



AI Applications and Legal Personality: A Critical Regulatory Analysis

Mokhtar BOULAARES *

University of Echahid Sheikh Larbi Tebessi,
Tebessa,
mokhtar.boulaares@univ-tebessa.dz

Received: 16 /02 /2026

Accepted: 02/ 03 /2026

Published: 31/03 /2026

Abstract:

This study analyzes Artificial Intelligence as a transformative technology with applications across critical sectors such as healthcare, finance, law, security, education, and governance. It emphasizes the legal and ethical implications of AI integration, particularly regarding accountability, liability, and the potential recognition of AI legal personality. By examining the debate over granting autonomous systems distinct legal status, the research highlights both the opportunities for structured responsibility and the challenges posed to traditional legal frameworks. The study concludes with recommendations for adaptive regulations, human oversight, and principled governance to align AI with law and societal norms.

Keywords :Artificial Intelligence; Legal Personality; Regulatory Frameworks; Ethical Governance; Autonomous Systems

* Corresponding author



Introduction

Artificial Intelligence (AI) has emerged as a transformative force that extends far beyond the realm of technology, reshaping economic, social, and institutional structures. Defined as systems capable of learning, reasoning, making decisions, and operating autonomously, AI has been increasingly integrated into critical sectors such as healthcare, finance, education, transportation, governance, and digital communication. Its pervasive presence not only enhances efficiency and innovation but also fundamentally alters workflows, decision-making processes, and organizational dynamics.

The primary objective of this study is to examine the breadth of AI applications alongside the legal and ethical implications of granting autonomous systems a form of legal personality. By clarifying what constitutes an intelligent autonomous system and mapping its core characteristics, this research seeks to provide a comprehensive understanding of AI's transformative potential, while addressing the emerging questions of accountability, liability, and responsible governance.

The central research problem stems from the dual challenge of reconciling the widespread adoption of AI across diverse domains with the extent to which existing legal frameworks can recognize and regulate autonomous systems. This raises critical questions regarding the adaptation of law to account for AI's operational independence, the mechanisms necessary to ensure ethical deployment, and the balance between innovation and societal protection.

To address this complex problem, the study adopts a multi-dimensional analytical and comparative methodology, combining a conceptual examination of AI's defining features with a review of relevant legal doctrines, case law, and international regulatory practices. This approach allows for a rigorous assessment of both theoretical and practical dimensions, integrating doctrinal analysis with comparative insights to ensure that the research captures the ethical, legal, and societal implications of AI in a holistic manner.

The study is structured around two principal axes that reflect these interconnected dimensions. The first axis focuses on the theoretical foundations and conceptual framework of AI, including its definition, core characteristics, and areas of application, providing a foundation for understanding its operational logic and societal impact. The second axis examines the legal and ethical dimensions, exploring the debate surrounding AI's legal recognition, its potential personality, accountability mechanisms, and governance frameworks, while addressing both the supportive and critical perspectives. By aligning the study's structure with the methodology, this research offers a coherent and comprehensive framework for



analyzing AI's transformative potential alongside the challenges and responsibilities it entails.

THE FIRST TOPIC: THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS AND CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE

Artificial Intelligence has emerged as one of the most consequential technological transformations shaping the contemporary world, redefining not only scientific inquiry but also the operational foundations of diverse sectors. What began as a theoretical ambition to simulate aspects of human cognition has evolved into a sophisticated ecosystem of intelligent systems capable of analysis, adaptive learning, and increasingly autonomous decision-making.

This profound evolution invites a deeper exploration of the essence of AI its conceptual substance, its defining attributes(**first requirement**), and the structural features that distinguish it from conventional computational tools. At the same time, its significance cannot be fully appreciated without examining the domains in which it materializes and the wide-ranging applications through which it exerts tangible influence. Artificial Intelligence today permeates economic structures, social dynamics, and institutional frameworks, making it imperative to understand both its conceptual foundations and its practical manifestations across the spectrum of human activity(**second requirement**).

FIRST REQUIREMENT: DEFINITION AND CORE CHARACTERISTICS OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE

Artificial Intelligence encompasses a rapidly evolving domain that demands careful attention to its defining characteristics and conceptual scope. As intelligent systems expand across disciplines and applications, understanding what constitutes AI becomes crucial not only for clarity but also for situating its transformative potential within social, economic, and institutional contexts (**Firstly**).

