INDIAN JOURNAL OF LEGAL REVIEW

VOLUME 6 AND ISSUE 9 OF 2026

INSTITUTE OF LEGAL EDUCATION

INDIAN JOURNAL OF LEGAL REVIEW

APIS – 3920 – 0001 | ISSN - 2583-2344

(Open Access Journal)

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

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

Volume 6 and Issue 9 of 2026 (Access Full Issue on - https://ijlr.iledu.in/volume-6-and-issue-9-of-2026/)

Publisher

Prasanna S,

Chairman of Institute of Legal Education

No. 08, Arul Nagar, Seera Thoppu,

Maudhanda Kurichi, Srirangam,

Tiruchirappalli – 620102

Phone : +91 73059 14348 - info@iledu.in / Chairman@iledu.in

INDIAN JOURNAL OF LEGAL REVIEW [IJLR – IF SCORE – 7.58]

VOLUME 6 AND ISSUE 9 OF 2026

APIS – 3920 - 0001 *(and)* ISSN - 2583-2344

Published by

Institute of Legal Education

https://iledu.in

THE ALGORITHMIC DUE PROCESS: CHALLENGING THE "BLACK BOX" STATE UNDER CONSTITUTIONAL REVIEW

AUTHOR -DEEPA E.* & JEEVARAJA S. D.**

* 2ND YEAR LL.M., DEPARTMENT OF BUSINESS LAW, SCHOOL OF EXCELLENCE IN LAW (SOEL)

** 2ND YR LL.M., DEPARTMENT OF CONSTITUTIONAL LAW AND HUMAN RIGHTS, SCHOOL OF EXCELLENCE IN LAW (SOEL)

BEST CITATION – DEEPA E. & JEEVARAJA S. D.**,** THE ALGORITHMIC DUE PROCESS: CHALLENGING THE "BLACK BOX" STATE UNDER CONSTITUTIONAL REVIEW, *INDIAN JOURNAL OF LEGAL REVIEW (IJLR),* 6 (9) OF 2026, PG. 350-356, APIS – 3920 – 0001 & ISSN - 2583-2344. DOI - https://doi.org/10.65393/IJLRV6I939

Abstract

In the modern digital era, the nature of the "State" is undergoing a silent metamorphosis. Decision-making, once the exclusive province of human bureaucrats, is increasingly being delegated to complex, automated systems—often referred to as the "Black Box State." In India, this shift is visible in everything from AI-driven welfare exclusion in Telangana to predictive policing in Delhi. While these technologies promise to solve India's "3E" challenge—Efficiency, Error-reduction, and Elimination of bias—they simultaneously threaten the foundational pillar of constitutional governance: State Accountability. The "Black Box" problem refers to the technical opacity of machine-learning models where the internal logic is invisible even to its creators. This creates a profound constitutional crisis. Under Article 14 (Right to Equality) and Article 21 (Right to Life and Liberty) of the Indian Constitution, the State is prohibited from acting "arbitrarily." A core requirement of non-arbitrary action is the "Right to a Reasoned Order." If a citizen is denied a pension or flagged as a criminal suspect by an algorithm, but the State cannot explain the specific variables that led to that outcome, the decision is effectively unchallengeable. This "failure of explanation" violates the principle of Audi Alteram Partem (the right to be heard), as one cannot argue against a logic that remains hidden.

To address this, legal scholars are proposing a multidisciplinary framework known as Algorithmic Due Process. This framework argues that for any State-used AI to be constitutional, it must incorporate Explainable AI (XAI). It shifts the burden of proof: instead of a citizen proving an algorithm is biased, the State must prove it is fair. Strategy-wise, litigants in 2026 are moving away from seeking "bans" on AI and instead seeking "Writs of Mandamus" to compel "Algorithmic Audits." They argue that "Proprietary Secrecy" cannot override "Constitutional Transparency." Ultimately, the challenge for the Indian judiciary is to ensure that the move toward a "Digital India" does not result in the "Death of Standards." By enshrining Algorithmic Due Process, the law can ensure that technology serves as a tool for empowerment rather than a shield for administrative opacity.

