EDUCATION INDIA

New Delhi

First Floor, 4598/12-B, 1st Floor,
Padam Chand Marg, Daryaganj,
New Delhi, Delhi 110002

Phone: +91 98 11 66 62 16 (M)

Phone: +91 70 11 60 56 18 (M)

Bengaluru

Jallahalli East

Bengaluru, Karnataka. India.

Phone: +91 98 11 66 62 16 (M)

Email: publisher.integrity@gmail.com

USA

New Jersey

14 Grandview Ave, Upper Saddle River,
NJ-07458, USA

Phone: +14805226504 (M)

London

37 Degree Media

64, Hodder Drive, Perivale, London UB68LL.
United Kingdom.

Phone: +44 7950 78 18 17 (M)

Website: integrityeducation.co.in

© Lex Scripta Magazine Of Law And Policy, 2025

Disclaimer

All Copyrights are reserved with the Authors. But, however, the Authors have granted to the Journal (Lex Scripta Magazine of Law and Policy), an irrevocable, non-exclusive, royalty-free and transferable license to publish, reproduce, store, transmit, display and distribute it in the Journal or books or in any form and all other media, retrieval systems and other formats now or hereafter known. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored, distributed, or transmitted in any form or by any means, including photocopying, recording, or other electronic or mechanical methods, without the prior permission of the publisher, except in the case of brief quotations embodied in critical reviews and certain other non-commercial uses permitted by copyright law.

The Editorial Team of Lex Scripta Magazine of Law and Policy Issues holds the copyright to all articles contributed to this publication. The views expressed in this publication are purely personal opinions of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Editorial Team of Lex Scripta Magazine of Law and Policy.

[© Lex Scripta Magazine of Law and Policy. Any unauthorized use, circulation or reproduction shall attract suitable action under application law.]

For any Query / Feedback
Phone: +91 98 11 66 62 16 (Vineet Sharma)

Printed in India @ New Delhi

ISSN: 2583-8725

Lex Scripta Journal

Quarterly Online and Print Edition

Law & Policy

"Join the League of National
and International Scholars"



Lex Scripta Journal

Algorithmic Accountability and the Law: Ethical Boundaries in AI-Driven Decision Making

Author

Dr. Manindra Singh Hanspal

Anshu Kumar



Algorithmic Accountability and the Law: Ethical Boundaries in AI-Driven Decision Making

Dr. Manindra Singh Hanspal,
*Assistant Professor, School of Law,
Presidency University, Bengaluru*

Anshu Kumar,
*Student B.A.LL.B., School of Law,
Presidency University, Bengaluru*

Abstract

Artificial intelligence (AI) and big data technologies are rapidly reshaping decision-making across governance, business, and public administration. While these technologies promise objectivity, efficiency, and predictive accuracy, they also challenge traditional notions of accountability, transparency, and human oversight. This chapter explores the intersection of law and ethics in AI-driven decision-making, focusing on how legal frameworks can respond to the ethical dilemmas posed by algorithmic systems. Drawing from India's evolving regulatory landscape, the discussion situates AI governance within the broader context of constitutional morality, administrative fairness, and data protection. The Digital Personal Data Protection Act, 2023, the Information Technology Act, 2000, and the principles of natural justice are considered potential foundations for ensuring algorithmic accountability. Comparative perspectives from the European Union's AI Act and UNESCO's Recommendation on the Ethics of AI highlight the need for global cooperation in embedding ethical values into technological design and governance. The chapter argues that the law must move beyond reactive regulation towards proactive ethical integration, which may be termed "ethics by design." A human-centric framework that prioritizes dignity, autonomy, and fairness is essential to prevent bias, discrimination, and opacity in algorithmic decisions. By blending socio-legal reasoning with ethical analysis, this chapter contributes to the discourse on responsible AI governance and the future of decision-making in democratic societies.

Keywords: *Artificial Intelligence; Algorithmic Accountability; Ethics by Design; Legal Framework; Transparency; Human Centric Governance*

1. Introduction

Ethics and regulation have always been closely connected to technological innovation.¹ However, the rise of artificial intelligence (AI) and big data marks an unprecedented shift in how decisions are conceptualized, processed, and implemented.² Algorithms now influence a wide range of human activities, from recruitment and credit assessment to predictive policing and judicial decision-support systems. What was once guided primarily by human judgment is increasingly mediated by data-driven logic.³ This transformation has sparked not only enthusiasm for efficiency and innovation but also deep ethical and legal anxieties about fairness, accountability, and human oversight. At the core of these anxieties lies the problem of algorithmic opacity. Unlike traditional administrative or corporate decision-making, algorithmic systems operate within complex, automated structures that are often inaccessible even to their designers. This “black box” nature of AI challenges the foundational legal principles of transparency, due process, and accountability, values deeply rooted in both constitutional governance and the rule of law.⁴ When decisions affecting rights, opportunities, or access to justice are made or assisted by algorithms, the questions arise: Who is accountable when things go wrong? Can an algorithm be held legally responsible? Furthermore, how can ethical principles guide machines that lack moral consciousness?⁵

In India, the question of technological ethics intersects powerfully with constitutional and administrative law. The Indian Constitution, while drafted in a pre-digital era, embodies enduring values of equality, dignity, and procedural fairness that remain relevant to contemporary technological challenges.⁶ The jurisprudence of the Supreme Court of India, from *Maneka Gandhi v. Union of India (1978)*⁷ to *Justice K.S. Puttaswamy v. Union of India (2017)*⁸, has consistently reinforced the notion that state action, even when technologically mediated, must conform to the principles of reasonableness and fairness. As governance and private services increasingly rely on algorithmic systems, these constitutional values offer a moral compass for regulating the digital sphere.

