



INTERNATIONAL LAW
JOURNAL

**WHITE BLACK
LEGAL LAW
JOURNAL
ISSN: 2581-
8503**

Peer - Reviewed & Refereed Journal

The Law Journal strives to provide a platform for discussion of International as well as National Developments in the Field of Law.

WWW.WHITEBLACKLEGAL.CO.IN

DISCLAIMER

No part of this publication may be reproduced or copied in any form by any means without prior written permission of Editor-in-chief of White Black Legal – The Law Journal. The Editorial Team of White Black Legal 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 reflect the views of the Editorial Team of White Black Legal. Though all efforts are made to ensure the accuracy and correctness of the information published, White Black Legal shall not be responsible for any errors caused due to oversight or otherwise.

WHITE BLACK
LEGAL

EDITORIAL TEAM

Raju Narayana Swamy (IAS) Indian Administrative Service officer



Dr. Raju Narayana Swamy popularly known as Kerala's Anti-Corruption Crusader is the All India Topper of the 1991 batch of the IAS and is currently posted as Principal Secretary to the Government of Kerala. He has earned many accolades as he hit against the political-bureaucrat corruption nexus in India. Dr Swamy holds a B.Tech in Computer Science and Engineering from the IIT Madras and a Ph. D. in Cyber Law from Gujarat National Law University. He also has an LLM (Pro) (with specialization in IPR) as well as three PG Diplomas from the National Law University, Delhi- one in Urban Environmental Management and Law, another in Environmental Law and Policy and a third one in Tourism and Environmental Law. He also holds a post-graduate diploma in IPR from the National Law School, Bengaluru and

a professional diploma in Public Procurement from the World Bank.

Dr. R. K. Upadhyay

Dr. R. K. Upadhyay is Registrar, University of Kota (Raj.), Dr Upadhyay obtained LLB, LLM degrees from Banaras Hindu University & PHD from university of Kota. He has successfully completed UGC sponsored M.R.P for the work in the Ares of the various prisoners reforms in the state of the Rajasthan.



Senior Editor

Dr. Neha Mishra



Dr. Neha Mishra is Associate Professor & Associate Dean (Scholarships) in Jindal Global Law School, OP Jindal Global University. She was awarded both her PhD degree and Associate Professor & Associate Dean M.A.; LL.B. (University of Delhi); LL.M.; PH.D. (NLSIU, Bangalore) LLM from National Law School of India University, Bengaluru; she did her LL.B. from Faculty of Law, Delhi University as well as M.A. and B.A. from Hindu College and DCAC from DU respectively. Neha has been a Visiting Fellow, School of Social Work, Michigan State University, 2016 and invited speaker Panelist at Global Conference, Whitney R. Harris World Law Institute, Washington University in St. Louis, 2015.

Ms. Sumiti Ahuja

Ms. Sumiti Ahuja, Assistant Professor, Faculty of Law, University of Delhi,

Ms. Sumiti Ahuja completed her LL.M. from the Indian Law Institute with specialization in Criminal Law and Corporate Law, and has over nine years of teaching experience. She has done her LL.B. from the Faculty of Law, University of Delhi. She is currently pursuing PH.D. in the area of Forensics and Law. Prior to joining the teaching profession, she has worked as Research Assistant for projects funded by different agencies of Govt. of India. She has developed various audio-video teaching modules under UGC e-PG Pathshala programme in the area of Criminology, under the aegis of an MHRD Project. Her areas of interest are Criminal Law, Law of Evidence, Interpretation of Statutes, and Clinical Legal Education.



Dr. Navtika Singh Nautiyal

Dr. Navtika Singh Nautiyal presently working as an Assistant Professor in School of law, Forensic Justice and Policy studies at National Forensic Sciences University, Gandhinagar, Gujarat. She has 9 years of Teaching and Research Experience. She has completed her Philosophy of Doctorate in 'Inter-country adoption laws from Uttarakhand University, Dehradun' and LLM from Indian Law Institute, New Delhi.

