LEGAL LOCK JOURNAL

2583-0384

VOLUME 4 || ISSUE 5

2025

FROM CODE TO COURT: LEGAL INTERPRETATIONS OF AI

Malika Bawa[1] and Samta Kathuria[2]

ABSTRACT:

The article reflects on the pressing need in the world to ensure legal and technical regulation in the fast-growing sphere of artificial intelligence (AI). Although the current state of AI technologies is quite advanced in terms of neural networks, cloud computing, fuzzy systems, swarm intelligence, and evolutionary computation, there is a considerable shortage of detailed legal regulations on the development, integration, and application of AI. The paper examines the current methods of defining AI in the field of legal studies and suggests a novel definition. The author claims that AI is a sophisticated cybernetical system that consists of software and hardware that has autonomy, substantivity, and data perception, analysis, and self learning capabilities. The other controversial concept of the article is the proposal to provide AI systems with legal status and refer to the so-called electronic person, which depends on the functions of system elements and areas of application. Two main approaches to legal regulation are addressed, such as universal-total regulation that concerns all AI systems and targeted regulation that addresses certain types. The article identifies the most important risks and uncertainties that are linked to AI, and they need to be reflected in the legislative process. These comprise the possible risks to the individual rights, the social values, and the national security. Finally, the article concludes that AI is best legal regulated in a contextual, gradual, manner concerning the distinct issues of various application domains. It promotes a moderated style that defends the interests of both individuals and the society as well as ensuring technological innovation in the interest of the majority.

Keywords: AI, law, security, legislation, privacy

[1] The author is Assistant Professor at School of Law, Lovely Professional University, Punjab, India.
[2] The co author is a student of law at School of Law, Lovely Professional University, Punjab, India.

INTRODUCTION

The field of artificial intelligence has been advanced quickly numerous facets of civilization are being altered by development in neural networks, cloud computing fuzzy systems, warm intelligence and evolutionary computation. There isn't any comprehensive legislation controlling the development integration and application of AI, nevertheless because this technological I solution has not been accomplished by an equally strong legal framework.The legal and policy discussions surrounding artificial intelligence regulation are taking shape at both national and international levels, with distinct philosophies emerging across major global powers. The global response to this challenge is split between two divergent approaches, international consensus building through soft law and national implementation through harder law.

The global view is mostly defined by adaptable regulation working through the suggestions and guidelines like the AI principles from the OECD[3] that provide a global non binding framework for trustworthy ai in the legal domain centred on human centric values .Primarily, the demand that all as system should adhere to human rights and the rule of law requiring stringent human agency and supervision to guarantee judges maintain ultimate decision making authority and recommendation from UNESCO[4] that AI will result in human centric governance in the legal industry, necessitating rigorous human supervision and final accountability for all choices, assuring faintness, preventing discrimination by reducing algorithmic basis and ensuring transparency and explainability so that court decision may be comprehended and contested as important pillars. However, these adaptable rules do not have the power to make anyone follow them, and often struggle with the problem of not being able to keep up with how fast technology is changing. On the other hand, the view of individual countries or regions depends on strong laws and rules that must be followed that show different political, economical and cultural beliefs, resulting in a very separated environment where rules can be enforced. With its significant AI Act, The European Union backs a comprehensive ride focused risk based approach that seeks to safeguard fundamental liberties with its brutal effects that extend beyond its boundaries.

[3] AI principles, https://oecd.ai/en/ , last visited on 18 October 2025.
[4] Policy Dialogue on AI Governance, https://www.unesco.org/en/articles/policy-dialogue-ai-governance, last visited on 18 October 2025.

AI systems have a great deal of autonomy, the ability to perceive and analyse complicated data and sophisticated self learning capabilities. AI can now do operations like legal research, evidence, assessment, predictive analytics and the automation of regular legal procedures with previously unheard of sickness and accuracy owing to these technological advancements.AI is a sophisticated cyber entity that transcends the conventional bounds of Legal interpretation and norms due to its combination of hardware and software. Since legal frameworks have not yet fully kept up with the hazards and practical applications of as system, the expanding use of AI in law highlights the lack of comprehensive regulation. Privacy, individual rights, national security and the moral ramifications of giving legally recognized status to highly developed systems, sometime known as electronic person, are important concerns. Either comprehensive, universal regulation for all air systems or specialized targeted legislation for certain users are needed to address these problems.AI should be governed gradually and contextually using a legislative framework that protects people's and societies interest while fostering technical advancement.