Globally, the discourse on AI ethics has shifted from mere innovation management to responsible governance. Initiatives such as the European Union’s AI Act (2024) and UNESCO’s Recommendation on the Ethics of Artificial Intelligence (2021) have sought to define accountability and human oversight for algorithmic processes.⁹ These frameworks advocate for an “ethics by design” approach, embedding fairness, non-discrimination, and transparency into AI architecture itself, rather than treating ethics as a post facto regulatory fix. India’s Digital Personal Data Protection Act, 2023, also marks a significant step in this direction by

emphasizing lawful processing, consent, and individual rights in data governance.¹⁰ However, technological regulation cannot succeed through statutory instruments alone. Law must collaborate with ethics, philosophy, and social reasoning to ensure that innovation serves humanity rather than subordinating it. A purely legalistic approach risks lagging behind technological evolution, while an unregulated ethical framework may lack enforceability. Thus, the real challenge lies in achieving a normative equilibrium in which law internalizes ethical reasoning and ethics gains procedural legitimacy through statute.

This chapter, therefore, seeks to explore the ethical boundaries of algorithmic accountability in the context of AI-driven decision-making. It aims to identify how Indian legal frameworks, constitutional doctrines, and global norms can collectively shape a human-centric governance model. By weaving together insights from law, philosophy, and policy, the discussion argues that algorithmic accountability must not only ensure compliance but also cultivate moral responsibility, preserving the centrality of human values in an increasingly data-driven world.

2. Understanding Algorithmic Accountability Concept, Challenges, and Ethical Dilemmas

The term algorithmic accountability refers to the obligation of designers, developers, and deployers of artificial intelligence (AI) systems to ensure that the outcomes produced by their algorithms are explainable, lawful, and ethically sound.¹¹ In traditional governance, accountability implies that a decision maker can justify their choices based on established legal norms or moral reasoning. In algorithmic systems, however, accountability becomes complex, as decisions emerge from data-driven computations that often lack transparency and human traceability. This phenomenon, commonly known as the black box problem, poses a central challenge to both ethical evaluation and legal oversight.¹²

2.1 Defining Algorithmic Accountability

At its core, algorithmic accountability demands responsibility, transparency, and answerability in the design and use of AI systems. It entails the ability to trace decisions back to identifiable human agents or institutions who can be held liable for outcomes. Nevertheless, the diffusion of responsibility across developers, data scientists, corporations, and government bodies complicates this process. When an algorithm denies a person access to credit, employment, or welfare benefits, identifying “who” made the decision is not always clear. This uncertainty disrupts the conventional framework of liability and due process on which democratic governance

rests.¹³ Moreover, AI systems often evolve through machine learning, in which algorithms modify themselves based on patterns in the data, which makes them adaptive but unpredictable.¹⁴ Ethical concerns arise when biases embedded in datasets lead to discriminatory outcomes that reinforce existing social inequalities. Thus, accountability in AI must address not only who is responsible but also how systems are designed, trained, and audited.

2.2 Ethical Dilemmas in AI Decision Making

AI's ethical dilemmas stem from the tension between efficiency and morality. While automation enhances speed and consistency, it can also depersonalize justice, empathy, and discretion, values intrinsic to human decision-making.¹⁵ Ethical theories offer practical frameworks for evaluating this tension.

- Utilitarianism would justify algorithmic efficiency if it maximizes collective welfare, but it risks overlooking individual rights.¹⁶
- Deontological ethics, by contrast, prioritizes moral duties and human dignity over outcomes, emphasizing fairness and procedural justice even in automated environments.¹⁷
- A virtue ethics perspective reminds us that technology should cultivate moral character and social good, not merely productivity.¹⁸

Another dilemma arises in the realm of autonomy and control. When machines predict human behaviour or make preemptive decisions, individuals lose agency over choices that affect their lives, undermining the ethical foundations of consent and participation principles central to both human rights law and democratic governance.

The concept of “algorithmic bias” further complicates ethical accountability. Biases can arise from skewed data, flawed model design, or human prejudices embedded during system training.¹⁹ For instance, facial recognition algorithms have shown higher error rates for women and darker-skinned individuals, leading to wrongful profiling and surveillance concerns. Such outcomes violate fundamental rights to equality and dignity, as recognized in Article 14 and Article 21 of the Indian Constitution.

2.3 Socio-Legal Implications of Algorithmic Decision Making

From a legal standpoint, the opacity of algorithms challenges procedural fairness, a key component of administrative and constitutional law. Traditional legal systems rely on principles of audi alteram partem (the right to be heard) and reasoned decision-making.²⁰ However, when an AI system autonomously generates outcomes without providing a rationale comprehensible to humans, these principles are jeopardized. The affected individual may have no means to effectively appeal or contest the decision.

Furthermore, accountability gaps emerge in both private and public sectors. In public administration, algorithmic governance tools such as predictive policing or welfare distribution systems may inadvertently perpetuate discrimination, yet legal remedies remain underdeveloped.²¹ In the private domain, companies often shield their algorithms as proprietary secrets, making it difficult for individuals to challenge unfair decisions. These issues highlight the need for algorithmic transparency, a mechanism by which decisions can be audited, explained, and justified before legal and ethical standards.²²

Ethically, delegating decision-making power to machines raises questions about moral agency. Can a machine be said to make a “decision” in the moral sense, or is it merely executing programmed logic? The law traditionally presumes that only humans or legally recognized entities (such as corporations) can bear responsibility.²³ AI complicates this by acting autonomously but without consciousness or intent.

