

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL FOR LEGAL RESEARCH AND ANALYSIS



Open Access, Refereed Journal Multi-Disciplinary
Peer Reviewed

www.ijlra.com

DISCLAIMER

No part of this publication may be reproduced or copied in any form by any means without prior written permission of Managing Editor of IJLRA. The views expressed in this publication are purely personal opinions of the authors and do not reflect the views of the Editorial Team of IJLRA.

Though every effort has been made to ensure that the information in Volume II Issue 7 is accurate and appropriately cited/referenced, neither the Editorial Board nor IJLRA shall be held liable or responsible in any manner what sever for any consequences for any action taken by anyone on the basis of information in the Journal.

Copyright © International Journal for Legal Research & Analysis

EDITORIALTEAM

EDITORS

Dr. Samrat Datta

Dr. Samrat Datta Seedling School of Law and Governance, Jaipur National University, Jaipur. Dr. Samrat Datta is currently associated with Seedling School of Law and Governance, Jaipur National University, Jaipur. Dr. Datta has completed his graduation i.e., B.A.LL.B. from Law College Dehradun, Hemvati Nandan Bahuguna Garhwal University, Srinagar, Uttarakhand. He is an alumnus of KIIT University, Bhubaneswar where he pursued his post-graduation (LL.M.) in Criminal Law and subsequently completed his Ph.D. in Police Law and Information Technology from the Pacific Academy of Higher Education and Research University, Udaipur in 2020. His area of interest and research is Criminal and Police Law. Dr. Datta has a teaching experience of 7 years in various law schools across North India and has held administrative positions like Academic Coordinator, Centre Superintendent for Examinations, Deputy Controller of Examinations, Member of the Proctorial Board



Dr. Namita Jain



Head & Associate Professor

School of Law, JECRC University, Jaipur Ph.D. (Commercial Law) LL.M., UGC-NET Post Graduation Diploma in Taxation law and Practice, Bachelor of Commerce.

Teaching Experience: 12 years, AWARDS AND RECOGNITION of Dr. Namita Jain are - ICF Global Excellence Award 2020 in the category of educationalist by I Can Foundation, India. India Women Empowerment Award in the category of "Emerging Excellence in Academics by Prime Time & Utkrish Bharat Foundation, New Delhi. (2020). Conferred in FL Book of Top 21 Record Holders in the category of education by Fashion Lifestyle Magazine, New Delhi. (2020). Certificate of Appreciation for organizing and managing the Professional Development Training Program on IPR in Collaboration with Trade Innovations Services, Jaipur on March 14th, 2019

Mrs.S.Kalpana

Assistant professor of Law

Mrs.S.Kalpana, presently Assistant professor of Law, VelTech Rangarajan Dr.Sagunthala R & D Institute of Science and Technology, Avadi. Formerly Assistant professor of Law,Vels University in the year 2019 to 2020, Worked as Guest Faculty, Chennai Dr.Ambedkar Law College, Pudupakkam. Published one book. Published 8Articles in various reputed Law Journals. Conducted 1Moot court competition and participated in nearly 80 National and International seminars and webinars conducted on various subjects of Law. Did ML in Criminal Law and Criminal Justice Administration.10 paper presentations in various National and International seminars. Attended more than 10 FDP programs. Ph.D. in Law pursuing.



Avinash Kumar



Avinash Kumar has completed his Ph.D. in International Investment Law from the Dept. of Law & Governance, Central University of South Bihar. His research work is on "International Investment Agreement and State's right to regulate Foreign Investment." He qualified UGC-NET and has been selected for the prestigious ICSSR Doctoral Fellowship. He is an alumnus of the Faculty of Law, University of Delhi. Formerly he has been elected as Students Union President of Law Centre-1, University of Delhi. Moreover, he completed his LL.M. from the University of Delhi (2014-16), dissertation on "Cross-border Merger & Acquisition"; LL.B. from the University of Delhi (2011-14), and B.A. (Hons.) from Maharaja Agrasen College, University of Delhi. He has also obtained P.G. Diploma in IPR from the Indian Society of International Law, New Delhi. He has qualified UGC – NET examination and has been awarded ICSSR – Doctoral Fellowship. He has published six-plus articles and presented 9 plus papers in national and international seminars/conferences. He participated in several workshops on research methodology and teaching and learning.