This research paper utilizes a comparative and deductive methodology. The authors have reviewed various research papers, guidelines and scholarly articles to grasp difference perspectives and opinions. Through this analysis, the author aims to contribute to a comprehensive and balanced discussion on the Personhood status of artificial intelligence, author emphasized the need for policy framework that ensures responsible AI deployment within the justice system by improving efficiency, access to justice and the calibre of legal decision making so that Artificial intelligence plays a revolutionary and forward thinking role in contemporary legal system.

ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE IN LEGAL DOMAIN

In legal sector artificial intelligence in is playing a rapidly expanding and revolutionary role, changing legal research and education to better educate aspiring professionals for a rapidly evolving legal profession[5]. The way attorneys and other legal professionals handle cases analyse data and do research is being completely transformed by AI powered solutions. These tools automate legal research, document review, contract analysis and litigation prediction

[5] Sreelatha, A., & Choudhary, G. (2023). Exploring The Use of AI In Legal Decision Making: Benefits and Ethical Implications. Woxsen University.

using innovative technologies including machine learning (ML) [6] and natural language processing (NLP) [7]. For example AI systems can analyse massive case files to identify relevant precedents predict case outcomes and highlight significant legal issues all of which are directly increase the precession and effectiveness of legal process. There are two approaches of using AI to build substantive court rulings. It might be an advisory model in the first place and a completely automated system in the second place. One of them is predicated on developing an AI based system would complete all process and reasoning, as well as a thorough analysis of facts, need to render a decision that is legally binding on all parties involved in the case. This process would be entirely automated, eliminating the need for human intervention. The advisory paradigm is predicated on assisting, not replacing the human judge The system would perform an initial analysis of the case and suggested ruling to a human judge, Issuing the ruling would be left to the description of a judge who could then agree with the decision suggested by the system, partially agree with it or reject it entirely. For example, phase III[8] introduced into 2024 in India integrates AI across high courts for predictive analytics, automated documentation and workflow optimization. Pilot programmes are explored for judgement summarization, jurisprudential mapping and AI argumented sentencing.

Worldwide courts have promoted the use of AI in legal domain by delivering judgments such as the USA code promoted use of AI by delivering judgement like ***Da Siliva Moore v. Publicicis Groupe &MSL Groups S.D.N.Y (2012)*** [9].In this case use of computer assisted review for massive amounts of electronic stored information (ESI) in discovery has been officially approved for the first time and also ruled that TAR should be seriously considered because it can save a lot of money on legal expense. The court stated clearly stated in case of Rio Tinto Plc v. Vale S.A[10] That the TAR Should be adopted by highlighting the need of lawyers to be proficient in technology and to use TAR when appropriate, therefore promoting its use. The Supreme Court of India has formally started projects to advance AI for court

[6] El Naqa, I., & Murphy, M. J. (2015). What is machine learning?. In Machine learning in radiation oncology: theory and applications (pp. 3-11). Cham: Springer International Publishing.
[7] What is NLP (natural language processing)?, https://www.ibm.com/think/topics/natural-language-processing ,last visited on 18 oct 2025.
[8] Digital Transformation of Justice: Integrating AI in India's Judiciary and Law Enforcement, https://www.pib.gov.in/PressNoteDetails.aspx?NoteId=153773&ModuleId=3 ,last visited on 18 oct 2025
[9] Da Silva Moore v. Publicis Group, 2012 WL 607412.
[10] (2015) EWHC 1865 (QB).

efficiency, which includes the Supreme Court portal for court efficiency assistance [11] (SUPACE) in 2021 In this the Supreme Court can deploy machine learning to process and arrange enormous volume of data it receives from case submission. It also introduced e-court that That are a part of digital transformation of the judiciary using technology to streamline case management, digital records and enable services like E filing, virtual hearings and online access to case information. Their goal is to improve efficiency, transparency and accessibility in the justice system. The Kerala High Court AI Policy 2025 sets of precedent by outlining risk based deployment models, ensuring human oversight at every decision layer for the operationalizing the Indian AI mission 2024 .