Globally, cases have already demonstrated the human cost of algorithmic errors. The Netherlands’ “child benefits scandal” (2020) exposed how automated fraud detection systems wrongly accused thousands of families based on biased data, leading to financial ruin and political resignation.²⁴ Similar issues in the United States, such as biased risk assessment algorithms in the criminal justice system, illustrate that automation without ethical checks can exacerbate injustice rather than correct it. In the Indian context, algorithmic governance is expanding rapidly in digital services, fintech, and e-governance. However, there is no dedicated legislative framework to ensure algorithmic accountability.²⁵ The absence of statutory obligations for explainability, fairness, or independent audits makes India vulnerable to opaque technological governance. Without embedding ethical safeguards, the promise of AI-driven efficiency risks undermining the constitutional commitment to justice, equality, and human dignity.²⁶

3. Legal Framework and Regulatory Landscape in India

Artificial intelligence (AI) and big data systems are increasingly influencing decisions in India’s public administration, finance, health, and legal sectors. Nevertheless, the country’s regulatory architecture is still in its formative stage when it comes to addressing algorithmic ethics and accountability.²⁷ The Indian legal system, rooted in constitutional morality and administrative fairness, provides guiding principles that can shape the governance of emerging technologies. However, these principles need reinterpretation and expansion to ensure that technological advancement aligns with justice, equality, and human dignity.

3.1 Constitutional Foundations of Algorithmic Accountability

The Indian Constitution is not a technology-specific document, but its fundamental rights and governance principles offer a normative framework for regulating the ethical use of AI.²⁸ Three constitutional provisions are particularly relevant:

- **Article 14 (Right to Equality):** Ensures that state action must not be arbitrary or discriminatory. In the context of AI, this principle translates into a legal duty to prevent algorithmic bias or unequal treatment in automated decision-making systems.
- **Article 19 (Freedom of Speech and Expression):** Extends to digital expression and informational autonomy, including a citizen's right to know how algorithms process their data.
- **Article 21 (Right to Life and Personal Liberty)** has evolved through judicial interpretation to encompass the rights to privacy, dignity, and informational self-determination, core ethical concerns in AI governance.

The Supreme Court of India, through landmark cases, has laid the foundation for accountability in the digital era. In *Maneka Gandhi v. Union of India* (1978), the Court held that any procedure affecting personal liberty must be “just, fair, and reasonable.” This principle implies that algorithmic decision-making, which can impact liberty or livelihood, must also adhere to fairness and reasoned decision-making. In *Justice K.S. Puttaswamy v. Union of India* (2017), the Court recognized privacy as a fundamental right, establishing that informational privacy is intrinsic to personal autonomy and dignity. This judgment provides the constitutional bedrock for ethical AI governance, emphasizing that technological efficiency cannot override human rights. Similarly, in *Anuradha Bhasin v. Union of India* (2020), the Court underlined the necessity of proportionality and transparency in state actions affecting digital freedoms, principles equally relevant to algorithmic regulation.²⁹ Collectively, these judgments affirm that constitutional accountability extends to algorithmic systems. The state, or any entity performing a public function through AI, must ensure that its systems do not violate the principles of equality, fairness, and non-arbitrariness.

3.2 Statutory and Regulatory Instruments

India currently lacks a comprehensive Artificial Intelligence Act, but several existing legal instruments provide partial safeguards for accountability and ethical compliance.

a) Information Technology Act, 2000 (IT Act)

The IT Act forms the cornerstone of India's digital regulation. Sections 43A and 72A establish liability for mishandling sensitive personal data and breaches of confidentiality. Although not designed for AI, these provisions impose a duty of care on data controllers and service providers.³⁰ Under Section 79, intermediaries are required to exercise due diligence, a principle that could be expanded to include algorithmic transparency and fairness. However, the IT Act does not define standards for algorithmic explainability, nor does it require AI-driven platforms to disclose decision-making logic. Thus, while it provides a legal foundation, it remains inadequate to address the unique ethical risks posed by machine learning systems.

b) Digital Personal Data Protection Act, 2023 (DPDP Act)

The DPDP Act, 2023, represents India's most significant legislative step toward responsible data governance. It enshrines principles of consent, lawful processing, purpose limitation, and user rights, aligning closely with global norms like the EU's General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR).³¹ From an accountability perspective, the Act empowers individuals (referred to as "Data Principals") to demand correction, deletion, or an explanation of the use of their personal data. The Data Protection Board can impose penalties for non-compliance, introducing a quasi-judicial mechanism of oversight.³² Ethically, this strengthens individual control over data and curtails arbitrary algorithmic profiling. Nevertheless, the Act is primarily concerned with data protection, not algorithmic decision-making. It does not address the explainability or auditability of AI models that process such data. Consequently, the ethical gaps between data governance and algorithmic accountability persist.

c) Sectoral Regulations

Various regulators—the Reserve Bank of India (RBI), Securities and Exchange Board of India (SEBI), and the National Health Authority (NHA)—have issued guidelines on AI and data use.³³ The RBI, for example, emphasizes responsible AI adoption in fintech, urging banks to ensure fairness and human oversight in automated credit scoring. While these are policy level interventions rather than enforceable statutes, they signify a growing recognition of algorithmic ethics in India's governance ecosystem.

3.3 Principles of Administrative Fairness and Natural Justice

The principles of natural justice, foundational to administrative law, provide a moral and legal framework for algorithmic accountability. These include:

- **Audi alteram partem** – the right to be heard.
- **Nemo iudex in causa sua** – no one should be a judge in their own cause.
- **Reasoned decision making** – decisions must be accompanied by justifiable reasoning.