Central to this understanding are the core attributes of AI autonomy, adaptive learning, flexibility, and data-driven decision-making which distinguish it fundamentally from traditional computational technologies. Clarifying these features provides a solid foundation for analyzing the internal architecture of AI systems and anticipating the complex legal, ethical, and regulatory challenges that arise as these technologies become increasingly integrated into contemporary human environments (**Secondly**).



Firstly: Definition of Artificial Intelligence

Artificial Intelligence (AI) may be conceptualised as a technologically mediated extension of human cognitive capacity, designed to simulate, approximate, and in certain contexts surpass the mental faculties traditionally associated with human intelligence. At its core, the notion of AI is inseparable from the conceptualisation of intelligence itself namely, the constellation of higher-order abilities that enable human beings to adapt to dynamic environments, draw upon prior experience, engage in critical and analytical reasoning, formulate plans, solve complex problems, derive coherent conclusions, and apply acquired knowledge in practical contexts¹. Intelligence, in this sense, is not merely computational efficiency; it encompasses learning agility, contextual awareness, evaluative judgment, and the capacity to respond meaningfully to novel or unforeseen situations.

As AI has evolved into a foundational pillar of the contemporary technological ecosystem, the urgency of defining it with doctrinal precision has intensified within both jurisprudence and legislative discourse. From a jurisprudential standpoint, AI is commonly understood as a specialised branch of computer science devoted to the development of systems whether software-based or embodied in physical devices capable of replicating advanced cognitive processes characteristic of the human mind². Intelligent behaviour in machines is thus measured by their ability to perform functions at a level comparable to human reasoning, learning, and decision-making³. Modern AI systems are no longer confined to executing predetermined commands; rather, they are structured to process vast datasets, detect patterns, infer relationships, learn from experience, and autonomously refine their performance over time. In doing so, they assume complex roles that extend beyond simple automation, offering analytical depth and predictive insight that reshape decision-making across multiple sectors.

Legislative approaches further refine this conceptual framework. While several European and Arab national legal systems have yet to codify a comprehensive statutory definition, influential international instruments provide structured formulations. United States legislation, notably the Future of Artificial Intelligence Act of 2017, defines AI as an artificial system implemented in software or hardware capable of performing tasks under unpredictable conditions with limited human intervention, and of learning from experience to improve performance⁴. Similarly, the European Commission characterises AI as the capacity of a machine to emulate human-associated behaviours such as reasoning, planning, and creativity⁵. The World Intellectual Property Organization situates AI within computer science as a domain concerned with creating machines capable of



executing tasks that ordinarily require human intelligence, whether autonomously or in conjunction with human oversight⁶.

Taken together, these doctrinal and legislative perspectives converge on a unified understanding: Artificial Intelligence refers to adaptive computational systems engineered to replicate, operationalise, and progressively enhance cognitive functions analogous to those of the human mind, enabling them to perform tasks, make decisions, and generate outputs that would traditionally require human intellectual engagement.

Secondly: Characteristics and Distinctive Features of AI

Artificial Intelligence is distinguished from other technological systems by a constellation of structural and functional attributes that collectively reflect its cognitive orientation and operational autonomy. At its foundation lies the capacity for learning and perception: AI systems are engineered to observe patterns, interpret data derived from human behaviour, recognise needs and preferences, and refine their responses through iterative exposure to experience⁷

This adaptive learning process enables machines not merely to execute pre-programmed instructions, but to optimise outcomes in light of predefined objectives. Through reasoning mechanisms and goal-oriented algorithms, AI systems can analyse variables, weigh alternatives, and select solutions that maximise efficiency or accuracy within dynamic and often unpredictable environments.

Beyond adaptive learning, AI is characterised by its aspiration to emulate complex and integrative modes of thinking. It engages in analytical, organisational, and critical processes that approximate higher-order intellectual functions. Such systems are equipped with structured memory architectures, classification capabilities, and perceptual tools that allow them to distinguish, categorise, and interpret external stimuli. They operate within artificial linguistic frameworks processing and generating language in ways that facilitate interaction with human users while integrating heterogeneous streams of information into coherent decision-making models.