ABOUT US

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL FOR LEGAL RESEARCH & ANALYSIS ISSN- 2582-6433 is an Online Journal is Monthly, Peer Review, Academic Journal, Published online, that seeks to provide an interactive platform for the publication of Short Articles, Long Articles, Book Review, Case Comments, Research Papers, Essay in the field of Law & Multidisciplinary issue. Our aim is to upgrade the level of interaction and discourse about contemporary issues of law. We are eager to become a highly cited academic publication, through quality contributions from students, academics, professionals from the industry, the bar and the bench. INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL FOR LEGAL RESEARCH & ANALYSIS ISSN 2582-6433 welcomes contributions from all legal branches, as long as the work is original, unpublished and is in consonance with the submission guidelines.

CONSTITUTIONAL MORALITY IN THE MACHINE AGE: REIMAGINING EQUALITY AND HUMAN DIGNITY IN AN ALGORITHMIC SOCIETY

AUTHORED BY - SHALINEE SHARMA

Abstract

The rapid integration of automated systems and artificial intelligence into governance, commerce, and public services has transformed the way decisions affecting human lives are made, often raising fundamental questions about their compatibility with constitutional morality and the protection of fundamental rights. This paper critically examines how automated decision-making challenges the normative framework of equality and human dignity enshrined in the Indian Constitution. Using a doctrinal and comparative methodology, the study draws on Indian constitutional jurisprudence, including landmark cases such as *Navtej Singh Johar v Union of India*¹ and *Justice K.S. Puttaswamy v Union of India*, as well as international frameworks governing AI ethics and accountability, to analyze the socio-legal implications of algorithmic discrimination. The analysis reveals a structural tension between opaque automated systems and the principles of equality, liberty, and dignity, demonstrating that technological neutrality does not guarantee fairness in society. By situating AI governance within a human-rights-based legal framework, the paper contributes to scholarly discourse on the integration of constitutional morality into emerging technologies. It proposes a normative model for ethical AI deployment in India, emphasizing transparency, accountability, and inclusivity. The study concludes that safeguarding equality and human dignity in an algorithmic society requires proactive legal and policy interventions, thereby ensuring that technological innovation strengthens democratic legitimacy rather than exacerbating social inequities.

Introduction

In the contemporary era, artificial intelligence and automated decision-making systems are no longer confined to the realms of science fiction; they are actively shaping governance, commerce, healthcare, education, and public services. Decisions once made by human

¹ *Navtej Singh Johar v Union of India* (2018) 10 SCC 1.

discretion—ranging from employment selection, credit approvals, welfare allocation, to predictive policing—are increasingly entrusted to algorithms designed to process vast amounts of data. While these technologies promise efficiency, consistency, and objectivity, they also carry the risk of perpetuating existing social inequalities, often in subtle and opaque ways. For vulnerable and marginalized communities, the consequences can be particularly severe, threatening to undermine the foundational principles of equality, justice, and human dignity that underpin the Indian Constitution. The increasing reliance on automated systems raises fundamental questions about their compatibility with the normative framework of constitutional morality, which seeks to harmonize law with ethical and societal values.²

Despite the transformative potential of these technologies, Indian constitutional and statutory law has yet to develop a comprehensive framework addressing the socio-legal implications of algorithmic decision-making. Articles 14 and 21 guarantee equality before the law and protection of life and personal liberty, yet they were framed long before the advent of intelligent systems capable of automated, large-scale decision-making.³ In practice, algorithmic opacity and embedded biases mean that technological neutrality does not guarantee fairness, creating a regulatory vacuum that can disproportionately affect marginalized populations, including women, lower-caste communities, and economically disadvantaged groups. This gap in law and governance underscores the urgent need to explore how constitutional morality can guide ethical and accountable AI deployment in India.⁴

The primary objective of this study is to critically examine the intersection of constitutional morality and automated decision-making, with a focus on the socio-legal implications of algorithmic governance. The study seeks to answer three key questions: Can automated decision-making violate the principles of equality and dignity under Articles 14 and 21? How can the doctrine of constitutional morality inform regulation and policy in the AI era? What lessons can India draw from international regulatory frameworks, such as the European Union’s Artificial Intelligence Act and UNESCO’s AI ethics guidelines, to ensure fairness, transparency, and accountability in algorithmic systems?⁵

² Navtej Singh Johar v Union of India (2018) 10 SCC 1.