In algorithmic systems, these principles require translation into technical and procedural safeguards. For instance, the right to be heard implies that citizens should have access to meaningful explanations of algorithmic outcomes affecting them. Similarly, the principle of impartiality demands that algorithms be trained on unbiased data and subject to independent audits. The requirement of reasoned decisions aligns with the call for algorithmic explainability, a cornerstone of AI ethics worldwide. If a system cannot justify its decisions in terms understandable to humans, it undermines the rule of law.³⁴ Thus, natural justice must evolve from courtroom principles to digital governance standards, ensuring fairness even in automated processes.

4. Regulatory Gaps and Emerging Ethical Concerns

Despite this legal foundation, India faces several regulatory and ethical challenges:

- Lack of a unified AI policy or law: Multiple ministries and agencies address AI from economic or technological perspectives, but no central authority oversees ethical compliance.³⁵
- Absence of algorithmic impact assessments: Unlike the EU, India does not mandate prior ethical evaluation of AI systems deployed in sensitive sectors.³⁶
- Trade secrecy vs. transparency conflict: Companies often resist algorithmic disclosure, citing intellectual property rights, creating tension between commercial confidentiality and public accountability.³⁷
- Limited legal awareness: Citizens often lack an understanding of how algorithms affect their rights, leading to underutilized redress mechanisms.³⁸

To bridge these gaps, India requires an integrated AI governance framework that harmonizes law, ethics, and innovation. Such a framework should include statutory recognition of algorithmic rights, such as the right to explanation, the right to human oversight, and the right to redress, alongside institutional mechanisms for independent ethical audits.

5. The Path Ahead: From Compliance to Responsibility

Legal compliance alone cannot ensure ethical AI governance. As Justice V.R. Krishna Iyer once observed, “Law without ethics is a body without soul.” India’s approach to AI must therefore evolve from reactive regulation to proactive responsibility. Legislators, courts, and civil society must collaborate to craft a “human-centric AI governance model,” one in which algorithms operate within the moral boundaries of constitutional values. Ethical governance should not be seen as a constraint on innovation, but rather as a catalyst for sustainable and trustworthy technological progress. Embedding transparency, fairness, and accountability into AI systems will not only enhance legal legitimacy but also reinforce public trust in digital governance.³⁹

6. Comparative and Global Perspectives

National borders do not bind artificial intelligence; its governance, therefore, requires a transnational ethical and legal framework. Nations and international bodies worldwide are grappling with how to regulate algorithms that increasingly shape social, economic, and political life. While India’s approach to AI regulation is still in its developmental phase, several global initiatives offer useful benchmarks for embedding ethics and accountability into AI systems.⁴⁰ Notably, the European Union’s AI Act (2024), UNESCO’s Recommendation on the Ethics of Artificial Intelligence (2021), and the OECD Principles on AI (2019) have emerged as global reference points for responsible innovation.

6.1 The European Union AI Act (2024): Risk-Based Regulation

The EU AI Act, passed in 2024, represents the world’s first comprehensive legislative framework for AI governance.⁴¹ It adopts a risk-based approach, categorizing AI systems into four levels:

- **Unacceptable Risk:** Systems banned outright (e.g., social scoring by governments).
- **High Risk:** Systems that impact health, safety, or fundamental rights (e.g., recruitment, credit scoring, law enforcement).
- **Limited Risk:** Systems requiring transparency obligations (e.g., chatbots, emotion recognition).
- **Minimal Risk:** Systems with voluntary compliance.

The Act mandates transparency, human oversight, and accountability as binding legal obligations for high-risk AI systems. It also requires providers to maintain documentation demonstrating compliance and to conduct conformity assessments before deployment. For India, this model provides a blueprint for balancing innovation with protection. A similar graded

approach could help Indian regulators identify high-impact areas, such as welfare distribution, policing, or healthcare, where algorithmic errors could have severe human consequences.

6.2 UNESCO's Recommendation on the Ethics of AI (2021)

UNESCO's Recommendation is a soft law instrument adopted by over 190 countries, including India.⁴² It offers a global ethical framework built around four foundational values:

- Human Rights and Dignity
- Environmental and Socio-cultural Wellbeing
- Diversity and Inclusiveness
- Peaceful, Just, and Interconnected Societies

Unlike the EU Act, which focuses on compliance and enforcement, UNESCO emphasizes ethical reflection and social responsibility. It urges states to ensure that AI systems promote human flourishing and do not exacerbate inequality. Key provisions include:

- Prohibition of AI systems that violate human rights.
- Promotion of transparency and explainability.
- Encouragement of gender equality and cultural diversity in AI development.
- Creation of Ethical Impact Assessments (EIAs) prior to system deployment.

India's endorsement of this Recommendation signals a moral commitment to responsible AI. However, implementation requires integrating these values into national legislation and institutional practice.

6.3 OECD Principles on AI (2019)

The Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) formulated its AI Principles in 2019, which were later endorsed by the G20.⁴³ These principles focus on fostering trustworthy AI through five key commitments:

- Inclusive growth, sustainable development, and wellbeing.
- Human-centred values and fairness.
- Transparency and explainability.
- Robustness, security, and safety.
- Accountability.

The OECD framework emphasizes multi-stakeholder governance, encouraging collaboration between governments, academia, and the private sector. It has influenced many national AI policies, including those in Canada, Japan, and Australia. For India, which has a vibrant start-up

ecosystem and public-private technology partnerships, the OECD approach provides a model for cooperative regulation that bridges ethics, innovation, and economic growth.⁴⁴

6.4 Comparative Overview

The following table summarizes the core features of these international frameworks and their relevance to India’s evolving AI governance model.

