SCIENCEZONE | ONLINE SCIENTIFIC CONFERENCES

ALGORITHMIC GOVERNANCE AND CONSTITUTIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY: A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS

Kratika Giri

LLM (Dual/Double Degree) — Cybercrime Law & Digital Forensics

Kratikagiri2003@gmail.com

Abstract: Artificial intelligence isn't just a buzzword anymore, it's running the show in public administration. Governments everywhere now use algorithms to decide who gets welfare, how risky your taxes look, who's next in line for public housing, and even questions about immigration and criminal sentencing. This shift raises some serious constitutional issues. When machines take over jobs that used to belong to human officials, what happens to our rights? Let's break it down. The first problem is due process, people should know what's being decided about them, have a chance to speak up, and be able to challenge decisions. But with algorithms, these basic rights get shaky, because the logic behind the outcome is often a black box. Then there's the question of separation of powers. These complex models make big decisions with almost no human oversight, shifting real authority to systems that no one really understands or monitors.

Keywords: algorithmic governance, automated decision-making, due process, artificial intelligence law, India, Uzbekistan, administrative law reform, transparency, accountability, procedural fairness, constitutional limits, GDPR

1. Introduction

Governments worldwide are increasingly deploying algorithms to make decisions once handled by humans — determining welfare eligibility, flagging taxpayers for audit, assessing immigration cases, and predicting criminal recidivism. These automated decision-making (ADM) systems operate at massive scale with opacity that fundamentally challenges traditional administrative law (Pasquale, 2015). The constitutional stakes are concrete: individuals denied benefits, assigned fraud-risk scores, or sentenced based on algorithmic outputs may find that core procedural rights — notice, hearing, and appeal — are rendered hollow when decisions emerge from a black box.

The scale problem compounds individual harm. Human errors affect one person; algorithmic errors replicate identically across thousands of cases. Australia's Robodebt scandal (2018), the Netherlands' SyRI system struck down in 2020, and the U.S. Arkansas Medicaid algorithm controversy (Ledgerwood v. Arkansas Department of Human Services, 2019) all illustrate how algorithmic errors cascade through vulnerable populations before any corrective mechanism engages.

2. Theoretical Foundations

2.1 Due Process Under Algorithmic Pressure

Due process remains the primary constitutional lens for evaluating ADM. The tripartite balancing test from Mathews v. Eldridge (1976) — weighing private interests, risk of erroneous deprivation, and governmental burden — was designed for human decision-making. Applied to algorithms, the risk of erroneous deprivation depends on data quality, model performance across demographic groups, and training data composition — factors neither affected individuals nor reviewing officials can ordinarily assess without expert assistance.

Citron and Pasquale (2014) argue that algorithmic due process demands individualized, human-readable explanations identifying which factors drove a decision and what changes would produce a different outcome. This aligns with the State Farm requirement that agencies provide reasoned, case-specific justifications subject to meaningful review (Motor Vehicle Manufacturers Association v. State Farm, 1983). General descriptions of how a system works are insufficient; individuals are entitled to know why their specific circumstances produced the outcome they received.

The right to be heard — audi alteram partem — is similarly undermined when decision-makers cannot interrogate the system's reasoning. Eubanks (2018) found that welfare caseworkers almost never overrode algorithmic recommendations even when their judgment suggested error, reflecting the automation bias documented by Cummings (2004). Wachter et al. (2017) propose counterfactual explanations as a practical remedy: telling people not merely that they were denied, but what would need to change for a favorable outcome — without requiring disclosure of proprietary model architecture.

2.2 Equal Protection and Structural Discrimination

Angwin et al. (2016) analyzed over 7,000 cases involving the COMPAS recidivism tool and found Black defendants were labeled high-risk at nearly twice the rate of white defendants who did not reoffend, while the system consistently underestimated risk for white defendants who did. These disparities are not anomalies; they are encoded consequences of training data saturated with historical enforcement biases.

U.S. equal protection doctrine, requiring proof of discriminatory intent (Washington v. Davis, 1976; Arlington Heights v. Metropolitan Housing Development Corp., 1977), is structurally ill-suited to address algorithmic bias, which operates through statistical patterns without any human intent. European

equality law takes an impact-based approach through the GDPR and EU AI Act, shifting the burden to deployers to demonstrate non-discrimination — a far more practical allocation given algorithmic opacity.

