



International Journal of Advance Studies and Growth Evaluation

A Sustainable Development of Indian Society under Constitutional Values: With Special Reference to Artificial Intelligence

^{*1} Jyoti Verma

^{*1} Assistant Professor, Shriji Institute of Legal and Vocational Education and Research (SILVER Law College), Bareilly, Uttar Pradesh, India.

Article Info.

E-ISSN: 2583-6528

Impact Factor (QJIF): 8.4

Peer Reviewed Journal

Available online:

www.alladvancejournal.com

Received: 17/Aug/2026

Accepted: 14/Sep/2026

Abstract

Artificial Intelligence (AI) is increasingly influencing public administration, education, employment, healthcare, finance, communication, policing, and access to essential services. Its developmental promise is substantial, but so are the risks arising from automated discrimination, opaque decision-making, privacy intrusions, misinformation, exclusion, labour displacement, and environmental costs. This paper examines whether the constitutional values embedded in the Indian constitutional order can provide a normative and legal framework for ensuring that AI contributes to sustainable development rather than deepening existing social inequalities. It develops the proposition that constitutional values should function not merely as limits on State power but as design principles for responsible technological governance. The analysis connects dignity, liberty, equality, non-discrimination, privacy, fraternity, social justice, rule of law, accountability and environmental responsibility with contemporary AI governance in India. The paper adopts a doctrinal and analytical methodology based on the Constitution of India, legislation, judicial decisions, government policy documents, international instruments and selected academic literature. It studies the relationship between Articles 14, 19 and 21, Directive Principles of State Policy, Fundamental Duties, constitutional morality and the emerging governance framework for AI. Particular attention is given to the Digital Personal Data Protection Act, 2023, the Digital Personal Data Protection Rules, 2025, NITI Aayog's Responsible AI framework, the IndiaAI Mission, and UNESCO's Recommendation on the Ethics of Artificial Intelligence. The paper argues for a constitutional sustainability matrix combining rights protection, risk-based governance, human oversight, explainability, institutional accountability, inclusion, AI literacy and environmental assessment. The central contribution of the paper is a proposed Indian Constitutional AI Sustainability Framework. Under this framework, AI systems affecting rights or access to public and essential services should be subjected to proportionality review, equality and bias assessment, privacy and data-governance safeguards, meaningful human oversight, reasons and review mechanisms, accountability allocation, accessibility standards, and sustainability assessment. Such an approach can permit technological innovation while preserving the constitutional identity of Indian society.

*Corresponding Author

Jyoti Verma

Assistant Professor, Shriji Institute of
Legal and Vocational Education and
Research (SILVER Law College),
Bareilly, Uttar Pradesh, India.

Keywords: Artificial Intelligence; Constitution of India; Sustainable Development; Constitutional Values; Fundamental Rights; Privacy; Equality; Responsible AI; Data Protection; Rule of Law.

1. Introduction

The contemporary transformation produced by Artificial Intelligence is not simply a technological development; it is a transformation in the conditions under which individuals participate in social, economic and civic life. AI systems increasingly classify persons, recommend opportunities, detect patterns, generate content, allocate attention, support administrative decisions and influence the distribution of

resources. The constitutional question therefore extends beyond whether a particular AI tool is efficient. It concerns the conditions under which technological power can be exercised consistently with human dignity, equality, liberty and democratic accountability.

In India, the constitutional framework is particularly significant because the Constitution is not limited to a catalogue of negative restraints. Its Preamble, Fundamental

Rights, Directive Principles of State Policy and Fundamental Duties collectively articulate a vision of justice, liberty, equality and fraternity. The Constitution also structures public power through legality, institutional accountability and judicial review. AI governance must therefore be considered within this larger constitutional ecosystem rather than as an isolated question of technical regulation.

Sustainable development adds a second dimension. Development cannot be regarded as sustainable merely because it increases productivity or economic output. Sustainable development requires inter-generational responsibility, social inclusion, environmental protection and institutional conditions that allow individuals to participate meaningfully in development. AI can support these objectives through better public services, agricultural applications, health technologies, educational tools, language technologies and climate-related analysis. Conversely, poorly governed AI can reproduce structural discrimination, intensify digital exclusion, compromise privacy, consume significant computational resources and shift risks onto groups that have the least capacity to contest automated decisions.