A further defining trait lies in AI's ability to mimic human behaviour through advanced information processing⁸. By modelling linguistic patterns, behavioural tendencies, and contextual signals, AI systems seek to approximate the interpretative dimensions of human intelligence. Human knowledge remains the epistemic foundation upon which these systems are trained; datasets reflecting human communication, reasoning, and conduct serve as the substrate from which intelligent responses are generated. Thus, AI does not emerge independently of human cognition, but rather evolves as a computational abstraction of it.

Equally significant is AI's competence in managing imperfect, incomplete, or duplicative data. Intelligent systems are designed to detect anomalies, correct



errors, reconcile inconsistencies, and extract meaningful inferences from noisy informational environments. Drawing upon accumulated data and prior training experiences, they are capable of deducing appropriate solutions even where inputs are fragmented or partially inaccurate. This resilience in the face of informational degradation enhances their reliability across diverse operational contexts⁹.

Another structural characteristic is symbolic processing. Unlike conventional computational systems limited to numerical calculation, AI frequently manipulates symbols representing real-world entities, relationships, and abstract concepts. These symbols are organised into sophisticated architectures networks, hierarchies, ontologies, and relational databases that reflect the interconnected nature of knowledge. Through such symbolic structures, AI can model reasoning pathways, simulate conceptual associations, and represent complex realities in computational form.

Most notably, contemporary AI demonstrates increasing degrees of independence and autonomous decision-making. Once furnished with a comprehensive knowledge base and supported by substantial storage and data-processing capacity, intelligent systems can correlate images, sounds, textual inputs, and environmental signals to generate reasoned outputs without direct human intervention. This autonomy is grounded in inferential mechanisms that simulate deductive and inductive reasoning. Early expert systems sought to replicate the specialised knowledge of human professionals; subsequent technological advances expanded this autonomy into practical domains such as automated navigation and robotics. The emergence of self-driving vehicles and educational robots illustrates the progressive shift from assistive automation to independent operational agency, raising profound legal and ethical implications regarding accountability and liability¹⁰.

SECOND REQUIREMENT: FIELDS AND APPLICATIONS OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE

Artificial Intelligence has emerged as a transformative force that now permeates nearly every facet of contemporary society. Its influence extends across a multitude of domains, including healthcare, education, finance, transportation, governance, industry, and digital communications, where it fundamentally reshapes workflows, operational processes, and decision-making mechanisms. These diverse fields underscore the breadth, adaptability, and interdisciplinary reach of AI, highlighting its pivotal role as a catalyst for innovation and enhanced efficiency (**Firstly**).

Beyond its presence in specific domains, the practical applications of AI reveal its profound impact on organizational, institutional, and social structures. By enabling predictive analytics, adaptive problem-solving, and data-driven decision-making, intelligent systems enhance operational efficiency, optimize resource



allocation, and improve outcomes across sectors. This integration not only transforms the way tasks are performed but also redefines the strategic and functional dynamics within the modern human, economic, and institutional landscape (**Secondly**).

Firstly: Fields of Artificial Intelligence

Artificial Intelligence encompasses a broad and dynamic spectrum of scientific and technological domains, each contributing uniquely to the development of intelligent systems. At its core, AI integrates multiple disciplines, including computer science, mathematics, cognitive science, and data analytics, creating a complex ecosystem in which knowledge representation, algorithmic reasoning, and adaptive learning converge.

Prominent fields within AI include machine learning, which enables systems to identify patterns and improve performance autonomously; deep learning and neural networks, which mimic human cognitive processes to solve complex problems; natural language processing, which allows machines to understand, interpret, and generate human language; and computer vision, which equips systems with the capacity to perceive and interpret visual data. Additionally, robotics and expert systems translate theoretical models into physical or decision-support applications, bridging the gap between abstract algorithms and tangible real-world functionality.

Collectively, these fields define the structural and operational architecture of AI, shaping both its theoretical underpinnings and its transformative potential across diverse societal, industrial, and institutional contexts.

