International Journal of Web of Multidisciplinary Studies
(Peer-Reviewed, Open Access, Fully Refereed International Journal)
website: https://ijwos.com
Volume 3 Issue 6 , June 2026
E-ISSN : 3049-2424
DOI: https://doi.org/10.71366/ijwos

The Algorithmic State: Constitutional Challenges in AI-Driven Denial of Welfare Benefits in India

Yashwant Shailendra Soni [1]
[1] *Mahatma Gandhi Kashi Vidyapeeth*

Article Info

Article History:

Published: 25 June 2026

Publication Issue:
Volume 3, Issue 6
June-2026

Page Number:
286-299

Corresponding Author:
Joycemary Karatapu

Abstract:

The world of public administration is expanding and gaining more and more the territory of Artificial Intelligence (AI) also. Algorithmic systems are helping governments to distribute welfare benefits, assess eligibility, use computer algorithms and algorithms for processing applications, and detect fraud more efficiently. Digitization of government services is driving the trend of automated decision-making in India, e.g., social welfare, public distribution systems, scholarships, pensions, and many others. These technologies have the potential to increase service delivery effectiveness, reduce costs, and improve administration, but also raise important constitutional issues in instances of decision-making that is largely opaque and is used almost exclusively by automated means when decisions impinge upon citizens' rights and entitlements.

This paper considers the implications for the constitution of AI-based decision making in relation welfare administration. It asserts that the growing use of algorithmic systems in the assessment of entitlement to public benefits may have a potential impact on the rule of law and go against the basic and underlying constitutional values of equality, fairness, transparency and procedural justice. Automated systems may lead to discriminatory outcomes, lack of complete or accurate data, and withhold benefits without offering adequate explanations or review options. These risks are particularly great in welfare systems where the beneficiaries tend to be more socially and economically disadvantaged.

The paper works through the notion of algorithmic state and examines the relevance of classic traditional concepts of constitutional protection to novel experiences of automated governance. It also investigates issues of bias, lack of transparency in algorithmic decisions, and the reduction of human oversight in public decisions. The study argues that "administrative efficiency," cannot excuse a tampering with the constitutional protections. It recognizes that the implementation of AI in welfare governance needs to be supported by strong safeguards such as transparency stipulations, accountability systems, human review procedures, and remedies for those impacted by adverse outcomes due to automated decision-making.

Keywords: Algorithmic State

1. Introduction and Conceptual Framework

These past 20 years have seen a radical change in the relationship between technology and governance. Digital technologies are a tool governments increasingly use to bring public administration to life, characterize the role of a responsive bureaucracy and deliver better public services. One of the biggest developments in this space is the increasing implementation of Artificial Intelligence (AI) and algorithmic decision making systems. Such technologies

are able to manipulate massive amounts of data, recognize patterns, forecast future trends, and even support decision-making for administrative agencies—and with fewer humans involved.

AI is promoted in public administration with the argument of efficiency and accuracy. In addition to the ability to process applications faster than human officials, automated systems will lower the cost of administration and help governments keep track of large-scale welfare programmes. Technology is often considered a tool needed to govern better and to mitigate inefficiencies in countries with large populations and complex welfare systems. India has embraced the digital governance as an integral part of the public governance. Digital infrastructure is increasingly important in providing benefits and public services, depending on various government initiatives. The reliance on digital databases and automated systems for verification is key to welfare schemes, such as those on pension, scholarships, subsidies, health support, and social security. Technology is now increasingly sophisticated, and its use to meet eligibility requirements, detect any potential fraud, identify priorities of beneficiaries and take administrative decisions is gaining popularity.

While these benefits may appear to be significant, there are constitutional issues to consider as AI is increasingly integrated into public administration. Welfare benefits don't just exist for the convenient administrative reason. They are vital resources for many citizens, needed for their survival, education, health care and economic security. When algorithmic systems are used to decide who gets and who does not receive or lose such benefits, concerns about ‘fairness, accountability, and constitutional legitimacy arise'.

