International Research Journal on Advanced Engineering and Management
https://goldncloudpublications.com
https://doi.org/10.47392/IRJAEM.2025.0549
e ISSN: 2584-2854
Volume: 03 Issue: 12
December 2025
Page No: 3458 - 3463

Good Governance and The Role of Artificial Intelligence in India: Scope, Limitations, And Remedy

Dr. D. Umamaheswari[1]
[1]*Associate Professor the Tamil Nadu Dr. Ambedkar Law University, Chennai, India.*
Emails: *drumamaheswari.d@gmail.com*[1]

Abstract
Artificial Intelligence (AI) is transforming governance worldwide, offering unprecedented opportunities for efficiency, transparency, and inclusiveness. In India, AI is increasingly integrated into public service delivery, policing, judicial processes, urban management, and welfare schemes. However, the rapid deployment of AI also raises constitutional, ethical, and legal challenges, particularly concerning privacy, non-discrimination, accountability, and transparency. This paper examines the evolution of AI in Indian governance, constitutional safeguards, international norms, comparative law, judicial interpretations, and regulatory remedies. The study concludes with recommendations for a comprehensive AI governance framework aligned with India's constitutional values and global best practices.

Keywords: *Artificial Intelligence, Good Governance, Constitutional Law, Algorithmic Accountability, Digital Rights*

1. Introduction
Artificial Intelligence (AI) refers to computational systems capable of performing tasks that typically require human intelligence, including learning, reasoning, problem-solving, and language processing. In governance, AI offers opportunities to enhance efficiency, accuracy, and transparency, while facilitating predictive and data-driven decision-making. In India, AI intersects with public service delivery, welfare schemes, urban governance, law enforcement, and judicial administration. AI-enabled governance in India spans multiple sectors, including welfare, policing, judiciary, urban management, and healthcare. The aim of this research article is to examine AI's role in Indian governance, evaluate constitutional safeguards, compare international approaches, identify limitations, and propose remedies.

2. Evolution of Artificial Intelligence In Indian Governance:
India's AI journey is rooted in its Digital Public Infrastructure (DPI). Initiatives such as Aadhaar, Unified Payments Interface (UPI), and the National Digital Health Mission have created foundational datasets enabling large-scale AI applications.

Institutional Frameworks such as the National Strategy for Artificial Intelligence (2018). NITI Aayog identified priority sectors: healthcare, agriculture, education, smart mobility, and smart cities.[1] India AI Mission (2023), as Ministry of Electronics and IT established research centre's, data governance offices, and ethical AI guidelines.[2] State-Level AI Programs in States such as Telangana, Karnataka, Tamil Nadu, and Maharashtra implement AI in traffic management, crop forecasting, municipal services, and digital policing. Sectoral Deployment such as the Welfare Delivery: AI-assisted fraud detection, biometric authentication, and benefits tracking.[3] Policing: Facial recognition, predictive policing, and surveillance dashboards.[4] Judiciary: AI tools for legal research, translation, and case summarization (SUPACE, SUVAS).[5] Healthcare & Disaster Management: Disease prediction, telemedicine, and climate modeling.[6] Urban Governance: Smart city management using traffic optimization, water distribution, and waste management analytics.[7]

3. AI and Constitutional Pillars of Good Governance:

International Research Journal on Advanced Engineering and Management
https://goldncloudpublications.com
https://doi.org/10.47392/IRJAEM.2025.0549
e ISSN: 2584-2854
Volume: 03 Issue: 12
December 2025
Page No: 3458 - 3463

