INDIAN JOURNAL OF LEGAL AFFAIRS AND RESEARCH

VOLUME 3 ISSUE 1

Peer-reviewed, open-access, refereed journal

DISCLAIMER

The views and opinions expressed in the articles published in the Indian Journal of Legal Affairs and Research are those of the respective authors and do not necessarily reflect the official policy or position of the IJLAR, its editorial board, or its affiliated institutions. The IJLAR assumes no responsibility for any errors or omissions in the content of the journal. The information provided in this journal is for general informational purposes only and should not be construed as legal advice. Readers are encouraged to seek professional legal counsel for specific legal issues. The IJLAR and its affiliates shall not be liable for any loss or damage arising from the use of the information contained in this journal.

Introduction

Welcome to the Indian Journal of Legal Affairs and Research (IJLAR), a distinguished platform dedicated to the dissemination of comprehensive legal scholarship and academic research. Our mission is to foster an environment where legal professionals, academics, and students can collaborate and contribute to the evolving discourse in the field of law. We strive to publish high-quality, peer-reviewed articles that provide insightful analysis, innovative perspectives, and practical solutions to contemporary legal challenges. The IJLAR is committed to advancing legal knowledge and practice by bridging the gap between theory and practice.

Preface

The Indian Journal of Legal Affairs and Research is a testament to our unwavering commitment to excellence in legal scholarship. This volume presents a curated selection of articles that reflect the diverse and dynamic nature of legal studies today. Our contributors, ranging from esteemed legal scholars to emerging academics, bring forward a rich tapestry of insights that address critical legal issues and offer novel contributions to the field. We are grateful to our editorial board, reviewers, and authors for their dedication and hard work, which have made this publication possible. It is our hope that this journal will serve as a valuable resource for researchers, practitioners, and policymakers, and will inspire further inquiry and debate within the legal community.

Description

The Indian Journal of Legal Affairs and Research is an academic journal that publishes peer-reviewed articles on a wide range of legal topics. Each issue is designed to provide a platform for legal scholars, practitioners, and students to share their research findings, theoretical explorations, and practical insights. Our journal covers various branches of law, including but not limited to constitutional law, international law, criminal law, commercial law, human rights, and environmental law. We are dedicated to ensuring that the articles published in our journal adhere to the highest standards of academic rigor and contribute meaningfully to the understanding and development of legal theories and practices.

THE SILICON SOVEREIGN: REIMAGINING CONSTITUTIONALISM AND JUDICIAL REVIEW IN THE AGE OF ALGORITHMIC GOVERNANCE

AUTHORED BY - SAKSHI SINGH

LLB at Sudhakar Mahila Vidhi Mahavidyalaya

Mahatma Gandhi Kashi Vidyapith (MGKVP), Varanasi

I. ABSTRACT

The rapid integration of Artificial Intelligence (AI) into the machinery of the State has birthed a new era of "Algorithmic Governance." In India, from the use of facial recognition by law enforcement to the automated distribution of welfare subsidies, the State is increasingly delegating its "sovereign functions" to software code. This research paper explores the constitutional crisis posed by the "Silicon Sovereign"—systems that make life-altering decisions through "Black Box" logic. The paper argues that traditional administrative law, rooted in human reason, is ill-equipped to handle the opacity of AI. By analyzing Articles 14 and 21 of the Indian Constitution, the paper proposes a new legal framework: "Algorithmic Due Process," which mandates transparency, auditability, and a human-in-the-loop.

II. INTRODUCTION

The core of constitutionalism lies in the restraint of power. As A.V. Dicey famously posited, the "Rule of Law" requires that no person be punished or made to suffer except for a distinct breach of law established in the ordinary legal manner before the ordinary courts.[^1] However, the 21st century has introduced a silent actor into this framework: the Algorithm.

In the contemporary Indian State, the "Silicon Sovereign" is no longer a futuristic concept. It is present in the "Aadhaar" authentication failures, in the "CCTNS" policing systems, and in the "Predictive Policing" trials in cities like Delhi and Hyderabad. While these technologies promise efficiency, they operate on a logic of probability rather than causality. This paper seeks to answer

a fundamental constitutional question: If a citizen is denied a fundamental right by a machine whose "reasoning" is hidden in a "Black Box," can the Rule of Law survive?

III. LITERATURE REVIEW: THE BLACK BOX SOCIETY

Scholars like Frank Pasquale have warned of the "Black Box Society," where secret algorithms control money and information.[^2] In the legal context, the "Black Box" problem refers to the inability of human observers to trace the specific path an AI took to reach a conclusion.

In India, the discourse on AI and Law is still nascent. While the NITI Aayog's *National Strategy for Artificial Intelligence* (2018) focuses heavily on economic benefits, it provides a very thin framework for constitutional safeguards.[^3] Legal scholars have noted that the Digital Personal Data Protection (DPDP) Act, 2023, while a step forward, largely ignores the "Automated Decision Making" (ADM) risks that are addressed in more mature frameworks like the EU's GDPR.[^4]

IV. CONSTITUTIONAL CHALLENGES UNDER THE INDIAN CHARTER

4.1 Article 14: The Strike Against Algorithmic Bias

Article 14 of the Constitution of India guarantees equality before the law and equal protection of the laws. The Supreme Court in *E.P. Royappa v. State of Tamil Nadu* famously held that "Arbitrariness is the antithesis of Equality." [^5]

Algorithms are often perceived as neutral, but they are trained on historical data. If historical data contains biases against certain castes, genders, or religions, the AI will "learn" and amplify these biases. For instance, if a predictive policing algorithm is trained on data from biased policing in the past, it will disproportionately target marginalized communities. This is "Manifest Arbitrariness" in digital form.