Automated systems can generate incorrect exclusions, misassessments, and/ or wrong outcomes of these. People can be rejected from receiving benefits for various reasons including inaccuracies in the data, human error in algorithms, and distorted interpretations within technologies. Many times, an affected person may not be aware of the reasoning behind a decision, nor know how to challenge the decision. This comes into its own when choices between members, such as about recruiting faceoffs, are made in an opaque manner, and it is hard to question.

Thus, the balance of administrative efficiency with protecting the rights of individual citizens is a case of balancing that is argued before the Constitution. As technological innovation enhances governance, it can also seek to undermine the key principles of equality, fairness and due process, that underpin constitutional democracy. In situations where increasing decisions are made by automating rather than humans, the nature of constitutional protections must be reconsidered as to how they work.

2. Understanding the Algorithmic State

An algorithmic state is one in which public institutions are using algorithms, automated processes, and AI to take or aid administrative decisions. These technological tools are not simply tools for officials to work with but also ones that can impact citizens' rights, opportunities, and entitlements.

An Algorithm is a set of instructions that processes some information and output some results based on some set rules or criteria. AI systems today use state-of-the-art computation methods to detect patterns in massive amounts of data and to make forecasts or suggestions based on these patterns. These systems can have a impact on decisions regarding welfare distribution, taxation, healthcare, law enforcement, education and social services, when applied to public administration.

The growing prevalence of algorithmic systems is part of a larger shift toward government by data. Governments're collect and process vast amounts of data about citizens, their economic activities and use of public services. With artificial intelligence, there's the potential to analyze that data and gain insights to further assist with the decision-making process. Thus, algorithmic governance is suggested as a more neutral and effective management of decisions in contrast to bureaucratic decision-making.

The original premise of automated systems, however, that they are objective and neutral, is increasingly questioned, however. Algorithms developed by people, trained on past data, and shaped by institutional policies. This can lead to the carrying out of prejudice, inaccurate assumptions or to the generation of outcomes that impact on certain groups disproportionately to others. Algorithms often have sophisticated computational processes that are not easy to comprehend and may not be fully understood by individuals that are impacted by the algorithms. This opacity is a huge hindrance to constitutional government. In classical administrative law, it is assumed that legal mechanisms are available to explain, examine and contest the public decision. This assumption is complicated by algorithmic systems which introduce technical processes that can be unavailable even to the officials, on the basis of which these questions are drawn. Given this development, there are numerous questions about accountability, democratic oversight, and how algorithms affect democratic accountability.In light of the algorithmic state, there are a host of accounting and democratic oversight questions and, inevitably, questions about how the algorithmic state impacts citizen accountability.

Why Welfare Decisions Require Constitutional Scrutiny

AI's application in welfare administration is a specific area where the constitution should be addressed since the distribution of welfare benefits have a direct impact on the lives of disadvantaged people. The people who have less resources and less options to them receive a number of programs or services stemming from their needs for food security, for pension benefits, for housing help, for studying through a scholarship, for medical services, for social welfare etc. Failure to provide such benefits can lead to dire repercussions.

Constitutional values are closely tied to many welfare determinations that lie beyond the scope of most commercial decisions. Enabling individuals to access their basic entitlements has implications for their life and their interactions with the world around them. This means that welfare decisions are not purely efficiency and/or resource management decisions.

The dangers of automation of welfare administration are great. Errors can be made by algorithmic systems, such as classifying people as not eligible, when in fact they may be, and vice versa, treating a legitimate claimant to be a fraudulent claimant, or omitting to consider unique situations where human judgement is needed. Inaccuracies in government databases can worsen in automation steps, resulting in incorrect denials of government benefits.