Table 1: Comparative Overview of Global AI Governance Frameworks

Framework	Nature of Instrument	Core Focus	Key Principles / Mechanisms	Relevance to India
EU AI Act (2024)	Binding legislation (complex law)	Risk-based regulation and compliance	Categorization of AI by risk, mandatory human oversight, and penalties for non-compliance	Provides a legislative blueprint for structured AI regulation
UNESCO Recommendation on the Ethics of AI (2021)	Non-binding (soft law)	Ethical reflection and human rights	Human dignity, inclusiveness, cultural diversity, and environmental impact	Aligns with India’s constitutional ethics and cultural pluralism
OECD Principles on AI (2019)	Policy guidelines (voluntary)	Trustworthy and human-centred AI	Transparency, fairness, accountability, stakeholder collaboration	Beneficial for India’s multi-sector innovation and governance ecosystem
India (Current Position)	Fragmented, evolving	Sectoral and constitutional basis	Data protection (DPDP Act 2023); IT Act; judicial safeguards	Needs integrated AI law incorporating ethics by design and rights-based oversight

6.5 Lessons for India

A comparative analysis reveals several takeaways for India's regulatory evolution:

- **Adopt a Risk-Based Framework:** India could emulate the EU's model by identifying "high-risk" AI systems and mandating stricter compliance for them.
- **Institutionalize Ethical Impact Assessments:** Drawing from UNESCO, every major AI deployment should undergo ethical scrutiny before public rollout.
- **Foster Multi-Stakeholder Oversight:** In line with OECD principles, India should establish an AI Ethics Council comprising jurists, technologists, and civil society experts.
- **Embed Ethics by Design:** Encourage developers to integrate ethical safeguards like fairness and explainability into algorithms from inception.
- **Strengthen Transparency Laws:** Mandate algorithmic transparency and public audits, especially for government and financial systems that impact citizens' rights.

6.6 Towards Global Convergence

The global discourse on AI governance is moving toward the convergence of ethics and law. While the EU prioritizes enforceability, UNESCO focuses on moral responsibility, and the OECD emphasizes collaboration. India, as a developing democracy with a constitutional culture of justice and pluralism, has the opportunity to integrate all three perspectives. Rather than replicating Western frameworks, India can craft a context-sensitive model grounded in constitutional ethics, participatory governance, and technological sovereignty. This approach would not only ensure accountability but also reflect India's commitment to inclusive and human-centric development.

• **Towards Ethical AI Governance: The Way Forward**

The preceding discussions reveal that algorithmic accountability is not merely a matter of legal compliance but a question of moral vision and institutional design. India stands at a pivotal moment: as it embraces AI-driven innovation across governance, finance, and industry, it must also ensure that technological growth does not compromise the values of justice, fairness, and human dignity enshrined in its Constitution. The challenge, therefore, is to move from fragmented regulation to coherent ethical governance from compliance to conscience.⁴⁵

7.1 Embedding “Ethics by Design” in AI Systems

The concept of “Ethics by Design” advocates for the proactive integration of moral and legal principles within the technical architecture of AI systems. Rather than applying ethical filters after harm occurs, algorithms should be designed to prevent bias, promote transparency, and respect human rights from the outset.⁴⁶ For India, this requires an interdisciplinary approach. Lawmakers, computer scientists, and ethicists must collaborate to establish ethical design standards checklists that ensure fairness, explainability, and accountability during development. Ethical algorithms could incorporate mechanisms for bias detection, data audit trails, and explainability features that enable users to understand decisions. Government agencies deploying AI for public services should mandate Algorithmic Impact Assessments (AIAs) evaluations that measure an algorithm’s potential impact on privacy, equality, and access before implementation.⁴⁷ Such assessments can serve as an “ethical clearance” process, akin to environmental impact assessments in environmental law.

7.2 Human Oversight and the Principle of Control

While automation enhances efficiency, it must not replace human judgment and responsibility. The principle of “human in the loop” ensures that critical decisions, particularly those affecting rights, liberty, or welfare, remain subject to human review.⁴⁸ Human oversight is not merely procedural but philosophical. It recognizes that algorithms lack empathy, moral intuition, and contextual understanding, the very qualities that give law its humanity. Thus, AI systems should serve as decision-support tools, not as autonomous adjudicators.⁴⁹ Institutionally, India can establish AI oversight committees across sectors such as finance, health, and governance. These committees should include technologists, legal scholars, ethicists, and representatives of civil society. Their role would be to review algorithmic models for fairness and assess whether automated systems align with constitutional principles.

7.3 Strengthening Institutional and Policy Frameworks

A robust legal framework must accompany ethical intent. India can take several policy steps to institutionalize ethical AI governance:

- **Enact a Comprehensive AI Regulation Act:** A dedicated legislation can consolidate scattered principles across the IT Act, DPDP Act, and sectoral regulations. This law should define accountability obligations, mandate transparency for high-risk AI systems, and establish penalties for unethical use.

- **Create a National AI Ethics Commission:** Modelled on the National Human Rights Commission, this body could monitor AI deployment across sectors, issue ethical guidelines, and investigate complaints of algorithmic bias or harm.
- **Mandate Transparency Disclosures:** Public and private entities that use AI in decision-making should publish algorithmic transparency reports detailing the purpose, data sources, and fairness metrics of their models.
- **Promote Ethical Literacy:** Universities, especially law schools, should integrate AI law and ethics courses to foster awareness among future judges, policymakers, and engineers. Ethical literacy can ensure that the next generation of professionals internalizes the social responsibilities of technology.
- **Public Consultation and Participatory Governance:** Citizens should have the opportunity to contribute to the formulation of AI policy. This participation aligns with the democratic spirit of Sabka Saath, Sabka Vikas, ensuring that AI serves collective welfare rather than merely corporate or bureaucratic efficiency.