There is a significant lack of comprehensive legal legislation pertaining to the creation integration and use of artificial intelligence despite advancements in neural networks cloud computing for the system and swarm intelligence therefore integrating democratic accountability at every digital node is essential In achieving an equitable ai recognition system this evolution must be supported by an open source transparency a constitutional review process and ongoing impact assessment**.**The approach suggested for AI regulation is a contextual, gradual panel that address the distinct issues of various applicant domains. The overall goal is to promote a moderated style that defends the interests of both individual and society, while ensuring technological innovation.

WHY ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE TO BE GIVEN LEGAL STATUS

AI should be recognized by the law owing to how autonomous it is turning into and how it is affecting the liability, these traditional notions of liability and accountability are unable to keep up with the unprecedented level of autonomy and decision making that artificial intelligence systems are achieving this makes the justification for a separate legal status more than a theoretical discussion it is now becoming a practical necessity. “Legal Personhood” is an expandable concept that is not exclusive to living individuals. Legal personality has traditionally been extended to organizations such as business, trusts and ship in order to fulfil utilitarian social and commercial objectives[12]. Users content that a similar functional need for a type of legal subjectivity is presented by AI growing autonomy. A restricted form like

[11] Use of AI in supreme court case management, https://www.pib.gov.in/PressReleasePage.aspx?PRID=2113224, last visited on 17 October 2025.
[12] Simonart, V. (2021). Artificial intelligence and legal personality. Entre tradition et pragmatisme. Liber amicorum Paul-Alain Foriers, 1, 1359-1370.

electronic personhood or agenthood that is especially suited to the rights and obligations required for highly autonomous computers could be the first step in this process.

Giving AI legal status like the way companies as legal entities are recognised can suitably establish accountability and responsibility for autonomous activities. Even when an as behaviour is completely outside of individual control current laws frequently hold developers may course or users accountable. For example legal action is still taken against the company not the as system if a self driving system autonomously makes a decision that causeway harm as in the 2021 tells the autopilot crash in California because of this discrepancy people are unfairly held accountable for action they did not directly control or intend to do by eliminating actionable accountability and establishing AI as a legal entity will not only promote responsible development but also stimulate innovation. If used an innovators are shielded from unforseen consequences they will be inclined to interact with AI more. AI's ability to participate in contractual agreements, possessing intellectual property and enforcing rights and obligation can all be facilitated by legal recognition. For example the European Union [13] had discussed copyright for works credited by AI and Chinese courts have acknowledged that air generated content is entitled to copyright protection[14].

Now if we look around the legal system around the world we will come across Instances in which artificial intelligence has been crucial in cases like ***Rio Tinto Plc v. Vale S.A (2015)[15]and da Silva Moore v. Publicis Groupe(2012)[16],*** Courts have encouraged the use of technology assisted review(TAR).This instance demonstrate that the need for AI expertise and pavedt the way for greater legal acknowledgment of AI role in legal system. In the Uber Spain [17] case the European Court of Justice held Uber accountable for the AI- driven judgments made on its platform highlighting the fact that existing legal frameworks continues to hold businesses liable Even when those decisions are the result of AI algorithm. Although it is still not been passed into legislation yet the European Parliament recommended in 2017 that highly autonomous AI agents will fall under a category of "electronic personhood" in order to distinguish between some AI driven rights and liabilities. Under section 65B of the

[13] High-level summary of the AI Act
, High-level summary of the AI Act | EU Artificial Intelligence Act last visited on 17 Oct 2025.
[14] Mohanty, A., & Sahu, S. (2024). India's Advance on AI Regulation. Carnegie India, November, 21.
[15] (2015) EWHC 1865 (QB).
[16] Da Silva Moore v. Publicis Group, 2012 WL 607412.
[17] ECJ C-434/15

Indian Evidence Act 1872[18] electronically generated documents may qualify as advisable if certified however AI generated evidence such as facial recognition outputs or predictive risk assessments cannot be authenticated via traditional certification since the author is a system rather than a person the information technology act 2000[19] though enabling electronic governance lacks provision for algorithmic culpability. Also If AI system commits error in digital evidence analyzing leading to prejudicial outcomes liability enforcement split among the programmers, deployers and users. The digital personal data Protection Act 2023[20] adds privacy safeguard but it's largely silent on algorithmic accountability.