A further issue to consider is that there are no informative explanations. The public authorities' accountability to the public is usually in terms of giving people reasons for their decisions when their businesses or activities have a negative impact on the people. Automated systems can produce results with no transparency on why the system made the result. This can make it difficult for the person who was denied benefits to grasp why they were excluded or how they can go about getting their benefits.

Welfare decisions have a more pronounced constitutional significance when considered from a vulnerable community's perspective. The people that rely most on public benefits are least likely to be able to use complex technological systems or even question administrative mistakes. Algorithmic decision-making can exacerbate inequalities if proper precautions are not taken, meaning that inequalities may be further entrenched.

Such a sophisticated reliance on algorithms in public services gives rise to a core constitutional challenge - Is the use of automated systems to measure eligibility for welfare benefits compatible with the principles of equality, fairness, and accountability agreed to and protected by the constitution? The main axis of the present research becomes the question whether AI systems can serve as welfare administration bodies in their own right. That is the question that dominates the present work and is used to examine the constitutional problems of welfare administrative structures based on AI.

Part II: Constitutional Challenges of Algorithmic Decision-Making

There is growing concern in the field of constitutional matters in public administration with the use of artificial intelligence. Although often used to serve the efficiency and the certainty of algorithmic systems, the resulting decisions with automated decision-making approach the rights and interests of citizens in a direct manner in the case of welfare administration. Constitutional guarantees of equality, fairness, transparency, and accountability have heightened relevance in their context where eligibility for pension, scholarship, food assistance, access to medical benefits, or other public services is defined by algorithms. The challenge goes beyond technology, it is constitutional: technological dependency on automation and the question of ‘algorithmic governance and fundamental rights'.

3. Article 14 and Algorithmic Equality

The equality before the law along with the equality of laws is guaranteed by Article 14 of the Constitution of India. As the years have gone by, judicial interpretation has broadened the interpretation of Article 14 to provide protection against arbitrary action by the State. The Supreme Court has constantly highlighted that government actions must be

fair, reasonable and devoid of arbitrariness. These constitutional requirements are challenged particularly by the use of algorithmic systems in the administration of welfare. While algorithms tend to be taken at face value and treated as unbiased and neutral, they are based on data and assumptions that have been incorporated into their development. The decisions based on an algorithm may reinforce social inequalities that are embedded in the data used to train the algorithm. Thus, people can be treated differently, not because of the legal differences but because of patterns that became ingrained in technological systems.

There are several ways in which algorithmic-bias can manifest. Having an eligibility system built on a rather poor set of data could lead to incorrectly labeling some as not receiving welfare benefits. Likewise, if there are patterns of bias in historic claim data, predictive systems used to detect fraudulent claims can unfairly reflect a particular community's claims. These results create some problematic issues of substantive equality, as people are set up to fail at things that are not under their control.

The constitutional issue is exacerbated by the fact that discriminatory results might not be immediately realized. Often explicit policies or practices will reveal the presence of traditional forms of discrimination. By comparison, algorithmic discrimination can be embedded in strategy that might be costly or complex that may not be easily reviewed. As a consequence, affected persons can be treated differently in a non-discriminatory way and do not even know how or why this is the case.

Algorithmic systems in public administration need, therefore, to be scrutinized carefully to ensure their non-arbitrariness in line with the scope of Article 14. It does not matter if government decisions are made using technology as opposed to human officials, they are always subject to constitutional review. Algorithmic systems, which produce irrational, discriminatory or arbitrary results, are still subject to constitutional constraints.

Article 21 and Procedural Fairness

During the development of the Dodd-Frank, it became clear that the House Financial Services Committee intended to expand the corporate liability that the bill imposes.As the Dodd-Frank evolved in the House Financial Services Committee, it was apparent that committee members were looking for a broader corporate liability in the bill. Judicial interpretation has led to its interpretation with a very wide interpretation scope, and it also indicates that the procedures affecting the person shall be fair, just and reasonable. Procedural justice has become a core element of constitutionalism.