Keywords: Algorithmic Due Process, Black Box State, Artificial Intelligence, Judicial Review, Technological Sovereignty.

INTRODUCTION:

In the modern digital era, the Indian State is no longer acting only through files, desks and human signatures; it increasingly governs through code, databases and algorithmic systems that sift, rank and sort citizens at scale. Decisions that once emerged from visible

INDIAN JOURNAL OF LEGAL REVIEW [IJLR – IF SCORE – 7.58]
VOLUME 6 AND ISSUE 9 OF 2026
APIS – 3920 - 0001 *(and)* ISSN - 2583-2344
Published by
Institute of Legal Education
https://iledu.in

bureaucratic processes an officer's inquiry, a hearing, a speaking order are now frequently pre-shaped, or even effectively taken, by opaque computational models embedded in welfare platforms, policing dashboards and administrative portals. This quiet migration from "file to algorithm" has produced what scholars term the "Black Box State": a configuration of public power in which the decisive reasoning lies inside systems that ordinary people, and often even frontline officials, cannot see or understand.

In India, this transformation is not theoretical. Experiments with AI-assisted welfare targeting have led to exclusion of beneficiaries based on pattern-recognition models and risk scores, while predictive policing tools guide patrol intensity and surveillance focus in particular neighbourhoods. These technologies are often justified through the language of the "3Es": promises of greater efficiency, lower human error and reduced bias in comparison to traditional administration. Yet, as critical scholarship and field reports show, algorithmic systems can just as easily amplify existing inequalities, entrench historical prejudices encoded in data, and make error both faster and harder to reverse when their logic is hidden behind technical complexity and contractual secrecy.

The resulting tension goes to the heart of Indian constitutionalism. Article 14's guarantee of equality before the law and Article 21's protection of life and personal liberty have been interpreted by the Supreme Court to forbid arbitrariness and to require fair procedure, reasoned decisions and meaningful opportunities to be heard. These doctrines presuppose a State that can articulate why it acted as it did, and a citizen who can confront and contest those reasons. When an automated system quietly denies a pension, flags a person as a suspect, or marks a locality as a "hotspot," and no one can reconstruct the specific variables, weights and thresholds that produced this outcome, the right to a reasoned order and the principle of audi alteram partem are placed under severe strain. The decision becomes practically unchallengeable not because it is infallible, but because it is inexplicable in human terms.

Against this backdrop, the emerging doctrine of Algorithmic Due Process seeks to translate the familiar demands of natural justice into the algorithmic age. It starts from a simple premise: if the State chooses to govern through algorithms, those algorithms must themselves become objects of constitutional scrutiny. This implies at least three shifts. First, a move from opacity to explainability, operationalised through Explainable AI (XAI) techniques and legal duties to provide intelligible, case-specific reasons wherever automated systems materially influence outcomes. Second, a move in evidentiary posture: rather than placing on the individual the near-impossible burden of proving that a complex model is biased, the State bears a positive obligation to demonstrate that its systems are fair, proportionate and regularly audited. Third, a move in litigation strategy, with petitioners framing their claims not as blanket demands to ban AI, but as calls for constitutional guardrails writs of mandamus for algorithmic audits, disclosure of model documentation, and robust appeal mechanisms that keep human judgment firmly in the loop.

MAPPING THE BLACK BOX STATE IN INDIA

Mapping the Black Box State in India requires tracing how opaque, data-driven systems have quietly migrated into the core of public decision-making and begun to reconfigure the relationship between citizen and State. The term "Black Box State" captures situations where crucial decisions about welfare, policing, and public services are made or heavily guided by algorithmic systems whose internal logic is inaccessible, uninterpretable, or contractually shielded from scrutiny. In such a regime, the visible face of the State may still be the human official or digital interface, but the real site of decision is a model that citizens cannot interrogate, understand, or effectively challenge.