³ Constitution of India, arts 14, 21.

⁴ NITI Aayog, National Strategy for Artificial Intelligence: #AIForAll (Government of India, 2018) <https://www.niti.gov.in/national-strategy-artificial-intelligence>

⁵ European Commission, ‘Proposal for a Regulation Laying Down Harmonized Rules on Artificial Intelligence (Artificial Intelligence Act)’ COM (2021) 206 final <https://digital-strategy.ec.europa.eu/en/library/proposal->

Methodologically, this paper adopts a doctrinal and comparative socio-legal approach. Primary sources include the Indian Constitution, landmark Supreme Court judgments such as *Navej Singh Johar v Union of India* and *Justice K.S. Puttaswamy (Privacy) v Union of India*, along with statutory documents and policy papers from both Indian and international bodies. Secondary sources comprise scholarly articles, reports, and commentaries that discuss algorithmic fairness, ethics, and socio-legal implications of technology in governance.⁶ By integrating these sources, the study situates technological challenges within the broader normative framework of constitutional morality.

The significance of this study lies in its contribution to a largely underexplored area of legal scholarship: the application of constitutional morality to contemporary technological governance. By highlighting the human impact of algorithmic decision-making, the paper seeks to foreground the ethical responsibility of law and policy in shaping AI systems that do not merely operate efficiently, but operate fairly. The ultimate aim is to propose a normative framework that aligns AI governance with the values of equality, human dignity, and accountability, thereby ensuring that technological innovation strengthens democratic legitimacy rather than exacerbating societal inequities.⁷

Constitutional Morality: The Ethical Core of Indian Jurisprudence

Constitutional morality serves as the moral compass of India's legal system, guiding judicial interpretation and legislative action to align with the ethical values enshrined in the Constitution. It goes beyond mere textual compliance or majoritarian preferences, ensuring that law operates in the interest of justice, equality, and human dignity. In the context of rapidly advancing technologies such as artificial intelligence and automated decision-making systems, constitutional morality acquires renewed significance. While these systems promise efficiency and objectivity, they can inadvertently perpetuate historical social inequalities. Constitutional morality, therefore, provides a normative lens through which such technological interventions must be assessed to ensure they do not violate fundamental rights or exacerbate existing disparities.⁸

regulation-laying-down-harmonised-rules-artificial-intelligence UNESCO, Recommendation on the Ethics of Artificial Intelligence (2021) <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000373434>

⁶ S Shukla, 'Algorithmic Bias and the Right to Equality in India' (2022) 14 *Indian Journal of Law and Technology* 45.

⁷ D Chandrachud, 'Constitutional Morality and the Supreme Court' (2018) 9 *NUJS Law Review* 23; *Indra Sawhney v Union of India* (1992) Supp (3) SCC 217.

⁸ D Chandrachud, 'Constitutional Morality and the Supreme Court' (2018) 9 *NUJS Law Review* 23.

The concept of constitutional morality is deeply rooted in the debates of the Constituent Assembly. Dr B.R. Ambedkar repeatedly emphasized that the Constitution was not merely a legal document but an instrument to achieve ethical and social transformation. He argued that constitutional morality should guide lawmaking and judicial review, ensuring that rights are interpreted in a manner that promotes social justice, equality, and the protection of vulnerable groups.⁹ Over the years, the Supreme Court has reinforced this idea, applying constitutional morality to safeguard individual liberties and address systemic discrimination. For instance, in *Shayara Bano v Union of India*, the Court struck down discriminatory practices in personal law, underscoring that ethical principles embedded in the Constitution must guide the application of law in contemporary society.¹⁰