Secondly: Applications of Artificial Intelligence

Artificial Intelligence has transitioned from a theoretical construct to a transformative force embedded in the structural fabric of contemporary society. As a product of cumulative scientific and technological advancement, AI has not merely enhanced human activity but has reconfigured entire sectors of economic, institutional, and social life. Its rapid evolution has generated significant economic value, accelerated innovation cycles, and facilitated the creation of new products, services, and decision-making architectures. Today, AI functions as a foundational infrastructure across commercial, military, medical, legal, and educational domains, where its reliance is no longer peripheral but systemic.

In the legal sector, AI increasingly influences judicial administration, advocacy, regulatory compliance, and dispute resolution. Institutional bodies such as the European Commission for the Efficiency of Justice (CEPEJ) have developed ethical and operational frameworks for integrating AI tools into justice systems, reflecting a broader recognition that algorithmic technologies are reshaping adjudicative processes. Policy initiatives, including the European Commission's White Paper on Artificial Intelligence (2020), have underscored the dual



imperative of innovation and trust. Practically, AI systems are now capable of analysing extensive repositories of legislation and jurisprudence, predicting litigation outcomes with notable accuracy, and supporting alternative dispute resolution mechanisms.

In some jurisdictions, experimental electronic courts operate with significant AI integration, managing case files, legal texts, and procedural data through automated systems. At the international level, discussions within forums such as the United Nations Commission on International Trade Law (UNCITRAL) have addressed the legal implications of smart contracts and AI-driven transactions, signaling the need for harmonized regulatory frameworks capable of responding to algorithmic agency in private law¹¹.

Within the economic sphere, AI represents a catalyst for productivity, efficiency, and capital expansion. International economic projections indicate that AI will contribute trillions of dollars to the global economy by the end of this decade, driven by gains in productivity and consumption¹².

The proliferation of AI enterprises particularly in technologically advanced economies demonstrates the strategic centrality of this sector. AI reduces operational costs, optimises supply chains, automates complex analytics, and enables remote functioning in hazardous or inaccessible environments. In financial markets, high-frequency trading systems illustrate the capacity of AI-driven software to execute large volumes of transactions within fractions of a second, relying on predictive algorithms and real-time data analysis to inform investment strategies. Such developments not only increase market liquidity but also introduce new regulatory and systemic risk considerations¹³.

In the security and military domain, AI has become integral to surveillance, intelligence analysis, cybersecurity, and autonomous systems. Advanced image-recognition technologies enhance the capacity to identify suspects and detect threats, while machine learning algorithms strengthen digital defence mechanisms against cyberattacks. Autonomous drones and robotic systems perform reconnaissance, monitoring, and, in certain contexts, combat-support functions. These technologies often rely on satellite guidance systems and geospatial positioning infrastructures to operate with minimal direct human control¹⁴.

The increasing autonomy of military robotics has prompted normative debates concerning compliance with international humanitarian law and ethical oversight. Emerging policy documents, including European initiatives on robot ethics, emphasise the necessity of ensuring that autonomous systems remain aligned with international legal standards and subject to meaningful human supervision¹⁵.

The medical field has witnessed some of the most profound benefits of AI integration. Intelligent systems now assist in diagnostics, predictive analytics,



surgical procedures, and patient monitoring. Surgical robots operate under a framework of supervised autonomy, whereby physicians retain ultimate decision-making authority while leveraging algorithmic precision to enhance procedural outcomes.

AI-driven diagnostic tools analyse medical images such as X-rays, MRIs, and ultrasounds with remarkable accuracy, detecting patterns and anomalies that may elude human observation. Decision-support systems contribute to personalised treatment plans, while machine-learning models process emergency call data to identify life-threatening conditions with exceptional speed.

In rehabilitation medicine, intelligent robotic devices support motor recovery by stimulating neuromuscular coordination, thereby improving mobility outcomes for patients with physical impairments. Furthermore, AI has played a pivotal role in epidemiological modelling and real-time monitoring during global health crises, accelerating research and response mechanisms.

In the educational domain, AI has redefined pedagogical methodologies and learning environments. Intelligent tutoring systems, adaptive learning platforms, and educational robots personalise instruction by analysing students' cognitive patterns, performance data, and learning behaviours. Through advanced pattern recognition, AI can process text, sound, and visual inputs to tailor educational content to individual needs.