India's policy approach has already recognised the need for responsible AI. NITI Aayog's Responsible AI work identifies principles including safety and reliability, equality, inclusivity and non-discrimination, privacy and security, transparency, accountability and protection of positive human values. The IndiaAI Mission, approved in March 2024, combines infrastructure, datasets, innovation, future skills, application development, financing and Safe & Trusted AI. These initiatives demonstrate that AI policy is not confined to innovation alone; it also encompasses public trust, inclusion and responsible deployment.

The legal position is nevertheless evolving. The Digital Personal Data Protection Act, 2023 provides a statutory framework for processing digital personal data, while the Digital Personal Data Protection Rules, 2025 establish implementation details and a phased commencement structure. At the constitutional level, judicial decisions on privacy, equality, free speech and due process provide principles that can be applied to technologically mediated State and private action. The challenge is to translate these general principles into operational safeguards for AI systems.

This Paper Consequently Asks Three Related Questions

First, what constitutional values are most relevant to AI-enabled development in India; second, how existing Indian law and policy respond to AI-related risks; and third, what governance architecture can reconcile innovation with sustainable and rights-respecting development?

2. Research Objectives, Questions and Methodology

Objectives. The first objective is to identify the constitutional values that should guide AI development in India. The second is to examine the relationship between Fundamental Rights and AI-related risks, particularly privacy, equality, freedom of expression and access to public services. The third is to evaluate the contribution and limitations of existing legal and policy instruments. The fourth is to formulate a practical constitutional framework for sustainable AI governance.

Research questions. (1) How can constitutional values operate as substantive principles for AI governance? (2) How should Articles 14, 19 and 21 apply when algorithmic systems influence decisions affecting individuals? (3) What safeguards are necessary to prevent AI from reinforcing existing social and economic inequalities? (4) How can India promote AI

innovation while preserving accountability, privacy, environmental responsibility and human agency?

Methodology. The study follows a doctrinal, analytical and interdisciplinary approach. Primary legal materials include the Constitution of India, legislation, judicial decisions and subordinate legislation. Secondary materials include government policy documents, international standards and academic literature on AI governance, constitutional law and sustainable development. The analysis is normative in the legal sense: it identifies principles from existing law and develops a structured framework for their application to AI. No empirical survey or statistical causal inference is claimed.

Scope and limitations. The paper focuses principally on civil and constitutional dimensions of AI in India. It does not attempt to provide technical specifications for machine-learning models, nor does it evaluate individual commercial AI products. Because AI regulation is evolving rapidly, the discussion of statutes and policy instruments is framed as of September 2026 and should be checked against subsequent amendments, notifications and judicial decisions before journal publication.

3. Constitutional Values and the IDEA of Sustainable Development

The constitutional vision of India begins with justice-social, economic and political-and continues through liberty, equality and fraternity. These values have practical significance for technological governance. A technology that expands efficiency while systematically denying equal participation cannot be treated as constitutionally neutral merely because the underlying software is private or technically sophisticated. Article 14 establishes equality before law and equal protection of laws. In the AI context, equality concerns both discriminatory outcomes and the design of decision-making systems. A model trained on historically unequal data may reproduce patterns that disadvantage particular groups. The constitutional inquiry should therefore consider not only intentional discrimination but also whether the deployment of an AI system has an unjustifiable disparate impact, whether adequate safeguards exist, and whether the affected person can challenge the decision.

Article 19 protects several freedoms relevant to the digital environment, including speech and expression. Generative AI and recommendation systems create new questions concerning content moderation, synthetic media, automated amplification and restrictions on online expression. Constitutional analysis requires legality, legitimate purpose and proportionality rather than technological convenience alone. Restrictions must remain within constitutional limits, while platforms and public authorities must also address unlawful or harmful content through lawful procedures.

Article 21, as interpreted by the Supreme Court, has become a major source of protection for dignity, autonomy, privacy and procedural fairness. In *K.S. Puttaswamy v Union of India*, privacy was recognised as a constitutionally protected right and intrusions were subjected to requirements including legality, legitimate State aim and proportionality. These principles are highly relevant to AI because AI systems depend heavily on data and can infer information beyond what an individual consciously discloses.