7.4 Building a Human Centric AI Ecosystem

India's AI governance should be grounded in a human-centric philosophy that values autonomy, dignity, and inclusivity. This perspective aligns with both UNESCO's ethical vision and India's constitutional ethos. A human-centric approach ensures that technology remains a means, not an end. It prioritizes accessibility, ensuring marginalized communities are not excluded from AI-driven services because of digital illiteracy or data bias.⁵⁰ Policies must encourage diversity in data, representation of local languages and cultures in algorithmic training, and equitable access to technological benefits. Further, AI's role in environmental sustainability and social justice must not be overlooked. Ethical AI governance should integrate sustainability principles, promoting green computing and environmentally conscious innovation.

7.5 Collaborative and Global Engagement

AI governance cannot thrive in isolation. India should actively participate in international dialogues on AI ethics, contributing its unique perspective rooted in constitutional morality and pluralism.

- Collaboration with the EU can help develop legal standards for risk-based regulation.
- Partnerships with UNESCO and the OECD can help establish ethical norms and promote multi-stakeholder participation.

- Regionally, India can lead the Global South in framing AI governance models that balance innovation with inclusivity.

Such collaboration would enhance India's credibility as a responsible digital power while ensuring domestic policy coherence with global norms.

7.6 Ethical Responsibility as the New Social Contract

Ultimately, the governance of AI is not only a legal necessity but also a moral commitment a renewal of the social contract in the digital age. The Indian tradition, from Gandhian ethics to constitutional philosophy, emphasizes the unity of duty and justice. In this sense, ethical AI is not foreign to Indian jurisprudence; it is a continuation of its moral lineage. The law, when imbued with ethical consciousness, ensures that technology serves humanity rather than subjugating it. As India stands on the threshold of an algorithmic era, it must reaffirm that progress without accountability is regression in disguise. Ethical AI governance, therefore, becomes both a constitutional obligation and a civilizational responsibility.

Conclusion

Artificial intelligence has emerged as both a promise and a paradox, offering efficiency and innovation while challenging fundamental legal and ethical principles. As algorithms increasingly shape decisions in governance, business, and daily life, the question of accountability becomes central to sustaining justice and human dignity in the digital age. This chapter has argued that algorithmic accountability is not a purely technical issue but a deeply moral and legal one. AI systems reflect the biases, values, and priorities of their creators and societies. Therefore, the responsibility for fairness and transparency ultimately rests with human institutions. Ethical theories, utilitarian, deontological, and virtue-based, collectively point toward the need for a balance between efficiency and moral responsibility. In India, constitutional guarantees of equality, liberty, and procedural fairness offer a strong normative foundation for ethical AI governance. Judicial precedents such as *Maneka Gandhi v. Union of India* and *Puttaswamy v. Union of India* reaffirm that all state or algorithmic actions must be just, fair, and reasonable. However, existing statutes such as the Information Technology Act, 2000, and the Digital Personal Data Protection Act, 2023 must evolve into a coherent framework that addresses algorithmic opacity, bias, and explainability. Global instruments, such as the EU AI Act (2024), UNESCO's Recommendation on AI Ethics (2021), and OECD Principles (2019), provide valuable guidance on embedding ethics by design, human oversight, and transparency into AI systems. India can adapt these lessons to develop a human-centric AI governance model rooted in

constitutional morality and cultural inclusiveness. Ultimately, the pursuit of algorithmic accountability is about preserving the human spirit within technological progress. By aligning law with ethics, India can ensure that AI remains a servant of justice, not its substitute, advancing innovation while upholding the values that define a democratic and humane society.

References

- ¹ Carsten Stahl, “IT for a better future: how to integrate ethics, politics and innovation,” 9 *Journal of Information, Communication and Ethics in Society* 140-156 (2011).
- ² Duan Y., Edwards J.S. & Dwivedi Y.K., “Artificial intelligence for decision making in the era of Big Data – evolution, challenges and research agenda” 48 *International Journal of Information Management* 63-71 (2019).
- ³ Shapiro A., “Predictive policing for reform? Indeterminacy and intervention in big data policing” 17 *Surveillance & Society* 456-472 (2019).
- ⁴ Butt J.S., “From bureaucracy to black box: Revolutionizing natural justice and due process in administrative law” 16 *Acta Universitatis Danubius. Administratio* 7-47 (2024).
- ⁵ Land M.K. & Aronson J.D., “Human rights and technology: new challenges for justice and accountability” 16 *Annual Review of Law and Social Science* 223-240 (2020).
- ⁶ Bharal S., Sharma R., Pandey A., & Ahmed S., “Code, Constitution and AI: Rethinking Fundamental Rights in the Algorithmic Era” 16 *IJSAT-International Journal on Science and Technology* (2025).
- ⁷ Maneka Gandhi v. Union of India, AIR 1978 SC 597.
- ⁸ K.S. Puttaswamy v. Union of India, (2017) 10 SCC 1.
- ⁹ Reji T.R., *Artificial Intelligence in Social Sciences and Social Work: Bridging Technology and Humanity to Revolutionize Research, Policy, and Human Services* (2025).
- ¹⁰ Renuka O., RadhaKrishnan N., Priya B.S., Jhansy A., & Ezekiel S., “Data privacy and protection: Legal and ethical challenges,” in *Emerging Threats and Countermeasures in Cybersecurity* 433-465 (2025).
- ¹¹ Puchakayala P.R.A., “Responsible AI: Ensuring Ethical, Transparent, and Accountable Artificial Intelligence Systems” 30 *Journal of Computational Analysis and Applications* 1 (2022).
- ¹² Farinu U., “Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency in AI: Ethical Challenges in Data-Driven Decision-Making,” available at SSRN 5128174 (2025).
- ¹³ Yeung K. & Lodge M. (eds.), *Algorithmic Regulation* (Oxford University Press, 2019).
- ¹⁴ Gheibi O., Weyns D., & Quin F., “Applying machine learning in self-adaptive systems: A systematic literature review” 15 *ACM Transactions on Autonomous and Adaptive Systems (TAAS)* 1-37 (2021).
- ¹⁵ Kumar N., Sharma M.J.K., & Singh S., *Theory and Practice of Human Ethics: Basics of Ethics in Life, Work and Law* (Crown Publishing, 2025).
- ¹⁶ Lubis A.R. & Azhami M.R.A.N., “Beyond the 'Greatest Happiness Principle': Exploring the Compatibility of Individual Rights and Utilitarian Ethics in Legal Policy Making” 3 *Enigma in Law* 1-13 (2025).
- ¹⁷ Jedličková A., “Ethical approaches in designing autonomous and intelligent systems: a comprehensive survey towards responsible development” 40 *AI & Society* 2703-2716 (2025).
- ¹⁸ Vallor S., “Twenty-first-century virtue,” in *Science, Technology, and Virtues: Contemporary Perspectives* 77 (2021).

