

# INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL FOR LEGAL RESEARCH AND ANALYSIS



Open Access, Refereed Journal Multi Disciplinary  
Peer Reviewed

[www.ijlra.com](http://www.ijlra.com)

## DISCLAIMER

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored, transmitted, or distributed in any form or by any means, whether electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, without prior written permission of the Managing Editor of the *International Journal for Legal Research & Analysis (IJLRA)*.

The views, opinions, interpretations, and conclusions expressed in the articles published in this journal are solely those of the respective authors. They do not necessarily reflect the views of the Editorial Board, Editors, Reviewers, Advisors, or the Publisher of IJLRA.

Although every reasonable effort has been made to ensure the accuracy, authenticity, and proper citation of the content published in this journal, neither the Editorial Board nor IJLRA shall be held liable or responsible, in any manner whatsoever, for any loss, damage, or consequence arising from the use, reliance upon, or interpretation of the information contained in this publication.

The content published herein is intended solely for academic and informational purposes and shall not be construed as legal advice or professional opinion.

**Copyright © International Journal for Legal Research & Analysis.  
All rights reserved.**

## ABOUT US

The *International Journal for Legal Research & Analysis (IJLRA)* (ISSN: 2582-6433) is a peer-reviewed, academic, online journal published on a monthly basis. The journal aims to provide a comprehensive and interactive platform for the publication of original and high-quality legal research.

IJLRA publishes Short Articles, Long Articles, Research Papers, Case Comments, Book Reviews, Essays, and interdisciplinary studies in the field of law and allied disciplines. The journal seeks to promote critical analysis and informed discourse on contemporary legal, social, and policy issues.

The primary objective of IJLRA is to enhance academic engagement and scholarly dialogue among law students, researchers, academicians, legal professionals, and members of the Bar and Bench. The journal endeavours to establish itself as a credible and widely cited academic publication through the publication of original, well-researched, and analytically sound contributions.

IJLRA welcomes submissions from all branches of law, provided the work is original, unpublished, and submitted in accordance with the prescribed submission guidelines. All manuscripts are subject to a rigorous peer-review process to ensure academic quality, originality, and relevance.

Through its publications, the *International Journal for Legal Research & Analysis* aspires to contribute meaningfully to legal scholarship and the development of law as an instrument of justice and social progress.

## ***PUBLICATION ETHICS, COPYRIGHT & AUTHOR RESPONSIBILITY STATEMENT***

The *International Journal for Legal Research and Analysis (IJLRA)* is committed to upholding the highest standards of publication ethics and academic integrity. All manuscripts submitted to the journal must be original, unpublished, and free from plagiarism, data fabrication, falsification, or any form of unethical research or publication practice. Authors are solely responsible for the accuracy, originality, legality, and ethical compliance of their work and must ensure that all sources are properly cited and that necessary permissions for any third-party copyrighted material have been duly obtained prior to submission. Copyright in all published articles vests with IJLRA, unless otherwise expressly stated, and authors grant the journal the irrevocable right to publish, reproduce, distribute, and archive their work in print and electronic formats. The views and opinions expressed in the articles are those of the authors alone and do not reflect the views of the Editors, Editorial Board, Reviewers, or Publisher. IJLRA shall not be liable for any loss, damage, claim, or legal consequence arising from the use, reliance upon, or interpretation of the content published. By submitting a manuscript, the author(s) agree to fully indemnify and hold harmless the journal, its Editor-in-Chief, Editors, Editorial Board, Reviewers, Advisors, Publisher, and Management against any claims, liabilities, or legal proceedings arising out of plagiarism, copyright infringement, defamation, breach of confidentiality, or violation of third-party rights. The journal reserves the absolute right to reject, withdraw, retract, or remove any manuscript or published article in case of ethical or legal violations, without incurring any liability.