Given as potential to develop into super intelligence and cognitive autonomy legislative changes must keep up with technological advancement. Legal status guarantees that AI acts, whether positive or negative are tracked And hand it through an open system, avoiding unchecked technology advancements that could undermine current legal standards with strict human control, required insurance, algorithmic audits and rules scattered to industry specific risk,This suggested strategy is incremental and contextual. Giving a legal standing is in line with both past legal precedents and current demands for accountability, transparency and technological integration , it additionally renders to split, blame fairly, promotes creativity and guarantee that legal frameworks are prepared to handle the profound effects of autonomous AI on society .This phase illustrates how crucial it is for legislation to change in light of rapidly developing machine autonomy which is also shaped by noteworthy judicial citations and continuous legal developments.

GLOBAL CONTEXT

The first complete risk based regulatory framework for AI is established by the European Union's AI act[21], which divides system into four tiers to align compliance efforts with possible impact. At the top systems that provide an unacceptable risk to fundamental rights such as social scoring and cognitive behaviour manipulation are expressively forbidden. In order to ensure that regulation targets the impact on the technology, the next tier, High risk is subject to strict requirements and includes safety components of regulated products. However there is a contextual derogation that excludes system that performs only a narrow procedure

[18] THE INDIAN EVIDENCE ACT, 1872.
[19] THE INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY ACT, 2000
[20] The DIGITAL DATA PROTECTION ACT 2023
[21] High-level summary of the AI Act
High-level summary of the AI Act | EU Artificial Intelligence Act) last visited on 17 oct 2025

task or do not materially influence human decisions. The EU AI act regulates AI on a risk-tier basis placing judiciary system under high-risk due to their societal impact it mandates human oversight, transparency declaration and audit mechanisms[22].

The AI Bill of Rights (2022) in U.S advocates "explainable AI" ensuring citizens understand algorithmic decision in public administration. Courts use predictive policing cautiously often recovering algorithmic disclosure in discovery[23].The us government has responded by heavily emphasizing security safeguards the 2023 executive order and the subsequent 2024 national security memorandum on AI initiated processes focused on advancing trustworthy AI[24].This includes creating a thorough framework to guarantee responsible AI deployment in the national security context and imposing new requirements on AI developers to communicate safety Testing results to the government This framework shows a clear understanding of the regulatory tension that the policy seeks to enable the goal of the strategy is to safeguard civil liberties and human rights while utilizing state of the art AI capabilities.

China's "smart courts" showcase AI - assisted adjudication but highlight dangers of over-automation risking human disengagement and bias reinforcement. A strong state led push for "intelligent justice" which seeks to greatly improve judicial efficiency by integrating AI as a "potent" assistant while rigorously upholding human control over final judgments characterizing China's position on AI regulation in the legal arena. The Supreme People's court firmly asserts that AI can never replace human judges in rendering decisions, But it is actively encouraging the creation of comprehensive AI system and national level AI legal infrastructure to help judges with duties like legal research, case selection and document analysis. A vertical regulatory framework such as the interim measures for generating AI services overseas this technological adoption it places strict requirements on systems like legal chat bots in terms of data security content safety and algorithmic fairness it also enables compliance with China's more general laws such as the PIPL and requires algorithm filing and security review to safeguard social stability and national interests.

While formally maintaining human control over court functions India maintains a pro innovation and light touch approach to AI revelation in the legal arena stressing the

[22] Mohanty, A., & Sahu, S. (2024). India's Advance on AI Regulation. Carnegie India, November, 21.
[23] Ruhil, O. (2024). The Legal Assembly Line: A Critique of AI in Indian Law. *Indian Journal of Integrated Research in Law*, *4*.
[24] The U.S Executive Order On AI: National Security Implications https://cetas.turing.ac.uk/publications/us-executive-order-ai-national-security-implications, last visited on 17 Oct 2025.

integration of technology to increase efficiency and access to justice the Supreme Court promotes this through programmes like the e- court projects and resources like SUVAS[25] for language translation and bigger research with the goal of helping judges with administrative and analytical duties using SUPAV**.** Critically the prevailing national guidelines such as those from the Kerala High Court explicitly prohibit AI from making any final findings orders or judgments reserving all substantive decision making authority for the human judge this approach is governed by brother legislation such as personal data protection act 2023 and relies on internal court protocols that mandates meticulous human verification of all AI generated outputs to mitigate risk like hallucination data privacy breaches and automation bias.