Dr. Rinu Saraswat



Associate Professor at School of Law, Apex University, Jaipur, M.A, LL.M, PH.D,

Dr. Rinu have 5 yrs of teaching experience in renowned institutions like Jagannath University and Apex University. Participated in more than 20 national and international seminars and conferences and 5 workshops and training programmes.

Dr. Nitesh Saraswat

E.MBA, LL.M, PH.D, PGDSAPM

Currently working as Assistant Professor at Law Centre II, Faculty of Law, University of Delhi. Dr. Nitesh have 14 years of Teaching, Administrative and research experience in Renowned Institutions like Amity University, Tata Institute of Social Sciences, Jai Narain Vyas University Jodhpur, Jagannath University and Nirma University. More than 25 Publications in renowned National and International Journals and has authored a Text book on CR.P.C and Juvenile Delinquency law.



Subhrajit Chanda



BBA. LL.B. (Hons.) (Amity University, Rajasthan); LL. M. (UPES, Dehradun) (Nottingham Trent University, UK); PH.D. Candidate (G.D. Goenka University)

Subhrajit did his LL.M. in Sports Law, from Nottingham Trent University of United Kingdoms, with international scholarship provided by university; he has also completed another LL.M. in Energy Law from University of Petroleum and Energy Studies, India. He did his B.B.A.LL.B. (Hons.) focussing on International Trade Law.

ABOUT US

WHITE BLACK LEGAL is an open access, peer-reviewed and refereed journal provide dedicated to express views on topical legal issues, thereby generating a cross current of ideas on emerging matters. This platform shall also ignite the initiative and desire of young law students to contribute in the field of law. The erudite response of legal luminaries shall be solicited to enable readers to explore challenges that lie before law makers, lawyers and the society at large, in the event of the ever changing social, economic and technological scenario.

With this thought, we hereby present to you

WHEN TECHNOLOGY OUTPACES LAW: RETHINKING INDIA'S READINESS FOR AI

AUTHORED BY - HIMANSHU KUMAR VIPLAVA
& SUDHANSHU KUMAR VIPLAVA

Abstract

Artificial Intelligence (AI) is rapidly transforming legal systems worldwide, offering tools that can enhance efficiency, decision-making, and access to justice. In India, this transformation is visible through the judiciary's adoption of AI-driven platforms like SUPACE and SUVAAS, and the legal profession's growing reliance on AI for research, contract review, and compliance. However, this technological progress is unfolding in a regulatory vacuum. Despite initiatives like the IndiaAI Mission, India lacks a dedicated legal framework to govern AI's ethical deployment, accountability, and impact on fundamental rights.

This paper investigates India's preparedness for an AI-powered legal ecosystem, highlighting the widening gap between technological advancement and legal adaptation. It contrasts India's reactive, innovation-centric posture with global approaches such as the EU's risk-based AI regulation. Through a constitutional and comparative lens, the study assesses India's existing institutional responses and outlines key reforms to ensure that legal innovation remains rights-based, transparent, and future-ready.

Keywords: Artificial Intelligence, Legal Technology, AI Regulation, Access to Justice, Technology and Law.

1. Introduction

1.1 Background and Context

Artificial Intelligence (AI) is no longer a speculative concept confined to research labs; it now permeates daily life, economies, and increasingly, the legal system. Globally, AI tools are being deployed to expedite legal research, automate documentation, predict case outcomes, and even assist judges in sentencing. India is not insulated from this revolution. The judiciary has taken steps to integrate technology into its workflow, most notably through tools like SUPACE and

SUVAAS, which assist in judicial data analysis and translation.¹ Meanwhile, legal professionals are gradually incorporating AI-enabled tools for drafting, reviewing contracts, and legal analytics.²

However, this rapid adoption raises critical legal and ethical questions. Unlike sectors with clearly defined regulatory pathways, India's legal system is embracing AI in a largely unregulated environment. This creates a disjunct between innovation and accountability, especially when AI systems influence decisions involving fundamental rights, such as liberty, privacy, and due process.