The first layer of this mapping lies in welfare governance, where automated beneficiary-

INDIAN JOURNAL OF LEGAL REVIEW [IJLR – IF SCORE – 7.58]
VOLUME 6 AND ISSUE 9 OF 2026
APIS – 3920 - 0001 *(and)* ISSN - 2583-2344
Published by
Institute of Legal Education
https://iledu.in

identification and risk-scoring tools decide who is "deserving" of rations, pensions, or subsidies based on opaque data correlations and blacklisted profiles. Data-driven exclusions often triggered by errors, outdated records, or biased proxies materialize as cancelled benefits or silent denials, without intelligible reasons or effective notice to affected individuals. A second layer appears in policing and security, where predictive systems and crime-mapping platforms guide patrol deployment, hotspot identification, and surveillance targeting. Here, historical data about crime, complaints, and arrests is recycled into risk scores, potentially hardening over-policed localities and communities into algorithmically reinforced "danger zones."

A third layer emerges in administrative and judicial support tools, from automated document triaging and e-courts dashboards to AI-enabled drafting assistance. While formally "advisory," such tools can shape institutional priorities, frames, and defaults in ways that are difficult to detect and contest. Across these layers, the Black Box State is characterised by three converging features: technocratic outsourcing of judgment, contractual opacity via proprietary claims, and the erosion of the constitutional requirement of reasoned, reviewable decisions. Mapping it, therefore, is not merely an exercise in technology cataloguing but a constitutional cartography of where and how explanation, accountability, and audi alteram partem are being silently displaced by code.

THE CONSTITUTIONAL CRISIS: CONFLICT WITH THE GOLDEN TRIANGLE

The expression "golden triangle" in Indian constitutional law denotes the inseparable interdependence of Articles 14, 19 and 21, which together constitutionalise a thick vision of liberty, equality and dignity.[514] The rise of the algorithmic or "Black Box" State where opaque AI systems guide welfare, policing and administrative decisions generates a constitutional crisis because it structurally undermines each limb of this triangle simultaneously.[515] When decisions are driven by undisclosed models, datasets and risk scores, individuals face a form of invisible governance in which the norms and reasons that shape state action are concealed, fragmented or contractually privatised.

Article 14 is threatened because opacity enables arbitrary and discriminatory classifications that cannot be meaningfully scrutinised or challenged in court. If a predictive-policing tool or welfare-filter disproportionately burdens certain communities, but its logic and training data are shielded from review, the equality guarantee is hollowed out in practice. Article 19 suffers where black-box systems are deployed in surveillance, social media monitoring and protest-policing, chilling political speech and association without transparent legal standards or narrowly tailored restrictions. The individual cannot know what triggers profiling, watch-listing or throttling of digital expression, making self-censorship a rational survival strategy rather than a free choice.[516]

Article 21, as expanded in post-Emergency jurisprudence, embeds substantive due process and a right to a fair, reasoned and participatory procedure. Black-box decision-making revives, in digital form, the very pathologies the Court promised never to repeat after ADM Jabalpur: unreviewable power, secrecy and suspension of effective habeas and remedy.[517] When welfare is cut, mobility restricted, or liberty indirectly constrained by algorithmic scoring, without intelligible notice, reasons, or a real opportunity to contest the underlying model, the "procedure established by law" requirement is reduced to a

514 https://www.lawjournals.org/assets/archives/2025/vol11issue7/11138.pdf

515 https://twailr.com/crisis-constitutionalism-permanent-emergency-and-the-amnesias-of-international-law-in-jammu-and-kashmir/

516 https://twailr.com/crisis-constitutionalism-permanent-emergency-and-the-amnesias-of-international-law-in-jammu-and-kashmir/(accessed on 29/12/2025)