Concerns exist about procedural justice in welfare administration regarding the use of AI-driven decision making. Individuals who may access welfare benefits have a real impact on their capacity to access food, health care, education and basic economic security. Dennis's appeal alleges that his decision to withhold this benefit will have significant impacts on human dignity and well-being.

One major issue is the decision-making process that happens because of algorithm systems without anytime enough human control. Automated systems can manage huge amounts of data and obtain results with the basis of rules or standards. But, these systems may be unable to deal with unusual situations, context or experience that a human decision maker might consider. If one becomes too reliant on automatic systems then this can lead to an inequitable result.

Some challenges include the lack of insight regarding their decisions into negative outcomes for affected people. The concept of procedural fairness is usually conceived as the principle that people be informed of the reasons for actions and decisions and that they have some chance of contesting them. In cases of on-going algorithms as 'black boxes' explanations may be required but may not be meaningful. This could then leave citizens without adequate reasons or adequate review for being denied access to welfare programs.

The constitutional issues are even more serious if an automated system constitutes the sole basis for decision making. Technology can therefore be used to replace human judgment when it comes to things that impact perhaps most importantly the fundamental interests. The absence of proper safeguards could jeopardise the procedural safeguards that are being looked for by Article 21.

Natural Justice at the time of Artificial Intelligence

The principles of Natural Justice have been a striking feature of the Indian Administrative Law for long. These values assure the just and accountable use of power by public officials. Two aspects of natural justice are germane to the context of algorithmic-governance: the right to be heard and the demand that decisions be brought about through fair procedures.

The first, sometimes called the doctrine of "audi alteram partem," is that people must be allowed to have a say in the matter before harming them. Thus in the classic administrative context, citizens are able to challenge accusations, rectify errors and give relevant details.

This is made complicated by algorithmic systems. Automated decisions can be made automatically, may not be based on an individual's actions at all, and can be made without notice or any meaningful interaction with the individual concerned. Citizens can be deprived of benefits without being given a chance to correct the information or to address exceptional conditions. These practices can be misleading in terms of the participatory aspects of the procedural justice claims.

The second issue is the need for management action to be justifiable and published. The public bodies are generally expected to give grounds for any action that impacts rights and interests. Reasoned decision making ensures accountability and helps in judicial review. But algorithmic systems often produce results using processes that can 'be difficult to make sense of in comprehensible terms.

People will not be able to use the right to complain against negative decisions if there aren't good explanations. Lack of transparency thus undermines the actual benefits of natural justice principles. In an increasingly automated and virtualised public administration, it is vital for citizens to have effective means of participation in decision-making processes, in compliance with the constitution.

Transparency, Explainability, and Constitutional Accountability

Transparency has become one of the biggest hurdles empirical with algorithmic governance. In most traditional modes of decision-making, the decisions are the product of an identifiable process, and the basis of the decisions as well as their justification can be explained by the officials making them. Algorithmic systems, on the other hand, frequently run based on intricate models which can be hard to decipher for citizens, administrators and even algorithm makers themselves.

Indeed, as soon as the subject of AI governance comes up, the word explainability comes into play. Explainability is the sense in which the individual can explain how and why a decision was made. Welfare administration requires explainability because if citizens cannot detect an error, their rights to challenge agency decisions or to seek appropriate action in response to poor decisions are curbed.

Lacking transparency is highly challenging with regards to accountability. When management at the government level is dependent on algorithmic systems and there is no understanding of the working of such systems, blame is hard to come by and the accountability issue becomes complex. When citizens are led to believe a wrongful refusal was due to faulty data, narrow programming, administrative mistakes or some kind of technical error, it may be hard to decide which is their opinion is accurate and how to deal with it. This creates incredible doubt and reduces democratic accountability.

There must be public power subject to scrutiny and review in order to function in a constitutional manner. Processes that are not accountable are not efficient. It is therefore crucial to treat transparency and explainability as a constitutional requirement and not as an option in technology.