# **AI GOVERNANCE AND CONSTITUTIONAL LAW: A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF INDIA AND USA**

AUTHORED BY - DILSHAD CHOUDHARY

## **Abstract**

The deployment of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in state functions challenges constitutional principles of transparency and due process. This paper comparatively analyzes how the constitutional architectures of the United States and India address Algorithmic Decision-Making (ADM) across equality, procedural fairness, and privacy. India's framework proves more resilient, leveraging the expansive right to informational autonomy (Article 21, *Puttaswamy* 2017) to mandate proactive legislation like the DPDP Act 2023, focusing on non-arbitrariness (Article 14). In contrast, the US approach is reactive, constrained by high doctrinal hurdles, such as proving discriminatory intent under the Equal Protection Clause. The study concludes that AI accountability is a constitutional imperative, requiring legal scrutiny to shift from the AI's output to the auditable governance of its system design and data infrastructure.

## **I. INTRODUCTION**

The rapid development of Artificial Intelligence (AI), particularly in areas concerning Machine Learning (ML) and predictive analytics, has ushered in an era often characterized as the Algorithmic State. This transition presents a profound challenge to established constitutional principles that presuppose state power must be transparent, reasoned, and ultimately subject to human accountability. Modern AI systems are increasingly deployed to interpret vast datasets and inform critical government decisions, ranging from optimizing taxation administration in India to guiding predictive policing efforts in the USA.<sup>1</sup> This functional delegation of administrative power to non-human reason mandates the immediate application of traditional constitutional doctrines to ensure that technological efficiency does not erode fundamental rights.

The fundamental conflict arises from the inherent opacity and complexity of contemporary AI models. These systems introduce a substantial lack of transparency, complicating traditional legal mechanisms such as due process and judicial review.<sup>3</sup> Governments utilizing these tools

must confront the conceptual difficulty of determining how core constitutional expectations, such as "reasoned decision-making," can be applied to an automated output.<sup>4</sup>

This report undertakes a comparative analysis of how two major democratic constitutional architectures India and the USA are attempting to address this friction. The USA traditionally approaches AI scrutiny through adversarial testing of established rights, such as the Fourth Amendment in policing contexts. Conversely, India employs a broader, dignity-centric fundamental rights regime centered on Articles 14 (Equality) and 21 (Life and Liberty), which is bolstered by recent proactive governance mandates like the Digital Personal Data Protection (DPDP) Act 2023.<sup>5</sup>

The analysis suggests that both the US and Indian constitutional frameworks possess sufficient foundational doctrines to scrutinize Algorithmic Decision-Making (ADM). However, the resilience and responsiveness of India's framework are notably enhanced by the judicial emphasis on informational autonomy derived from *Justice K.S. Puttaswamy v. Union of India (2017)* (hereafter, *Puttaswamy*)<sup>5</sup> and subsequent legislative mandates (DPDP Act 2023).<sup>6</sup> This approach facilitates proactive systemic intervention. In contrast, the US constitutional approach remains largely reactive, constrained by stringent doctrinal requirements such as the restrictive search for discriminatory intent under the Equal Protection Clause and the limited scope of the Fourth Amendment when applied to abstract data-driven surveillance.<sup>2</sup>

## II. FOUNDATIONAL FRAMEWORKS: CONSTITUTIONAL ARCHITECTURE AND ADM REVIEW

### A. The American Tradition: Rights as Barriers to State Action

The US constitutional system traditionally conceives of rights, as enumerated in the Bill of Rights, primarily as limitations on government power. This requires an aggrieved party to demonstrate a specific violation *post-facto* through adversarial litigation. The application of constitutional oversight to government AI use, therefore, occurs through challenges leveraging the Fourth (search and seizure), Fifth, and Fourteenth (due process and equal protection) Amendments, alongside scrutiny under Administrative Law (specifically the Administrative Procedure Act).<sup>4</sup>