3. International Regulatory Landscape

The EU AI Act (2024) establishes the most comprehensive framework to date, applying a risk-tiered structure with mandatory requirements for high-risk systems in welfare, migration, law enforcement, and justice contexts. These include bias-testing of training data, genuine human oversight mechanisms, technical documentation enabling post-deployment audit, and mandatory registration in a public database before deployment. Categorical prohibitions — including government social scoring and psychological manipulation — carry penalties up to €35 million or 7% of global turnover.

Predating the AI Act, GDPR Article 22 grants individuals the right to contest solely automated decisions with significant effects, requiring human review, the opportunity to express views, and the ability to challenge outcomes. The Article 29 Working Party (2018) clarified that qualifying human review must be substantive: the reviewer must have access to all relevant data, understand the system's functioning, and operate in an environment that genuinely supports independent judgment.

Canada's Directive on Automated Decision-Making (Treasury Board Secretariat, 2019) requires pre-deployment algorithmic impact assessments tiered to consequence severity, with Level 4 systems — those affecting fundamental rights at scale — requiring ministerial approval and mandatory human review of every decision. New Zealand's Algorithm Charter (2020), though voluntary, has achieved broad uptake and normalized transparency expectations across government agencies. Germany's Wesentlichkeitstheorie (essentiality doctrine) requires Parliament to specifically authorize automated

decision-making for each decision type, mandating that legislation specify permissible data, accuracy thresholds, oversight mechanisms, and appeal rights (Verwaltungsverfahrensgesetz, as amended 2021).

4. India and Uzbekistan: Comparative Analysis

4.1 India

India's constitutional foundations are robust but underutilized. Justice K.S. Puttaswamy v. Union of India (2017) established privacy as a fundamental right under Article 21, requiring that government data processing be lawful, necessary, and proportionate. Maneka Gandhi v. Union of India (1978) requires that liberty-affecting procedures be fair and non-arbitrary; Olga Tellis v. Bombay Municipal Corporation (1986) grounds livelihood rights in Article 21, providing constitutional authority to scrutinize algorithms governing welfare and economic benefit allocation.

Legislatively, the Digital Personal Data Protection Act 2023 (DPDPA) addresses data rights but contains no equivalent to GDPR Article 22 — no right to opt out of automated decisions, no right to case-specific explanation, and no mandatory human review. The Srikrishna Committee (Ministry of Electronics and Information Technology, 2018) recommended an explanation right, but this was excluded from the final legislation. The Right to Information Act (2005) offers a partial workaround, but requires applicants to know what to request, cannot compel systems to generate explanations they are not designed to produce, and operates too slowly for time-sensitive decisions. The Vidhi Centre for Legal Policy (2021) found no cross-sectoral accountability body overseeing government ADM systems.

4.2 Uzbekistan

Uzbekistan's 2021–2030 National AI Strategy commits to transparency, fairness, and human-centered design, but the World Bank (2021) identified a

significant gap between strategic aspiration and institutional capacity to implement or enforce those commitments. The 2023 constitutional amendments created appeal rights (Article 32) and information access rights (Article 55), but these provisions lack substantive algorithmic content — they do not specify what information must be disclosed, how fairness must be demonstrated, or who bears enforcement responsibility. A 2019 Presidential Decree prohibiting purely automated government decisions went largely unknown to implementing agencies and remains unenforced (UNDP, 2023).

5. Unified Recommendations

Eight reform priorities emerge from this comparative analysis, applicable to both jurisdictions with contextual adaptation:

1. Enact dedicated AI-in-government legislation establishing rights to notification, explanation, human review, and non-discrimination.
2. Mandate pre-deployment algorithmic impact assessments for high-consequence systems, modeled on Canada's tiered directive, with public disclosure and comment periods.
3. Create accessible, non-specialist appeal mechanisms with ombudsperson-type reviewers empowered to override algorithmic outcomes.
4. Equip courts with procedural tools and expert resources to conduct meaningful substantive review of ADM systems.
5. Require proactive public disclosure of system purpose, data inputs, accuracy metrics, and bias-mitigation measures.
6. Build institutional capacity through mandatory technical training for judges, legislators, and civil servants.
7. Engage with OECD (2019) and UNESCO (2021) frameworks to ensure international coherence and accountability for cross-border systems.