4.2 Article 21: The Right to Algorithmic Due Process

The right to life and personal liberty under Article 21 has been interpreted to include the right to a "fair, just, and reasonable" procedure.[^6] A procedure that relies on an opaque algorithm is inherently "unreasonable."

If a student in Varanasi is denied a government scholarship because an AI flagged their application as "high risk" without explaining why, that student's right to due process is violated. The principle of *Audi Alteram Partem* (hear the other side) becomes a mockery if the "other side" doesn't know what evidence the machine used against them.

V. JUDICIAL REVIEW AND THE SILICON SOVEREIGN

Judicial review is a "Basic Structure" of the Constitution, as held in *L. Chandra Kumar v. Union of India*.[^7] However, Algorithmic Governance creates two major hurdles for the Judiciary:

1. **The Transparency Gap:** Courts cannot review what they cannot see. If the State claims that the algorithm is a "Trade Secret" of a private vendor, the Court is blinded.
2. **The Technical Gap:** Judges are trained in law, not in neural networks. There is an urgent need for "Technical Examiners" or "Specialist Masters" to assist the court in auditing algorithms.

The Supreme Court's judgment in *K.S. Puttaswamy v. Union of India* (Privacy Judgment) is the strongest weapon here. The court held that any state interference with rights must pass the "Proportionality Test." [^8] If a less intrusive, more transparent human-led process is available, the use of an opaque AI may be deemed unconstitutional.

VI. COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS: THE GLOBAL LANDSCAPE

6.1 The EU AI Act (2024)

The European Union has moved from "Ethics" to "Hard Law." The EU AI Act classifies AI into risk categories. High-risk AI (used in education, employment, and law enforcement) must undergo "Conformity Assessments" and provide "Human Oversight." [^9] India lacks such a classification system, leaving all AI deployments in a "gray zone."

6.2 The US Case of State v. Loomis

In the United States, the case of *State v. Loomis* is a landmark. The defendant challenged the use of a private algorithm (COMPAS) used to calculate his risk of re-offending. The court allowed the use of the algorithm but admitted that the "secret" nature of the software prevented the defendant

from fully challenging its accuracy.[^10] This case serves as a warning for Indian courts: delegating justice to private software leads to a "Black Hole" in the legal system.

VII. THE ROADMAP TO REFORM: AN ALGORITHMIC BILL OF RIGHTS

To prevent the Silicon Sovereign from becoming an absolute monarch, this paper proposes the following legislative and constitutional reforms:

1. **The Right to Explanation:** Every citizen must have a statutory right to a human-understandable explanation for any automated decision that affects their rights.

2. **Algorithmic Impact Assessments (AIA):** Similar to Environmental Impact Assessments, every government department must perform an AIA before deploying AI.

3. **No "Solely Automated" Decisions:** Critical decisions (Bail, Health, Subsidy) must have a "Human-in-the-loop" to ensure empathy and constitutional context.

4. **Waiver of Trade Secrets:** When a private company sells an algorithm to the State for a sovereign function, it must waive its right to keep the code secret from the Judiciary.

VIII. CONCLUSION

The transition from a "Bureaucratic State" to an "Algorithmic State" is inevitable, but it must not be "unconstitutional." The Silicon Sovereign offers the promise of a corruption-free, efficient India, but it also carries the threat of a silent, mathematical tyranny.

As a law student from the holy city of Varanasi, where the ancient tradition of "Nyaya" (Justice) was born, I conclude that justice cannot be reduced to 0s and 1s. The Constitution must remain the supreme "Source Code" of the country. If an algorithm cannot be explained, it cannot be sustained. Sovereignty must always remain with "We the People," and never be ceded to the "Silicon Sovereign."

IX. FOOTNOTES

[^1]: A.V. Dicey, *Introduction to the Study of the Law of the Constitution* (10th edn, Macmillan 1959) 188.

[^2]: Frank Pasquale, *The Black Box Society: The Secret Algorithms That Control Money and Information* (Harvard University Press 2015).

[^3]: NITI Aayog, 'National Strategy for Artificial Intelligence' (Discussion Paper, June 2018).

[^4]: Digital Personal Data Protection Act 2023 (India).

[^5]: *E.P. Royappa v. State of Tamil Nadu* (1974) 4 SCC 3.

[^6]: *Maneka Gandhi v. Union of India* (1978) 1 SCC 248.

[^7]: *L. Chandra Kumar v. Union of India* (1997) 3 SCC 261.

[^8]: *Justice K.S. Puttaswamy (Retd.) v. Union of India* (2017) 10 SCC 1.

[^9]: Regulation (EU) 2024/1689 of the European Parliament and of the Council (Artificial Intelligence Act).

[^10]: *State v. Loomis*, 881 N.W.2d 749 (Wis. 2016).

X. BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources:

- The Constitution of India, 1950.
- Digital Personal Data Protection Act, 2023.
- Information Technology Act, 2000.

Secondary Sources:

- **Books:**
  - M.P. Jain, *Indian Constitutional Law* (8th edn, LexisNexis 2018).
  - Cathy O'Neil, *Weapons of Math Destruction: How Big Data Increases Inequality and Threatens Democracy* (Crown 2016).
- **Articles & Reports:**
  - NITI Aayog, "Responsible AI for All" (Approach Document, 2021).
  - Janosch Delcker, 'The World's First Comprehensive AI Law' (Politico, 2024).