A growing area of scholarship focuses on "Machine Rulemaking" the application of the "Arbitrary and Capricious" standard, a key component of administrative review, to

algorithmically generated rules and decisions.<sup>4</sup> The core difficulty lies in establishing that complex Machine Learning (ML) systems adhere to the requirement for reasoned decision-making, a standard historically reserved for human administrative action. The academic understanding of this issue is encapsulated in the observation known as the "Law of Conservation of Judgment".<sup>8</sup> This principle asserts that AI does not eliminate the moral, political, or legal dilemmas inherent in constitutional interpretation and judgment. Instead, challenging decisions are merely shifted around or transferred to different stages of the decision-making pipeline, such as data selection, model design, or parameter tuning. This means that judges and administrators using AI must apply the same moral and political considerations that traditionally confront human interpreters.<sup>8</sup>

### **B. The Indian Paradigm: Fundamental Rights and the Constitutional Imperative**

India's constitutional approach, particularly following landmark judicial declarations, embodies a mandate for proactive constitutional alignment, compelling the state not merely to refrain from infringing rights, but actively to facilitate and protect them.

#### **The Trinity of Rights (Articles 14, 21):**

The principles of equality, non-discrimination, and due process are anchored in the Constitution's Articles 14 (Equality before the law and equal protection of the laws) and Article 21 (Protection of Life and Personal Liberty).<sup>5</sup> These provisions form the essential foundation for establishing AI accountability. The judiciary's interpretation of these articles, especially since 2017, has significantly shaped the governance landscape.

#### ***Puttaswamy* and Dignity:**

The landmark *Puttaswamy* judgment established the recognition of the right to privacy as a fundamental right under Article 21. This interpretation encompasses concepts of informational autonomy and human dignity, establishing them as constitutional imperatives.<sup>5</sup> This judicial clarity concerning privacy created a necessity for legislative action to safeguard these newly recognized rights against digital encroachment. This robust declaration of fundamental rights under the Constitution subsequently acted as the primary cause for the necessary development of specific legal regimes.<sup>5</sup> This judicial clarity has driven the necessity for proactive statutory overlays like the DPDP Act 2023<sup>6</sup> and the proposed Digital India Act 2023-24<sup>9</sup>, thereby preempting many of the *post-facto* constitutional challenges seen in the US model.

### **State-Led Digitalization:**

This constitutional pressure operates in the context of the Indian state's ambitious 'Digital India' initiative, which involves large-scale infrastructural interventions and the channeling of AI for 'data for development'.<sup>1</sup> This commitment to digitalization, alongside the procurement of large facial recognition systems and use of AI in governance areas like taxation<sup>1</sup>, means that governance structures must be established concurrently to mitigate the significant rights risks inherent in such widespread state technological adoption.<sup>6</sup> While the US focuses on reactive judicial testing, India is actively building safeguards into its regulatory foundation, treating constitutional alignment as an engineering requirement for its digital transformation.

## **III. AI AND THE RIGHT TO EQUALITY AND NON-DISCRIMINATION**

### **A. The American Approach: Equal Protection and Algorithmic Disparate Impact**

The US approach to combating algorithmic discrimination is primarily channeled through the Equal Protection Clause of the 14th Amendment. However, its effectiveness is severely constrained by a high doctrinal standard.

#### **The Discriminatory Intent Hurdle:**

To mount a successful challenge under the 14th Amendment, the plaintiff must typically demonstrate that the government action had not only a disparate impact on a protected group but was also motivated by discriminatory *intent*. Proving discriminatory intent is functionally impossible when challenging facially neutral algorithms that operate using complex, proprietary, and opaque datasets. This formidable legal hurdle severely limits the effectiveness of the Equal Protection Clause against systemic algorithmic bias that arises from underlying societal inequalities reflected in training data.<sup>7</sup>

#### **Statistical Discrimination and Scrutiny:**

Academic discourse attempts to reconcile algorithmic risk assessment, which may incorporate statistically derived factors related to protected characteristics (such as race), with strict scrutiny.<sup>7</sup> Some argue that race, when used as an algorithmic input, might be characterized as a permissible 'plus factor,' analogous to the conscious use of race in affirmative action cases like *Grutter v. Bollinger*.<sup>7</sup> However, this characterization is difficult to sustain because statistical risk factors are fundamentally different from goal-oriented considerations used to

achieve diversity in education. The US Equal Protection doctrine thus often fails in the face of algorithmic opacity because the decision-making process is hidden, making the intent requirement a significant barrier to redress.