-
- ¹⁹ Kordzadeh N. & Ghasemaghaei M., “Algorithmic bias: review, synthesis, and future research directions” 31 *European Journal of Information Systems* 388-409 (2022).
- ²⁰ Frosio G., “Algorithmic Enforcement Tools: Governing Opacity with Due Process,” in *Driving Forensic Innovation in the 21st Century: Crossing the Valley of Death* 195-218 (Springer International Publishing, 2024).
- ²¹ Bajracharya K., “Big Data and Artificial Intelligence Integration in Modernizing Governance and Public Administration Practices” 8 *Global Research Perspectives on Cybersecurity Governance, Policy, and Management* 34-47 (2024).
- ²² Hacker P., “Manipulation by algorithms: Exploring the triangle of unfair commercial practice, data protection, and privacy law” 29 *European Law Journal* 142-175 (2023).
- ²³ Solum L.B., “Legal personhood for artificial intelligences,” in *Machine Ethics and Robot Ethics* 415-471 (Routledge, 2020).
- ²⁴ Ranchordás S. & Scarcella L., “Automated government for vulnerable citizens: Intermediating rights” 30 *Wm. & Mary Bill Rts. J.* 373 (2021).
- ²⁵ Varghese A., “E-governance and smart policing in Kerala, India: towards a Kerala model of algorithmic governance?” in *Policing and Intelligence in the Global Big Data Era, Volume I: New Global Perspectives on Algorithmic Governance* 213-241 (Springer Nature Switzerland, 2024).
- ²⁶ Dhir M. & Verma S., *AI for Good: India and Beyond: Detailed Analysis of AI & Laws, Policies, Ethical Frameworks and Judgements* (Notion Press, 2024).
- ²⁷ Marda V., “Artificial intelligence policy in India: a framework for engaging the limits of data-driven decision-making” 376 *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences* 20180087 (2018).
- ²⁸ Mohanty, A., & Sahu, S. (2024). India’s Advance on AI Regulation. *Carnegie India, November 21*.
- ²⁹ Gupta A., “Recalibrating Free Speech in India's Digital Age: Balancing Expression, National Integrity and the Global Democratic Challenges” 3 *LawFoyer Int'l J. Doctrinal Legal Rsch.* 703 (2025).
- ³⁰ Gill J., “Right to Privacy in Digital Era in Balancing Securities and Individual Liberties” 10 *NUJS J. Regul. Stud.* 119 (2025).
- ³¹ Taylor L., de Souza S., Mittal A., Punia S., Joshi S., Kakkar J., et.al., *RECONFIGURING DATA GOVERNANCE: Insights from India and the EU* (2024).
- ³² Usha T. & Neeral G., “Informational Privacy in the Age of Artificial Intelligence: A Critical Analysis of India’s DPDP Act, 2023” 2 *Legal Issues in the Digital Age* 87-117 (2025).
- ³³ Rai, P., & Shekha, C. *Artificial Intelligence in Financial Markets: Global Trends, Regulatory Challenges, and Comparative Analysis with India*.
- ³⁴ Leslie D., Burr C., Aitken M., Cows J., Katell M., & Briggs M., “Artificial intelligence, human rights, democracy, and the rule of law: a primer,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2104.04147* (2021).
- ³⁵ M. A. N. Miazzi, “Interplay of legal frameworks and artificial intelligence (AI): A global perspective” 2 *Law & Policy Review* 01 (2023).
- ³⁶ S. Vignesh & D. N. Nagarjun, “Legal Challenges of Artificial Intelligence in India’s Cyber Law Framework: Examining Data Privacy and Algorithmic Accountability Via a Comparative Global Perspective” 6 *International Journal of Financial & Management Research* 1 (2024).
- ³⁷ C. Okunola, “Beyond Secrecy: Evaluating the Limits of Trade Secret Law as a Framework for Artificial Intelligence Protection in a Globalized Data Economy” (Oct. 8, 2025) (Available at SSRN No. 5578590).