The Directive Principles reinforce the social dimension of technological development. Articles 38 and 39 direct the State toward social justice and reduction of inequalities, while Article 47 addresses public health and Article 48A directs the State to protect and improve the environment. Article 51A

also articulates duties relating to scientific temper and environmental protection. Taken together, these provisions support a constitutional understanding in which innovation should expand human capabilities while remaining socially and environmentally responsible.

Fraternity has particular importance in the AI age. Automated systems can create invisible categories of inclusion and exclusion: a person may receive a different opportunity, price, service or level of scrutiny without understanding why. Constitutional fraternity requires institutions to preserve equal civic standing and social trust. AI governance should therefore be designed not only around efficiency but around explainability, contestability and respect for the equal status of persons.

4. Fundamental Rights in the AGE of AI

Privacy and autonomy. AI systems can process large volumes of personal information, generate profiles, infer preferences and make predictions about individuals. Privacy protection must therefore address the complete data lifecycle: collection, purpose specification, storage, sharing, model development, deployment, retention and deletion. The Digital Personal Data Protection Act, 2023 recognises the interests of individuals in protecting personal data while permitting lawful processing. Its implementation framework should be understood alongside constitutional privacy principles.

Equality and non-discrimination. Algorithmic bias can arise from training data, labels, model design, proxy variables or deployment contexts. A facial-recognition system, for example, may produce different error rates across demographic groups. A recruitment model may learn historical patterns of exclusion. A public-benefit system may produce unequal access where data quality varies between regions. Constitutional equality requires attention to these mechanisms rather than treating algorithmic outputs as inherently objective.

Freedom of speech and information. Generative systems can create synthetic text, images, audio and video at scale. This creates opportunities for education and expression but also raises problems of impersonation, misinformation and manipulation. Legal responses should distinguish unlawful content from lawful but controversial expression and should preserve procedural safeguards against arbitrary removal or suppression. Transparency regarding automated moderation can help users understand the basis of decisions.

Due process and administrative fairness. Where AI assists a public authority in deciding eligibility for a benefit, identifying a suspect, assessing risk, allocating resources or determining regulatory compliance, the affected person should not be left without a meaningful route to challenge the outcome. Human review should be real rather than merely formal. The responsible authority must remain answerable for the decision even when software has materially influenced it.

Access and digital inclusion. Rights are not meaningful if technological systems are inaccessible to persons with disabilities, persons lacking digital literacy, or communities with inadequate connectivity. Sustainable AI policy should include language diversity, accessibility, offline or assisted channels where necessary, and institutional mechanisms for those who cannot effectively interact with automated systems. The constitutional commitment to equality therefore has an infrastructural dimension.

5. AI, Sustainable Development and Social Justice Sustainable Development in the AI Context Requires Balancing at Least four Interests

Innovation, social inclusion, rights protection and environmental responsibility. AI can contribute to sustainable development through precision agriculture, health screening, energy optimisation, disaster management, accessible education, language translation and public-service delivery. The same technology can undermine sustainability if its benefits are concentrated while its social and environmental costs are externalised. The United Nations Sustainable Development Goals provide a useful international reference, particularly goals relating to poverty, health, education, gender equality, decent work, reduced inequalities, climate action and strong institutions. UNESCO's 2021 Recommendation on the Ethics of AI expressly links AI governance with human dignity, human rights, fairness, environmental sustainability, accountability, transparency and human oversight. This international framework is consistent with, though not identical to, India's constitutional structure.

The principle of inclusion is central. India's linguistic, regional, socio-economic and educational diversity means that a one-size-fits-all AI model can create exclusion. Public-sector AI should be evaluated for whether it works across Indian languages and contexts, whether it accommodates persons with disabilities, and whether rural and low-connectivity populations can access meaningful alternatives. Inclusion should be treated as a measurable governance objective rather than a general aspiration.

