



INDIAN JOURNAL OF
LEGAL REVIEW

VOLUME 4 AND ISSUE 4 OF 2024

INSTITUTE OF LEGAL EDUCATION



INDIAN JOURNAL OF LEGAL REVIEW

APIS – 3920 – 0001 | ISSN – 2583-2344

(Free and Open Access Journal)

Journal's Home Page – <https://ijlr.iledu.in/>

Journal's Editorial Page – <https://ijlr.iledu.in/editorial-board/>

Volume 4 and Issue 4 of 2024 (Access Full Issue on – <https://ijlr.iledu.in/volume-4-and-issue-4-of-2024/>)

Publisher

Prasanna S,

Chairman of Institute of Legal Education (Established by I.L.E. Educational Trust)

No. 08, Arul Nagar, Seera Thoppu,

Maudhanda Kurichi, Srirangam,

Tiruchirappalli – 620102

Phone : +91 94896 71437 – info@iledu.in / Chairman@iledu.in



© Institute of Legal Education

Copyright Disclaimer: All rights are reserved with Institute of Legal Education. No part of the material published on this website (Articles or Research Papers including those published in this journal) may be reproduced, distributed, or transmitted in any form or by any means, including photocopying, recording, or other electronic or mechanical methods, without the prior written permission of the publisher. For more details refer <https://ijlr.iledu.in/terms-and-condition/>

ALGORITHMS ON TRIAL: CORPORATE LIABILITY IN THE AGE OF AI

AUTHOR – GAANA SHREE M, STUDENT AT CHRIST ACADEMY INSTITUTE OF LAW

BEST CITATION – GAANA SHREE M, ALGORITHMS ON TRIAL: CORPORATE LIABILITY IN THE AGE OF AI, INDIAN JOURNAL OF LEGAL REVIEW (IJLR), 4 (4) OF 2024, PG. 808-813, APIS – 3920 – 0001 & ISSN – 2583-2344.

I. ABSTRACT

“The question is not whether machines think, but whether humans do.”

Can artificial intelligence in governance be a friend or foe? The line between innovation and liability is thinning as corporations embrace AI-driven decision-making. In an era of AI, this article unravels the complexities of corporate liability while also illuminating how to use AI's power without breaking any laws. It looks at how AI has permeated corporate governance, shifting paradigms from being accountable to being auditable, and the urgency of creating legal pathways to handle important ethical issues like bias, transparency, and privacy. This research proposes actionable solutions to mitigate risk for AI, in a manner consistent with full compliance with integrity, through the examination of real-world case studies and regulatory insights. In the end, the study lays out a roadmap to harmonize accountability with the required innovation for AI to be used sustainably.

Keywords: Ethical Governance, A.I. Liability, Innovation vs Accountability, Corporate Risk, Legal Solutions.

II. INTRODUCTION- AI IN CORPORATE GOVERNANCE

Artificial intelligence has become a game changer in corporate governance, and integration of it into organizational processes has moved decision-making from an artistry to a science, revolutionizing financial forecasting, compliance, and the governance of companies. Boards and executives are empowered to make informed decisions quickly, as AI systems are increasingly utilized to manage complex datasets and provide real-time insights.¹²²³

A. Growing Relevance of AI in Business Decision-Making

Machine learning, natural language processing, and automated systems AI technologies are now such important business operations tools that they must be tailored to the needs of companies. *These technologies help an organization scale data, which helps it be more*

efficient and innovative. The adoption of AI has seen industries like *finance, healthcare, and manufacturing* engage with AI to accelerate the process of company operations, predict market trends, and also ensure regulatory compliance Catering for a competitive market.