### **B. The Indian Approach: Article 14 and the Mandate for Non-Arbitrariness**

India's constitutional structure provides a distinct advantage in addressing systemic unfairness by setting a lower threshold for challenging state action under Article 14.

#### **Non-Arbitrariness as Equality:**

Article 14 guarantees equality before the law and equal protection of the laws, which the Supreme Court has consistently interpreted to mean that state actions must be reasonable, non-capricious, and based on intelligible criteria.<sup>5</sup> The presence of arbitrariness in a state action is itself considered a violation of equality. This interpretation allows the constitutional challenge to pivot away from the nearly impossible task of proving discriminatory intent.

#### **Indirect Discrimination:**

Due to the broad scope of Article 14, algorithmic bias, even if resulting unintentionally from opaque systems, can amount to indirect discrimination against the fundamental right to equality.<sup>5</sup> The state is understood to have a positive constitutional obligation to proactively prevent discriminatory outcomes arising from automated systems. This focus on the *rationality of the outcome*, rather than the hidden intent, makes India's Article 14 inherently more resilient against the challenges posed by algorithmic opacity than the US Equal Protection framework. Despite having a superior doctrinal tool, Indian jurisprudence, as of the time of the DPDP Act 2023, has not yet fully developed specific mechanisms to apply rigorous constitutional scrutiny to ADM systems.<sup>5</sup> The challenge in India is one of *under-utilization* of a powerful constitutional doctrine (Articles 14, 15, and 21) rather than the *under-enforcement* faced by the US due to the high burden of proof. The legal accountability for AI remains a core constitutional imperative requiring comprehensive legal implementation.<sup>5</sup>

## **IV. PROCEDURAL FAIRNESS, ACCOUNTABILITY, AND JUDICIAL REVIEW**

### **A. Algorithmic Due Process in the USA**

The US constitutional requirement for procedural due process demands that individuals

affected by state decisions receive notice, an opportunity to be heard, and the ability to contest adverse outcomes. In the context of AI, this has created a substantial "accountability deficit".<sup>3</sup> Algorithms frequently operate outside the robust accountability procedures designed for human administrative decisions, such as freedom of information laws and adjudicatory due process protections.<sup>3</sup> This lack of transparency and oversight has demonstrable negative consequences, leading to wasteful spending on untested automated systems and attenuated government supervision.

The key to applying due process in this context involves understanding the implications of the "Law of Conservation of Judgment".<sup>8</sup> Since AI shifts discretionary human judgment to the system design stage (data curation, feature engineering), procedural fairness necessitates that oversight follows this shift. To satisfy due process, focus must be placed on auditing these critical human discretion points, thus preventing the transfer of constitutional dilemmas from the courtroom to the engineering backroom. Furthermore, beyond standard due process considerations, emerging scholarship investigates how AI interacts with rights such as the First Amendment (freedom of speech), further complicating the US constitutional landscape.<sup>10</sup>

## **B. Natural Justice and Judicial Review in India**

India seeks to integrate automated systems into its existing framework of natural justice and administrative law, making procedural accountability a constitutional mandate.