Constitutional morality comprises several core principles, including equality, fairness, human dignity, justice, and ethical governance. These principles function as touchstones for evaluating both state action and emerging societal challenges. In socio-legal terms, constitutional morality ensures that laws and policies remain responsive to the evolving needs of society. It establishes a framework for judging the legitimacy of technological interventions by measuring them against human-centric values rather than mere technical efficiency. For example, automated systems used in public administration must be designed to uphold fairness, transparency, and accountability to avoid marginalizing disadvantaged communities.¹¹

Contemporary jurisprudence has further clarified the role of constitutional morality in interpreting fundamental rights. Landmark cases such as *Navtej Singh Johar v Union of India* and *Justice K.S. Puttaswamy (Privacy) v Union of India* highlight that constitutional morality is not an abstract concept but a guiding principle for practical governance. In these cases, the Court emphasized the ethical foundation of the Constitution, affirming that the protection of liberty, privacy, and equality requires moral reasoning that transcends rigid textual interpretation.¹²

Justice D.Y. Chandrachud has articulated that constitutional morality obliges courts and lawmakers to adopt a proactive stance in ensuring that laws and policies reflect the normative

⁹ Constituent Assembly Debates, Vol XI, 5 December 1948 (B R Ambedkar).

¹⁰ *Shayara Bano v Union of India* (2017) 9 SCC 1.

¹¹ *Indra Sawhney v Union of India* (1992) Supp (3) SCC 217.

¹² *Navtej Singh Johar v Union of India* (2018) 10 SCC 1.

values of equality and human dignity.¹³ These insights are particularly relevant in the context of algorithmic decision-making, where opaque systems may threaten the realization of fundamental rights unless assessed through the lens of constitutional morality.¹⁴

In the age of intelligent machines, constitutional morality provides a critical framework for regulating AI and automated systems. Ethical AI governance necessitates that algorithms operate in a manner consistent with principles of equality and human dignity. Policy frameworks such as NITI Aayog's Responsible AI for All and UNESCO's Recommendation on the Ethics of Artificial Intelligence echo this approach, emphasizing fairness, accountability, and inclusivity.¹⁵ By grounding AI governance in constitutional morality, India can ensure that technological advancement strengthens democracy and social justice rather than perpetuating inequality or discrimination.¹⁶

In sum, constitutional morality is the ethical core of Indian jurisprudence, bridging the gap between law and social justice. It ensures that legal interpretation, policymaking, and technological regulation are guided by principles that protect the most vulnerable members of society. In an era increasingly dominated by automated decision-making, this normative framework provides an indispensable tool to align technological innovation with human values, safeguarding equality, dignity, and fairness for all.

Algorithmic Decision Making and the Right to Equality

Artificial intelligence and automated decision-making systems are increasingly embedded in governance, banking, healthcare, education, and policing in India. These systems, designed to process large datasets and make decisions efficiently, have the potential to enhance administrative effectiveness and reduce human error. However, the very design of these systems often reflects existing societal biases, whether based on gender, caste, economic status, or regional disparities. The socio-legal stakes of algorithmic decision making (ADM) are profound, as errors or biases in automated systems can directly affect fundamental rights,

¹³ D Chandrachud (n 1).

¹⁴ S Shukla, 'Algorithmic Bias and the Right to Equality in India' (2022) 14 Indian Journal of Law and Technology 45.

¹⁵ NITI Aayog, Responsible AI for All: Approach Document (2021) <https://www.niti.gov.in> accessed 8 October 2025; UNESCO, Recommendation on the Ethics of Artificial Intelligence (2021) <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000373434>

¹⁶ B R Ambedkar, The Constitution of India: Notes on the Drafting (Government of India, 1949) 125.

including the right to equality under Article 14 of the Constitution. In a society where historical inequalities persist, reliance on opaque algorithms without ethical oversight may reinforce systemic discrimination rather than mitigate it.¹⁷