1.2 Research Objectives

This paper explores India's current level of legal and institutional readiness for the widespread adoption of AI, particularly within its judicial and legal systems. It aims to:

- Identify and analyse existing legal gaps in India's AI governance framework.
- Examine the constitutional, ethical, and professional risks posed by AI in law.
- Evaluate recent developments such as the IndiaAI Mission³ and initiatives within the Indian judiciary.
- Compare India's trajectory with global regulatory models, especially the European Union's AI Act.
- Propose policy and legal reforms that align innovation with rights-based safeguards.

1.3 Methodology

This research is grounded in a qualitative review of primary government releases, policy documents, and expert commentaries.

¹ Gopika, The Rise Of Gen AI In Law: The Indian Supreme Court Gets a Technology Makeover, AKAIKE (June 29, 2025, 10:04 AM), <https://www.akaike.ai/resources/the-rise-of-gen-ai-in-law-the-indian-supreme-court-gets-a-technology-makeover>.

² Aditi Prabhu, Artificial intelligence in the context of the Indian legal profession and judicial system, Bar and Bench (June 29, 2025, 10:32 AM), <https://www.barandbench.com/columns/artificial-intelligence-in-context-of-legal-profession-and-indian-judicial-system>.

³ Santosh Kumar, Sheetal Angral and Vatsla Srivastava, Digital Transformation of Justice: Integrating AI in India's Judiciary and Law Enforcement, Press Information Bureau (July 2, 2025, 11:44 AM), <https://www.pib.gov.in/PressNoteDetails.aspx?NoteId=153773&ModuleId=3>.

2. The AI Revolution and Its Legal Implications

2.1 Understanding the Scope of AI in India

In India, AI is being integrated into diverse domains, ranging from agriculture and healthcare to intelligent governance and judicial assistance. According to the IndiaAI Mission launched by the Government of India in 2024, AI is envisioned not only as a driver of economic productivity but also as a strategic national capability.^[6] The initiative includes plans to invest ₹10,000 crore in compute infrastructure, data platforms, foundational models, and AI applications tailored for Indian use cases.

In the legal sector specifically, AI applications now range from transcription tools and case law summarisation to intelligent search systems that assist judges and lawyers. LegalTech startups and platforms are also developing proprietary generative AI tools to automate repetitive legal tasks, enabling faster and more efficient services.⁴ The Supreme Court's use of SUPACE and SUVAAS reflects a growing recognition of AI's capacity to streamline judicial work and reduce procedural delays.

Despite this potential, the deployment of AI in India remains fragmented and primarily driven by executive or institutional discretion. There is no overarching national law governing AI usage, particularly in high-risk areas such as adjudication, sentencing, or public decision-making.

2.2 Emerging Use Cases in Governance, Law, and Justice

The most transformative impact of AI in India's legal system has been its potential to modernize judicial processes. AI-enabled tools now assist with:

- Speech-to-text transcription during court proceedings
- Language translation between Indian vernacular languages and English
- Legal research and predictive analytics on case outcomes
- Summarisation of judgments for easier access to jurisprudence

The Supreme Court of India's technology makeover, including the incorporation of GenAI, has

⁴ Dr Nivash Jeevanandam, India's AI-driven legal future: Opportunities and emerging trends in 2025, India AI (July 9, 2025, 10:58 AM), <https://indiaai.gov.in/article/india-s-ai-driven-legal-future-opportunities-and-emerging-trends-in-2025>.

significantly increased judicial efficiency.⁵ Meanwhile, private law firms and legal departments are integrating AI to reduce time spent on compliance, discovery, and document review.⁶

In governance, AI is already being tested in e-courts, legal aid platforms, and citizen grievance redressal systems. While these tools promise increased access to justice, their opaque decision-making logic, reliance on biased datasets, and absence of auditability mechanisms raise concerns about due process and accountability.