Sustainable AI also requires attention to the environmental footprint of computing. Training and operating large models may require substantial electricity, data-centre infrastructure and cooling resources. Environmental assessment should therefore be integrated into public procurement and major AI projects, particularly where large-scale computation is involved. The constitutional environmental principles provide a normative basis for considering ecological costs alongside economic benefits. Social justice additionally requires a labour transition strategy. Automation can displace some tasks while creating new occupations. NITI Aayog's Responsible AI framework has recognised the impact of AI on jobs and the importance of skilling and education. A constitutional approach should protect workers against arbitrary technological displacement while enabling reskilling, mobility and participation in the emerging digital economy. The key insight is that AI should be assessed according to the distribution of its benefits and burdens. A system may be technically accurate yet socially unsustainable if it disproportionately burdens a vulnerable population. Sustainable development therefore requires not merely accuracy but fairness, accessibility, accountability and institutional capacity.

6. Indian AI Governance: Policy and Legal Landscape

India's AI governance landscape is currently distributed across constitutional law, sectoral statutes, data protection law, information technology rules, policy frameworks and institutional initiatives. Rather than a single comprehensive AI statute, governance operates through multiple legal and policy instruments. This can provide flexibility but can also create uncertainty about responsibility, standards and remedies.

NITI Aayog's Responsible AI Approach Identifies Seven Broad Principles

Safety and reliability; equality; inclusivity and non-discrimination; privacy and security; transparency; accountability; and protection and reinforcement of positive human values. Part II of the approach document discusses operationalization, including mechanisms relevant to impact on jobs and malicious uses of AI. These principles are valuable because they connect AI governance with India's constitutional context.

The IndiaAI Mission, approved on 7 March 2024, is designed to build a national AI ecosystem through pillars covering compute capacity, innovation, datasets, application development, future skills, startup financing and Safe & Trusted AI. The Mission reflects an ecosystem approach: infrastructure and innovation are accompanied by safety and responsible-use components. This is important for sustainable development because regulatory capacity and technological capacity need to evolve together.

The Digital Personal Data Protection Act, 2023 provides a statutory framework for digital personal data. It recognises individuals' interests in personal data protection and provides obligations for entities determining the purpose and means of processing. The Digital Personal Data Protection Rules, 2025 supply implementation details, with provisions coming into effect according to the notified commencement structure. AI developers and deployers using personal data must therefore consider both statutory requirements and constitutional privacy principles.

The Information Technology Act, 2000 and associated rules remain relevant to online intermediaries, cybersecurity and electronic activity. Consumer protection, intellectual property, criminal law, sector-specific regulation and administrative law may also apply depending on the use case. The distributed nature of the framework makes institutional coordination essential.

The emerging approach can be characterised as principles-plus-sectoral-regulation. IndiaAI's responsible AI materials recognise that existing laws cover many consequences of AI but may require adaptation and, in some sectors, additional regulation. The legal challenge is therefore not simply to enact a new statute; it is to ensure that existing constitutional and statutory protections remain effective when decisions become automated or partially automated.

7. Data Governance, Privacy and Algorithmic Power

Data is the principal resource through which many AI systems learn, operate and improve. Consequently, data governance is inseparable from AI governance. The constitutional significance of data arises because information about an individual can reveal identity, location, relationships, preferences, behaviour and other aspects of private life. Large-scale aggregation may also create forms of power that were difficult to exercise through individual records alone.

The privacy principle of purpose limitation is particularly important for AI. Data collected for one legitimate purpose should not automatically become available for unrelated predictive or profiling uses. Governance should identify the lawful purpose, assess necessity, limit access, maintain security and establish retention controls. Where high-risk processing occurs, organisations should undertake structured impact assessment and document their risk-mitigation measures.

AI Introduces a Second Problem

Inference. An individual may never have explicitly provided a particular fact, yet a model may infer it from patterns. This creates a challenge for conventional consent models because people cannot realistically anticipate every possible inference that future models might produce. The governance response should therefore combine consent where appropriate with purpose restrictions, accountability, minimisation and safeguards for high-risk uses. The Digital Personal Data Protection Act, 2023 should be integrated with constitutional proportionality. Statutory compliance does not eliminate the need to consider whether a State action affecting privacy is lawful, pursues a legitimate aim and is proportionate. For public-sector AI, the responsible authority should document why automation is necessary, what less intrusive alternatives were considered, and what safeguards exist against misuse.

Data quality and representativeness are also constitutional concerns. If certain communities are under-represented in datasets, an AI system may perform poorly for those groups. Public institutions should therefore record relevant performance limitations and avoid treating model outputs as neutral facts. Where a decision affects rights or entitlements, human verification and appeal should be available.

Finally, data governance should recognise collective dimensions. Some AI systems may affect communities even when individual data rights are formally respected. Decisions about public surveillance, predictive policing or population-level classification can influence freedom and social trust at a collective level. Constitutional governance should therefore include institutional review of broader social effects, not merely individual consent.

8. Equality, Discrimination and Inclusion

Article 14's promise of equality becomes increasingly important as AI systems are used to classify people. Traditional discrimination law often focuses on identifiable decision-makers. Algorithmic systems complicate this model because discriminatory effects may emerge from data and statistical relationships without an explicit discriminatory instruction. The absence of human intention does not by itself make an unequal outcome socially or constitutionally acceptable.

A Robust Framework Should Distinguish Three forms of Algorithmic Discrimination

Data bias, model bias and deployment bias. Data bias occurs when training data reflects historical inequalities or incomplete representation. Model bias arises from choices about features, objectives, thresholds or optimisation. Deployment bias occurs when a model designed for one context is used in another context where its assumptions do not hold. Each form requires different remedies.

High-impact AI systems should therefore undergo equality impact assessments before deployment and periodic audits after deployment. These assessments should identify affected populations, test performance across relevant groups, document limitations and establish corrective procedures. Independent evaluation may be appropriate where the deploying institution has a significant conflict of interest.

Inclusion also requires linguistic justice. India's constitutional and social diversity makes language a critical component of access. AI systems that work well only in dominant languages can indirectly exclude citizens. Public-facing AI should, where feasible, support major Indian languages and provide human or assisted alternatives. The objective is not

technological uniformity but equal access to public benefits and participation.

Gender and disability require particular attention. Automated recruitment, credit scoring, facial analysis and content moderation can reproduce stereotypes or disadvantage persons with disabilities when datasets and interfaces are not inclusive. The governance framework should therefore require accessibility testing and gender-sensitive impact assessment for high-risk systems.

An Important Institutional Principle Follows

The burden of demonstrating responsible deployment should increase with the potential impact on rights. Low-risk productivity tools may require ordinary safeguards; high-impact systems affecting liberty, essential services, employment, education, health or public benefits should face stronger documentation, testing, oversight and appeal requirements.

9. Transparency, Accountability and Human Oversight

The rule of law requires that public power be exercised through intelligible and reviewable standards. AI can challenge this principle because complex models may be difficult even for developers to explain in ordinary language. Nevertheless, technical complexity cannot eliminate legal accountability. A citizen affected by a decision should be able to understand the relevant reason at a level sufficient to challenge the decision.

Transparency should therefore be understood as contextual rather than absolute. Requiring disclosure of every technical detail may conflict with security, privacy or intellectual property. A proportionate model is preferable: disclose the purpose of the system, categories of data used, material factors affecting decisions, known limitations, human oversight arrangements, routes of appeal and responsible institutions. Higher-risk systems require deeper transparency. Accountability must attach to identifiable institutions and persons. 'The algorithm decided' should never become a legal defence for an authority. Public bodies remain responsible for the legality of decisions taken with technological assistance. Private entities deploying AI in regulated or high-impact settings should also have clear internal accountability, audit trails and grievance mechanisms.

Human oversight should be meaningful. A human reviewer who simply approves every automated result does not provide substantive oversight. Reviewers should have authority, information, time and training to question or override the system. They should also be able to identify cases in which the model is outside its validated operating conditions.

Procedural safeguards are especially important in public administration. A high-impact automated decision should, subject to legitimate confidentiality constraints, generate a record identifying the system used, relevant input categories, the decision or recommendation produced, the responsible officer and the review pathway. This would support judicial review, administrative accountability and institutional learning.

Auditability is therefore a bridge between technology and law. Logs, model versions, data provenance records, risk assessments and incident reports can convert abstract accountability into evidence. Regulators and courts should be able to ask not merely whether an AI system was accurate but whether it was lawfully designed, appropriately tested, fairly deployed and properly supervised.

10. AI IN Key Sectors of Indian Society

Healthcare. AI can support diagnosis, triage, medical imaging and health administration. Yet errors can have direct consequences for life and bodily integrity. High-impact medical AI should therefore require clinical validation, informed professional oversight, data protection and mechanisms for reporting adverse events. Automated recommendations should support rather than silently replace professional responsibility where human judgment is legally or clinically necessary.