B. Objectives of the Study: Liability in AI-Driven Governance

The growing dependence that we have on AI has put the questions in the spotlight about who is responsible and liable for mistakes made by these systems. *This article aims to address the due diligence requirements that could come up in the legal challenges surrounding AI in Corporate Governance while focusing on how best to assign blame if AI systems negatively impact the affected resources of organizations.* In particular, it seeks to answer the question of who should be held liable, the corporation, the creators of such AI developers, or the end user, and which of these frameworks will work in solving these challenges

¹²²³ Shokufeh Pourbahrami et al., The Implications of Artificial Intelligence for Social Media Governance: Perspectives and Challenges, *Frontiers in Comput. Sci.* Article 1068361 (2022), <https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/computer-science/articles/10.3389/fcomp.2022.1068361/full>.

III. THE EVOLUTION OF AI AND CORPORATE GOVERNANCE

A. Historical Perspective on Corporate Governance and Technological Adoption

Traditionally, corporate governance rested on human judgment and manual decision-making processes. This would help boards of directors and executives evaluate reports and data to guide business strategies and make sure of regulations and guidelines. The digital transformation era, however, introduced a tipping point as technology became the default tool of organizations to deal with emerging complexities in operations and business decisions. AI emerged as a key enabler for innovative solutions to increase the efficiency and responsiveness of governance.

B. Introduction of AI Tools and Systems in Governance Processes

The concept of corporate governance has been redefined by using the tools of AI in critical processes. *Risk assessment, regulatory compliance, and strategic planning for example are now conducted by AI systems.* For one thing, automated auditing systems make sure reviews are accurate and timely, predictive analytics forecast financial trends, and data-driven risk management tools help boards locate and diminish possible problems. By integrating with AI, corporations are empowered to function more efficiently and flexibly: they can track performance and keep up with compliance 24/7.

C. Ways AI can improve efficiency, transparency, and compliance

AI has facilitated substantial benefits of corporate governance by automating repetitive tasks and accelerating making decisions. AI's capacity to sift through large numbers of data incredibly fast and simply overpowers all other factors such as efficiency and transparency in the process of running a business. Furthermore, real-time monitoring and alerts for global regulatory standards, such as the *General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR)*, and *Sarbanes Oxley Act*, among others, are also enabled by AI.

With these advantages, managements across industries have been compelled to rely on AI to improve their governance practices.

IV. LEGAL FRAMEWORKS

• **Information Technology Act, 2000.**¹²²⁴

This fundamental law has taken on cyber problems but the Digital India Act that is near to becoming law is aimed at bringing a stricter set of rules on what constitutes high-risk AI systems, including if particular AI systems are allowed to be used and penalties for crossing the line.

• **Digital Personal Data Protection Act 2023**¹²²⁵

It is this act that governs how personal data is handled for AI systems that depend on big sets of data. However, they argue shortcomings in dealing with the more far-reaching effects of AI technologies.

• **National Strategy on AI (NITI Aayog)**

This is a strategy for 'AI for All' in guiding responsible AI adoption in the areas of health and agriculture. Part of the governance structure emphasizes capacity building and ethics by design.

V. THE ANALYSIS OF CORPORATE LIABILITY IN THE AI CONTEXT.

A. Definition and Scope of Corporate Liability

Corporate liability is a corporation's legal responsibility for what its employees, agents, or agents do. The autonomous, or semi-autonomous, nature of AI systems makes corporate liability in the context of AI more complex. AI systems can do the work without human input, but these same systems also raise questions about who should be held responsible when the AI causes harm or makes a bad decision. With the increasing involvement of AI in corporate governance, the question of the liability of the corporation, the developer of

¹²²⁴ Information Technology Act, No. 21 of 2000, India Code (2000).

¹²²⁵ Digital Personal Data Protection Act, No. 13 of 2023, India Code (2023).

the AI, and the user of the AI system has become a major debate.¹²²⁶

B. Concept of Liability in Traditional Corporate Governance

Traditionally, corporate governance liability was clear and well-defined: The actions of the employees or agents of corporations were held accountable. The company itself could even be found liable if an employee or agent made a decision that harmed it. But in the case of AI, things become muddled. As AI systems start to make autonomous decisions, it becomes difficult to assign liability to the company and its developers, or with the AI system itself. That makes it hard to hold parties accountable for errors or harm done by AI.