2.3 Global Trends vs Indian Realities

Globally, countries are approaching AI regulation through a mix of hard law (e.g., the EU's AI Act) and soft law (non-binding principles, industry self-regulation). The EU AI Act, adopted in 2024, offers a structured risk-based framework that classifies AI systems and mandates different levels of compliance—from transparency and documentation to outright bans for unacceptable-risk systems.⁷

India, by contrast, has so far adopted a pro-innovation, light-touch regulatory approach, focusing more on enabling AI development than constraining its risks. According to the Carnegie Endowment, India's current policy lacks binding guardrails around ethical use, liability, or transparency, and instead encourages self-regulation by AI developers and platforms.⁸

This divergence creates an urgent need for India to reassess its legal foundations. Without structured legal safeguards, India risks not only technological misuse but also the erosion of public trust in judicial and governance institutions.

⁵ Gopika, The Rise Of Gen AI In Law: The Indian Supreme Court Gets a Technology Makeover, AKAIKE (June 29, 2025, 10:04 AM), <https://www.akaike.ai/resources/the-rise-of-gen-ai-in-law-the-indian-supreme-court-gets-a-technology-makeover>.

⁶ Aditi Prabhu, Artificial intelligence in the context of the Indian legal profession and judicial system, Bar and Bench (June 29, 2025, 10:32 AM), <https://www.barandbench.com/columns/artificial-intelligence-in-context-of-legal-profession-and-indian-judicial-system>.

⁷ Ankit Singh, The AI Regulatory Landscape in India: What to Know, Azorobotics (July 10, 2025, 1:04 PM), <https://www.azorobotics.com/Article.aspx?ArticleID=742>.

⁸ Amlan Mohanty and Shataktratu Sahu, India's Advance on AI Regulation, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace (July 12, 2025, 3:04 PM), <https://carnegieendowment.org/research/2024/11/indias-advance-on-ai-regulation?lang=en>.

3. Legal and Judicial Embrace of AI in India

3.1 The Judiciary's Strategic Integration of AI

In recent years, the Indian judiciary has emerged as an unexpected front-runner in experimenting with AI. This shift is not merely technological, it reflects an institutional effort to tackle chronic systemic issues such as delays, backlogs, and linguistic complexity. One of the most significant milestones was the Supreme Court's 2021 pilot of SUPACE (Supreme Court Portal for Assistance in Court's Efficiency), an AI-driven research assistant developed to assist judges in analyzing case files and identifying relevant precedents.⁹

This was soon followed by SUVAAS, a translation tool designed to overcome linguistic barriers by translating judgments from regional languages into English and vice versa which is crucial in a multilingual country where access to legal reasoning has long been limited by language. Unlike conventional digitalisation efforts, these initiatives signal the judiciary's willingness to co-create and deploy AI tools that augment decision-making processes, rather than merely automate clerical tasks.

3.2 The Role of Generative AI in Court Functioning

The rise of Generative AI (GenAI) marks a turning point in how legal institutions conceptualize automation. The Indian Supreme Court has begun testing GenAI tools to produce draft bench memoranda, judicial summaries, and even first-level notes for internal circulation among judges.¹⁰ This is a significant departure from traditional AI models that were rule-based and limited to data retrieval. GenAI, by contrast, operates on probabilistic models that generate human-like reasoning and articulation—making it especially attractive in complex litigation environments.

Importantly, the use of GenAI is not limited to higher courts. Some High Courts have initiated AI-assisted e-filing systems and are piloting platforms for intelligent case classification and digital cause lists. These tools reduce administrative burdens and are being aligned with ongoing efforts under the National Judicial Data Grid and e-Courts Phase III project.

⁹ Dr Nivash Jeevanandam, India's AI-driven legal future: Opportunities and emerging trends in 2025, India AI (July 9, 2025, 10:58 AM), <https://indiaai.gov.in/article/india-s-ai-driven-legal-future-opportunities-and-emerging-trends-in-2025>.

¹⁰ Gopika, The Rise Of Gen AI In Law: The Indian Supreme Court Gets a Technology Makeover, AKAIKE (June 29, 2025, 10:04 AM), <https://www.akaike.ai/resources/the-rise-of-gen-ai-in-law-the-indian-supreme-court-gets-a-technology-makeover>.