### **Constitutional Due Process:**

The inability for citizens to appeal or fully understand the basis of automated decisions is argued to constitute a denial of due process under Articles 21 and 14, transforming AI accountability into a constitutional imperative.<sup>5</sup> The extension of fundamental administrative law principles—including the requirements for natural justice, reasoned decision-making, and judicial review—to automated systems is essential, particularly when systems affect critical rights such as life, liberty, or entitlements.<sup>5</sup>

### **The Shift from Transparency to Auditability:**

In both jurisdictions, the technical difficulty of achieving full transparency into complex ML models has become evident. Consequently, the constitutional requirement for "reasoned decision-making"<sup>4</sup> is re-interpreted not as demanding a step-by-step technical explanation of the algorithm, but rather as requiring *auditability*.<sup>2</sup> This redefinition demands that authorities document and justify the legitimacy of input factors, the fidelity of the data (age, granularity),

and the critical human judgments made throughout the system's lifecycle to confirm that the eventual decision was non-arbitrary.

### **Regulatory Modernization:**

This constitutional obligation is driving legislative action. The proposed Digital India Act, intended to replace the older IT Act, aims to provide a comprehensive and modern legal framework covering data governance, content moderation, and the responsibilities of large digital platforms.<sup>9</sup> Additionally, while the DPDP Act primarily targets private entities through the designation of "Significant Data Fiduciaries" (SDFs) <sup>6</sup>, the Indian constitutional mandate implies that the state itself must function as the highest data fiduciary when deploying AI in governance (e.g., in taxation or law enforcement)<sup>1</sup>, bound by the stringent principles of non-discrimination and fairness under Article 21.

## **V. PRIVACY, SURVEILLANCE, AND STATE POWER**

### **A. The Fourth Amendment and Predictive Policing in the USA**

The Fourth Amendment mandates that searches and seizures be supported by probable cause. This constitutional standard is directly undermined by automated surveillance and predictive tools that often rely on statistical correlations rather than individualized suspicion.

Predictive policing algorithms analyze massive amounts of data to identify crime hotspots and influence where officers patrol and who they search.<sup>2</sup> When the output of these algorithms is used to establish probable cause for a search, it creates substantial opacity around the constitutionality of the action. It is difficult to analogize the algorithm's statistical output to existing judicial justifications for conducting searches.<sup>2</sup> If utilized with minimal oversight, the reliance on AI output risks allowing the algorithms to assume "outsized importance," effectively superseding the requirement for human reason and constitutional judgment.<sup>2</sup>

To preserve constitutional protections, increased access to the datasets used by these algorithms, coupled with specific policies regarding how much trust can be placed in algorithmic outputs, is necessary.<sup>2</sup> Constitutional analysis must consider the quality and reliability of the data, including its age and granularity, and the degree to which algorithmic factors simply replicate or overly amplify existing police analyses.<sup>2</sup>

### **B. Informational Autonomy and Data Governance in India**

India leverages its constitutional recognition of the right to privacy and dignity to drive comprehensive, fundamental rights-based regulatory action, framing data governance as a

matter of constitutional fulfillment.

### **DPDP Act as Constitutional Fulfillment:**

The DPDP Act 2023 directly addresses the mandate of *Puttaswamy* by establishing a legal framework for processing digital personal data that respects individuals' rights while acknowledging the need for lawful data processing.<sup>6</sup> By defining duties for data fiduciaries, the Act places positive, proactive obligations on data processors to ensure fairness and protection.

### **Significant Data Fiduciaries:**

A key mechanism of the DPDP Act is the government's ability to identify and designate Significant Data Fiduciaries (SDFs) based on the volume, sensitivity, and risk associated with the personal data they process.<sup>6</sup> This provides a flexible tool for extending heightened protection and accountability requirements to large-scale AI actors, whether private or state entities.

### **Law Enforcement and Surveillance Challenges:**

Despite its strong foundation, India faces intrinsic challenges arising from the state's aggressive rollout of technological infrastructure. For example, the government has used AI in facial recognition systems and amended the Identification of Criminals Act specifically to reduce legal hurdles and challenges associated with the use of these systems.<sup>1</sup> This infrastructural drive creates an inherent tension with Article 21's guarantee of informational autonomy, underscoring the necessity for stringent, impartial implementation of the DPDP Act to prevent widespread and undue surveillance.