Rule of Law and Non-Arbitrariness (Article 14) as the decisions by AI systems must be non-arbitrary. Bias, data skew, and opaque algorithms violate Article 14 principles.[8] *Privacy and Informational Autonomy* (Article 21) in the case K.S. Puttaswamy v. Union of India recognized privacy as part of Article 21. AI systems must satisfy proportionality: legitimate aim, rational nexus, necessity, and balance.[9] *Freedom of Speech* (Article 19(1)(a)) with AI surveillance can chill free expression. Anuradha Bhasin v. Union of India mandates proportionality and necessity in restrictions. [10] *Equality in the Digital State*, with AI must avoid discrimination against marginalized communities, women, linguistic minorities, and economically vulnerable groups. Inclusive datasets, audits, and grievance mechanisms are essential. [11]*Opacity and Accountability* with the Black-box algorithms impede explain ability and judicial review. Explainable AI (XAI) is constitutionally necessary for decisions affecting rights.[12] AI and Good Governance: Opportunities and Strengths in AI can lead to the followind advantages in administration of a country. Transparency: AI dashboards in welfare, urban governance, and judiciary improve citizen access and predict policy outcomes.[13] Efficiency: Case prioritization, resource allocation, and fraud detection enhance administrative efficiency.[14] Inclusiveness: AI assists in identifying underserved populations and delivering proactive support.[15]Accountability: Audit trails and standardized decision-making reinforce rule-of-law compliance.[16] Risks and Limitations: A Constitutional Critique: Algorithmic Bias and Discrimination: Skewed datasets can systematically disadvantage vulnerable groups.[17] Privacy and Surveillance Risks: Mass data collection, facial recognition, and black-box algorithms threaten Article 21 rights.[18] Accountability Gaps: Liability for AI errors remains unclear under the IT Act and administrative law.[19]Ethical and Social Risks: Digital exclusion, chilling effects on expression, and dependence on foreign AI systems are major concerns.[20] Legal Deficiencies: Absence of AI-specific legislation, mandatory audits, and impact assessments weakens safeguards.[21] The International Standards And Conventions give guidelines to deal with these issues. As such the UN SDGs & UNESCO AI Ethics (2021): Promote human rights, transparency, fairness, and accountability.[22] OECD AI Principles: Inclusive growth, human-centered values, robustness, transparency, and accountability.[23] EU AI Act & GDPR: Risk-based classification, high-risk AI regulation, mandatory audits, and data protection.[24] ILO Guidelines: Human-centric automation, labor protection, and reskilling in AI adoption.[25] Human Rights Impact Assessments (HRIA): Recommended for public AI projects.[26] This comparative map demonstrates that India should combine EU-style rights protections with Singapore-style operational frameworks and U.S.-style innovation flexibility. EU: Risk-based AI classification, mandatory audits.[27] USA: Sectoral guidance, innovation-friendly risk management.[28] Singapore: Model AI Governance Framework emphasizing transparency and human oversight.[29] South Korea: Ethics guidelines for bias-free, explainable AI.[30] It gives the understanding that the risk-based classification, mandatory audits, human oversight, and transparency are global best practices.

4. Role of Judiciary in Interpreting the Role Of AI For Good Governance:

Good governance, as understood within the Indian constitutional framework, is not merely an administrative ideal but a normative commitment derived from constitutional morality and democratic values. The Supreme Court has repeatedly held that governance must be transparent, accountable, fair, responsive, inclusive, and aligned with the rule of law. Artificial Intelligence, when integrated into state functions, must therefore conform to these constitutional benchmarks. This section expands on the relationship between AI-driven governance and India's constitutional architecture. Article 14 guarantees equality before law and equal protection of laws. It prohibits arbitrariness in state action, as established in *E.P. Royappa v. State of Tamil Nadu* , this case introduced the doctrine that arbitrariness violates equality. AI-driven decisions that lack explainability or fairness are inherently arbitrary and later expanded in *Maneka Gandhi v. Union of India*. When governance decisions are automated or

International Research Journal on Advanced Engineering and Management
https://goldncloudpublications.com
https://doi.org/10.47392/IRJAEM.2025.0549
e ISSN: 2584-2854
Volume: 03 Issue: 12
December 2025
Page No: 3458 - 3463