3.3 AI in the Legal Profession: Transforming Practice, Raising Concerns

AI is also reshaping legal practice beyond the courtroom. Law firms and corporate legal teams are adopting AI for contract analytics, compliance monitoring, and due diligence. Tools now allow automatic clause comparison, risk tagging, and even prediction of litigation probability based on historical data.¹¹ As client expectations shift toward speed, accuracy, and cost-efficiency, AI is becoming a competitive necessity in the legal services market.

Yet, these developments raise foundational concerns. The use of opaque AI tools in high-stakes legal processes risks reinforcing biases, undermining client confidentiality, and distorting the ethical responsibilities of legal professionals. The Bar Council of India has not yet issued binding guidelines on the permissible use of AI in advocacy, leaving a regulatory vacuum that could affect both professional accountability and fairness.

3.4 Institutional Readiness and Capacity Gaps

While the judiciary's AI integration efforts are commendable, their success is not uniform across the country. The majority of district courts still struggle with basic infrastructure issues such as unreliable internet, lack of trained staff, and minimal digitisation. Without parallel investment in digital literacy and institutional capacity, AI integration risks deepening existing hierarchies within the justice system between well-equipped urban courts and under-resourced rural ones.

Moreover, as highlighted by Carnegie, India lacks a regulatory architecture that mandates human-in-the-loop design, periodic audits of AI tools, or clear standards for explainability. This makes it difficult to challenge AI-derived outcomes or scrutinize how decisions are made, especially in matters involving fundamental rights.

4. India's Current Legal Framework: Gaps and Challenges

4.1 Absence of Comprehensive AI-Specific Legislation

Despite the increasing integration of AI into legal and governmental functions, India has no dedicated legal framework to govern the development, deployment, or oversight of AI systems. Most AI-related policies are currently articulated through non-binding guidelines, sectoral

¹¹ Aditi Prabhu, Artificial intelligence in the context of the Indian legal profession and judicial system, Bar and Bench (June 29, 2025, 10:32 AM), <https://www.barandbench.com/columns/artificial-intelligence-in-context-of-legal-profession-and-indian-judicial-system>.

roadmaps, and institutional pilot programs. While documents like the National Strategy on Artificial Intelligence (2018) and the IndiaAI Mission (2024) highlight the potential of AI, they fall short of offering a legally enforceable regulatory structure. As a result, developers, courts, and legal professionals are operating in a grey zone—without clear guidance on liability, consent, transparency, or auditability.¹²

The lack of legal codification leaves vital questions unaddressed: What happens when an AI-generated legal output causes harm? Who is liable: developer, deployer, or end-user? How are AI systems to be tested for fairness, accuracy, or bias? These questions are currently answered inconsistently, if at all.

4.2 Inadequacies in Data Protection and Algorithmic Transparency

AI systems depend extensively on vast datasets, which frequently include personal or sensitive data. However, India currently lacks an enforceable, comprehensive data protection framework. Although the Digital Personal Data Protection Act, 2023 has been passed, its implementation remains slow and patchy. Moreover, the Act is narrowly focused on data privacy and does not meaningfully address broader concerns such as algorithmic accountability, automated decision-making, or the right to explanation.

As AI tools are introduced into legal and judicial workflows, the opacity of their decision-making mechanisms becomes especially problematic. Without mandatory disclosure of training datasets, model logic, or performance metrics, there is no effective way to audit or contest the output of AI systems used in legal proceedings.

4.3 Regulatory Lag: Why the Law Trails Behind

India's regulatory lag is not merely a function of technical delay; it reflects a structural hesitation to preemptively legislate in fast-evolving tech domains. Policymakers have often justified a “wait-and-see” approach to AI regulation, arguing that premature restrictions could stifle innovation.¹³ However, this reactive stance risks allowing untested, opaque, and potentially biased AI systems to become entrenched in sensitive areas such as criminal justice,

¹² AI and India's Legal Landscape, DrishtiIAS (July 13, 2025, 10:24 AM), <https://www.drishtiiias.com/daily-updates/daily-news-editorials/ai-and-india-s-legal-landscape>.