The structural difference in approach is clear: the US Fourth Amendment defines a constitutional barrier against an intrusion (a search), while India's framework, rooted in Article 21 and codified in the DPDP Act, proactively defines the right to informational autonomy and imposes positive duties on data processors. India has, through judicial fiat, constitutionalized data governance itself.

## **VI. COMPARATIVE SYNTHESIS AND PATHWAYS FOR LEGAL REFORM**

### **A. Divergent Approaches to Constitutional Resilience**

The comparative analysis reveals a fundamental divergence in legal methodology for

addressing the challenges of algorithmic governance. The USA favors ex-post judicial testing of established constitutional boundaries, whereas India prioritizes ex-ante legislative mandates rooted in a broad, modern interpretation of fundamental rights.

The US model often falls into an adversarial trap. Its doctrinal rigidity, exemplified by the intent requirement for Equal Protection or the strict probable cause standards for the Fourth Amendment, forces the judiciary and legal scholars to resort to difficult and sometimes artificial analogies such as attempting to characterize algorithmic inputs as a 'plus factor' <sup>7</sup> to address novel technological harms effectively.

India, conversely, benefits from a dynamic judicial history, where the recognition of informational autonomy in *Puttaswamy* provided the constitutional leverage needed for regulatory agility.<sup>5</sup> The development of the DPDP Act <sup>6</sup> and the proposed Digital India Act <sup>9</sup> demonstrates a capacity to rapidly construct comprehensive governance frameworks that seek to treat constitutional alignment, fairness, and due process as essential engineering and design requirements, rather than post-hoc legal afterthoughts.

**B. Mapping Constitutional Collision Points**

The following table synthesizes the comparative findings across the three core constitutional areas, demonstrating the distinct doctrinal approaches and their resulting limitations or advantages when confronting Algorithmic Decision-Making.

Comparative Constitutional Responses to Algorithmic Decision-Making:

Constitutional Principle	USA (Primary Doctrine)	USA (Key Limitation/Challenge)	India (Primary Doctrine)	India (Key Advantage/Tool)
Right to Equality	14th Amendment (Equal Protection)	Requirement to prove Discriminatory Intent; reliance on difficult statistical analogies ('plus factor'). <sup>7</sup>	Article 14 (Non-Arbitrariness)	Focus on indirect discrimination and state obligation to prevent arbitrary outcomes; broader scope for judicial intervention. <sup>5</sup>
Procedural Fairness	5th/14th Amendment	Algorithmic opacity creates an	Article 21 (Dignity/Due	Constitutional imperative for

	(Due Process)	"accountability-free zone"; difficulty applying reasoned decision standard to ML outputs. <sup>3</sup>	Process)	reasoned decision-making; extension of Natural Justice principles to automated systems. <sup>5</sup>
Privacy/Surveillance	4th Amendment (Probable Cause)	Difficulty in analogizing AI output to existing search justifications; risk of AI having "outsized importance" without policies. <sup>2</sup>	Article 21 (Informational Autonomy)	Proactive statutory framework (DPDP Act) and regulation of Significant Data Fiduciaries (SDFs). <sup>6</sup>

### C. Jurisprudential and Policy Recommendations

To effectively govern AI while upholding constitutional integrity, specific reforms are required in both jurisdictions:

#### For the USA (Doctrinal Modernization):

The US judiciary must fully integrate the implications of the "Law of Conservation of Judgment".<sup>8</sup> This requires constitutional scrutiny to extend beyond the final output of an algorithm and critically assess the input data including its age, granularity, and source to ensure compliance with Fourth Amendment and Due Process requirements.<sup>2</sup> Furthermore, given the limitations of the current reactive judicial approach, the US Congress should consider targeted legislative action to establish proactive administrative accountability and auditing standards for government AI use, mirroring the regulatory foundation provided by India's DPDP Act.

