 ISSN: 2349-6002

Artificial Intelligence, Technology and the Future of Constitutional Rights

Duke Batra
5th Semester B.A.LL.B. student, Faculty of Law, Tantia University
doi.org/10.64643/IJIRTV12I6-191357-459

Abstract -The future of constitutional rights has significant implications as Artificial Intelligence and Technology are rapidly transforming the world. Vast amount of data could be analyzed by the AI systems, it can make decisions and even predict behaviors that enhance efficiency in many sectors. AI systems has became increasingly integrated into various aspects of life, from law enforcement and healthcare to employment and social media. AI could affect constitutional rights such as, The Right to Privacy, Freedom of Speech and Protection Against Discrimination, if Ai becomes more integrated into government or any legal systems. If the AI is used without any proper regulations, AI surveillance tools may infringe on the privacy rights. To avoid biases that could violate the right to equal protection under law, algorithms used in enforcing law or judicial decisions must be transparent and fair. Strong legal frameworks should be developed to ensure that technology is used ethically and responsibly, this is crucial to protect constitutional rights in the age of AI. Creating laws that regulate data collection, ensure transparency in AI decision-making and provide mechanisms for accountability when rights are threatened should be included in strong legal frameworks. AI governance should corenerstone Transparency and accountability. In Future, constitutional rights might include a "Right to Explanantion" that ensures that AI decisions are not mysterious but open to challenge and survey. AI also deeply affects "Freedom of Expression", "Right to Privacy" and "Equal Protection under the Law". The Priciples of transparency, accountability and human oversight in the development and deployement of AI systems should also be examined. Societal implications of AI should be explored broader, that includes its impact on democratic institutions, social justice and the future of human rights. In an increasingly AI-driven world, the importance of international cooperation and collabration in estaishing global standards for AI governance to ensure the protection of constitutional rights. In sum, the intersection of AI, technology and constitutional rights is not about adapting the laws, its about safeguarding human dignity, fairness and freedom in a world that changes rapidly.

I. INTRODUCTION

Artificial Intelligence today influences nearly every aspect of human life—from how citizens interact with the State to how they exercise constitutional freedoms in digital spaces. The integration of AI in public administration, policing, welfare distribution, and surveillance systems raises deep constitutional implications. India, with its growing digital population and rapidly expanding AI ecosystem, stands at a constitutional crossroads. The traditional constitutional framework, designed in an era devoid of automated decision-making systems, must now grapple with the complexities of machine learning, neural networks, large-scale data collection, algorithmic profiling, and opaque automated governance. These developments impose structural challenges to the protection of fundamental rights, particularly the rights to privacy, equality, speech, and due process.

The central tension lies between constitutionalism, which demands accountability, transparency, fairness, and human dignity, and algorithmic governance, which often operates through opaque models, limited explainability, immense data hunger, and autonomous decision pathways. As the State increasingly relies on AI for welfare mapping, predictive policing, facial recognition, and public order mechanisms, the potential for constitutional harm intensifies. At the same time, private technology companies wield unprecedented influence over elections, public opinion, online speech, and behavioural manipulation—raising issues of private-power constitutionalism. Thus, the Constitution is confronted not only by the might of the State but also by

algorithmic systems embedded in private platforms that mediate fundamental freedoms.

This paper argues that while AI poses new threats, it also presents opportunities for strengthening constitutional governance if properly regulated. The future of constitutional rights hinges on creating a normative and legal framework that integrates AI into democratic structures without compromising individual freedom or human dignity. Through an examination of privacy, speech, equality, due process, and algorithmic transparency, this paper seeks to create a comprehensive constitutional analysis of AI in India.

II. EVOLUTION OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE & THE CONSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORK

AI has evolved through three major phases—rule-based systems, statistical machine learning, and modern neural networks such as deep learning and generative models. As AI systems became more autonomous and more deeply embedded in social infrastructure, constitutional challenges emerged. The Indian Constitution, built on principles of liberty, equality, and justice, was not originally intended to address machine-driven decision-making or algorithmic surveillance. Nevertheless, its dynamic interpretation by courts allows it to remain relevant in the age of AI.

The integration of AI into public functions raises questions under Articles 14, 19, and 21. Automated systems used in welfare distribution must meet Article 14's requirement of fairness and non-arbitrariness. Predictive policing and facial recognition technologies must comply with the constitutional right to privacy recognised in K.S. Puttaswamy v. Union of India. AI-driven content moderation implicates Article 19(1)(a)'s free speech protections. And algorithmic decision-making in administrative processes must adhere to the principles of natural justice.

These constitutional interactions demonstrate that AI cannot be viewed merely as a technological tool; it must be situated within the constitutional order. The State's use of AI must be bound by proportionality, necessity, and accountability—principles central to India's constitutional jurisprudence. The Constitution must therefore evolve to incorporate technological realities without compromising foundational democratic ideals.

III. AI AND THE RIGHT TO PRIVACY

The right to privacy, affirmed as a fundamental right in Puttaswamy (2017), is the constitutional right most deeply impacted by AI. AI systems require vast amounts of data. The combination of big data analytics, real-time surveillance, facial recognition, biometric mapping, and behavioural prediction tools creates unprecedented intrusion into personal autonomy. Technologies such as the Delhi Police facial recognition system, Aadhaar-based authentication, CCTV-AI integrations, and predictive policing algorithms raise privacy and data protection concerns at multiple levels.

AI-driven surveillance threatens informational privacy, bodily privacy, and decisional autonomy. Facial recognition systems collect biometric information without explicit consent and often without legal safeguards. Predictive policing systems process sensitive personal data and generate risk profiles that may stigmatise individuals or communities. Machine learning models infer personal attributes—such as political preferences, religious beliefs, or mental-health tendencies—that a person never voluntarily disclosed. These forms of surveillance risk creating a "panoptic society," where individuals modify their behaviour due to the fear of being constantly watched. Under the Puttaswamy proportionality test, the State must show (1) legality, (2) necessity, (3) proportionality, and (4) procedural safeguards. Most AI surveillance systems in India lack statutory backing and are introduced through executive notifications or police orders, failing at the first hurdle. The absence of data-minimisation principles, transparent audits, algorithmic explainability, and independent oversight mechanisms further violate procedural safeguards.

Thus, without a comprehensive data protection framework and clear restrictions on AI-based surveillance, the right to privacy remains under constitutional threat. The future of digital constitutionalism in India will depend on how effectively the law can regulate AI-driven surveillance tools while still enabling their legitimate use for public safety and governance.

IV. AI AND FREEDOM OF SPEECH IN DIGITAL PLATFORMS

AI governs the digital public sphere by curating information through personalised feeds, recommendation systems, content moderation, and algorithmic demotion or amplification. These processes deeply influence how citizens exercise the freedom of speech under Article 19(1)(a). AI's control over online visibility creates risks of censorship, echo chambers, misinformation, and manipulation—each affecting the democratic marketplace of ideas.

Content moderation algorithms often remove speech without contextual understanding, disproportionately targeting marginalised groups or political dissent. Automated moderation lacks transparency and provides little to no opportunity for appeal, raising questions about natural justice. Recommendation systems—like those of YouTube, Instagram, and TikTok—amplify content based on engagement rather than truth, thereby altering how democratic discourse evolves. AI-driven misinformation systems, including deepfakes, threaten electoral integrity and cause reputational harm.

While the State cannot directly restrict speech except under reasonable restrictions under Article 19(2), private platforms can indirectly suppress speech through opaque algorithms. This raises the question of horizontal application of fundamental rights, where private actors effectively shape public discourse. Indian courts have acknowledged limited horizontality in cases like Vishaka and Puttaswamy, but a clear jurisprudence for algorithmic governance remains lacking.

The future of free speech will depend on the creation of transparent AI-governance structures, accountability mechanisms for platforms, user rights in algorithmic curation, and regulatory frameworks that protect democratic discourse from algorithmic distortions without enabling State censorship.

V. AI, EQUALITY AND NON-DISCRIMINATION

AI systems deployed in welfare delivery, loan approvals, predictive policing, hiring, and governmental decision-making often replicate and magnify structural biases present in their training data. This directly implicates Article 14 (equality before the law), Article 15 (non-discrimination), and Article 16 (equality of opportunity).

Algorithmic bias occurs when datasets reflect historical inequalities. For instance, an AI-based policing model trained on crime data from over-policed communities will reinforce discriminatory policing. A welfare distribution algorithm that uses biased datasets may deny subsidies to deserving individuals. Private-sector hiring tools trained on past hiring patterns may penalise women or marginalised groups.

Under Article 14 jurisprudence, State action must be non-arbitrary, fair, and reasonable. Opaque AI systems that deliver discriminatory outcomes violate these principles. The doctrine of "manifest arbitrariness" would render such systems unconstitutional unless the State provides safeguards ensuring fairness. However, bias in AI is often statistical and systemic, making it difficult to prove intentional discrimination. This calls for a new constitutional approach that recognises algorithmic discrimination as a harm independent of motive.

The future constitutional challenge lies in ensuring that AI systems used by public authorities comply with equal protection principles and undergo mandatory fairness audits, transparency reporting, and bias-mitigation processes.

VI. AI AND DUE PROCESS

Automated decision-making by the State—whether in welfare targeting, tax assessments, predictive policing, or public-order management—must comply with constitutional due process. Even though "due process" is not explicitly mentioned in the Constitution, Maneka Gandhi v. Union of India read Articles 14, 19, and 21 together to establish substantive and procedural due process.

AI systems threaten due process when decisions are made without explanation, when individuals cannot challenge automated outcomes, or when proprietary algorithms prevent disclosure. For example, an AI model denying welfare benefits without providing reasons violates the right to a fair hearing. Automated blacklisting or risk assessments used by police may

restrict movement or impose surveillance without notice.