Education. Adaptive learning and automated assessment can personalise education, but profiling students may create long-term consequences. AI should not reduce learners to predictive scores. Students should receive opportunities to understand and challenge significant automated assessments, and educational institutions should maintain human review for consequential decisions.

Agriculture and rural development. AI-enabled weather prediction, crop monitoring, irrigation management and market information can contribute to sustainable agriculture. However, benefits depend on connectivity, affordability, local-language interfaces and reliable data. Rural deployment should therefore be evaluated for accessibility and not merely technical performance.

Public welfare. AI can help identify eligible beneficiaries, detect fraud and improve service delivery. At the same time, false positives can exclude genuine beneficiaries. Welfare systems should maintain assisted channels, correction mechanisms and human review. No person should lose access to an essential entitlement solely because an opaque automated system produced an adverse classification without meaningful review.

Policing and criminal justice. Predictive policing, facial recognition and risk assessment create particularly serious constitutional concerns because they may affect liberty, privacy and equality. Their use should require clear legal authority, necessity and proportionality, rigorous accuracy and bias testing, strict purpose limitation and independent oversight. Technological evidence should not be treated as infallible merely because it is computational.

Judicial administration. AI may assist with research, translation, document management and case-flow analysis. It can improve efficiency but should not displace judicial responsibility. Judicial reasoning is a constitutional function requiring independence, reasons and accountability. AI-generated legal material should therefore be verifiable against authoritative legal sources before it is relied upon in adjudication.

Finance and employment. Automated credit scoring and recruitment can improve speed but may encode historical inequality. Institutions should provide notice, appropriate explanations, correction channels and human review for materially adverse decisions. Sectoral regulators should determine risk-appropriate standards rather than applying identical controls to every AI use case.

11. Environment, Labour and Inter-Generational Justice

AI governance should incorporate environmental sustainability from the beginning of the project lifecycle. Large-scale models can require substantial computational infrastructure. The constitutional commitment to environmental protection, combined with sustainable development principles, supports an approach in which major AI projects assess energy use, resource consumption, e-waste and lifecycle impacts where material.

Public procurement can be an important lever. Government agencies purchasing AI services should include contractual requirements relating to security, data governance, audit access, accessibility, incident reporting, energy efficiency and termination or transition arrangements. Procurement contracts should avoid creating irreversible dependence on a single vendor where such dependence undermines public accountability.

Employment presents both opportunities and risks. AI may automate repetitive tasks, augment professional work and create new roles. It may also change bargaining power between employers and workers. A sustainable approach should prioritise reskilling, transition support and fair workplace governance. Employers should not use automated monitoring or productivity scoring in ways that disregard privacy, dignity or lawful labour protections.

Inter-generational justice requires policymakers to avoid short-term technological gains that create long-term institutional or environmental costs. Public-sector AI systems may persist for years and shape administrative practices. Before deployment, authorities should consider whether the system can be audited, updated, retired and replaced without compromising rights or public access.

The environmental and labour dimensions also demonstrate why AI governance cannot be reduced to data protection. Data privacy is necessary but insufficient. A constitutional sustainability framework must consider the full social lifecycle of AI—from data extraction and model development to deployment, employment effects, environmental costs, contestability and retirement.

12. Towards an Indian Constitutional AI Sustainability Framework

This paper proposes a Constitutional AI Sustainability Framework (CASF) based on seven connected requirements. The framework is not presented as a substitute for legislation; rather, it is a structured method for applying constitutional values to AI governance and for identifying areas where legislation, regulation or institutional practice may need development. First, constitutional legality and purpose. Every high-impact public-sector AI system should have a clearly stated legal and institutional purpose. The authority should identify its statutory basis and explain why AI is necessary or appropriate for the function.

Second, proportionality and risk classification. Systems should be classified according to potential impact on rights and essential interests. Higher-risk uses—such as decisions affecting liberty, essential public benefits, employment, education, health or significant financial access—should require stronger safeguards than low-risk administrative tools.

Third, equality and inclusion assessment. Before deployment, institutions should identify affected groups, test relevant disparities, document limitations and implement mitigation. Periodic post-deployment evaluation should be mandatory for high-impact systems. Accessibility and language inclusion should form part of the assessment.

