International Journal for Multidisciplinary Research (IJFMR)
E-ISSN: 2582-2160 ● Website: www.ijfmr.com ● Email: editor@ijfmr.com

Legal Liability of AI Systems: Who is Accountable?

Ms. Anusuya K P

Assistant Professor, Department of Humanities, Dayananda Sagar College of Engineering, Bengaluru:560078, Karnataka, India.

Abstract

Artificial intelligence is the ability of a machine to think and act like humans or replicate" cognitive" functions that humans associate with other human minds, such as "learning and "problem solving". As Artificial Intelligence (AI) becomes increasingly integrated into sectors ranging from healthcare and finance to transportation and legal systems, questions of legal accountability become critical. AI is helping in medical diagnosis, managing health records, designing treatments, managing medication and drug creation. AI refers to the capacity of machines to perform cognitive tasks like thinking, perceiving, learning, problem solving and decision making initially conceived as technology that could mimic human intelligence. When AI systems cause harm or violate legal norms, it becomes essential to determine who is responsible. This paper explores the legal liabilities surrounding AI, evaluates current legal frameworks, and proposes recommendations for addressing these emerging challenges.

Keywords: AI, Policy, Liability, Ethical and Legal Responsibility.

Introduction

Artificial Intelligence (AI) is revolutionizing how decisions are made and services are delivered. AI systems, especially those employing machine learning, can act autonomously and unpredictably, leading to legal and ethical dilemmas. A self-driving car involved in a fatal accident, a medical AI misdiagnosing a patient, or a financial algorithm engaging in discriminatory lending—these are no longer science fiction but real-world legal concerns. As AI systems evolve beyond mere tools into semi-autonomous agents, the question of legal liability—who is responsible when AI causes harm? — becomes increasingly complex.

The article embarks on an investigative journey into the complex legal and ethical landscape shaped by the advent of Artificial Intelligence (AI). The research problem centers on the urgent need to understand and address the gap between evolving AI technologies and the existing legal and ethical frameworks. This gap poses significant challenges to societal norms, legal systems, and ethical principles, warranting a comprehensive multidisciplinary analysis.

Supreme Court judge, Justice B.R. Gavai, has voiced apprehension about efforts to turn Artificial Intelligence (AI) as a tool to predict court verdicts, questioning if a machine lacking human emotions and moral reasoning can be expected to truly grasp the complexities and nuances of legal disputes.

The essence of justice often involves ethical considerations, empathy, and contextual understanding-elements that remain beyond the reach of algorithms," Justice Gavai, who was speaking on 'Leveraging

on Technology within the Judiciary', said while speaking in his address at Nairobi. Justices Gavai and Surya Kant are on a five-day visit at the invitation of the Kenyan Supreme Court.

The objectives of this research is to dissect the legal implications AI poses to existing regulatory structures, and secondly, to explore the ethical dilemmas emanating from AI's pervasive influence across various societal sectors. The study employs an eclectic research method, integrating doctrinal analysis with a qualitative examination of case studies and existing literature across disciplines like law, ethics and technology. This approach facilitates a holistic understanding of the AI era's legal and ethical intricacies.

The key findings of this research underscore a dissonance between rapid technological advancements in AI and the slower evolution of legal and ethical norms. This disjunction leads to legal loopholes and ethical ambiguities in AI governance, privacy, accountability, and human rights. Furthermore, the study identifies a pressing need for adaptive legal frameworks and ethical guidelines that can keep pace with AI's transformative impact.

Implications of these findings are profound for both theory and practice. Theoretically, the article contributes to an enriched understanding of the intersection between law, ethics, and technology. Practically, it offers actionable insights for policymakers, technologists, and ethicists to collaboratively formulate responsive legal and ethical strategies. These strategies are essential for safeguarding societal values while embracing technological progress, ensuring AI's development is both legally sound and ethically responsible.

Traditionally, liability in tort or contract law is assigned to human actors or legal entities (such as corporations). However, AI complicates this model due to its potential for autonomy, opacity ("black box" nature), and unpredictability. The legal systems across the world are still grappling with adapting doctrines to this new technological paradigm. This paper aims to explore existing legal frameworks, identify gaps, analyze challenges, and propose possible regulatory solutions to ensure legal accountability of AI systems.