C. Shifting Paradigms: The Journey from Human-Centric to AI-Centric Liabilities

Corporate liability is now going from a human-based to a machine-based modality as AI technologies evolve. By enabling AI systems to make decisions without contribution by humans at the outset, AI undercuts traditional notions of corporate personhood. This shift introduces several questions that revolve around accountability and the question of who is legally responsible for AI's role in decision-making questions that would require new legal frameworks to keep up with the extreme complexity of corporate liability in terms of the rise of AI in the corporate world.

VI. AI-DRIVEN CORPORATE GOVERNANCE WITH LEGAL CHALLENGES

A. The government lacks specific AI legal frameworks

As AI becomes more ubiquitous in corporate governance, existing legal frameworks tend to struggle with how to navigate the legal and practical intricacies of AI. Corporate governance of AI continues to largely rest on traditional legal frameworks that are not well equipped to respond to the particular challenges brought by AI technology where many jurisdictions do not yet have specific laws

governing AI. The most recent attempt to codify AI, the *European Union's AI Act (2021)*, has yet to satisfy all the concerns concerning AI and is still in flux.

B. Issues of Accountability: Who Is Liable Division, Developers or Users?

Finding accountability in AI-driven governance is one of the biggest challenges. If an AI system harms someone, we are not sure who should be held responsible: the AI system's owner, the creators of the AI system, or the people who interact with it. *One such example is the 2018 self-driving car Uber incident where an Uber hit and killed a pedestrian.* The legal fallout from this incident questions who was liable for the fatal accident, Uber, or the people who developed the AI system.

C. Challenges in Ensuring Fairness, Transparency, and Non-Discrimination

AI systems, especially those used in decision-making, can propagate system-induced biases, or make non-transparent decisions. Corporate governance fairness, transparency and non-discrimination are presented here in challenges. There is a widely discussed example of the *COMPAS algorithm*, used in *U.S. criminal justice* to predict the likelihood of recidivism. The crackpots in the news accused the algorithm of being racially biased an issue that raises the specter of unregulated AI systems making decisions with the potential to discriminate and produce outcomes that aren't just.

D. Cross-Border Legal Complexities in Multinational Corporations Using AI

Very broadly, AI works on a global scale and often when multinational corporations use it the challenge becomes how to enforce legal standards firmly in one jurisdiction over others. Companies have to deal with different rules in the legal realm the *General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR)* in Europe, and the *California Consumer Privacy Act (CCPA)*, it's also worth saying algorithms have their legislation, such as in other countries. Cross-border legal complexities for corporations pose problems in ensuring compliance with a single unified

¹²²⁶ Corporate Liability, *Wikipedia* (Nov. 21, 2024), https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Corporate_liability

regulatory approach which potentially throws up legal conflicts.

VII. ETHICAL AND REGULATORY

A. Ethical Dilemmas in AI Decision-Making: Data Privacy, and Security Bias

The process of AI-driven corporate governance ignites a bounty of ethical quandaries, especially when they revolve around biases, data privacy, and security. However, solving these problems requires weakening the adversarial state of the system and introducing a 'bias reset' the act of deliberately and intentionally modelling any biases potentially present in AI. Moreover, accountability is also missing from decisions taken with AI, resulting in unintended harm. For example, AS in the hiring process, where AI favors certain groups than others resulting in a potential discrimination lawsuit.

B. Transparency and Explainability in the AI Models

Ethics associated with AI in corporate governance are critical, specifically transparency, and explainability. Many of these AI models are "black boxes" in the sense that we have little to no ability to understand how the decisions are made. A lack of such transparency makes it hard to trust AI systems and more difficult to hold AI to account for its decisions. The idea of explainable AI is emphasized by the *European Union's proposed AI Act (2021)*, in particular, as required for AI systems in high-risk applications to make transparency and public trust achievable.