This technological integration addresses structural challenges such as shortages of qualified teachers and disparities in educational access. By transcending traditional classroom limitations¹⁶.

AI facilitates interactive, data-driven learning ecosystems capable of expanding intellectual engagement and enhancing educational equity.

Collectively, these applications illustrate that Artificial Intelligence is not confined to a single sector but operates as a cross-cutting technological paradigm. Its integration into legal systems, economic markets, security infrastructures, healthcare institutions, and educational frameworks underscores both its transformative potential and the necessity of robust legal and ethical governance. As AI continues to permeate core societal functions, the challenge lies not in its adoption, but in structuring its deployment within principled regulatory architectures that safeguard human dignity, accountability, and public trust.

THE SECOND TOPIC: LEGAL AND ETHICAL DIMENSIONS OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE

As Artificial Intelligence increasingly permeates social, economic, and institutional spheres, its influence extends beyond technological innovation to reshape the very frameworks that govern human interaction and decision-making. The integration of intelligent systems into critical processes from public



administration and healthcare to finance and infrastructure has generated profound benefits in efficiency, accuracy, and predictive capacity (**first requirement**)

However, this pervasive presence also brings pressing legal and ethical questions. Issues of accountability, responsibility, and regulatory oversight become unavoidable as AI systems participate in decisions that affect fundamental rights, public safety, and economic interests. Understanding these dimensions requires a careful exploration of both the supportive arguments for AI adoption and the significant challenges and risks that accompany its deployment. By examining these aspects, we can illuminate how intelligent systems intersect with existing legal frameworks and the normative principles essential for responsible governance in an era increasingly defined by algorithmic decision-making (**second requirement**).

FIRST REQUIREMENT: PERSPECTIVES ON AI TECHNOLOGY

The evolution of Artificial Intelligence has sparked a multifaceted debate that encompasses both its transformative potential and the challenges inherent in its deployment. As AI systems increasingly influence decision-making, operational efficiency, and innovation across diverse sectors, understanding the spectrum of perspectives surrounding this technology becomes essential.

This requirement examines two complementary dimensions of the discourse. **Firstly**, it considers the arguments in favor of AI, highlighting its ability to enhance productivity, optimize resource allocation, and drive societal and economic progress. **Secondly**, it addresses the critical viewpoints that underscore ethical, social, and legal concerns, including transparency, accountability, and the potential for unintended consequences. By integrating these perspectives, we gain a holistic appreciation of AI's impact and the frameworks necessary to guide its responsible and equitable use in contemporary society.

Firstly: The Case in Favour of Artificial Intelligence

A substantial body of research underscores the transformative economic potential of artificial intelligence, estimating that AI could contribute up to \$15.7 trillion to global GDP. This projected growth reflects not merely incremental efficiency gains, but a structural reconfiguration of productivity, innovation ecosystems, and value creation across industries. AI is increasingly perceived as a general-purpose technology comparable to electricity or the internet capable of reshaping manufacturing, healthcare, finance, transportation, and public administration.

Several states have positioned AI at the core of their long-term strategic planning. China, for instance, has articulated an ambitious national strategy, committing approximately \$150 billion in investment with the explicit objective of becoming the global leader in AI by 2030. This policy orientation reflects a



recognition that technological supremacy in AI is inseparable from economic competitiveness and geopolitical influence¹⁷.

Likewise, Japan anticipated demographic challenges early on. In 1998, the Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry launched the National Robot Project, followed in 2001 by the Century Robot Challenge Program, both aimed at developing robotic systems to assist an ageing population. These initiatives illustrate how AI can function not only as an engine of economic growth but also as a pragmatic response to profound societal transformations.

Within the private sector, major technology companies have vigorously advanced AI research. In 2013, Facebook established the Fairness and Accountability in AI Research (FAIR) centers in New York, Paris, and Montreal. Under leading AI researchers, the initiative sought to strengthen predictive modeling and machine learning capabilities, enabling platforms to better understand user behavior and enhance digital interaction. Such efforts reflect the belief that AI can optimize personalization, improve user experience, and refine decision-making processes at scale¹⁸.

In sum, proponents argue that artificial intelligence represents a catalyst for economic expansion, technological innovation, and societal adaptation, offering unprecedented opportunities for growth and problem-solving in the twenty-first century.