Fourth, privacy and data governance. Organisations should document data sources, legal basis, purpose, retention, access controls and security measures. Where AI involves high-risk processing, impact assessment should address inference risks and secondary uses. Public authorities should apply constitutional proportionality in addition to statutory data-protection requirements.

Fifth, explainability, human oversight and remedy. Individuals affected by significant AI-assisted decisions

should receive an intelligible explanation, subject to legitimate constraints, and access to a human review process. The reviewer must have genuine authority to correct the result. Records should be maintained to permit later audit or judicial review.

Sixth, accountability and auditability. Every high-impact system should have an identifiable responsible institution, documented model version, incident-response procedure and audit trail. Contracts with vendors should preserve the government's ability to investigate failures and protect public records.

Seventh, sustainability and inter-generational review. Major AI deployments should assess environmental impact, labour effects, social inclusion and long-term institutional dependence. Systems should have sunset, review or renewal mechanisms where appropriate, preventing outdated models from becoming permanent administrative infrastructure.

The Framework can be expressed as a Simple Decision Sequence

Legal authority → risk classification → rights and equality assessment → data and security assessment → environmental and social assessment → human oversight design → deployment → continuous audit → remedy and review. This sequence turns constitutional values into an operational governance process.

Institutionally, implementation may involve MeitY, sectoral regulators, public authorities, courts, data-protection institutions, procurement agencies, academic experts and civil society. The objective should not be centralisation for its own sake, but coordinated responsibility. Standards should remain technology-neutral where possible and should be updated through transparent consultation as AI capabilities evolve.

Conclusion

Artificial Intelligence presents India with an opportunity to strengthen public services, productivity, scientific capacity and social development. The same technology can, however, amplify existing inequalities and create new forms of power that are difficult for individuals to see or challenge. The constitutional question is therefore not whether India should adopt AI, but how AI should be governed so that technological progress remains compatible with constitutional democracy and sustainable development.

The analysis demonstrates that India's constitutional values already provide a substantial normative foundation. Equality under Article 14 addresses discriminatory outcomes; freedoms under Article 19 protect expression and participation; Article 21 protects life, liberty, dignity and privacy; Directive Principles orient the State toward social and economic justice and environmental protection; and constitutional morality supports an inclusive understanding of public power. These principles can guide the interpretation and design of AI governance even as specific legislation develops.

The existing policy framework is significant but evolving. NITI Aayog's Responsible AI principles and the IndiaAI Mission establish important foundations for responsible innovation. The Digital Personal Data Protection Act, 2023 and the 2025 Rules strengthen the data-governance environment. UNESCO's international framework provides a complementary human-rights and sustainability perspective. The remaining challenge is operational: translating principles into risk classification, impact assessment, auditability, meaningful human oversight and effective remedies.

The Paper Therefore Recommends

(1) mandatory rights and equality impact assessments for high-impact public AI; (2) clear legal authority and purpose limitation; (3) meaningful human review and accessible grievance mechanisms; (4) documentation and audit trails; (5) periodic bias and performance testing; (6) accessibility and Indian-language inclusion; (7) environmental and labour impact assessment for major deployments; (8) responsible public procurement standards; (9) AI literacy for officials, lawyers, judges, educators and citizens; and (10) periodic legislative and regulatory review as technology changes.

A sustainable Indian AI ecosystem should be judged by more than computational capability or economic value. Its legitimacy ultimately depends on whether people remain rights-bearing participants rather than objects of automated classification. Constitutional values provide the bridge between innovation and human-centred development. If AI governance is anchored in dignity, equality, liberty, privacy, accountability, inclusion, environmental responsibility and human oversight, technological progress can be integrated into India's constitutional project without sacrificing the social purposes that make development sustainable.

Original contribution. The paper's principal conceptual contribution is the Constitutional AI Sustainability Framework, which brings together constitutional legality, proportionality, equality, privacy, human oversight, accountability, inclusion and sustainability as a single governance sequence. The framework is intended as a research proposition for further empirical testing and doctrinal development rather than as a claim that the existing legal system has already adopted a unified model.