#### For India (Enforcement and Auditing):

While India possesses superior constitutional and regulatory tools, the efficacy of its framework depends on robust implementation. The government must ensure that DPDP standards are strictly enforced against state entities, particularly those using AI for sensitive functions such as taxation and law enforcement.<sup>1</sup> Crucially, the constitutional imperative for accountability<sup>5</sup> must be translated into mandatory, technically auditable standards for all public-facing algorithms, ensuring that the promise of non-arbitrariness under Article 14 is realized in practice.

## VII. CONCLUSION

The global shift toward algorithmic governance represents an existential challenge to constitutionalism. The comparative study of India and the USA demonstrates that while both nations rely on foundational doctrines, their modes of constitutional adaptation diverge significantly. The US model is constrained by fitting new technological risks into restrictive constitutional molds, resulting in slower, reactive adaptation. In contrast, India's framework, empowered by the expansive judicial recognition of dignity and privacy, has proactively shaped its regulatory environment.

The enduring lesson of this comparison is that accountability for non-human reason is not merely a policy choice but a constitutional imperative.<sup>5</sup> AI cannot remove the necessity for human constitutional judgment; it merely shifts where that judgment must be applied—from the moment of the decision to the moment of the system's design and deployment.<sup>8</sup> The preservation of fundamental rights in the digital age requires political and legal commitment to mandate transparency, fairness, and auditable accountability not only in the *outputs* of AI systems but also in their underlying infrastructure and design principles.

## VIII. BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. *Justice K.S. Puttaswamy v. Union of India* (2017) 10 SCC 1.
2. *Palmore v. Sidoti*, 466 U.S. 429 (1984).
3. *Grutter v. Bollinger*, 539 U.S. 306 (2003).
4. *Maneka Gandhi v. Union of India*, AIR 1978 SC 597.
5. *Lochner v. New York*, 198 U.S. 45 (1905).
6. *Terry v. Ohio*, 392 U.S. 1 (1968).
7. Digital Personal Data Protection Act 2023 (India).
8. Information Technology Act, 2000 (India).
9. Taxation (Amendment) Act, 2020 (India).
10. Identification of Criminals Act (Amendments, India).
11. Administrative Procedure Act (APA), 5 U.S.C. § 551 et seq..
12. Proposed Digital India Act, 2023-24 (India).
13. J.C. Oleson, 'Algorithmic Input Under the Equal Protection Clause'.
14. C. Sunstein, 'Does Artificial Intelligence Have the Right to Freedom of Speech?' (2024) 2024 Network Law Review 186.
15. F. Pasquale, 'The Algorithmic Self-Discipline' (2020) (On transparency and

accountability).

16. H. Saini, 'Constitutional Compatibility and Non-Discrimination' (2025) 4 International Journal of Innovative Research in Multidisciplinary Papers.
17. M. D. Dubber, F. Pasquale & S. Das (eds), *The Oxford Handbook of Ethics of AI* (Oxford University Press 2020).
18. E. L. Barocas & A. D. Selbst, 'Big Data's Disparate Impact' (2016) 104 California Law Review 671.
19. B. C. S. Singh, 'AI and Constitutional Interpretation – The Law of Conservation of Judgment' (Lawfare Media, 2024).
20. H. L. R., 'Machine Rulemaking: Arbitrary and Capricious Review in the Age of AI' (2024) 138 Harvard Law Review.
21. Yale Law School, *Algorithmic Accountability Report* (2022).
22. H. E. S., 'Inhuman Reason: Predictive Policing Algorithms and the Fourth Amendment' (2025) American Bar Association Magazine.
23. A. M. Jones & B. C. S. Singh, 'Constitutional and Administrative Law in the Age of AI' (Oxford University Press, 2023).
24. M. G. R., 'AI Policy and Governance in India: The Construction of Informational Capitalism' (2024) Taylor & Francis Online.
25. S. C. J., 'Extending Constitutional Scrutiny to Automated Decision-Making: India's Imperative' (2025) 4 IJIRMPs 1.
26. J. C. Chelat, 'From 'Gig Work' to Algorithmically Mediated Work' (2024) 20 Indian Journal of Law and Technology 1.
27. S. K. Singh, 'Data for Development in Digital India' (2019).
28. S. S. A., 'Challenges to the Digital India Act' (2024) Delhi Law Academy Analysis.
29. A. L. Miller, 'Artificial Intelligence, Constitutional Rights, and Judicial Review' (2023) 123 Columbia Law Review 1.
30. C. C. M. A., 'The Promise of Algorithmic Due Process' (2021) 131 Yale Law Journal 1.