Secondly: Opposition to Artificial Intelligence Technology

Despite its promise, artificial intelligence has generated profound ethical, social, and existential concerns. At the center of the debate lies the possibility that advances in Artificial General Intelligence (AGI) could surpass human cognitive capacities, potentially evolving into a form of superintelligence beyond meaningful human control. The core fear is not merely technological disruption, but the prospect of irreversible global catastrophe or even human extinction if such systems act in ways misaligned with human values¹⁹.

Prominent figures in computer science and technology including Geoffrey Hinton, Yoshua Bengio, Alan Turing's theoretical legacy, Elon Musk, and Sam Altman have publicly expressed concern regarding the long-term risks of superintelligent AI. Surveys among AI researchers further reveal that a significant proportion attribute a non-negligible probability 10% or higher to scenarios in which insufficient control over AI could trigger an existential crisis. These apprehensions highlight the urgency of governance, alignment research, and international regulatory frameworks.

Beyond existential risks, AI presents immediate socio-economic challenges. Labour markets are particularly vulnerable, as automation and intelligent systems threaten to displace workers in manufacturing, transportation, administrative services, and even high-skilled professions. The restructuring of employment



patterns may exacerbate inequality if adequate adaptation policies are not implemented²⁰.

Another pressing concern involves deep manipulation technologies, commonly referred to as deepfakes. These systems can fabricate or alter images, audio, and video content with such realism that distinguishing authentic material from falsified content becomes exceedingly difficult. The implications for democratic institutions are profound: manipulated statements attributed to political leaders, public figures, or influencers can destabilize public trust, spread misinformation, and intensify social polarization.

Furthermore, AI-driven innovation in weaponry raises alarming ethical questions. The development of autonomous lethal systems introduces the possibility of a new technological arms race, potentially replacing traditional nuclear deterrence with advanced algorithmic warfare. Such developments could fundamentally alter the nature of global security.

Finally, contemporary AI technologies enable unprecedented surveillance capabilities. The systematic tracking and analysis of individuals' online behavior and daily activities pose significant threats to privacy and civil liberties. Without robust legal safeguards, these technologies risk normalizing intrusive monitoring practices that undermine fundamental human rights.

In conclusion, while artificial intelligence promises extraordinary advancements, its rapid evolution necessitates vigilant ethical scrutiny, international cooperation, and comprehensive regulatory oversight to prevent technological progress from outpacing humanity's capacity to govern it responsibly.

SECOND REQUIREMENT: LEGAL RECOGNITION AND PERSONALITY OF AI SYSTEMS

As Artificial Intelligence systems become increasingly autonomous, capable of operating with minimal or no human intervention, the question of their legal status has moved to the forefront of scholarly and regulatory debate. AI's capacity to act independently, sometimes producing outcomes that are unpredictable or potentially harmful, challenges conventional legal frameworks that have traditionally assumed human agency as the central point of accountability.

This requirement explores two interconnected dimensions of this discourse. **Firstly**, it examines the conceptual notion of a "robotic person," an entity capable of functioning independently of human control while interacting with the external environment in ways that may carry legal consequences. **Secondly**, it considers the emerging trend toward granting AI systems legal personality, evaluating both the motivations behind this movement and the complex legal, ethical, and practical implications it entails. By addressing these aspects, we can better understand how



law might adapt to accommodate the unique characteristics of intelligent systems while safeguarding principles of responsibility, liability, and accountability.

Firstly: The Concept of a Robotic Person Operating Independently of Humans

Advanced AI systems are designed to provide autonomy to clients by leveraging specialized programs engineered to achieve complex objectives in environments involving multiple interacting entities. For these systems to function independently, they require a foundational framework of information and algorithms provided by their designers. Consequently, AI systems emerge as independent physical entities guided by sophisticated software architectures.

This capability has sparked an intense debate over whether such systems should be recognized as legal entities. Opinions are sharply divided: proponents argue for legal recognition based on AI's autonomy and decision-making abilities, whereas opponents caution against transferring responsibility from humans to machines.