assisted by AI, the test of reasonableness and non-arbitrariness acquires new dimensions. K.S. Puttaswamy v. Union of India (2017) 10 SCC 1: Privacy as part of Article 21.[31] Under the doctrine of proportionality formalized in *Modern Dental College v. State of Madhya Pradesh* and affirmed in *Puttaswamy* any restriction on rights must be: legitimate in aim, rationally connected to the objective, necessary (least restrictive means),proportionate overall. AI-driven decisions that significantly affect individual rights (e.g., surveillance tagging, automated welfare exclusion) must satisfy this four-prong test. Without legislative safeguards, transparency, or human oversight, they seldom do. Anuradha Bhasin v. Union of India (2020) 3 SCC 637: Internet shutdowns and free expression.[32] E.P. Royappa v. State of Tamil Nadu (1974) 4 SCC 3: Administrative arbitrariness.[33] In *Kranti Associates v. Masood Ahmed Khan*, (2010) 9 SCC 496, the Supreme Court emphasized the constitutional requirement of "reasoned decisions." AI algorithms often operate as black boxes, producing outputs without clear explanations. When administrative decisions such as welfare denial or predictive policing alerts are based on opaque AI systems, affected individuals cannot challenge or understand the basis of the decision. Aadhaar Case (2018) 1 SCC 1: Consent, proportionality, and purpose limitation in biometric data use.[34] The Supreme Court in the *Aadhaar* judgment emphasized that denial of benefits due to technological errors is unconstitutional. AI magnifies these risks. AI enhances state capacity but simultaneously increases the vulnerability of citizens especially the poor, minorities, and digitally excluded. The central challenge is to deploy AI in ways that enhance, not diminish, constitutional democracy. Shreya Singhal v. Union of India (2015) 5 SCC 1 Struck down Section 66A IT Act for vagueness. Its principles apply to algorithmic content moderation is held to be vague AI classification of harmful content is unconstitutional and the subjective interpretations cannot govern fundamental rights. PUCL v. Union of India (2003) 4SCC 399, Supreme Court held that, in Telephone Tapping Case Laid down safeguards for surveillance. These principles extend to AI-enabled surveillance tools with authorization, oversight, necessity, record-keeping and review mechanism

5. Comparative Law Study

Table 1 Comparative Insight Summary

Jurisdiction	Regulatory Character	Strengths	Weaknesses	Lessons for India
EU	Comprehensive statute	Rights-based, accountability	Heavy compliance burden	Useful for public sector AI
USA	Sectoral, innovation-first	Flexible, market-driven	Lacks unified law	Protect innovation while guiding AI
Singapore	Practical, risk-based	Operationally sound	Limited civil liberties oversight	Balanced governance model
China	State-centric	Strong enforcement	Weak rights protection	Technical rigor, but rights must be prioritized
South Korea	Ethical + legal	Fairness, safety	Diffuse jurisdiction	Ethical grounding for Indian AI

International Research Journal on Advanced Engineering and Management
https://goldncloudpublications.com
https://doi.org/10.47392/IRJAEM.2025.0549
e ISSN: 2584-2854
Volume: 03 Issue: 12
December 2025
Page No: 3458 - 3463

Table 2 Case Law Synthesis

Doctrine	Case	Relevance to AI
Privacy	Puttaswamy	Data collection, surveillance, profiling
Proportionality	Aadhaar, Anuradha Bhasin	AI-based restrictions on rights
Due Process	Maneka Gandhi	Automated decisions
Non-Arbitrariness	Royappa	Algorithmic bias, opacity
Free Speech	Shreya Singhal	Automated content moderation
Surveillance Safeguards	PUCL	AI surveillance systems
Dignity	Gurmit Singh	Sensitive data handling

Constitutional Doctrines Applicable to AI This jurisprudential foundation provides a strong theoretical basis for AI regulation in India. The rapid integration of AI into governance necessitates a robust multi-layered regulatory and institutional ecosystem. This section proposes comprehensive legal, judicial, ethical, and institutional remedies designed to ensure that AI deployment aligns with constitutional values, international best practices, and democratic accountability.