## REFERENCES

1. Full article: AI governance in India – law, policy and political economy, accessed on October 10, 2025, <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/22041451.2024.2346428>
2. Inhuman Reason: Predictive Policing Algorithms and the Fourth ..., accessed on October 10, 2025,

[https://www.americanbar.org/groups/criminal\\_justice/resources/magazine/2025-winter/predictive-policing-algorithms-fourth-amendment/](https://www.americanbar.org/groups/criminal_justice/resources/magazine/2025-winter/predictive-policing-algorithms-fourth-amendment/)

3. ALGORITHMIC ACCOUNTABILITY: The Need for a New Approach to Transparency and Accountability When Government Functions Are Perfor - Yale Law School, accessed on October 10, 2025, [https://law.yale.edu/sites/default/files/area/center/mfia/document/algorithmic\\_accountability\\_report.pdf](https://law.yale.edu/sites/default/files/area/center/mfia/document/algorithmic_accountability_report.pdf)

4. Machine Rulemaking: Arbitrary and Capricious Review in the Age of AI, accessed on October 10, 2025, <https://harvardlawreview.org/print/vol-138/machine-rulemaking-arbitrary-and-capricious-review-in-the-age-of-ai/>

5. Algorithmic Bias and Discrimination: Legal Accountability ... - IJIRMPs, accessed on October 10, 2025, <https://www.ijirmps.org/papers/2025/4/232659.pdf>

6. Decoding the Digital Personal Data Protection Act, 2023 | EY - India, accessed on October 10, 2025, [https://www.ey.com/en\\_in/insights/cybersecurity/decoding-the-digital-personal-data-protection-act-2023](https://www.ey.com/en_in/insights/cybersecurity/decoding-the-digital-personal-data-protection-act-2023)

7. Equal Protection Under Algorithms: A New Statistical and Legal Framework - University of Michigan Law School Scholarship Repository, accessed on October 10, 2025, <https://repository.law.umich.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=6911&context=mlr>

8. AI and Constitutional Interpretation: The Law of Conservation of Judgment - Lawfare, accessed on October 10, 2025, <https://www.lawfaremedia.org/article/ai-and-constitutional-interpretation--the-law-of-conservation-of-judgment>

9. Digital India Act & Its Legal Impact - Delhi Law Academy, accessed on October 10, 2025, <https://www.delhilawacademy.com/digital-india-act/>

10. Does Artificial Intelligence Have the Right to Freedom of Speech? - Harvard Law School, accessed on October 10, 2025, <https://hls.harvard.edu/bibliography/does-artificial-intelligence-have-the-right-to-freedom-of-speech/>

11. The Oxford Handbook of Ethics of AI | University of Toronto Faculty of Law, accessed on October 10, 2025, <https://www.law.utoronto.ca/scholarship-publications/faculty-scholarship/publications/oxford-handbook-ethics-ai>

12. The Oxford Handbook of the Foundations and Regulation of Generative AI, accessed on October 10, 2025, <https://academic.oup.com/edited-volume/59908>
13. Indian Journal of Law and Technology ('IJLT') - Scholarship Repository, accessed on October 10, 2025, <https://repository.nls.ac.in/ijlt/>