¹³ Amlan Mohanty and Shatakratu Sahu, India's Advance on AI Regulation, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace (July 12, 2025, 3:04 PM), <https://carnegieendowment.org/research/2024/11/indias-advance-on-ai-regulation?lang=en>.

public administration, and legal advice.

Moreover, India lacks institutional mechanisms such as an independent AI regulator, a mandatory AI audit authority, or even advisory ethics boards attached to courts or law ministries. While nations like the EU and Singapore are building forward-looking, risk-based frameworks, India's regulatory apparatus remains fragmented and toothless in comparison.

5. Ethical, Constitutional, and Social Concerns

5.1 Bias, Discrimination, and Fairness in AI Systems

A key ethical concern in the application of AI to legal systems is the problem of algorithmic bias. AI systems, particularly those trained on historical legal data, often replicate and even amplify existing inequalities—whether related to caste, gender, socioeconomic status, or region. For example, if past court data reflects systemic prejudices (e.g., harsher sentences for certain communities), an AI model trained on such data may internalize and reproduce these patterns without awareness or correction.

Compounding this is the fact that most AI models used in Indian legal contexts are proprietary black boxes, offering little transparency about how they arrive at conclusions. Unlike a judge whose reasoning can be examined, challenged, and appealed, algorithmic logic often operates in inaccessible mathematical terms. The lack of explainability and transparency undermines trust and makes it nearly impossible for litigants to seek redress against discriminatory outcomes.¹⁴

5.2 Constitutional Compatibility: Due Process and Fundamental Rights

AI's intersection with constitutional rights raises serious concerns. Automated decision-making—particularly in legal aid screening, bail evaluations, or predictive policing—can affect fundamental rights such as personal liberty (Article 21), equality before law (Article 14), and non-discrimination (Article 15). If individuals are denied bail or legal assistance based on algorithmic risk scores, without an opportunity to challenge or understand the basis of the decision, due process is compromised.

¹⁴ AI and India's Legal Landscape, DrishtiIAS (July 13, 2025, 10:24 AM), <https://www.drishtiias.com/daily-updates/daily-news-editorials/ai-and-india-s-legal-landscape>.

Additionally, the absence of statutory safeguards to ensure human oversight in AI-enabled judicial or administrative decisions creates a constitutional vacuum. In liberal democracies, justice must not only be done but must also be seen to be done. When AI tools act as invisible, unaccountable actors, the very transparency and reason-giving that legitimize judicial authority are eroded.

Without legal requirements for notice, consent, and challengeability, citizens are left without procedural protections against automated governance, a trend antithetical to the values enshrined in the Indian Constitution.

5.3 Public Trust and Accountability in Automated Decision-Making

In a country where access to justice is already riddled with linguistic, digital, and economic barriers, the unchecked deployment of AI in the legal system risks alienating the very people it seeks to help. If litigants begin to perceive courts as impersonal or driven by machines rather than by human understanding, public trust in the justice system could erode irreversibly.

Moreover, AI systems lack moral reasoning, empathy, and the contextual flexibility that human judges bring to complex legal disputes. While AI can enhance efficiency, it cannot and should not replace the interpretive, value-laden functions of legal reasoning. Holding AI systems accountable is complicated by the diffused responsibility across developers, deployers, and decision-makers. This makes it difficult to attribute fault or remedy harm when AI errors occur.

In sum, without strong accountability mechanisms, clear lines of liability, and participatory design principles, the use of AI in law risks creating a techno-legal environment that is efficient, but not just.

6. India's Policy Responses and Strategic Initiatives

6.1 Analysis of Press Information Bureau & MeitY Releases

The Government of India has acknowledged the growing importance of AI through various policy announcements and mission-driven programs. A major recent milestone is the launch of the IndiaAI Mission, announced by the Ministry of Electronics and Information Technology (MeitY) and detailed in an official PIB release in March 2024. With a proposed investment of ₹10,372 crore, the Mission aims to enhance India's AI compute capacity, democratize access

to AI datasets, fund research in foundational models, and encourage ethical AI startups.¹⁵

While these objectives are commendable, the policy remains largely technology- and industry-driven, with limited focus on the legal or regulatory infrastructure necessary to govern the responsible use of AI in sensitive sectors like justice. The PIB release includes aspirational references to “ethical AI,” but provides no binding guidance or institutional roadmap for implementation in public governance or the legal system. This reflects a broader pattern in Indian policy: proactive on innovation, reactive on regulation.