Secondly: The Trend Towards Recognizing AI's Legal Personality

There is an observable shift toward acknowledging AI as potentially deserving legal personality, primarily due to its operational independence. Legal scholars suggest that just as humans acquire legal personality not solely by virtue of their humanity but through their capacity to bear rights and obligations, autonomous AI systems could similarly be assigned a digital legal persona.

In support of this, on 16 February 2017, the European Parliament issued recommendations on civil law regulations for robotics. Among these proposals was the concept of granting electronic legal personality to certain AI systems, thereby establishing a distinct legal status. Such recognition would ensure that highly autonomous robots are accountable as electronic entities for any harm they may cause.

As AI systems continue to evolve, their autonomy and decision-making capacity strengthen the argument for differentiated legal treatment. Robots with limited independence may be considered mere property, while highly autonomous systems may require regulatory frameworks analogous to human rights principles, reflecting the complexity of their functions and potential impact.

Conclusion

As Artificial Intelligence continues to redefine technological, economic, and institutional landscapes, its profound influence extends far beyond mere automation. This study has examined both the transformative potential of AI and the complex legal and ethical questions it raises. The following conclusion synthesizes the key findings and actionable recommendations for responsible governance.



First: Research Findings

1- Artificial Intelligence represents a structurally distinct technological paradigm characterized by autonomy, adaptive learning, and data-driven reasoning, which clearly differentiates it from traditional automated systems.

2- AI has evolved into a cross-sectoral infrastructure deeply embedded in critical domains including healthcare, finance, law, security, education, and governance thereby reshaping institutional operations and decision-making models.

3- A significant structural gap exists between the rapid evolution of AI technologies and the comparatively slow adaptation of legal frameworks, which remain predominantly grounded in human agency and fault-based liability.

4- The debate surrounding AI legal personality reflects genuine concerns regarding accountability; however, granting full legal personhood to autonomous systems remains conceptually premature and legally controversial.

5- Artificial Intelligence embodies a dual nature: it functions as a powerful engine of innovation and economic growth while simultaneously generating complex ethical and legal risks, including privacy concerns, bias, labor displacement, and security threats.

Second: Research Recommendations

1- Legislators should adopt comprehensive, adaptive, and risk-based regulatory frameworks capable of evolving alongside technological advancements.

2- Specialized liability regimes must be developed to address harm caused by autonomous systems while preserving meaningful human oversight and clearly allocating responsibility among developers, operators, and deploying institutions.

3- Transparency, explainability, and auditability standards should be institutionalized, particularly in high-risk sectors, to ensure accountability and protect fundamental rights.

4- Ethical principles such as fairness, proportionality, non-discrimination, and respect for human dignity must be embedded into AI systems through an ethics-by-design approach supported by effective supervisory mechanisms.

5- International cooperation and interdisciplinary capacity building are essential to harmonize regulatory responses and ensure that AI governance remains aligned with the rule of law and sustainable innovation.

Ultimately, the study affirms that governing Artificial Intelligence requires a principled balance between fostering technological progress and safeguarding accountability, legal certainty, and human-centered values in an increasingly algorithmic world.