Judicial Review and the Limits of Automated Governance

The growth of algorithmic government also poses difficulties for judicial review. Constitutional and legal requirements form part of the constitutional and legal forum through which courts traditionally have evaluated administrative actions. This process assumes that there are decision-making procedures that can be reviewed; evidence that can be examined; and reasons that can be examined.

Each of these takes the complexity of algorithmic systems. Judges can find it challenging to assess models which are complex, technical, and involve more advanced computations. When decisions are not transparent it might be hard to

examine what they were based on. Moreover, the government may not be able to give a comprehensive explanation of the algorithmic output itself.

Nonetheless, constitutional supervision can't be forfeited. Technology is not an end but a means and it doesn't take away constitutional mandates. The decisions made by public authorities continue to have an impact on citizens, whether this takes the form of a direct or indirect order, a human decision or artificial intelligence support.

So the constitutional question is how to make sure that technological innovation 'serves' constitutional values. Administrative authorities may need to use algorithms to support their actions, yet they cannot rely upon algorithms instead of the demands of a fair, accountable, equal, and just procedure underpinning a democratic system of government. With the increasingly broad and powerful use of the algorithmic state, the role of guaranteeing constitutional rights to citizens, in an algorithmic society, will be vital.

Part III: Real-World Risks and Comparative Perspectives

Alongside the principles of the constitution and its guiding role in the assessment of algorithmic governance, the risks that flow from the use of AI for decision-making cannot be overlooked. In some jurisdictions, other than government, errors, discriminatory outcomes and wrongful exclusions resulting from the use of automated systems in welfare administration have already raised controversy. These experiences illustrate that algorithmic systems are not simply machines, but thoroughly impactful systems that have the potential to impact millions of lives. A closer look on these risks allows us to better understand the need for constitutional protection in times of overuse of AI by governments for public benefit distribution.

Algorithmic Bias and Discriminatory Outcomes

Algorithmic bias is one of the most recurring topics of discussion when it comes to AI. Algorithms work by recognising patterns in data sets, making decisions, or making recommendations, based on them. The quality of the data and information available for training and running an algorithm, however, can have a great impact on the output of the algorithm.

If algorithmic systems are used within datasets that exhibit historical problems such as inaccuracies or missing information, then the algorithmic systems can perpetuate those issues. That can in turn lead to outcomes that unfairly impact on specific social groups as a result of automated decision-making. This is particularly alarming in welfare administration, as governments' decisions will directly impact vulnerable groups.

Discrimination can be unintended and still create bias. A fraud detection algorithm that seeks to detect welfare fraud, for instance, may be based on patterns found in welfare rolls from past years that demonstrate the inequalities of the social and economic system as it is. In particular, some groups may receive more scrutiny than others, even when there is no valid reason or basis for differential treatment.

The root reason for the constitutional concern with algorithmic bias is that it can impugn substantive equality. The fairness of any governmental action that unfairly discriminates against specific groups cannot be justified simply because it is being made by technology. Though the process is important, it is equally crucial to examine outcomes. Constitutional concerns emerge even if the AI system's effects are discriminatory but it was unintentionally so.

Wrongful Exclusion from Welfare Benefits

One of the most serious risks of the automated arrangement of welfare is the risk of misexcluding. Welfare indirectly supports people who are relying on assistance from the government for a multitude of reasons such as food, health, education, housing, and financial services, etc. Inaccuracies with regard to the eligibility determination can hence have instant and harsh repercussions. Traditional administrative systems depend on human officers who can be better able to grasp each situation, and be flexible and tolerant where required. Algorithmic systems, in turn, utilize a set of rules and statistical models. This can make for efficiency, but can also play into the danger that unique situations get missed. Inaccuracies in government records, mismatched identity information, incomplete databases, and errors in the computer systems could result in a citizen missing out on benefits. The person concerned may not even know that he or she was a party to an algorithmic system on which the decision relates, or that any such influence was present. The substantive eligibility requirement may not be met and vulnerable persons may be cut off from being placed in essential support, for example, because of the exclusion.