6.2 The IndiaAI Mission and Strategic Roadmaps

Beyond funding and infrastructure, the IndiaAI Mission outlines three strategic pillars:

- Compute Infrastructure (IndiaAI Cloud & IndiaAI Supercomputing)
- Innovation & Startups (IndiaAI FutureSkills, IndiaAI Datasets Platform)
- Responsible AI (IndiaAI Responsible AI Centres & Public Sector Use Cases)

These centers are expected to create frameworks for fairness, transparency, and accountability in AI deployment. However, the roadmap does not yet articulate how these principles will be codified into law, especially in domains where decisions affect constitutional rights.

Furthermore, the Mission does not directly address the judiciary or the legal profession even though these are among the earliest public institutions to adopt AI tools like SUPACE and SUVAAS. Without statutory mandates or oversight protocols, such public sector experimentation runs the risk of bypassing critical legal and ethical scrutiny.

7. Comparative Insights: Global Approaches to AI Regulation

7.1 The EU AI Act and Lessons for India

One of the most advanced regulatory frameworks for artificial intelligence is the European Union’s AI Act, formally adopted in 2024. The Act introduces a risk-based classification system, separating AI applications into four tiers: unacceptable risk, high risk, limited risk, and minimal risk. The use of AI for biometric surveillance, social scoring, or manipulative behavior tracking is strictly prohibited. High-risk applications such as those used in law enforcement, border control, or judicial decision-making are subjected to rigorous transparency,

¹⁵ Santosh Kumar, Sheetal Angral and Vatsla Srivastava, Digital Transformation of Justice: Integrating AI in India's Judiciary and Law Enforcement, Press Information Bureau (July 2, 2025, 11:44 AM), <https://www.pib.gov.in/PressNoteDetails.aspx?NoteId=153773&ModuleId=3>.

documentation, and audit requirements.¹⁶

India, by contrast, does not yet have any such graded framework. All AI systems, regardless of risk level, are treated under a common policy umbrella with no sector-specific guardrails. This lack of legal granularity can result in under-regulation of critical applications (like judicial AI tools) and over-regulation in low-risk domains (like legal research automation).

The EU AI Act offers India two key lessons:

1. The importance of prioritizing high-risk sectors for legal intervention.
2. The need to legally mandate transparency, human oversight, and redress mechanisms in AI systems affecting rights and public services.

7.2 Soft Law vs Hard Law: Striking the Right Balance

Many countries are navigating between “soft law” approaches (voluntary guidelines, ethics codes, industry best practices) and “hard law” mechanisms (statutes, regulations, and binding rules). The United States, for example, has primarily relied on sectoral guidance and federal agency oversight, while countries like Canada and Singapore are experimenting with AI audit tools and sandboxing regulatory environments.

India currently favors a soft-law model, emphasizing innovation facilitation over legal enforceability. This has allowed rapid experimentation evident in judiciary-led pilots like SUPACE but also creates vulnerabilities. Without binding obligations, ethical principles remain aspirational rather than operational.

It is crucial to maintain an equilibrium between adaptability and legal enforceability. A hybrid regulatory model, where baseline legal requirements coexist with adaptive policy instruments could help India maintain innovation while ensuring accountability.

7.3 Adapting Best Practices for the Indian Context

While importing foreign regulatory models wholesale may be unfeasible, context-sensitive adaptation is both possible and necessary. India’s legal system is grounded in constitutional

¹⁶ Ankit Singh, The AI Regulatory Landscape in India: What to Know, Azorobotics (July 10, 2025, 1:04 PM), <https://www.azorobotics.com/Article.aspx?ArticleID=742>.

supremacy and judicial review, meaning any AI regulation must be evaluated against the backdrop of fundamental rights. Moreover, India's multilingual landscape, inconsistent digital infrastructure, and overburdened judiciary call for customized protective measures.