Literature Review

A considerable body of legal and academic scholarship has emerged to tackle the implications of AI liability. There are several open questions for the AI community, regulators, and eventually courts, to consider with respect to designing AI models in a way that allows creators to opt-out, and perhaps program attribution to copyright owners within the models – although the technical feasibility of these options will need to be evaluated.

Policymakers must address the following questions to reconcile these issues – *First*, when should data scraping be allowed and in what circumstances is it legal? *Second*, in what circumstances can there be exceptions to allowing scraping of copyrighted works, or other content under a license or other form of ownership? *Third*, how would seeking permission, or allowing for opt-outs to scraping are operationalised, especially in the case of bulk datasets? *Fourth*, can there be remedies built into the regulatory process, for instance, creating systems for compensation by AI companies to IP owners? Would there be exceptions for scientific/works for objectives in the public interest?

Tort and Negligence Law

As per traditional tort law, negligence occurs when a duty of care is breached, resulting in harm. Scholars like PA Gallo (2013) argue that applying traditional negligence doctrines to AI can be difficult,

as autonomous systems may act in ways that are unforeseeable by their designers or users. Thus, identifying proximate cause becomes ambiguous.

Product Liability

AI systems are often treated as products. Under this approach, manufacturers and developers can be held liable for defects or malfunctions. However, as AI systems evolve after deployment through machine learning, determining what constitutes a "defect" becomes problematic (Calo, 2015).

AI as Legal Personhood

Some scholars, such as Solaiman (2017), have argued for granting AI limited legal personhood, akin to corporations, to allow for direct attribution of liability. However, this is contentious, both ethically and practically.

European Union Approach

The European Commission's 2020 white paper on AI and the European Parliament's 2021 proposal for AI liability highlight the EU's proactive stance. The Digital Services Act and AI Act attempt to establish clear lines of responsibility among developers, deployers, and users.

Indian Context

India currently lacks a dedicated legal framework for AI liability. Existing laws such as the Consumer Protection Act (2019), the Information Technology Act (2000), and tort principles are insufficient to tackle AI-specific complexities.

Methodology

This research adopts a doctrinal legal research methodology, involving:

Primary sources: Statutory laws, judicial decisions, white papers from government and international organizations.

Secondary sources: Academic journal articles, reports, and scholarly commentary.

Comparative analysis: Legal frameworks from the EU, US, and India are compared to understand the global approach to AI liability.

Analytical approach: Legal principles are analyzed in relation to AI technologies to identify existing gaps and suggest regulatory responses.

Analysis: Understanding AI Liability

Types of AI and Liability Scenarios

AI systems can vary from simple automated tools to complex self-learning agents. The nature of liability may depend on:

Level of autonomy: Greater autonomy may imply less user control and greater manufacturer liability.

Predictability: If outcomes are unpredictable even to developers, traditional liability doctrines struggle to apply.

Data dependency: Biased or erroneous input data can lead to discriminatory or harmful outputs, complicating liability.

Who Could Be Held Liable?

A. Developers and Programmers

If an AI system causes harm due to coding errors or poor design, developers may be held liable under product liability or negligence laws.

B. Manufacturers

For hardware-based AI (e.g., robots, self-driving vehicles), manufacturers may be liable for defective integration or testing.

C. Operators and Users

Entities using AI systems—hospitals, banks, companies—may be liable if they failed to monitor or misuse the technology.

D. No One? (Autonomous Systems)

In cases where AI acted in an unforeseeable way, assigning blame becomes difficult. This raises the possibility of "liability gaps."

Legal Challenges

Black Box Problem: AI systems, especially deep learning models, are often non-transparent, making it difficult to trace cause.

Causation and Foreseeability: Tort law depends on foreseeability of harm; AI's autonomy complicates this.

Joint Liability: In many AI systems, multiple actors are involved—developers, data providers, users—raising questions of joint or several liabilities.