Algorithmic bias arises when the datasets, assumptions, or design choices embedded in AI systems produce unequal outcomes for different groups. Unlike intentional discrimination, algorithmic bias is often structural, unintentional, and hidden within complex computational processes. For instance, recruitment algorithms trained on historical hiring data may disadvantage women or candidates from certain social backgrounds. Similarly, AI-driven credit scoring models or predictive policing tools may inadvertently target marginalized communities due to biased training datasets. These issues highlight the ethical and legal dilemma of trusting ostensibly neutral systems to make consequential decisions about human lives.¹⁸ Studies have shown that bias in algorithmic systems is not just hypothetical but tangible, with real-world implications for socio-economic mobility, access to public services, and civic inclusion.¹⁹

The Indian judiciary has long emphasised equality and non-arbitrariness as foundational principles of Article 14. In *E.P. Royappa v State of Tamil Nadu*, the Supreme Court held that equality is antithetical to arbitrariness, emphasizing that any state action must be guided by reason and fairness.²⁰ In *Indra Sawhney v Union of India*, the Court recognized affirmative action as a constitutional tool to address historical inequalities, reinforcing that equality requires active measures to prevent systemic discrimination.²¹ More recently, in *Navtej Singh Johar v Union of India*, the Court expanded the scope of equality to protect marginalized and historically oppressed communities, interpreting Article 14 in light of human dignity and social justice.²² These principles are directly applicable to algorithmic decision making. ADM must not be assessed purely on technical efficiency but on whether it perpetuates or mitigates inequality in society.

¹⁷ Constitution of India, art 14.

¹⁸ S Shukla, 'Algorithmic Bias and the Right to Equality in India' (2022) 14 Indian Journal of Law and Technology 45.

¹⁹ NITI Aayog, National Strategy for Artificial Intelligence: #AIForAll (Government of India, 2018) <https://www.niti.gov.in/national-strategy-artificial-intelligence> accessed 8 October 2025.

²⁰ *E.P. Royappa v State of Tamil Nadu* (1974) 4 SCC 3.

²¹ *Indra Sawhney v Union of India* (1992) Supp (3) SCC 217.

²² *Navtej Singh Johar v Union of India* (2018) 10 SCC 1.

The socio-legal implications of ADM are significant. Automated systems influence access to essential services, economic opportunities, and social mobility. A biased algorithm in welfare distribution can deprive vulnerable citizens of life-saving benefits, while discriminatory hiring tools can entrench workplace inequality. The consequences are not abstract: individuals and communities experience material deprivation, social exclusion, and erosion of trust in public institutions. Comparative insights from international frameworks underscore the need for ethical oversight. The European Union's AI Act, UNESCO's AI Ethics Recommendations, and OECD AI Principles advocate for fairness, transparency, and accountability in automated systems, highlighting the global consensus that technology must be human-centric and socially responsible.²³

Legal and policy challenges in India remain formidable. While Article 14 guarantees equality, enforcing this right against algorithmic discrimination is complex. ADM often operates as a "black box," making it difficult to identify and rectify bias. There is limited jurisprudence explicitly addressing automated systems, and statutory frameworks for AI governance are still nascent. Ensuring accountability, explainability, and remedial mechanisms for affected individuals remains a critical legal challenge. Human-centred regulation is needed to translate constitutional equality into actionable protections in the digital era.²⁴

Linking back to constitutional morality, ADM must be evaluated not only for compliance with formal rules but also for alignment with ethical principles. Constitutional morality demands that decision-making systems respect human dignity, fairness, and equality. Embedding these principles in AI governance ensures that technology serves society without reproducing existing disparities. Policy frameworks such as NITI Aayog's Responsible AI for All and UNESCO's recommendations emphasize the ethical obligation of developers and regulators to design inclusive and accountable AI systems.²⁵ By grounding ADM in constitutional morality, India can prevent discrimination, uphold the right to equality, and foster social trust in emerging technologies.

In brief algorithmic decision making is a powerful tool with transformative potential, yet it

²⁴ S Shukla (n 2); NITI Aayog, Responsible AI for All: Approach Document (2021) <https://www.niti.gov.in> accessed 8 October 2025.