Best practices that India could adapt include:

- Mandatory algorithmic impact assessments for AI tools used in public administration or law.
- Establishment of an independent AI regulatory body empowered to issue guidelines, review systems, and conduct audits.
- Legally enforceable rights to explanation, correction, and appeal in AI-influenced legal outcomes.

8. The Way Forward: Rethinking Legal Readiness

8.1 Proposed Legislative and Regulatory Reforms

To address the growing regulatory vacuum, India must move beyond policy-level declarations and adopt a comprehensive legal framework for artificial intelligence. This framework should:

- Define AI in legal terms and categorize it by risk, use-case, and context.
- Establish obligations for developers and deployers of AI systems, including disclosure of model architecture, training datasets, and performance benchmarks.
- Mandate algorithmic impact assessments before deployment in high-risk domains like criminal justice, judicial decision-making, or public services.
- Include civil and criminal liability provisions for harm caused by AI systems, especially where negligence or bias is demonstrable.

Given India's complex federal structure and constitutional safeguards, such legislation should ideally be national in scope but allow sectoral regulators (e.g., judiciary, health, education) to set specific standards aligned with domain-specific needs.

8.2 Enhancing Institutional Capacity and Digital Literacy

Legal readiness is not only about passing laws; it also depends on building institutional capacity. For AI to be deployed responsibly in the justice system, the following are necessary:

- Training judges, lawyers, and court staff on the capabilities and limitations of AI tools.
- Creating interdisciplinary advisory boards within courts that include technologists, ethicists, and legal scholars.

- Investing in public legal education to help litigants understand their rights in AI-influenced proceedings.
- Ensuring regional courts and legal aid centers are equipped with the digital infrastructure to access AI tools in a meaningful, rights-respecting way.

8.3 Towards a Tech-Conscious, Rights-Respecting Legal Framework

India must resist the temptation to view AI as a silver bullet for judicial efficiency or governance automation. While AI can assist in managing caseloads, summarising judgments, or improving legal research, it must not be allowed to replace human judgment, empathy, or moral reasoning—core elements of justice.

The path forward lies in a "tech-conscious, rights-respecting" model of regulation that neither stifles innovation nor sacrifices individual dignity. This means embedding constitutional values like equality, liberty, and non-discrimination into the design and deployment of AI systems, especially those used by state institutions.

Crucially, India must foster a culture of regulatory foresight rather than post-hoc crisis management. That includes establishing early-warning systems for AI misuse, developing participatory policy-making processes, and incentivizing ethical innovation through public funding and procurement policies.

By grounding AI deployment in the principles of accountability, transparency, and procedural fairness, India can build not just an AI-powered legal system, but a just and inclusive one.

9. Conclusion

As artificial intelligence continues to evolve at a pace faster than the law can adapt, India stands at a pivotal crossroads. The country has made promising strides through government initiatives like the IndiaAI Mission, judicial experiments with tools such as SUPACE and SUVAAS, and the gradual uptake of legaltech in professional practice. However, these developments are unfolding in the absence of a robust legal framework that can safeguard constitutional rights, ensure fairness, and provide redress against algorithmic harm.

This paper has demonstrated that while India's policy discourse has embraced AI's potential,

its legal and institutional foundations remain underprepared. The regulatory lag marked by the absence of binding rules, audit mechanisms, and enforceable ethical standards—risks normalizing opaque, biased, or unaccountable systems within the justice sector. International models like the EU AI Act offer valuable lessons, but India must tailor its approach to reflect its democratic commitments, federal structure, and socio-legal realities.

Ultimately, rethinking India's readiness for AI is not just a question of catching up with technology, it is a constitutional imperative. The law must not only regulate AI but actively shape its trajectory in ways that uphold dignity, equality, and justice. A future-ready legal framework must therefore be anticipatory, inclusive, and rooted in the very values the Indian Constitution seeks to protect. Only then can the promise of AI be aligned with the purpose of law.