Cross-Border Use: AI products are often developed in one jurisdiction and deployed in another, complicating enforcement of liability.

Government Protocols

Governments are laboriously working on shaping AI regulations to ensure its responsible and ethical use:

1. **Diverse Legal Landscape:** The legal frameworks grinding Al vary significantly among different countries. While some nations have comprehensive laws specifically addressing artificial intelligence, others calculate on being regulations to govern Al-related activities.
2. **Emerging Regulatory Efforts:** Numerous countries are actively working towards developing and implementing artificial intelligence regulations. These efforts aim to address the unique challenges posed by Al technologies while icing the ethical and responsible use of artificial intelligence.
3. **Privacy and Data Protection:** Privacy and protection are major concerns in the artificial intelligence area.
4. Countries are enacting legislation to safeguard individuals' data rights, establish guidelines for data operations, and ensure translucency in all system's data handling practices.
5. **Liability and Accountability:** Determining liability in Al-related incidents is a complex issue.
6. Countries are exploring legal frameworks to attribute responsibility and establish accountability for Al systems conduct, especially in cases of harm or negligence.
7. **Ethical Considerations:** The ethical implications of Al are receiving increasing attention. Countries are incorporating ethical guidelines and principles into their legal frameworks to guide Al's development and deployment, promoting fairness, translucency, and mortal-centric values.

8. **International Collaboration:** Given the global nature of Al, international collaboration and adjustment of Al-related laws are crucial. Countries are actively engaging in conversations and hook-ups to partake in best practices, foster interoperability, and address cross-border legal challenges.

SUGGESTIONS:

1. **Privacy:** Understand how personal data should be collected, stored, and used, and take necessary measures to protect user privacy.
2. **Transparency and explain ability:** Strive for transparency in AI systems. Consider providing clear explanations of how your AI algorithms work and the basis for their decisions, especially in critical areas like healthcare, finance, or legal domains.
3. **Avoid bias and discrimination:** Be mindful of potential biases in AI algorithms and take steps to mitigate them. Regularly evaluate and test your AI systems to ensure fairness and prevent discrimination.
4. **User consent and accountability:** Obtain appropriate consent from users when collecting and using their data. Be accountable for the actions and decisions made by your AI systems.
5. **Stay updated:** Check for any updates or changes in AI-related laws and regulations that may impact your AI projects.
6. It's always advisable to consult with legal professionals and experts who specialize in AI and technology law for accurate and detailed guidance.

CONCLUSION:

As AI systems become more integral to societal functioning, they also pose novel legal challenges, especially concerning liability. The complexity of attributing responsibility in AI-induced harm cases necessitates a rethinking of traditional legal doctrines. Current frameworks—while providing some guidance—are largely inadequate for dealing with the autonomous, dynamic, and opaque nature of AI technologies.

In conclusion, the legal geography governing artificial intelligence in India and other countries is dynamic and evolving, and are underway to develop comprehensive regulations that balance invention with ethical considerations, sequestration protection, liability criterion, and transnational collaboration. Continued exploration and dialogue will be essential in shaping effective legal fabrics that govern Al technologies responsibly. Ensuring that victims of AI-related harm have access to justice and remedies must remain a central concern as we navigate the legal terrain of artificial intelligence.

References

1. PA Gallo, U. (2013). The Laws of Robots: Crimes, Contracts, and Torts. Springer.
2. Calo, R. (2015). "Robotics and the Lessons of Cyber law." California Law Review, 103(3), 513–563.
3. Solaiman, S. M. (2017). "Legal Personality of Robots, Corporations, Idols and Chimpanzees: A Quest for Legitimacy." Artificial Intelligence and Law, 25(2), 155–179.
4. European Commission. (2020). White Paper on Artificial Intelligence – A European approach to excellence and trust. Brussels.
5. NITI Aayog. (2021). Responsible AI for All: Part 1 – Principles for Responsible AI. Government of India.

6. *Role of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in Justice Delivery system by DR. N Venkateshwarulu published in online Article (AIR) -2022*
7. Statement given by Supreme Court judge: The Hindu, Dt. 10th March 2025