²⁵ D Chandrachud, 'Constitutional Morality and the Supreme Court' (2018) 9 NUJS Law Review 23; B R Ambedkar, *The Constitution of India: Notes on the Drafting* (Government of India, 1949) 125.

carries significant risks to equality and social justice. The intersection of AI and Article 14 illustrates that technological efficiency cannot replace ethical and legal oversight. Realising the promise of equality in an automated society requires embedding constitutional values directly into the design, deployment, and regulation of AI systems. By integrating human rights, ethical governance, and constitutional morality, India can ensure that algorithmic systems empower rather than marginalize, and advance the constitutional mandate of equality for all.²⁶

Integrating Constitutional Morality into AI Governance: Policy and Legal Recommendations

The deployment of artificial intelligence and automated decision-making systems offers unprecedented efficiency and analytical capacity in governance, public administration, healthcare, banking, and education. Yet, this technological promise carries profound ethical and socio-legal challenges. Without robust legal and policy frameworks, AI systems risk reproducing or exacerbating historical inequalities, particularly affecting marginalized communities. The ethical imperative of constitutional morality demands that AI governance not only comply with the law but also uphold the core principles of human dignity, equality, and fairness. Embedding these principles into AI governance ensures that technology serves society without undermining constitutional values or fundamental rights.²⁷

A principle-based framework for ethical AI governance must foreground the core values of the Constitution, including equality, non-discrimination, human dignity, fairness, and accountability. Every AI system deployed in public or private decision-making processes should be evaluated against these principles. For instance, recruitment algorithms should be designed to prevent gender or caste-based discrimination, while AI systems in social welfare should be audited to ensure equitable distribution of benefits. Human-centric governance means that developers and policymakers are ethically responsible for ensuring AI systems respect the rights of the most vulnerable populations and do not exacerbate existing social inequities.²⁸ International norms such as UNESCO's Recommendation on the Ethics of Artificial Intelligence and OECD's Principles on AI reinforce this approach, highlighting the

²⁶ Ibid

²⁷ D Chandrachud, 'Constitutional Morality and the Supreme Court' (2018) 9 NUJS Law Review 23.

²⁸ B R Ambedkar, The Constitution of India: Notes on the Drafting (Government of India, 1949) 125.

global consensus that AI must be socially responsible, inclusive, and transparent.²⁹

From a legal perspective, India currently lacks a comprehensive statutory framework specifically regulating AI or algorithmic decision-making. While Article 14 guarantees equality before the law, its application to automated systems is still largely interpretive. Judicial pronouncements, however, provide guiding principles. In *E.P. Royappa v State of Tamil Nadu*, the Supreme Court held that equality is antithetical to arbitrariness, mandating that state actions, including technological interventions, be reasonable and non-discriminatory³⁰. *Indra Sawhney v Union of India* emphasized the constitutional imperative to address historical inequalities through affirmative action, illustrating that equality sometimes requires proactive measures rather than formal parity.³¹ These precedents indicate that legal safeguards must be embedded within AI governance frameworks to ensure adherence to constitutional morality and the principles of equality and fairness.

Practical legal recommendations include the enactment of a statutory framework for AI accountability, which mandates:

Algorithmic impact assessments for systems that affect fundamental rights.

Transparency obligations, requiring explainability of AI decisions to affected individuals.

Redress mechanisms for citizens adversely impacted by automated decision-making systems.

Such measures would align legal accountability with constitutional morality, ensuring that technology does not operate in a vacuum but remains anchored in ethical and legal obligations.³²

Policy measures are equally critical for operationalising constitutional morality in AI governance. Governments should establish AI ethics boards within regulatory bodies to oversee the deployment of AI systems, ensuring compliance with fairness, transparency, and inclusivity standards. Periodic audits of algorithmic systems should be mandated to detect and correct biases, while grievance redressal mechanisms should empower individuals to challenge

²⁹ UNESCO, Recommendation on the Ethics of Artificial Intelligence (2021) <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000373434> accessed 8 October 2025; OECD, OECD Principles on AI (2019) <https://www.oecd.org/going-digital/ai/principles/>

³⁰ *E.P. Royappa v State of Tamil Nadu* (1974) 4 SCC 3.

³¹ *Indra Sawhney v Union of India* (1992) Supp (3) SCC 217.