-
- ³⁸ D. Sachdeva, S. Luthra & S. Sharma, “BREAKING THE SILENCE: Addressing Legal Unawareness in Financial Fraud and Mitigating Justice through Education, Policy Reform, and AI-Driven Solutions” 14 *Global Journal For Research Analysis (GJRA)* (2025).
- ³⁹ G. Agrawal, “Accountability, Trust, and Transparency in AI Systems: From the Perspective of Public Policy – Elevating Ethical Standards”, in *AI Healthcare Applications and Security, Ethical, and Legal Considerations* 148-162 (IGI Global, 2024).
- ⁴⁰ A. Ghosh, A. Saini & H. Barad, “Transforming Healthcare in India: The Role of Artificial Intelligence and Regulatory Frameworks for Sustainable Growth” 17 *World Medical & Health Policy* 475 (2025).
- ⁴¹ J. Butt, “Analytical Study of the World’s First EU Artificial Intelligence (AI) Act” 5 *International Journal of Research Publication and Reviews* 7343 (2024).
- ⁴² U. Ganbaatar, “Do Ethics in AI Still Matter? A Review of the 2021 UNESCO Recommendation on the Ethics of AI” 23 *The Review of Faith & International Affairs* 26 (2025).
- ⁴³ A. Shelepov, “The Influence of the G20’s Digitalization Leadership on Development Conditions and Governance of the Digital Economy” 17 *International Organisations Research Journal* 96 (2022).
- ⁴⁴ R. Bal & I.S. Gill, “Policy Approaches to Artificial Intelligence-Based Technologies in China, European Union and the United States” (2020) (SSRN Scholarly Paper No. 3699640).
- ⁴⁵ K. Chopra, *Shaping the Future: AI Governance and its Dynamic Effect on India’s AI Competitiveness* (Master’s Thesis, Universidade Católica Portuguesa, 24 Jun. 2024).
- ⁴⁶ D. Sargiotis, “Fostering Ethical and Inclusive AI: A Human-Centric Paradigm for Social Impact” (June 10, 2024) (Available at SSRN No. 4879372).
- ⁴⁷ J. Iunes Monteiro, “The need for responsible use of AI by public administration: Algorithmic Impact Assessments (AIAs) as instruments for accountability and social control”, in *Public Governance and Emerging Technologies: Values, Trust, and Regulatory Compliance* 179-216 (Springer Nature Switzerland, 2025).
- ⁴⁸ O. Lobel, “Automation Rights: How to Rationally Design Humans-Out-of-the-Loop Law” *University of Chicago Law Review Online* 1 (2024).
- ⁴⁹ O. A. Niță, “THE PARADIGM OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE (AI) IN INTERPRETING LAW” 11 *International Journal of Social and Educational Innovation (IJSEIro)* 224 (2024).
- ⁵⁰ M. Zallio, C.B. Ike & C. Chivăran, “Designing Artificial Intelligence: Exploring Inclusion, Diversity, Equity, Accessibility, and Safety in Human-Centric Emerging Technologies” 6 *AI* 143 (2025).

EDITORIAL TEAM

PROF. (DR.) BANSHI DHAR SINGH

Professor,
Ex. Dean & Head,
Faculty of Law,
University of Lucknow

DR. KALPESHKUMAR L GUPTA

Founder ProBono India, Legal Start-ups,
Law Teachers India

DR. SUDHANSHU CHANDRA

Assistant Professor, Manuu Law
School, Maulana Azad National Urdu
University (Central University),
Hyderabad

PROF. (DR.) SANJAY SINGH

Director
of IIMT College of Law

INTERNATIONAL EDITORIAL TEAM

PROF. DR. MARC OLIVER OPRESNIK

President and CEO
Opresnik Management Consulting
and Opresnik Business School

*PROF. DR . COMRADE AMB.
CHUKWUNONSO C
HARLES OFODUM ESQ*

Chancellor, ALSA University.
Legal Director for Nigeria, World
Association for Humanitarian Doctors

ABOUT LEX SCRIPTA JOURNAL

Lex Scripta Magazine is a premier peer-reviewed online and print journal dedicated to advancing scholarly research in law, policy, and social sciences. With the vision of promoting academic excellence and fostering a culture of intellectual exchange, the magazine provides a distinguished platform for academicians, researchers, legal professionals, and students to publish their original work and contribute to contemporary legal discourse.

Each submission undergoes a rigorous double-blind review process conducted by a panel of eminent national and international professors, ensuring the highest standards of quality and academic integrity. Lex Scripta not only encourages original and innovative research but also strives to bridge the gap between theoretical insights and real-world applications in the legal domain.

Contributors and editorial members receive global recognition through certificates and publication opportunities, while readers gain access to insightful, authoritative, and thought-provoking content across diverse areas of law and policy.

Now managed by Integrity Education India, Lex Scripta Magazine is committed to expanding its academic footprint through enhanced digital presence, global collaborations, and university partnerships. Upholding its ISSN identity, Lex Scripta continues to evolve as one of India's most trusted and respected journals in the field of legal research and education.

KEY FEATURES

Scholarly Insights – Access in-depth, peer-reviewed research articles written by distinguished academicians and legal experts.

Global Perspectives – Explore diverse viewpoints on law, policy, and governance from national and international scholars.

Authentic Content – Read verified and academically sound articles that uphold the highest standards of research quality.

Knowledge Enhancement – Stay updated with emerging trends, case studies, and policy developments across multiple legal domains.

Easy Accessibility – Enjoy seamless access to online editions and exclusive hardcover issues for academic and professional use.



CONNECT WITH US **9811 666 216**
7011 605 618