The issue is further complicated where there is a weak or unavailable grievance process. But when people don't comprehend the reasons for the benefit's refusal, it's very hard to challenge a refusal. Therefore automation can be a mechanism of injustice for those communities most in need of government support. Wrongful exclusion is a matter of constitutional concern as to fairness, dignity and availability of remedies. No system of administration is worth it if there are not sufficient safeguards against mistakes to ensure that those who are eligible receive benefits.

Data Quality and Automation Errors

The effectiveness of an algorithmic system is greatly dependent on data quality assumptions. Governments are building up large-scale digital registers of data on identity, income, employment, education, health and involvement in welfare. The information is used by AI systems to make decisions and recommendations. Whereas, public databases have inaccuracies and/or incompleteness. Information might be inaccurate, inconsistent, repetitive, and not correctly documented. Human failure in the data source, data entry is also an issue which can impact the performance of the system. Errors from incorrect data can be compounded, rather than reduced, when used in algorithmic decision making.

One of the pressing issues is assuming the accuracy of information available within automated systems and the reliance on the same. Algorithms typically cannot assess whether underlying data is trustworthy, unless they are designed to

do so. This can result in incorrect eligibility decisions and other administrative processes being affected. Another way for automation errors to happen is any technical issue that might occur within the system. An algorithm can incorrectly classify someone, come up with the wrong estimates of risk, or enforce a decision based on a criterion in a manner different from the way the algorithm was designed. These become more a problem with large populations, since individual mistakes can impact thousands of decisions concurrently.

Thus emerges a paradox of relying on data driven governance. Technologies designed to enhance administrative precision can create additional errors when the data on which the technology is based is uncertain. It is essential that these threats to constitutional governance are appreciated and that adequate protections are put in place that could help avert mistakes in technology becoming mistakes in law.

4. Comparative Perspectives

There have been several difficulties in public administration resulting from algorithmic decision-making found in different jurisdictions. These learnings are useful insights on the potential opportunities and risks of automated governance.

The European Union has become one of the world's front runners in the field of automated decision making regulation. European data protection laws recognize that entirely automated decisions can have a significant impact on individuals. In such situations, where rights and interests are primarily affected by the implementation of an automated system, regulatory provisions put a spotlight on transparency and accountability as well as on a preventive vigilance against situations where purely automated decisions are made. Explainability has been a focus of much discussion in Europe, too. People impacted by automated decisions should receive adequate information explaining the nature of the decision they were subjected to and appeal against them if it is deemed necessary. Transparency is emphasized, reflecting a larger concern with maintaining the individual's autonomy and fairness in the process.

In the USA, the questions of care automation have been object of a broad discussion. Algorithmic systems have been criticized for false negative errors, when people were deemed to be ineligible or as having committed fraud, in various programs at the state level. These experiences have shown that technological efficiency is not suitable to achieve fair outcomes.

In recent years, American scholarship has increasingly turned to the notion of algorithmic accountability. Both policy makers and researchers are careful not to take for granted that technologies are neutral but take measures to allow for oversight to detect bias, errors and unintended consequences. The main message is the need for ongoing examination of computer systems and not blind faith.

Lessons for India

Other jurisdictions have valuable lessons to impart to India. First, the algorithmic system cannot replace the constitutional protections. Technological innovation can enhance administrative efficiency, but it cannot overcome the principles of fairness and equal opportunity, accountability.

Second, the "transparency" should be adopted as a prerequisite for the automated government. Users of algorithms should have an opportunity to appeal negative effects of algorithmic decisions and understand how those decisions are made. If it is not transparent, there can be no accountability.

Thirdly, human control cannot be replaced. While algorithms may help administrative bodies process information and to detect patterns, its functioning should not be completely autonomous while making decisions concerning fundamental interests. The human review is a valuable protective measure against errors and bias, and the possibility of unfair outcomes.

Last but not least, governments need to understand technological systems are not innocuous. AI systems built by designers, operated by designers and implemented by designers have constitutional implications. Achieving algorithmic consistency with constitutional values when India is becoming a digital nation is key to safeguarding individual rights and public trust in government institutions.

Part IV: Building a Constitutional Framework for the Algorithmic State

Public administration and the use of artificial intelligence is becoming more and more intertwined and it is necessary to shape a regulatory framework that can manage decisions made using AI algorithms. Although the overarching fundamental principles of the Constitution still apply, additional protection measures are necessary for the particular nature of AI systems. The aim is not to hinder the use of technology by government, but to make sure that the use of technology doesn't encroach on the constitutional limits. An efficient instrument should take account of both administration and fundamental rights/democratic accountability.

Existing Regulatory Landscape in India

The Indian government has taken major steps to modernize its administrative and service delivery processes, with the focus on digitization.The Indian government has made great strides in the field of digital governance, aiming to streamline services and administrative processes. Digital databases, automated verification systems and electronic platforms are increasingly being used by public authorities to manage welfare policies and public services. The process of algorithmic decision-making in government interventions, however, at present, falls short of a systematic, in-depth legal framework in India to govern these technologies.

The Digital Personal Data Protection Act, 2023 lays a significant historical precedent for protection of data and lays down obligations to the processing of Personal Data. However, the Act confirms data governance and data privacy are the core concepts of the legislation, not its constitutional implications of automated decision making. Does not

sufficiently cover algorithmic responsibility, algorithmic explainability or eligibility for public benefits. Likewise, practices and principles of administration apply to the administration of government, although they evolved in times when governments relied mostly on human decision makers. With increasingly powerful automated tools, a complex algorithm, machine learning models and vast data analysis may pose new questions to be answered by traditional law. The lack of clarity in this regulation is an example of the need for more specific safeguards that address the reality of algorithmic governance.

Proposed Constitutional Safeguard

The starting point of a constitutional algorithmic state should be that technology ought to be a servant of constitutional values. It is understandable that AI will support public administration but it should not be allowed to compromise essential rights or enhance accountability systems in public life. One of the first is that of following a human-in-the-loop approach. While algorithmic-assisted decision making might help officials clear information, consider that using automated systems doesn't necessarily mean that specific decisions to deny welfare benefits should only be based on the algorithm. There is a need for human review to ensure special circumstances, unusual situations and possible error are addressed. Keeping meaningful, human oversight, reduces risk of unfair playing outcomes and strengthens accountability.

A further protection is the acknowledgment of a right to explanation. People who experience adverse outcomes from the use of algorithms to make decisions should know why the decision was made. Citizens can't question decisions they don't understand and they can't do so without meaningful explanations. The transparency is thus not only used for fairness in procedure but also for the accountability of the democratic process. There should be a requirement for government authorities to publish such “criteria”, “factors” and “processes” that “will have a significant effect” on automated decisions.

The third is that, effective grievance and appeal procedures are established. Citizens should be provided with simple and quick avenues through which they could challenge decisions and correct errors. A process of meaningful review that goes beyond automation should be undertaken when making appeals. The mechanisms are therefore important for welfare administration, where their beneficiaries are susceptible populations that lack means.

Independent algorithmic audits are also an important protection. Government agencies operating AI systems should regularly audit their technologies to detect bias, inaccuracy, reliability and conform to the constitutional principles. Independent audits don't necessarily have to become a destructive force as they can uncover discriminatory outcomes, technical problems, and systemic errors before the community suffers widespread harm. Review is also a key to gain the trust of the public toward automated governance systems.