³² S Shukla, 'Algorithmic Bias and the Right to Equality in India' (2022) 14 Indian Journal of Law and Technology 45.

discriminatory AI outcomes. Humanising these policies, it is essential to emphasise that behind every automated decision is a person whose life, livelihood, or dignity may be affected. International examples, such as the EU AI Act, provide guidance on structuring such policy frameworks, highlighting a multi-tiered approach combining legal, technical, and social oversight.³³

A multi-stakeholder approach is indispensable for effective AI governance. Constitutional morality requires collaboration between government regulators, the judiciary, private sector developers, civil society, and academic researchers. Multi-stakeholder participation ensures that AI systems are socially responsible, technically robust, and legally accountable. Public consultation and participatory governance models, coupled with algorithmic audits, can enhance trust and ensure that automated systems reflect societal values rather than merely technical efficiency. Human-centric governance demands continuous engagement with communities affected by AI, particularly marginalized groups, to ensure that technology empowers rather than excludes.³⁴

In integrating constitutional morality into AI governance, the overarching principle is that legal and ethical accountability must be intrinsic to the design, deployment, and regulation of AI systems. AI should not merely be efficient; it must be just, equitable, and aligned with the fundamental rights guaranteed by the Constitution. Embedding constitutional morality into governance frameworks strengthens democratic legitimacy, protects the vulnerable, and ensures that technological innovation advances social justice rather than reinforcing historical disparities.³⁵

Operationalising constitutional morality in AI governance is both a legal and ethical necessity. India has the opportunity to lead by example, developing a governance framework where AI systems are accountable, transparent, and socially responsible. Legal statutes, regulatory policies, and multi-stakeholder mechanisms must work in tandem to ensure that AI enhances equality, dignity, and fairness in society. By grounding AI governance in constitutional morality, India can safeguard fundamental rights, foster public trust, and demonstrate that

³³ European Commission, 'Proposal for a Regulation Laying Down Harmonised Rules on Artificial Intelligence (Artificial Intelligence Act)' COM (2021) 206 final <https://digital-strategy.ec.europa.eu/en/library/proposal-regulation-laying-down-harmonised-rules-artificial-intelligence>

³⁴ NITI Aayog, Responsible AI for All: Approach Document (2021) <https://www.niti.gov.in>

³⁵ D Chandrachud (n 1).

technological progress and ethical governance are mutually reinforcing, rather than contradictory.³⁶

Conclusion and the Path Forward

The integration of artificial intelligence into governance, commerce, and public life has irrevocably altered the relationship between the State, technology, and citizens. While automated systems promise efficiency and objectivity, they also risk amplifying structural inequities embedded within data and social systems. This article has sought to demonstrate that constitutional morality—as articulated by the Supreme Court provides a crucial ethical compass to guide the governance of algorithmic technologies in India. The constitutional values of equality, liberty, dignity, and fraternity are not merely aspirational. they must shape the principles of design, deployment, and regulation of all technologies that impact human lives.³⁷ As Justice D.Y. Chandrachud observed, constitutional morality ensures that governance remains faithful to the transformative promise of the Constitution, even in new domains such as digital governance and AI.³⁸

The preceding analysis reveals that algorithmic decision-making, if left unchecked, can violate the fundamental right to equality under Article 14 by introducing arbitrariness and discrimination into administrative processes. Judicial precedents such as *E.P. Royappa v State of Tamil Nadu* underscored that arbitrariness is antithetical to equality,³⁹ while *Indra Sawhney v Union of India* reaffirmed the importance of substantive equality as a means to achieve social justice.⁴⁰ Furthermore, in *Navtej Singh Johar v Union of India*, the Court expanded the idea of constitutional morality to ensure that dignity and inclusion are central to the interpretation of rights.⁴¹ These doctrinal developments highlight that the right to equality must evolve in response to technological transformations, ensuring that digital governance systems remain consistent with the moral vision of the Constitution.

To align artificial intelligence with constitutional morality, India must adopt a rights-based and human-centric approach to AI governance. This requires the establishment of a robust statutory

³⁶ B R Ambedkar (n 2).