8. Sequence reforms across three phases: immediate administrative guidance, statutory rights creation, and constitutional or treaty-level entrenchment.

6. Conclusion

Algorithmic governance is not merely a technical upgrade; it is a structural transformation in how public power is exercised and how citizens can contest it. When ADM systems make consequential decisions without explanation, hearing, or meaningful appeal, they reproduce — and often amplify — the very inequities administrative law was designed to constrain (Crawford, 2021; Eubanks, 2018). India and Uzbekistan both possess constitutional foundations capable of supporting accountability frameworks, but legislative gaps, absent oversight institutions, and limited technical capacity leave those foundations largely unrealized. The reforms proposed here do not require rejecting algorithmic governance — they require making it genuinely accountable to the people it governs.

REFERENCES

Angwin, J., Larson, J., Mattu, S., & Kirchner, L. (2016). Machine bias. *ProPublica*. https://www.propublica.org/article/machine-bias-risk-assessments-in-criminal-sentencing

Article 29 Data Protection Working Party. (2018). *Guidelines on automated individual decision-making and profiling* (WP251rev.01). Brussels.

Citron, D. K., & Pasquale, F. (2014). The scored society: Due process for automated predictions. *Washington Law Review, 89*(1), 1–33.

Crawford, K. (2021). *Atlas of AI: Power, politics, and the planetary costs of artificial intelligence*. Yale University Press.

Cummings, M. L. (2004). Automation bias in intelligent time critical decision support systems. *AIAA 1st Intelligent Systems Technical Conference*. https://doi.org/10.2514/6.2004-6313

Eubanks, V. (2018). *Automating inequality: How high-tech tools profile, police, and punish the poor*. St. Martin's Press.

European Parliament & Council of the European Union. (2016). *General Data Protection Regulation* (EU) 2016/679. Official Journal of the EU, L 119, 1–88.

European Parliament & Council of the European Union. (2024). *Artificial Intelligence Act*, Regulation (EU) 2024/1689. Official Journal of the EU.

Government of Canada, Treasury Board Secretariat. (2019). *Directive on Automated Decision-Making*. Ottawa.

Justice K.S. Puttaswamy (Retd.) v. Union of India, (2017) 10 SCC 1 (India).

Ledgerwood v. Arkansas Department of Human Services, No. 4:17-cv-00780 (E.D. Ark. 2019).

Maneka Gandhi v. Union of India, AIR 1978 SC 597 (India).

Mathews v. Eldridge, 424 U.S. 319 (1976).

Ministry of Electronics and Information Technology. (2018). *Report of the Committee of Experts on Data Protection (Srikrishna Committee Report)*. Government of India.

Motor Vehicle Manufacturers Association v. State Farm Mutual Automobile Insurance Co., 463 U.S. 29 (1983).

New Zealand Government. (2020). *Algorithm Charter for Aotearoa New Zealand*. Statistics New Zealand.

OECD. (2019). *Recommendation of the Council on Artificial Intelligence*, OECD/LEGAL/0449. OECD.

Olga Tellis v. Bombay Municipal Corporation, AIR 1986 SC 180 (India).

Pasquale, F. (2015). *The black box society: The secret algorithms that control money and information*. Harvard University Press.

UNESCO. (2021). *Recommendation on the ethics of artificial intelligence*. SHS/BIO/PI/2021/1.

UNDP. (2023). *Rapid assessment of AI governance and data protection in Uzbekistan's public sector*. UNDP Uzbekistan.

Vidhi Centre for Legal Policy. (2021). *Mapping the use of AI in government: An exploratory analysis*.

Verwaltungsverfahrensgesetz [German Administrative Procedure Act] (BGBl. I p. 102, as amended 2021, § 35a).

Village of Arlington Heights v. Metropolitan Housing Development Corp., 429 U.S. 252 (1977).

Wachter, S., Mittelstadt, B., & Russell, C. (2017). Counterfactual explanations without opening the black box: Automated decisions and the GDPR. *Harvard Journal of Law & Technology, 31*(2), 841–887.

Washington v. Davis, 426 U.S. 229 (1976).

World Bank. (2021). *Uzbekistan digital economy diagnostic*. World Bank Group.