Next, the transparency requirements should be not limited to individual explanations. Information on the use of AI systems, what they can provide, the data that is processed, and the measures that are taken to ensure security for

citizens should be made public by public authorities. Political accountability should be transparent and available to everyone during any decisions made by any kind of government – human or otherwise.

5. Conclusion

The rise of algorithmic state is one of the greatest Constitutional questions in the digital era. AI provides governments with robust resources to enhancing the efficiency and effectiveness of their operations, lower administrative costs, and provide public services to many more. But as the technologies emerge, so do the equally related risks to equality, fairness, transparency, and accountability. Algorithmic systems have far-reaching impact when used to identify persons eligible for welfare services, as these may generate errors and biases with consequences for the person seeking welfare services.

This paper has been saying that constitutional principles are still applicable in today's era of algorithmic governance. The State's duty to act fairly, reasonably and transparently will not be undermined in its use of artificial intelligence. Public decisions (whether by humans or machines) must also honour equality, procedural fairness and human dignity as per articles 14 and 21.

The question stand is not whether or not India should utilize AI in his public administration, however how it is regulated. A transparent, accountable, human-controlled, and well-supported by remedies constitutional framework can guarantee that technological innovations do not compromise or erode democratic processes. At the end of the day, efficiency can't be a replacement for constitutional duty. Algorithms are possible tools for the State in the context of a constitutional democracy, but not tools that can be used to bypass the protections of a people against arbitrary and unjust uses of public power.

ReferenceS

1. Constitution of India, 1950.

Cases

- A.K. Kraipak v. Union of India, (1969) 2 SCC 262.
- E.P. Royappa v. State of Tamil Nadu, (1974) 4 SCC 3.
- Maneka Gandhi v. Union of India, (1978) 1 SCC 248.
- Justice K.S. Puttaswamy (Retd.) v. Union of India, (2017) 10 SCC 1.

1. Statutes

- Digital Personal Data Protection Act, No. 22 of 2023, INDIA CODE (2023).
- Information Technology Act, No. 21 of 2000, INDIA CODE (2000).

2. International Instruments

- Convention for the Protection of Individuals with regard to Automatic Processing of Personal Data, Jan. 28, 1981, ETS No. 108.
- Universal Declaration of Human Rights, G.A. Res. 217A (III), U.N. Doc. A/810 (Dec. 10, 1948).

3. European Union Materials

Regulation (EU) 2016/679 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 27 April 2016 (General Data Protection Regulation), 2016 O.J. (L 119) 1.

Secondary Sources

Books

1. Cathy O'Neil, *Weapons of Math Destruction: How Big Data Increases Inequality and Threatens Democracy* (2016).
2. Frank Pasquale, *The Black Box Society: The Secret Algorithms That Control Money and Information* (2015).
3. Virginia Eubanks, *Automating Inequality: How High-Tech Tools Profile, Police, and Punish the Poor* (2018).

Journal Articles

1. Danielle Keats Citron & Frank Pasquale, The Scored Society: Due Process for Automated Predictions, 89 Wash. L. Rev. 1 (2014).
2. Karen Yeung, Algorithmic Regulation: A Critical Interrogation, 12 Regulation & Governance 505 (2018).
3. Mireille Hildebrandt, Algorithmic Regulation and the Rule of Law, 376 Phil. Transactions Royal Soc'y A (2018).
4. 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 Int'l Data Privacy L. 76 (2017).

Reports and Policy Documents

1. European Commission, *White Paper on Artificial Intelligence: A European Approach to Excellence and Trust* (2020).
2. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), *Recommendation of the Council on Artificial Intelligence* (2019).
3. UNESCO, *Recommendation on the Ethics of Artificial Intelligence* (2021).
4. United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, *The Right to Privacy in the Digital Age*, U.N. Doc. A/HRC/48/31 (2021).
5. World Bank, *GovTech and Public Sector Innovation: Advancing Human-Centered Approaches* (2022).