517 https://resolve.cambridge.org/core/journals/federal-law-review/article/struggles-of-the-indian-constitution-in-the-face-of-autocratic-legalism-constitutionalism-at-crossroads/EEBAEE785987AD043B11B62FFCC8AEE2 (accessed on 29/12/2025)

INDIAN JOURNAL OF LEGAL REVIEW [IJLR – IF SCORE – 7.58]
VOLUME 6 AND ISSUE 9 OF 2026
APIS – 3920 - 0001 *(and)* ISSN - 2583-2344
Published by
Institute of Legal Education
https://iledu.in

formal shell. The constitutional crisis, therefore, lies in the fact that the Black Box State does not merely violate one right; it corrodes the structural grammar of the golden triangle itself, threatening to normalise a permanent, technologically mediated state of exception within ordinary governance.[518]

THE DOCTRINE OF ALGORITHMIC DUE PROCESS

The doctrine of Algorithmic Due Process reimagines traditional procedural fairness requirements for an era in which state power is increasingly exercised through automated, data-driven systems rather than solely by human officials. At its core, it insists that whenever the State uses algorithms to make or significantly influence decisions affecting rights, entitlements or legal status, the full bundle of constitutional guarantees associated with Articles 14 and 21 must "travel into the code." This doctrine responds to the "black box" problem: machine-learning models whose internal logic, training data and decision pathways are opaque even to their designers, thereby rendering decisions effectively unchallengeable.[519]

Algorithmic Due Process therefore extends classic elements of natural justice—notice, hearing, reasoned order, and review to the algorithmic layer itself. First, it requires ex ante transparency: individuals must know that an AI system is being used, the broad purposes it serves, the kinds of data it relies upon, and the possible legal or material consequences of its outputs. Second, it demands meaningful, not merely symbolic, explanation: affected persons must receive intelligible reasons linking input data, model logic and the specific adverse outcome in their case, rather than generic boilerplate. Third, it insists on a real opportunity to contest both the decision and the underlying system by challenging data quality, questioning proxies and variables, and exposing structural bias baked into the model.

A defining feature of Algorithmic Due Process is the proposed shift in the burden of proof. Instead of requiring an individual to prove that an algorithm is biased or arbitrary a near-impossible task from outside the black box the doctrine places a positive obligation on the State to demonstrate that the system is fair, proportionate, and minimally rights-restrictive. In practice, this translates into requirements for independent algorithmic audits, impact assessments, and documentation of design choices, governed by enforceable public-law standards rather than private contractual terms. Claims of trade secrecy or proprietary confidentiality cannot, under this doctrine, trump constitutional duties of transparency and accountability when an AI system effectively becomes part of the machinery of the State.

Finally, Algorithmic Due Process embeds human oversight as a non-negotiable safeguard. High-stakes decisions such as welfare exclusion, blacklisting, policing and risk scoring must remain subject to informed human review with authority to depart from algorithmic outputs and to correct systemic patterns of error. By constitutionalising these requirements, the doctrine seeks to ensure that "Digital India" does not become a jurisdiction of automated unreason, but one in which technology is subordinated to the rule of law, equality, and the right to be heard.

2026 LITIGATION STRATEGIES: FROM BANNING TO AUDITING

By 2026, challenges to the Black Box State in India are moving from the vocabulary of "ban this technology" to "audit this system and explain it," reflecting a more mature, human-centred litigation strategy. Instead of asking courts to switch off AI, petitioners increasingly ask judges to switch on transparency, accountability, and independent oversight. This shift recognises that AI is now embedded in welfare delivery, policing and even judicial administration, and that the real constitutional battle is about how these

[518] https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1111/aspp.70023(accessed on 29/12/2025)

[519] https://virtuositylegal.com/algorithmic-bias-and-the-quest-for-equal-justice-in-india/ (accessed on 29/12/2025)

systems are designed, monitored and justified to the people they affect.[520]