Research limitation. This paper is doctrinal and analytical and does not provide empirical measurement of algorithmic discrimination, energy consumption or public attitudes. Future research should combine constitutional analysis with field studies of AI deployment in welfare administration, healthcare, policing, education and employment, with particular attention to regional, linguistic and socio-economic differences.

References

1. Constitution of India, Government of India, Legislative Department, text as updated through the Constitution (One Hundred and Sixth Amendment) Act, 2023.
2. Digital Personal Data Protection Act, 2023, Act No. 22 of 2023, Ministry of Electronics and Information Technology, Government of India.
3. Digital Personal Data Protection Rules, 2025, Ministry of Electronics and Information Technology, Government of India.
4. Information Technology Act, 2000, Act No. 21 of 2000, Government of India.
5. Information Technology (Intermediary Guidelines and Digital Media Ethics Code) Rules, 2021, as amended from time to time.

Cases

1. K.S. Puttaswamy (Retd.) v Union of India, (2017) 10 SCC 1.
2. Maneka Gandhi v Union of India, (1978) 1 SCC 248.
3. Shreya Singhal v Union of India, (2015) 5 SCC 1.
4. Navtej Singh Johar v Union of India, (2018) 10 SCC 1.
5. Anuradha Bhasin v Union of India, (2020) 3 SCC 637.
6. Modern Dental College & Research Centre v State of Madhya Pradesh, (2016) 7 SCC 353.

7. Justice K.S. Puttaswamy (Retd.) v Union of India (Aadhaar), (2019) 1 SCC 1.

Government and Policy Sources

1. NITI Aayog, Responsible AI for All: Approach Document for India, Part 1—Principles for Responsible AI (2021).
2. NITI Aayog, Responsible AI for All: Approach Document for India, Part 2—Operationalizing Principles for Responsible AI (2021).
3. Government of India, Ministry of Electronics and Information Technology, Annual Report 2024–2025, section on IndiaAI Mission.
4. IndiaAI Mission, Government of India, official programme materials and AIKosh resources.
5. Ministry of Electronics and Information Technology, Digital Personal Data Protection Rules, 2025 and Explanatory Note.

International Materials

1. UNESCO, Recommendation on the Ethics of Artificial Intelligence (adopted 23 November 2021; published 2022).
2. United Nations, Transforming Our World: The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development (2015).
3. 20. OECD, Recommendation of the Council on Artificial Intelligence, OECD/LEGAL/0449 (2019), as updated.
4. Council of Europe, Framework Convention on Artificial Intelligence and Human Rights, Democracy and the Rule of Law (2024).

Selected Academic Literature

1. Frank Pasquale, *The Black Box Society: The Secret Algorithms That Control Money and Information*, Harvard University Press (2015).
2. Cathy O'Neil, *Weapons of Math Destruction: How Big Data Increases Inequality and Threatens Democracy*, Crown (2016).
3. Sandra Wachter, Brent Mittelstadt & Luciano Floridi, 'Why a Right to Explanation of Automated Decision-Making Does Not Exist in the General Data Protection Regulation', 7 *International Data Privacy Law* 76 (2017).
4. Danielle Keats Citron & Frank Pasquale, 'The Scored Society: Due Process for Automated Predictions', 89 *Washington Law Review* 1 (2014).
5. Solon Barocas & Andrew D. Selbst, 'Big Data's Disparate Impact', 104 *California Law Review* 671 (2016).
6. Luciano Floridi *et al.*, 'AI4People—An Ethical Framework for a Good AI Society', 28 *Minds and Machines* 689 (2018).
7. Brent Mittelstadt *et al.*, 'The Ethics of Algorithms: Mapping the Debate', 10 *Big Data & Society* (2016).
8. Virginia Eubanks, *Automating Inequality: How High-Tech Tools Profile, Police, and Punish the Poor*, St. Martin's Press (2018).
9. Karen Yeung, 'Algorithmic Regulation: A Critical Interrogation', 12 *Regulation & Governance* 505 (2018).

Online Official Sources Consulted

1. Government of India, Legislative Department, Constitution of India: <https://legislative.gov.in/>
2. India Code, Digital Personal Data Protection Act, 2023: <https://www.indiacode.nic.in/>
3. Ministry of Electronics and Information Technology: <https://www.meity.gov.in/>
4. IndiaAI, Government of India: <https://indiaai.gov.in/>