C. Existing Regulatory Frameworks: C.G.D.P.R, Indian I.T Act and Proposed A. I Act around the world

Some countries started to regulate AI to overcome the ethical and legal questions it poses. In Europe, the *General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR)* says that AI systems need to handle personal data to respect privacy rights. In India, we are seeing a Bill that may address specific provisions for regulating AI, including the *Personal Data Protection Bill*. The *EU's AI Act (2021)* is globally the first one looking at

regulating high-risk AI applications, so far setting standards for deployment in critical sectors, and other nations are looking to do the same.

VIII. SOLUTIONS AND BEST PRACTICES

A. Adopting AI Ethics and Governance Frameworks

An AI governance framework would be a top priority for companies to implement, however only if it centers around ethics, accountability, and transparency. Such systems should be diligently tested for fairness, compliance, and the risk of being biased on these frameworks before being implemented by corporate governance roles. By acknowledging ethical considerations in the design and deployment of AI, risks will be mitigated and trust in the AI systems will be built.

B. Enhancing Supervision and Accountability mechanisms for Human beings

To address the complexities of AI-governed governance, you need human oversight to intervene. AI systems making high-stakes decisions should be reviewed by human operators, and companies should ensure that if they use AI systems, they are subject to review by humans. To maintain responsibility and accountability for AI outcomes, AI-driven decisions must be designated to individuals or boards.

C. Legal Provisions for Algorithmic Transparency and Liability Incorporation

If companies are serious about AI, they should require AI developers to document how these algorithms work, how they're trained, and what decision-making process is used. If corporations can provide transparency by establishing clear documentation, they can make it easier for a legal responsibility framework to be established when AI systems malfunction or when such systems make bad decisions.

D. Cross-border Regulation of AI through International Cooperation

Since AI is a global thing, international cooperation must be brought around concerning a joint regulatory approach. To this end, standards might have to harmonize across countries, and even via the OECD, for instance. Such cooperation would also reduce the legal complexity of cross-border deals and lay down a common standard for the governance of AI.

IX. CASE STUDIES

A. AI-Driven Decisions Issues of Corporate Liability

• *(Gramophone Company of India Ltd. v. Super Cassettes Industries Ltd. 2011) and AI*

Delhi High Court has decided the copyrightability of the AI-generated works. Indian Copyright Act, of 1957 points out that AI-generated music has no human creativity which makes it not worthy of copyright protection in India. What's interesting about this case is that it helps shed some light on how intellectual property laws interface with AI innovation.¹²²⁷

• *E-Governance (National e-Governance Plan using AI)*

To foster decision-making with AI, the Indian government has embedded AI into e-governance to automate public services. But that also shows both the promise and the need, in the legal and ethical framework required for such uses of AI to strengthen governance and increase accessibility.

• *AI Research, Analytics and Knowledge Assimilation Platform (AIRAWAT)*

AIRAWAT, launched by NITI Aayog is aimed at fostering progress in India's AI. It centers on ethical AI research and development; it exposes India's regulatory challenges and opportunities in this space.

• *Uber Self-Driving Car Incident:*

An autonomous vehicle can kill a pedestrian -- a case where an AI-driven decision led the

victim into tragedy a fact that brought about serious questions about legal and ethical accountability. The case showed that clear regulations governing the use of AI in autonomous vehicles and other technology were necessary.¹²²⁸

• *Google DeepMind Health Case:*

Google's DeepMind Health raised concerns about privacy and consent in using AI technology in the UK. This case marked a strong precedent in making AI in healthcare governance and emphasized the requirement of transparent consent and privacy protection systems in AI-driven healthcare systems.