On the ground, this means PILs and writ petitions are framed around mandamus rather than prohibition. Litigants seek directions for algorithmic impact assessments before deployment of high-risk tools, court-supervised audits of existing welfare and policing algorithms, and compulsory disclosure of model documentation, error rates and bias-testing protocols.[521] They argue that trade secrecy and vendor contracts cannot override fundamental rights, urging courts to treat algorithmic logic as part of "record" for judicial review, open at least to the court and an independent expert for scrutiny. In parallel, petitioners press for robust notice-and-appeal procedures wherever an AI system is used to deny benefits, profile individuals or generate risk scores, ensuring a human decision-maker remains answerable for outcomes.[522]

Judges, too, are slowly recalibrating their stance. Public speeches around tools like SU-PACE in the Supreme Court[523] emphasise that AI can help with backlog and routine tasks, but must not replace judicial mind, empathy or constitutional sensitivity.[524] This climate makes courts more receptive to nuanced prayers: not "stop all AI," but "set guardrails, insist on explainability, and require periodic, independent audits as a condition of state use." For lawyers, the humanised strategy in 2026 is to tell concrete stories of exclusion and over-policing, then connect them to structural opacity: to show how a widow who loses her pension or a neighbourhood that lives under perpetual suspicion needs, above all, a right to reasons and a right to repair the system—not a promise that technology will simply disappear.[525]

RECOMMENDATIONS: BUILDING A GLASS BOX BUREAUCRACY

Building a glass box bureaucracy means redesigning India's AI-enabled state so that power is not only exercised lawfully, but seen to be exercised lawfully by citizens, courts and independent experts. It calls for a deliberate inversion of the Black Box State: every high-impact digital system used by the administration must be presumptively open to explanation, justification and correction. The recommendations below focus on legal, institutional and technical levers that a constitutional democracy can realistically adopt.virtuositylegal

Constitutionalising Transparency by Design

- Enact a framework law (or insert a dedicated chapter in an emerging AI statute) that classifies welfare, policing, credit-related and citizen-scoring systems as "high-risk public algorithms," subject to heightened transparency duties.
- Make "explainability" and "reasoned algorithmic orders" explicit extensions of Articles 14 and 21: any system that cannot yield an intelligible, case-specific explanation should be presumptively unconstitutional for high-stakes decisions

2. Mandatory Registers, Notices and Plain-Language Reasons

- Create a public Algorithm Register listing all significant government-used systems, their purposes, vendors, data sources and basic model families, updated in real time.
- Require agencies to give individuals clear notice whenever an algorithm

[520] https://practiceguides.chambers.com/practice-guides/artificial-intelligence-2025/india/trends-and-developments (accessed on 31/12/2025)
[521] https://indianexpress.com/article/explained/explained-law/how-india-proposes-to-deal-with-legal-challenges-posed-by-ai-to-copyright-law-10430219/ (accessed on 31/12/2025)
[522] https://indiaai.gov.in/article/india-s-ai-driven-legal-future-opportunities-and-emerging-trends-in-2025 (accessed on 30/12/2025)
[523] https://www.barandbench.com/columns/beyond-the-hype-the-ai-disruption-in-indias-legal-practice (accessed on 31/12/2025)
[524] https://www.bharatlaw.ai/post/from-dusty-stacks-to-digital-speed-understanding-ai-in-the-indian-legal-sector (accessed on 01/01/2026)
[525] https://www.legalnewsindia.com/ai-could-resolve-60-percent-of-indias-litigation-backlog-justice-manmohan/1201/ (accessed on 01/01/2026)

substantially influences a decision affecting rights or entitlements, along with a plain-language explanation and a channel to seek further technical clarification.

3. Independent Algorithmic Audits and Impact Assessments

- Before deployment, mandate Algorithmic Impact Assessments for high-risk systems, covering legality, necessity, proportionality, data quality, disparate impact and availability of less intrusive alternatives.
- Establish an independent, multi-disciplinary public body combining technologists, lawyers and social scientists to certify, periodically audit, and if necessary suspend or modify state algorithms.