6. Remedies and Regulatory Framework

Artificial Intelligence is reshaping the architecture of governance in India. Its promise lies in transforming administrative processes with unprecedented speed, efficiency, and analytical power. It can enhance transparency, improve service delivery, strengthen accountability, and support targeted welfare interventions. Yet AI also poses constitutional, ethical, and social risks particularly concerning privacy, equality, due process, and democratic oversight. The Indian Constitution provides a powerful framework for governing AI. Articles 14, 19, and 21, along with principles of administrative fairness and constitutional morality, offer foundational safeguards. However, existing legal provisions are insufficient to address the complexities of algorithmic governance. India must therefore adopt a comprehensive AI regulatory architecture that integrates legal, technical, and ethical safeguards. The future of AI in Indian governance must rest on five pillars: Human-centric design rooted in dignity and rights. Transparency and accountability as non-negotiable requirements. Robust regulatory oversight through an independent authority. Participatory governance ensuring citizen involvement. Ethical and inclusive practices preventing bias and exclusion. AI must remain a tool that strengthens democracy, not a mechanism that undermines it. Ultimately, governance should not be driven merely by technological capability but by constitutional values, human rights, and social justice. Actionable Recommendations are to enact a comprehensive AI law grounded in risk-based regulation. With a comparative adaptation of EU, Singapore, USA models[39]; Establish an independent AI regulatory authority with investigative and enforcement powers. Legislative Measures: PDPB, IT Act, proposed AI legislation.[35] Introduce mandatory algorithmic impact assessments for all high-risk government AI systems. Judicial Remedies: PIL, RTI, compensation, corrective relief.[36] Institutional Mechanisms: Independent AI authority, human-in-the-loop systems, algorithmic impact assessments, transparency reports.[37] Ensure human-in-the-loop oversight in welfare, policing, and judicial AI. Mandate algorithmic transparency portals for all public-sector AI deployments. Ethical and Social Measures: Bias mitigation, digital inclusion, ethics training.[38] Reform the Data Protection Bill to add AI-specific rights like explanation and contestation. Build AI ethics committees in every ministry and state government. Strengthen judicial doctrines for AI accountability, including compensation for harm. Promote digital inclusion programs to prevent exclusion of

International Research Journal on Advanced Engineering and Management
https://goldncloudpublications.com
https://doi.org/10.47392/IRJAEM.2025.0549
e ISSN: 2584-2854
Volume: 03 Issue: 12
December 2025
Page No: 3458 - 3463

marginalized groups. Institutionalize continuous public engagement and AI literacy initiatives. By embracing these steps, India can build an AI ecosystem that is both innovative and constitutionally grounded ensuring that technological progress advances democratic governance and social justice.

Conclusion and Suggestions

AI enhances governance but poses constitutional, ethical, and social risks. Legislation, regulatory institutions, and judicial oversight are essential. Human-centric, explainable, auditable AI aligns with Articles 14, 19, 21, and Directive Principles. Global best practices provide actionable models for India. AI's future depends on governance, not technology alone. Artificial Intelligence is reshaping the architecture of governance in India. Its promise lies in transforming administrative processes with unprecedented speed, efficiency, and analytical power. It can enhance transparency, improve service delivery, strengthen accountability, and support targeted welfare interventions. Yet AI also poses constitutional, ethical, and social risks particularly concerning privacy, equality, due process, and democratic oversight.

The Indian Constitution provides a powerful framework for governing AI. Articles 14, 19, and 21, along with principles of administrative fairness and constitutional morality, offer foundational safeguards. However, existing legal provisions are insufficient to address the complexities of algorithmic governance. India must therefore adopt a comprehensive AI regulatory architecture that integrates legal, technical, and ethical safeguards. The future of AI in Indian governance must rest on five pillars: ***Human-centric design*** rooted in dignity and rights. ***Transparency and accountability*** as non-negotiable requirements. ***Robust regulatory oversight*** through an independent authority. **Participatory governance** ensuring citizen involvement. ***Ethical and inclusive practices*** preventing bias and exclusion. AI must remain a tool that strengthens democracy, not a mechanism that undermines it. Ultimately, governance should not be driven merely by technological capability but by constitutional values, human rights, and social justice.