LIMITATIONS

Particularly as AI's capabilities grow and change their reserve severe lack of comprehensive legal standards governing its creation integration and real world use there are numerous present initiatives that rely on non binding soft law like ethical suggestions and international rounds which are not totally up to date with as technological advancements and lack enforcement authority so there comes a lack of global uniformity in as governments as a result of variety of national legislation where they exist being fragmented and having various goals and requirement across jurisdiction.

There is a significant absence of detailed universally accepted legal frameworks governing AI development, deployment and use. Existing regulations tend to be fragmented region specific and often unable to keep pace with rapid technological advancements govt and regulatory bodies are often reactive rather than proactive lagging behind the pace of innovation, This Delay hampers effective oversight of emerging AI capabilities especially autonomous systems and with that there comes difficulty in defining accountability and liability as the traditional ideas of liability are complicated by the independent decision making of AI systems. There are legal ambiguities since current laws find it difficult to determine who is responsible when AI system inflict harm.

AI system raise complex ethical questions related to privacy bias discrimination and moral status of highly autonomous system Sometimes called electronic person and with the absence

[25] ACTION PLAN FOR SIMPLE, ACCESSIBLE, AFFORDABLE AND SPEEDY JUSTICE, https://www.pib.gov.in/PressReleasePage.aspx?PRID=1947490, last visited at 17 October 2025.

of universally agreed standards for AI safety, transparency, and accountability makes compliance complex and inconsistent across jurisdiction.

SUGGESTIONS

Several suggestions can help address the substantial limitations of granting legal status to artificial intelligence particularly in areas of accountability ethics legal certainty and social impact .International organisation and regulatory coalition should be given local harmonisation of ar loss and ethics priority in order to reduce the risk of fragmented regulation. This means that rather than only making recommendations for soft law legally enforceable agreements or treaties that set minimal standards for AI governance technical transparency human oversight and ethical protections must be created. Regular cross border coordination Add updates would be required as air technology advances to national treasurers from deviating or relying on outdated legislation. To avoid humanity centric legal errors and resolve definition ambiguity, stakeholder perspective should be integrated into rule making and compliance process. Open communication between legal theories technologies and the general public would also be required for the following reason.

To guarantee strict governance supervision and compliance specific steps must be taken such as the establishment of clear norms regular technical assessments and reviews perhaps carried out by an unbiased oversight body could reduce the likelihood that is system would become accountable black boxes. Given its restricted legal position the law might require AI to have a designated and accountable human guardian trustee this ensures backup accountability and a plan of action in the event that an ethical problem procedural error or injury could result from as automated behaviours. Legislation must make the defence of social Values and individual rights the cornerstone of all risk assessments. Unless shown otherwise any AI system that is found to have the capacity to encode or magnify suicidal prejudice or to be immediately classified as high risk necessitating rigorous transparency requirements and required external audits.

The legislature ought to take immediate action to provide highly autonomous AI system legal status by using the business analogy this status needs to be specifically linked to the established technical standards of substantivity and autonomy. The federal and state governments must adopt clear focus advice and specific training on AI procurement and implementation must include system registration liability, channelling and mandatory

insurance systems to control financial risk and assure recompense for damages caused by the system. Civil liberties and human rights protection must be given top priority in these specialised procedures in order to stop technological risk from becoming institutionalised in vital national security infrastructure and public services.

CONCLUSION

The paper's conclusion insists on artificial intelligence for transforming the legal institution and indicates that as soon as possible a robust legal framework should be sound to running after the fast pace of technology developments even if AI can help improve efficiency access to justice or quality of legal decision making its added autonomy bring importer risk like unclear accountability ethical dilemma or regulatory decentralisation. The paper calls for overall gradual and contextual specific loss to make a compromise between technological advancement, human protection and social interest pointing out the failing of current legal norms and software methods to catch up with as achievements.

It supports international harmonisation by commitment to binding agreements resulted in the achievement of AI governance transparency and human oversight it is stressed that in the development and protection of human rights multidisciplinary collaboration of laws exports technologists and stakeholders on clarifying AI definition for legal purpose is crucial concrete steps like algorithmic audits, data provenance and responsible use requirements are needed to effectively stop misuse and serve justice.