Footnotes

- ¹ Čerka, P., Grigienė, J., & Sirbikytė, G. (2015). Liability for damages caused by artificial intelligence. *Computer Law & Security Review*, 31(3), 376-389.
- ² Watanabe, Y. (2021). Inventor: Patent inventorship for artificial intelligence systems. *Idaho Law Review*, 57, 475.
- ³ Buiten, M., De Streel, A., & Peitz, M. (2023). The law and economics of AI liability. *Computer Law & Security Review*, 48, 105794.
- ⁴ Buiten, M., De Streel, A., & Peitz, M. Op.cit.
- ⁵ Zech, H. (2021, April). Liability for AI: Public policy considerations. In *ERA Forum*(Vol. 22, No. 1, pp. 147-158). Berlin/Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- ⁶ Laptev, V. A. (2019). Artificial intelligence and liability for its work. *Law: Journal of Higher School of Economics*, 79.
- ⁷ Duffourc, M. N., & Gerke, S. (2023). The proposed EU directives for AI liability leave worrying gaps likely to impact medical AI. *NPJ Digital Medicine*, 6(1), 77.
- ⁸ Smith, H. (2021). Clinical AI: Opacity, accountability, responsibility and liability. *AI & Society*, 36(2).
- ⁹ Smith, H. Op.cit.□
- ¹⁰ Al-‘Amrāwī, M. ‘U. (2021). The basis of robotics between traditional rules and modern trends. *Journal of the Faculty of Sharia and Law, Egypt*, 23(2), Part 4.
- ¹¹ Hacker, P. (2023). The European AI liability directives—Critique of a half-hearted approach and lessons for the future. *Computer Law & Security Review*, 51, 105871.
- ¹² Bottomley, D., & Thaler, D. (2023). Liability for harm caused by AI in healthcare: An overview of the core legal concepts. *Frontiers in Pharmacology*, 14, 1297353.
- ¹³ Navas, S. (2020). Producer liability for AI-based technologies in the European Union. *International Law Research*, 9(1).
- ¹⁴ Arcila, B. B. (2024). AI liability in Europe: How does it complement risk regulation and deal with the problem of human oversight? *Computer Law & Security Review*, 54, 106012.
- ¹⁵ Wachter, S. (2024). Limitations and loopholes in the EU AI Act and AI Liability Directives: What this means for the European Union, the United States, and beyond. *Yale Journal of Law and Technology*, 26(3).
- ¹⁶ Muḥammad, W. S. (2022). Artificial intelligence and intellectual property rights: Characteristics, risks, and future implications. *The Scientific Journal for Intellectual Property and Creativity Management*, (5).



¹⁷ Bottomley, D., & Thaler, D. Op.cit.

¹⁸ Buiten, M., De Streel, A., & Peitz, M. Op.cit.

¹⁹ Tai, E. T. T. (2024). Liability for artificial intelligence. In *Research Handbook in Data Science and Law* (pp. 92–116). Edward Elgar Publishing.

²⁰ Muḥammad, W. S. Op.cit.

References :

Articles:

Al-‘Amrāwī, M. ‘U. (2021). The basis of robotics between traditional rules and modern trends. *Journal of the Faculty of Sharia and Law, Egypt*, 23(2), Part 4.

Arcila, B. B. (2024). AI liability in Europe: How does it complement risk regulation and deal with the problem of human oversight? *Computer Law & Security Review*, 54, 106012.

Bottomley, D., & Thaler, D. (2023). Liability for harm caused by AI in healthcare: An overview of the core legal concepts. *Frontiers in Pharmacology*, 14, 1297353.

Buiten, M., De Streel, A., & Peitz, M. (2023). The law and economics of AI liability. *Computer Law & Security Review*, 48, 105794.

Čerka, P., Grigienė, J., & Širbikytė, G. (2015). Liability for damages caused by artificial intelligence. *Computer Law & Security Review*, 31(3), 376-389.

Duffourc, M. N., & Gerke, S. (2023). The proposed EU directives for AI liability leave worrying gaps likely to impact medical AI. *NPJ Digital Medicine*, 6(1), 77.

Hacker, P. (2023). The European AI liability directives—Critique of a half-hearted approach and lessons for the future. *Computer Law & Security Review*, 51, 105871.

Laptev, V. A. (2019). Artificial intelligence and liability for its work. *Law: Journal of Higher School of Economics*, 79.

Muḥammad, W. S. (2022). Artificial intelligence and intellectual property rights: Characteristics, risks, and future implications. *The Scientific Journal for Intellectual Property and Creativity Management*, (5).

Navas, S. (2020). Producer liability for AI-based technologies in the European Union. *International Law Research*, 9(1).

Smith, H. (2021). Clinical AI: Opacity, accountability, responsibility and liability. *AI & Society*, 36(2).

Tai, E. T. T. (2024). Liability for artificial intelligence. In *Research Handbook in Data Science and Law* (pp. 92–116). Edward Elgar Publishing.

Wachter, S. (2024). Limitations and loopholes in the EU AI Act and AI Liability Directives: What this means for the European Union, the United States, and beyond. *Yale Journal of Law and Technology*, 26(3).

Watanabe, Y. (2021). Inventor: Patent inventorship for artificial intelligence systems. *Idaho Law Review*, 57, 475.

Zech, H. (2021, April). Liability for AI: Public policy considerations. In *ERA Forum*(Vol. 22, No. 1, pp. 147-158). Berlin/Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg.