ABSTRACT

The legal issue of liability in Artificial Intelligence in India considering the new governance structure in the country. Artificial intelligence systems have now impacted communication, trade, medicine, healthcare, administration, jobs and the increasing usage has posed challenging and ethical issues about liability in the event of injury. Damage through AI can include misinformation, discriminatory, privacy breach, unsafe, decision-making, consumer harm or damage to the platform. When this happens, it might not be the sole person to be held responsible since developers, deployers, intermediaries, data fiduciaries, platforms and users are all involved in one way or another. In the study, the issue of whether the current Indian legal framework is adequate to deal with such harms is critically explored. It examines the Information Technology Act 2000, Information Technology Rules 2021 as amended by the Digital Personal Data Protection Act 2023, the Rules of 2025, consumer protection law and the more modern criminal and evidentiary system. It also analyses the recent policy developments such as the AI Mission by India the process of AI governance guideline development and the India AI Governance Guidelines 2026. The study has taken a doctrinal, analytical and critical approach which is primarily based on secondary legal sources, official documents, policy materials and government reports. The study discovers that India does not have a clear and unified regime of AI liability. The current laws are offering partial protection but they are still in bits and fail to address the problem of fault foreseeability entirely because of the transparency of due diligence and distribution of risks. This study, then, supports the concept of a coherent and rights-based model of liability that considers a sense of fairness of innovativeness and accountability safety and constitutional values.

CHAPTER – I
INTRODUCTION

The Artificial Intelligence is no longer a technical innovation of a light matter but a regulatory and legal issue of the serious nature. The AIs are involved in such decisions as the communication moderation, recommendation architecture, credit, insurance, employment screening, public administration, healthcare assistance and predictive governance. The question of whether AI should be regulated is no longer central to focus, because the effects that these systems have on outcomes that are sensitive to rights, reputation, safety, property, privacy and access to opportunities are increasing and thus, the liability issue is about who should bear the responsibility in cases of harm caused by the AI-assisted or AI-driven decision making. The issue of the legal system of India is thus facing a new challenge that it may want to figure out who is to be responsible not in an event where a single human action has taken place but a series of events involving developers, deployers, intermediaries, users, data fiduciaries and automated systems.[1]

There are no single comprehensive AI liability laws that have been passed in India. In lieu, the status quo is coming about as a confluence of constitutional values, the Information Technology Act, 2000, the Rules of the Information Technology, 2021, Digital Personal Data Protection Act, 2023 and its Rules, 2025, the consumer protection law, sectoral regulation, criminal law and changing policy tools under the India's AI Mission. This renders the Indian place dynamic and fragmented. The legal implications of the current study are also that the various sources they comprise can be used to form the future model of AI governance that is able to distribute liability in a principled, just and enforceable way.[2]

The necessity of such investigation has been even stingier due to the fact that Government of India has passed beyond the discussion of general policies to systematic governance programs. In March 2024, the India's AI Mission was approved and official documentation under the name of the Mission now contains a pillar of Safeguarding and Trusted AI, an India's AI Safety Institute effort, a report on the development of AI governance guidelines in 2025 and the official release of India AI Governance Guidelines in April 2026. These changes demonstrate that India is shifting off its expansive innovation policy towards more tangible governance

---

[1] Gyandeep Chaudhary, "Artificial Intelligence: The Liability Paradox" 1 *Indian Law Institute Law Review* 144 (2020)

[2] Priyanka Majumdar and Bindu Ronald, "Regulation of Artificial Intelligence in India: Legal Personhood and Liability" 10 *International Journal of Modern Agriculture* 336 (2021).

structure, with a specific focus on the issues of trustworthiness, accountability, risk reduction and coordination across the entire government.[3]

Meanwhile, platform responsibility and synthetic media control has become of higher importance as well. The 2024 advisory of MeitY concerned the use of AI model and generative AI by the intermediaries and platforms and the current IT rules and the subsequent 2026 amendments and draft proposals indicate the increased interest of the government in due diligence, user safety, synthetic content and harms caused by the deepfakes. Such regulatory initiatives might not establish a full tort-based AI liability regime, yet they are strongly suggestive of the fact that the regulatory approach is becoming increasingly hard to governance in terms of traceability of responsibility, disclosure, due diligence and preventative compliance.[4]

The issue of the liability in the age of intelligent machines is a challenge to doctrinal issues that are difficult to answer. In case an AI system creates defamatory material, offers unsound medical advice, conducts discriminatory hiring, creates a deepfake or leads to an autonomous operational malfunction, who is to be held responsible? The programmer can also claim that he has no direct control of real time output. The deployer can make an argument that he/she is dependent on a third-party model. The technical knowledge can be rejected by the user. The platform can apply the protection of safe-harbour in style in case of due diligence. The legislation should thus go beyond the conventional one-actor fault paradigms and look into the paradigms of layered responsibility in terms of control, foreseeability, design decisions, deployment settings, level of autonomy and regulatory responsibilities.[5]

This question is also particularly significant to the Indian constitutional system. The AI systems may have an impact on equality, non-arbitrariness, privacy, dignity, freedom of speech and the opportunity to receive fair procedures. The DPDP Act, 2023 acknowledges the protection of digital personal data as an issue that should be handled lawfully and that data fiduciaries should have obligations and that the data principals have their rights as well as institutional enforcement. In cases where the AI systems are being trained on the personal data, profile

---

[3] Sejal Gupta, "India's AI Regulation at the Crossroads: A Comprehensive Law or a Sectoral Mosaic?" 11 *Journal of Development Policy and Practice* 120 (2026).
[4] Indranath Gupta and Lakshmi Srinivasan, "Evolving Scope of Intermediary Liability in India" 37 *International Review of Law, Computers & Technology* 294 (2023).
[5] Hifajatali Sayyed, "Artificial Intelligence and Criminal Liability in India: Exploring Legal Implications and Challenges" 10 *Cogent Social Sciences* 2343195 (2024

individuals or when it is making consequential decisions based on the digital data, data governance and liability are interlinked.[6]

Moreover, the element of evidences and criminal aspects are now inevitable. Replacing earlier frameworks, the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 and the Bharatiya Sakshya Adhiniyam, 2023 will have to be applied to AI-related misconduct, digitally generated harm and electronic evidence as of 1 July 2024, i.e. it will have to be evaluated in the framework of a newer statutory framework. In this regard, legal ethics of AI liability in India should not be limited to the abstract ethics or innovation policy only. It has to examine civil accountability, the intermediary responsibility, data protection duties, evidentiary treatment, consumer harm and criminal consequences holistically.[7]

The current study thus examines AI liability in India in reference to the new governance demands in the country. It aims at finding out whether the current framework suffices, whether the principle of liability can be sensibly drawn out of the current Indian law and whether there should be any reforms so that the innovation can be accountable to the right, safety, transparency and justice.[8]

1.1 RESEARCH OBJECTIVE

The main goal of the study is the critical analysis of the notion of liability due to the usage, implementation and management of the Artificial Intelligence systems in the country of India and, particularly, the new AI governance demands in the country. The research aims to examine the way of attributing responsibility in case of harm in one of the related areas of communication, commerce, administration, healthcare, employment and digital platforms, caused or contributed by AI systems.

The study also tries to assess the sufficiency of the current Indian laws, such as the Information Technology Act, 2000, the IT Rules, 2021, as amended, the Digital Personal Data Protection Act, 2023 and its 2025 Rules, consumer protection law and the more recently introduced criminal and evidentiary law, in responding to harms on intelligent systems. It also aims at

---

[6] Usha Tandon and Neeraj Kumar Gupta, "Informational Privacy in the Age of Artificial Intelligence: A Critical Analysis of India's DPDP Act, 2023" 6 *Legal Issues in the Digital Age* 87 (2025).
[7] S. Khan and R. Patel, "Evidentiary Challenges in Deepfake Litigation: Indian Judicial Approach" 18 *South Asian Law Review* 45 (2024).
[8] Girijarani Reddy, "Regulating Artificial Intelligence: A Critical Analysis of Emerging Legal Frameworks in India, EU, and the USA" 12 *International Journal of Academic Research* 102 (2025).

establishing the doctrinal gaps on the areas of fault, foreseeability, due diligence, product responsibility, platform accountability and decision making which is data-driven.

The other significant purpose of the research is to find out whether the recent AI governance efforts in India suggest the shift towards a consistent liability framework. That being the case, the study examines India's AI Mission, the process of development of AI governance guidelines, the 2026 India AI Governance Guidelines and the associated official advisories and regulations. The research also seeks to propose a model of assigning liability in India based on principles, which are balanced in the innovation and responsibility to society.

1.2 RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The questions that are related in the research are:

1. What is the legal nature of liability arising from AI systems and how does it differ from traditional human-centred liability models in India?
2. Whether the existing Indian legal framework is sufficient to address civil, criminal, consumer, privacy and platform-related harms caused by AI systems?
3. How far do the Information Technology Act, 2000, the IT Rules, 2021 as amended, the Digital Personal Data Protection Act, 2023 and allied legal instruments provide a basis for AI accountability in India?
4. What is the significance of India's recent policy and governance developments, including the India's AI Mission, the AI governance guidelines process and the 2026 India AI Governance Guidelines, for determining future legal responsibility?
5. How should liability be distributed among developers, deployers, platforms, intermediaries, data fiduciaries and end users when AI systems cause injury, misinformation, discrimination, privacy violation or unsafe outcomes?
6. What reforms are necessary to create a coherent and rights-oriented AI liability framework in India?

1.3 HYPOTHESIS

Based on the assumption that the current legal framework in India offers biased and implicit mechanisms of dealing with AI-related damages, the study continues to believe that it lacks a sufficiently transparent, integrated and liability-focused system of governance of intelligent systems. Current legislation (the Information Technology Act, the IT Rules, consumer law and the DPDP structure) forms significant responsibilities and compliance anticipations, but these

are still disjointed when it comes to autonomous or generative AI systems or systems with high impact.

The research also assumes that the nascent AI regulative needs in India exhibit slow transition to responsibility, risk-handling and responsible implementation, however, so long as the developments are not converted into more specific statutory obligations, application-specific norms and systematic liability standards, law ambiguity will persist. Based on this, the Indian AI governance regime needs to be effective, which means that it will need the layered liability model in terms of control, risk, due diligence, transparency and the type of harm done.

1.4 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The current study is dogmatic and critical in character. It is mostly founded on the second-hand data and legal information. The research study analyses the governmental policies, the provisions of the constitution, delegated laws, official policies, government guidance, grants of consultation and other pertinent government reports related to the AI governance in India. Particular attention is paid to formal legal documents and governmental reports to find out the current and new outlines of the AI accountability.

It is a critical and analytical approach to the research. It interprets the Information technology Act, 2000, the IT Rules, 2021 amended, the DPDP Act, 2023 and its Rules, the Consumer Protection Act, 2019 and the recent Bharatiya criminal and evidentiary laws to find out its applicability in the context of AI-generated or AI-assisted harm. Another approach that is adopted in the study is the comparative and policy-based one to assess whether emerging governance framework of India is shifting towards ex ante compliance obligations, ex post liability allocation or a hybrid approach.

The study also examines the official AI governance initiatives in the context of India's AI Mission such as the process of public consultation and the official release of governance principles in order to know how India is defining safe, trusted and responsible AI. The reason why this methodology is suitable is that the subject is currently a developing phenomenon through interpretation of the laws, policy documents and regulatory indications and not a single code.

1.5 REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The existing literature on AI governance is generally aware that the intelligent systems introduce new types of legal risks connected with the openness, partiality, autonomy, size and

decentralisation of responsibility.[9] Indian sources are growing more concerned with it. The report on the development of AI governance guidelines released by India's AI admits the necessity of the trustworthiness, accountability, the coordination of the whole-of-government activities and the analysis of the existing legal and regulatory environment. The subsequent release of India AI Governance Guidelines in 2026 is also a pointer that the discussion is no longer about the general ethical ideal on institutional governance design.[10]

The other literature branch that is also relevant is the Indian digital regulation and platform governance.[11] The amendments to the IT Rules, 2021 and further on allow concluding that intermediary due diligence, user safety, unlawful content management and synthetic information are increasingly becoming a part of the governance discussion. Similarly, both the DPDP Act, 2023 and the DPDP Rules, 2025 provide a significant privacy and data-governance dimension to AI accountability through organizing data fiduciary obligations, data principal rights and gradual compliance frameworks. The importance of these materials is that the majority of modern AI liability manifests itself due to the misuse of the data, profiling, inference by the algorithm or negative distribution.[12]

Nevertheless, there is a gap that can be found in the literature. Most of the writing in India about AI has been devoted to the topics of innovation, ethics, digital transformation and responsible use, although the specific problem of legal responsibility is not theorised in the specifically Indian doctrinal context.[13] It is still necessary to relate the discourse of policy with the enforceable legal categories of negligence, due diligence, defect of the product, consumer harm, intermediary responsibility, breach of privacy, evidentiary validity and criminal attribution. This gap is filled in the current research as it is possible to unite these themes to one liability-based legal framework.[14]

1.6 CHAPTERIZATION

---

[9] Ur's Gasser and Virgilio A. F. Almeida, "A Layered Model for AI Governance" 21 *IEEE Internet Computing* 58 (2017).
[10] Akmal Pervaiz Ghazi, "AI Accountability in India: Need for Dedicated Legal Framework" 5 *Indian Journal of Legal Review* 1128 (2025).
[11] Ryan Calo, "Robotics and the Lessons of Cyberlaw" 103 *California Law Review* 513 (2015).
[12] Ujwala Uppaluri and Prashant Reddy T., "The Intermediate's Dilemma: The IT Act and Freedom of Speech" 4 *Indian Journal of Law and Technology* 45 (2012).
[13] Apoorva Thakur and Manish Kumar, "Right to Privacy vis-à-vis Artificial Intelligence: Indian Scenario" 7 *International Journal of Law Management & Humanities* 3370 (2024).
[14] Pund reek Kumar Tiwari, "Artificial Intelligence and Indian Law – Privacy, Data Protection and Ethical Challenges" 3 *White Black Legal* 2278 (2025).

Chapter 1: Introduction

In this chapter, the author presents the theme of the research on the issue of liability in the era of intelligent machines with a particular focus on the new AI governance needs in India. It provides the background of the study, importance of the problem, research questions, objectives, hypotheses, scope, research methodology, literature review and scheme of the chapters hence providing the groundwork to the whole research.

Chapter 2: Conceptual and Theoretical Framework of Artificial Intelligence and Legal Liability

In this chapter, the authors describe the meaning, nature, forms and development of Artificial Intelligence as they evolved through the years to become intelligent decision-making technologies than automated systems. It also argues about the conceptual grounds of the legal liability, relationship between AI and responsibility, the conceptual basis of the responsibility of harm caused by machines and the necessity of the liability-oriented approach in the regulation of intelligent systems.

Chapter 3: Legal Framework Governing Artificial Intelligence and Liability in India

In this chapter, the author analyses the constitutional, legislative and regulatory environment in the context of Artificial Intelligence and liability in India. It examines the Information Technology Act, 2000, the Digital Personal Data Protection Act, 2023, intermediary due diligence regulations, the consumer protection law, the penal law and evidentiary law, together with the institutional and regulatory framework that creates the new legal response to the harms of AI.

Chapter 4: Judicial, Regulatory and Governance Analysis of AI Liability in India

This chapter research study examines the changing judicial and regulatory attitude towards the liability that occurs as a result of Artificial Intelligence in India. It discusses accountability principles using the case law, digital governance policies, policies and the new AI governance programs. It also considers the problem of algorithmic bias, privacy invasion, deepfakes, the responsibility of the platform and automated decision-making as well as the liability attribution between the developers, deployers, intermediaries and users.

Chapter 5: Conclusion and Suggestions

In this chapter, the key conclusions of the study are summed up and the sufficiency of the new AI governance needs in India is critically assessed to meet the issue of liability of intelligent machines. It presents conceptual, legal and enforcement issues and provides legislative, regulatory and implementation recommendations of developing a consistent, rights-based and accountable AI liability regime in India, as well as general recommendations on future studies.

1.7 BACKGROUND

The history of the current research is the fast-changing technology, which has evolved into more sophisticated intelligent systems with the capability of learning, adaptation and manipulation of human decisions. Artificial Intelligence has slowly become a part of the law, governance, commerce and public administration, as well as discussion of rights. With the growing influence of AI systems on privacy, safety, dignity, economic opportunity and accountability of the population, the law system has to re-evaluate the conventional regulations of responsibility. The problem has taken a particular topicality in India where the use of AI is rapidly increasing and the liability system is yet to be designed in its entirety. Thus, the history of the given study should be perceived both historically, legally and institutionally.[15]

1.7.1 Evolution from Traditional Machines to Intelligent Systems

The history of the liability in the era of intelligent machines starts with the previous legal understanding of machines as the inactive tools at the disposal of the human. During the era of industrial and mechanical age, machines were perceived to be machines that simply followed instructions issued by the operators. In case of any damage, the liability was normally placed on the manufacturer, owner, employer or immediate human user by the application of available doctrine of negligence, breach of duty, defective product or vicarious liability. With the advent of computers and software, this framework was broadened and it was still considered by the law that digital systems were programmed tools whose behaviour was traceable to the identifiable human decisions. This was however altered greatly with the evolution of the Artificial Intelligence. The AI systems can be pattern recognizing, predictive, autonomous processing, content generating and decision supporting which is not always capable of delivering entirely predictable results. Such systems generally work with dynamic data inputs, machine learning models, algorithmic tweaks and deployment situations to make their activities more complicated and less understandable, unlike traditional machines do.

[15] Abhinav Kumar and Kartik Tyagi, “Legal Framework and the Governance of AI in India” 70 *Indian Journal of Public Administration* 609 (2024).

Consequently, the legal problem has been created by the historical change of the immobile mechanical to intelligent computer systems. The law cannot just rely only on the direct human action as the only accountability. This is a technological change that has become the primary basis of the current research.[16]

1.7.2 Emergence of Artificial Intelligence as a Governance Concern

The creation of Artificial Intelligence as a legal issue did not start as a scientific and technological desire but as a concept of automation, efficiency and innovation. However, with time, AI stopped being used in laboratories and entered normal social and institutional life. It started to affect search engines, social media modulation, consumer profiling, recommendation systems, fraud detection, facial recognition, hiring, digital payments, health technologies, smart mobility and service delivery to the populace. This growth made AI a technological change to a governmental issue. As soon as the rights, opportunities, reputations and access to services began to be influenced by AI, the issues of fairness, transparency, explainability, discrimination, safety and responsibility became inevitable. The higher the level of AI application in critical social activities, the better the legal systems of most countries in the world realised that innovation could not be held above responsibility. The question now had shifted on whether AI is effective but whether it is effective legally, safely and fairly. Governance was also needed due to the possibility of harmful effects of the AI systems not only in the form of mechanical malfunction but also biased outputs, non-transparent decision-making, invasion of privacy, misinformation and systematic marginalization. Thus, the emergence of AI as one of the governance concerns is also a significant point in the historical evolution of the current subject. This change in the discourse of innovation to the discourse of accountability is the one that renders the issue of liability the focus of the intelligent machines research.[17]

1.7.3 Historical Development of Digital Regulation in India

In India, AI governance is closely related to the digital regulation development in general. The first significant move towards this direction was the passage of the Information Technology Act, 2000 that gave a legal status to the electronic records and transactions as well as creating the groundwork on cyber regulation. By that point, the legislation was not created with

---

[16] Rowena Rodrigues, "Legal and Human Rights Issues of AI: Gaps, Challenges and Vulnerabilities" 4 *Journal of Responsible Technology* 100005 (2020).
[17] Abhinav Kumar and Kartik Tyagi, "Legal Framework and the Governance of AI in India" 70 *Indian Journal of Public Administration* 609 (2024).

Artificial Intelligence in mind, but it developed the initial legislation on handling digital behavior, intermediary role, electronic evidence and cyber-related offenses. With the development of technology, the Indian legal system was responding slowly by subordinating the law, sectoral regulations, data security expectation and platform requirement. In the long run, the emergence of social media, digital platforms, online business and algorithm logic influenced the law by making it more focused on due diligence, accountability of the intermediary and the regulation of data. This was further enhanced by the fact that the issue of privacy has become a constitutional issue and probably with the subsequent adoption of a specific data protection system. In such a way, the process of forming the AI liability in India did not commence with a specific AI statute, instead, it is the development of the digital law in general. This incremental change is significant since the new AI governance demands in India are now being erected to have a foundation on already existing frameworks of the law of information technology, privacy law, intermediary liability and constitutional ideals. The Indian digital regulation history as such is thus a crucial background to the current topic of research.[18]

1.7.4 Rise of Data Protection and Rights-Based Accountability

One of the milestones of the background of this topic is the emergence of data protection and rights-based accountability in India. The current AI relies significantly on data to be trained, classified, profiled, predicted as well as automated inferred. In its turn, this implies that the question of the data collection, processing, storage and utilization should also be addressed when it comes to AI liability. Traditionally, the Indian law lacked a holistic system of personal data protection over a long time, despite the fact that the digital information was becoming a primary focus of an administration and business. Due to the growth of the issues related to privacy, surveillance, profiling and misuse of personal information, the law of technological harm was also modified. The issue was no longer that of a physical harm or economic damage, rather, it was invasion of privacy, injury to dignity, making of unjustifiable decisions and exploiting the data. The privacy right was a constitutional right with a great normative basis on subsequent regulatory developments. Subsequently, the trend towards the data protection law reinforced the relationship between the AI implementation and responsibility. Such a historical trend is very topical since AI systems tend to work based on the personal and behavioural data translation to decisions, which impact a person in real life. Thus, the liability of the era of

[18] Subhajit Basu and Richard Jones, "Indian Information and Technology Act 2000: Review of the Regulatory Powers under the Act" 19 *International Review of Law, Computers & Technology* 209 (2005).

intelligent machines cannot be perceived with the help of the conventional terms of responsibility or negligence. It also has to be examined using the data responsibility, informational fairness and legal protection using rights.[19]

1.7.5 Need for Reframing Traditional Liability Principles

Another reason as to why the current study background is based on the increasing ineffectiveness of the classical liability doctrines in the case of intelligent systems is the issue of their inapplicability to them. The classical legal thought evolved based on easy differentiation between actor and instrument, intention and result, manufacturer and consumer or wrongdoer and victim. The artificial intelligence makes these differences more complex due to the possibility of a chain of events that leads to an apparently harmful result and contains data providers, software developers, model trainers, deployers, institutional users, intermediaries and even end users of the system. This poses confusion on the causation, fault, foreseeability, standard of care as well as the legal attribution. Unfortunately, in the case when an AI tool attracts a discriminatory hiring recommendation, then it might be hard to determine whether it is a training data, model architecture, deployment environment or dependency on the employer. In the same way, in case the generative AI generates deceptive or defamatory content, it can be spread among the developer, platform, prompt-user and distributor. The cases when such situations take place show that, even in the new technological reality, traditional liability rules could be helpful, they only need to be interpreted. The legal system should consequently be transformed to a limited human-action model to a strata of accountability model which is founded on the areas of control, design responsibility, due diligence, risk allocation and context of deployment. This theological issue is among the most significant historical and theoretical reasons that lead to the given research.[20]

1.7.6 India's Emerging AI Governance and the Centrality of Liability

The last and the most direct background of the given research is the modern emergence of AI governance debate in India. With the advent of AI being a key focus of the economic growth, modernisation of the public sector and digital services, as well as the policy of innovation, India is starting to realise the necessity of responsible and trustful AI. The policy discourses, government policies and ethical theories have started to shift towards a more orderly system of

---

[19] Acharaj Kaur Tuteja and Digvijay Singh, "Data Protection in India: Privacy, Personal Data, and the Saga of a Legislative and Economical Approach" 6 *GNLU Journal of Law & Economics* 92 (2023)

[20] Miriam Buiten, Alexandre de Streel and Martin Peitz, "The Law and Economics of AI Liability" 48 *Computer Law & Security Review* 105794 (2023).

governance. Nevertheless, the principles of governance are not enough in case they are not related to legal implications. Only under the circumstances that explain why a person should provide the required compliance, who will be responsible in case of failure and what kind of remedies can be taken in case of harm, a system of AI governance will have a sense. That is why the discussion of the liability is in the center of the given issue. India is at a significant legal phase today when the adoption of AI is growing rapidly and the responsibility doctrines are not yet clear. The problem is in that it should be possible to avoid the discouragement of innovation, but not to violate the legal responsibility. Accordingly, the context of this study is in the necessity to relate the new AI governance demands with the enforceable principles of liability in the Indian law. The study then continues based on the realization that intelligent machines are no longer just a technological product; they are legally important actors in a system of highly complex governance, which is controlled by humans but under a human-controlled system.[21]

[21] Akmal Pervaiz Ghazi, "AI Accountability in India: Need for Dedicated Legal Framework" 5 *Indian Journal of Legal Review* 1128 (2025).