References

[1]. NITI Aayog, National Strategy for Artificial Intelligence: #AIforAll (2018).
[2]. Ministry of Electronics & Information Technology, Government of India, IndiaAI Mission: Vision, Architecture and Roadmap (2023).
[3]. Ministry of Finance, Government of India, Direct Benefit Transfer Mission: Annual Report 2022–23.
[4]. Telangana State Police, Integrated People Information Hub (IPIH): Technical Architecture Report (2021).
[5]. Supreme Court of India, SUPACE: Supreme Court Portal for Assistance in Court Efficiency — Concept Note (2021); Supreme Court of India, SUVAS Translation System Report (2021).
[6]. National Health Authority, Government of India, National Digital Health Mission—Health Data Management Policy (2020).
[7]. Ministry of Housing and Urban Affairs, Government of India, Smart Cities Mission: Annual Evaluation Report (2022).
[8]. E.P. Royappa v. State of Tamil Nadu, (1974) 4 SCC 3.
[9]. K.S. Puttaswamy v. Union of India, (2017) 10 SCC 1 (the Right to Privacy case).
[10]. Anuradha Bhasin v. Union of India, (2020) 3 SCC 637.
[11]. United Nations Human Rights Council, UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights (2011).
[12]. European Commission, Ethics Guidelines for Trustworthy Artificial Intelligence (High-Level Expert Group on AI, 2019).
[13]. Government of Karnataka, AI-Based Governance Dashboard for Public Service Delivery: White Paper (2022).
[14]. Comptroller & Auditor General of India (CAG), Performance Audit Report on e-Governance and IT Systems in Government Departments (2021).
[15]. UNICEF India, Artificial Intelligence for Social Inclusion in India: Status and Recommendations (2021).

International Research Journal on Advanced Engineering and Management
https://goldncloudpublications.com
https://doi.org/10.47392/IRJAEM.2025.0549
e ISSN: 2584-2854
Volume: 03 Issue: 12
December 2025
Page No: 3458 - 3463

[16]. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), Government at a Glance 2023.
[17]. Joy Buolamwini & Timnit Gebru, Gender Shades: Intersectional Accuracy Disparities in Commercial Gender Classification, 81 Proc. Mach. Learn. Res. 1 (2018).
[18]. Internet Freedom Foundation, Project Panoptic: A Study on Facial Recognition in India (2021).
[19]. Information Technology Act, No. 21 of 2000, §§ 43, 72, 79 (India).
[20]. United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (UNHCHR), The Right to Privacy in the Digital Age: Annual Report (2021).
[21]. Vidhi Centre for Legal Policy, Building an Accountability Framework for Artificial Intelligence in India (2022).
[22]. UNESCO, Recommendation on the Ethics of Artificial Intelligence (2021).
[23]. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), OECD Principles on Artificial Intelligence (2019).
[24]. European Parliament & Council, Artificial Intelligence Act (2024) (Provisional Final Text).
[25]. International Labour Organization (ILO), Human-Centric Artificial Intelligence Guidelines for the Future of Work (2022).
[26]. Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR), Human Rights Impact Assessments for Digital Technologies (2020).
[27]. European Commission, Impact Assessment Accompanying the Proposal for a Regulation Laying Down Harmonised Rules on Artificial Intelligence (AI Act), SWD(2021) 84 final.
[28]. National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST), U.S. Department of Commerce, AI Risk Management Framework (2023).
[29]. Infocomm Media Development Authority (IMDA) of Singapore, Model AI Governance Framework, 2nd ed. (2020).
[30]. Ministry of Science and ICT, Republic of Korea, National Guidelines for Ethical Use of Artificial Intelligence (2019).
[31]. K.S. Puttaswamy v. Union of India, (2017) 10 SCC 1.
[32]. Anuradha Bhasin v. Union of India, (2020) 3 SCC 637.
[33]. E.P. Royappa v. State of Tamil Nadu, (1974) 4 SCC 3.
[34]. K.S. Puttaswamy (Aadhaar) v. Union of India, (2019) 1 SCC 1.
[35]. Personal Data Protection Bill, 2019, Ministry of Electronics & IT (withdrawn 2022).
[36]. People's Union for Civil Liberties v. Union of India (Telephone Tapping Case), (1997) 1 SCC 301.
[37]. UK Information Commissioner's Office (ICO), Guidance on the AI Auditing Framework (2021).
[38]. World Economic Forum, Global AI Ethics Guidelines Mapping Report (2023).
[39]. Comparative synthesis prepared from: EU AI Act (2024); NIST AI Risk Management Framework (2023); Singapore Model AI Governance Framework (2020).