AI also threatens the principle of audi alteram partem—the right to be heard—because individuals cannot meaningfully contest algorithmic outputs they cannot understand. The lack of explainability and the reliance on trade-secret protections by AI vendors prevent transparency. Constitutional due process requires that individuals have the right to receive reasons for decisions that affect their rights, the right to appeal, and the right to human oversight.

Therefore, any governmental use of AI must incorporate mandatory human review, explainability obligations, and procedural safeguards ensuring fairness and accountability.

VII. AI AND THE FUTURE OF DEMOCRATIC PROCESSES

AI affects not only individual rights but also the structural foundations of democracy. Deepfake technology can manipulate elections by fabricating audio-visual content. Micro-targeting tools can deliver personalised political messages that influence voters based on behavioural data. Recommendation algorithms shape political opinions by amplifying content that maximises engagement. These developments undermine informed citizen participation.

AI can also distort democratic accountability. When governmental decisions are outsourced to automated systems, responsibility becomes diffused. Elected representatives may evade accountability by attributing outcomes to algorithms. Moreover, large private platforms that shape public discourse acquire quasi-constitutional power, raising concerns of unregulated private governance over political life.

If democratic legitimacy rests on transparency, deliberation, and accountability, then AI poses a structural challenge. Electoral laws, campaign regulations, and transparency obligations must be updated to control AI-based political manipulation, deepfakes, and micro-targeting.

VIII. ALGORITHMIC ACCOUNTABILITY AND LIABILITY

A major challenge in AI governance is determining liability when algorithms cause harm. If an AI model used by the government wrongfully denies benefits, who is responsible—the government official, the programmer, or the vendor? Traditional liability models do not address the autonomy of machine-learning systems.

Constitutionally, the State cannot escape accountability by outsourcing decisions to private algorithms. The Supreme Court has held that State responsibility extends to third-party actions performed on its behalf. Therefore, governmental use of AI must be accompanied by strict liability frameworks and transparent procurement processes ensuring compliance with constitutional norms.

Private actors also require regulation. Platforms must be held accountable for algorithmic harms such as amplification of hate speech, creation of echo chambers, or unlawful content moderation. Transparency reports, audit obligations, and user rights must be part of a comprehensive accountability framework.

IX. COMPARATIVE INTERNATIONAL PERSPECTIVES

Globally, jurisdictions have begun developing safeguards for AI. The European Union's AI Act categorises AI systems based on risk and necessitates strict obligations for high-risk systems, including transparency, human oversight, and accountability. The General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) provides a right to explanation in automated decision-making. The United States has sector-based regulations but lacks a comprehensive federal framework. China uses AI extensively in public surveillance but with strong State control, raising concerns about digital authoritarianism.

India's constitutional framework aligns more closely with the EU's human-rights-centric approach, but the absence of a comprehensive AI law creates gaps. A comparative evaluation reveals that India must incorporate global best practices while ensuring compatibility with domestic constitutional principles.

X. LEGAL REFORMS NEEDED FOR AI AND CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS

For AI to operate within constitutional boundaries, India must adopt a multi-layered regulatory framework. Key reforms include:

1. A comprehensive AI law aligned with constitutional rights.
2. Statutory limits on AI-based surveillance with judicial oversight.
3. Mandatory algorithmic transparency, fairness audits, and explainability.
4. Human-in-the-loop requirements for all governmental automated decisions.
5. Strong data protection legislation with rights to notice, correction, and data minimisation.
6. Regulation of political micro-targeting and deepfakes.
7. Platform accountability mechanisms with user appeal rights.
8. Independent AI regulatory authority.

These reforms would reconcile technological innovation with constitutionalism.

XI. ETHICAL PRINCIPLES FOR AI GOVERNANCE

Beyond legal frameworks, AI must also be governed by ethical principles rooted in constitutional values. These include fairness, non-discrimination, transparency, accountability, human oversight, respect for autonomy, and protection of human dignity. Ethical AI must minimise harm and ensure that individuals maintain meaningful control over technologies that affect their lives. Ethical governance must also consider collective harms such as societal manipulation, erosion of democratic deliberation, and systemic bias.

XII. THE FUTURE OF CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS IN AN AI-DRIVEN WORLD

The future of constitutional rights will be shaped by how well India harmonises AI with democratic values. Privacy will depend on regulating surveillance; equality will depend on addressing algorithmic bias; speech will depend on transparent content governance; and due process will depend on explainable AI. The Constitution must remain a living document that evolves with technological realities. AI offers opportunities for better governance, efficient justice delivery, and improved welfare distribution—but only if constrained within constitutional boundaries.

XIII. CONCLUSION

AI represents the most significant technological disruption since the Industrial Revolution, but its constitutional implications are profound. The Indian Constitution, grounded in liberty, equality, and dignity, offers a strong foundation to regulate AI. However, legal and policy reforms are urgently required. If AI continues to expand without constitutional safeguards, the future of fundamental rights may be compromised. But if properly regulated, AI can coexist with democracy and even strengthen constitutional governance. The future of constitutional rights will depend on our commitment to ensuring that technological power remains subordinate to constitutional power.