B. Lessons from Industries Like Healthcare, Finance, and E-Commerce

Errors in the use of AI-driven diagnostic tools which produce misdiagnosis in the healthcare sector led to legal challenges. In the finance sector, too, AI has been utilized for risk assessment, which has been scrutinized for algorithmic biases. Just like AI-driven product recommendations in the e-commerce world have come under attack from some because of their potential to discriminate against certain groups, so has the branding industry. The cases illustrate the significance of fairness, transparency, and regulatory oversight for AI-driven corporate governance.¹²²⁹

X. CONCLUSION

Delivering AI Impact to InfoSec, governance, OCO, and corporate operations. Yet it also poses big challenges, specifically, in areas of accountability, ethical standards, and liability. To take into account the shifting legal landscape, issues such as algorithmic bias, data privacy breaches, and the 'lack of transparency around AI decision-making processes' must be worked out. Through human oversight, algorithmic transparency, and standardized global regulations corporations

¹²²⁷ The Gramophone Company of India v. Super Cassette Industries Ltd., *Legal Wires* (Nov. 21, 2024), <https://legal-wires.com/case-study/case-study-the-gramophone-company-of-india-v-super-cassette-industries-ltd/>

¹²²⁸ Jody Serrano, Uber's Fatal Self-Driving Car Crash Saga Over: Operator Avoids Prison, *Wired* (Mar. 29, 2023), <https://www.wired.com/story/ubers-fatal-self-driving-car-crash-saga-over-operator-avoids-prison/>

¹²²⁹ Sara G. Timo M, Glenn, Ethical and legal challenges of artificial intelligence-driven healthcare, *PMC* (Mar. 1, 2020), <https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC7332220/>

can responsibly enforce the use of AI in their operations. To maintain a healthy balance between innovation and ethical responsibility, dependable, trust-based AI has to be developed and implemented to the benefit of society while mitigating such risks.

The Way Forward

“The question isn’t whether machines think, it’s whether we do.” It urges human corporate leaders, policymakers, and legal experts should take seriously the implications of AI-driven governance. And corporations can empower AI liability without it by adopting an ethically guided proactive approach.

At the other end of the spectrum, for sustainable AI governance to be possible, we need to commit AI technological advancements to abide by the overarching principles of justice, equity, and accountability, so we are not living in a situation where AI becomes a liability rather than a tool of progress.

XI. REFERENCES

Statutes Referred

- Information Technology Act, No. 21 of 2000, India Code (2000).
- Digital Personal Data Protection Act, No. 13 of 2023, India Code (2023).

Online Sources and Articles Referred

- Corporate Liability, Wikipedia (Nov. 21, 2024), https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Corporate_liability
- Shokufeh Pourbahrami et al., The Implications of Artificial Intelligence for Social Media Governance: Perspectives and Challenges, *Frontiers in Comput. Sci.* Article 1068361 (2022), <https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/computer-science/articles/10.3389/fcomp.2022.1068361/full>
- The Gramophone Company of India v. Super Cassette Industries Ltd, *Legal Wires* (Nov. 21, 2024), [https://legal-wires.com/case-](https://legal-wires.com/case-study/case-study-the-gramophone-company-of-india-v-super-cassette-industries-ltd/)

[study/case-study-the-gramophone-company-of-india-v-super-cassette-industries-ltd/](https://legal-wires.com/case-study/case-study-the-gramophone-company-of-india-v-super-cassette-industries-ltd/)

- Jody Serrano, Uber’s Fatal Self-Driving Car Crash Saga Over: Operator Avoids Prison, *Wired* (Mar. 29, 2023), <https://www.wired.com/story/ubers-fatal-self-driving-car-crash-saga-over-operator-avoids-prison/>
- Sara G. Timo M, Glenn, Ethical and legal challenges of artificial intelligence-driven healthcare, *PMC* (Mar. 1, 2020), <https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC7332220/>
- The Legal and Ethical Implications of Artificial Intelligence in Indian Corporate Governance, *Manupatra* (Dec. 1, 2024), <https://articles.manupatra.com/article-details/The-Legal-and-Ethical-Implications-of-Artificial-Intelligence-in-Indian-Corporate-Governance>.