³⁷ B R Ambedkar, *The Constitution of India: Notes on the Drafting* (Government of India, 1949) 125.

³⁸ D Y Chandrachud, 'Constitutional Morality and the Supreme Court' (2018) 9 NUJS Law Review 23.

³⁹ *E.P. Royappa v State of Tamil Nadu* (1974) 4 SCC 3.

⁴⁰ *Indra Sawhney v Union of India* (1992) Supp (3) SCC 217.

⁴¹ *Navtej Singh Johar v Union of India* (2018) 10 SCC 1.

framework that mandates algorithmic accountability, transparency, and non-discrimination. Legislation should require algorithmic impact assessments, particularly for AI systems used in public administration, welfare distribution, or law enforcement. These assessments can evaluate whether the system adheres to equality norms and avoids disparate impact on vulnerable groups. Inspired by global standards such as the UNESCO Recommendation on the Ethics of Artificial Intelligence and the OECD Principles on AI, India can adopt guidelines ensuring that fairness, inclusivity, and human oversight remain integral to the technological ecosystem.⁴²

Policy mechanisms must complement legal reforms. The government, in partnership with private actors and civil society, should institutionalise AI Ethics Boards under statutory regulators. These boards can ensure compliance with fairness standards, conduct periodic audits, and develop grievance redressal systems for those affected by biased or erroneous AI decisions. NITI Aayog's Responsible AI for All framework already outlines preliminary measures for ethical AI deployment in India, emphasizing transparency and accountability.⁴³ However, its recommendations require legislative reinforcement to move from principle to practice. Public trust in AI systems can only be sustained through mechanisms that make technology explainable, participatory, and accountable to the people it serves.

Beyond regulatory structures, integrating constitutional morality into AI governance requires interdisciplinary collaboration between lawyers, technologists, ethicists, and sociologists. The jurisprudence of constitutional morality is inherently dynamic, it adapts to changing social realities. Therefore, judicial engagement with algorithmic fairness, explainability, and human dignity must evolve continuously. Courts could, in time, interpret constitutional guarantees in light of digital-era challenges, developing doctrines that hold algorithmic systems to the same constitutional scrutiny as state actions. This approach would align with the spirit of *Puttaswamy v Union of India*, which recognised privacy and autonomy as facets of human dignity in a technological context.⁴⁴

⁴² UNESCO, Recommendation on the Ethics of Artificial Intelligence (2021) <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000373434> accessed 8 October 2025; OECD, OECD Principles on Artificial Intelligence (2019) <https://www.oecd.org/going-digital/ai/principles/>

⁴³ NITI Aayog, Responsible AI for All: Approach Document (2021) <https://www.niti.gov.in> accessed 8 October 2025.

⁴⁴ Justice K.S. Puttaswamy (Privacy) v Union of India (2017) 10 SCC 1.

Looking forward, future research and policy must address key issues such as algorithmic explainability, data protection, and human oversight in AI governance. Legal academia should engage in empirical studies of algorithmic decision-making to understand its real-world impact on equality and justice. These findings can inform judicial interpretation and legislative reform, ensuring that constitutional morality remains the living soul of governance in the digital age. As scholars like Kate Crawford have argued, the invisible power structures within AI systems demand ethical and legal scrutiny that centres on human welfare rather than technological determinism.⁴⁵

In conclusion, the path forward lies in reaffirming that technological progress must never come at the expense of human dignity. Constitutional morality, as envisioned by Dr. B.R. Ambedkar, is the moral compass that ensures governance remains rooted in justice and equality, not power or efficiency.⁴⁶ The constitutional vision of a just, egalitarian society demands that emerging technologies like AI be regulated not only by the rule of law but also by the rule of conscience. If constitutional morality becomes the guiding principle of AI governance, India can pioneer a model that harmonizes technological innovation with social justice, safeguarding the promise of equality and human dignity in the machine age.

⁴⁵ K Crawford, *Atlas of AI: Power, Politics, and the Planetary Costs of Artificial Intelligence* (Yale University Press 2021) 101–110.

⁴⁶ B R Ambedkar (n 1).