4. Rebalancing Secrecy and Rights

- Codify the principle that trade secrecy and proprietary contracts cannot override fundamental rights; where necessary, permit confidential, in-camera technical disclosure to courts and regulators while protecting genuine commercial secrets from broad public release.
- Insert algorithm-specific duties into procurement contracts: open documentation, audit access, logging requirements, and obligations on vendors to cooperate with constitutional and judicial review.

5. Human in the Loop, Human on Top

- For welfare, policing and blacklisting, make human review not a cosmetic checkbox but a legal right, with officials required to actively assess and, where justified, depart from algorithmic recommendations.
- Train bureaucrats, police and judges to understand the limits of AI, including bias, data drift and explainability gaps, so that deference to "what the system says" is replaced by informed, accountable judgment.

6. Repair, Participation and Community Oversight

- Design simple, time-bound grievance mechanisms where people can contest both individual decisions and systemic patterns, leading to model retraining, rule changes or withdrawal of flawed systems.
- Involve civil society, consumer groups and affected communities in consultations before deploying new public algorithms, especially in policing and welfare, to surface ground-level harms that technical testing may miss.

Together, these measures transform bureaucratic code from an invisible governor into a visible, reviewable public instrument. A glass box bureaucracy is not one without secrets, but one where secrecy is the rare exception, and constitutional transparency is the everyday operating system of Digital India.

CONCLUSION

Ensuring that Digital India is also a just India demands that technological transformation be treated not as an exception to constitutionalism, but as its newest frontier. The migration of state power into algorithms, databases and platforms has not diminished the force of Articles 14, 19 and 21; it has simply altered the form in which arbitrariness, discrimination and denial of hearing may appear. When decisions about pensions, welfare, policing or risk-scoring are channelled through opaque systems, the core guarantees of equality, reasoned orders and meaningful remedies risk being hollowed out behind a veneer of technical neutrality.

The idea of the Black Box State captures this danger: governance by models whose logic is hidden, fragmented or contractually privatised, leaving citizens to face adverse outcomes without intelligible reasons or effective avenues of contest. Algorithmic Due Process responds by

insisting that the traditional pillars of natural justice notice, explanation, participation, review must "travel into the code" whenever the State relies on AI to make or structure decisions. This involves not only a demand for Explainable AI (XAI) in high-stakes public systems, but also a decisive shift in burden: the State, not the individual, must demonstrate that its digital tools are fair, proportionate and regularly audited for bias and error.

Litigation strategies that move from calls to ban AI towards demands for algorithmic audits, disclosure, and robust appeal mechanisms signal a more mature constitutional engagement with technology. They recognise that the question is not whether the State will use AI, but under what constraints and with what safeguards. Courts, in turn, are called upon to treat algorithms as part of the administrative record open to scrutiny, expert assistance and, where necessary, invalidation rather than as inscrutable technical facts placed beyond legal reason.

Ultimately, a just Digital India will be measured not by the sophistication of its systems, but by the security of its most vulnerable citizens against invisible, unreasoned harms. Building a "glass box bureaucracy" through transparency registers, independent audits, enforceable procurement standards and meaningful human oversight can convert AI from a shield for opacity into an instrument of accountable governance. Enshrining Algorithmic Due Process in doctrine, legislation and administrative practice is therefore not a peripheral reform; it is central to preserving the golden triangle of Articles 14, 19 and 21 in the age of code. Only by constitutionalising the digital can India ensure that the promise of innovation deepens, rather than diminishes, its commitment to justice.

INSTITUTE OF LEGAL EDUCATION

(Managed by L TO J LAW ASSOCIATES)

NO. 08, ARUL NAGAR, SEERA THOPPU,
MARUDHAANDA KURICHI, SRIRANGAM - 620102,
TAMILNADU, INDIA.

ISSN 2583-2344