# CORPORATE LIABILITY IN ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE (AI) DECISIONS

S. Tanmayee Shekhar, B.com LL.B., B.M.S College of Law

**ABSTRACT**

The growing incorporation of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in business strategy and decision-making introduced Substantial moral and Judicial dilemmas particularly concerning liability for AI- driven actions.[1] While enhancing their efficiency and accuracy, unique accountable concerns when their decisions cause harm, discrimination, or financial losses.[2] Traditional Judicial frameworks assign responsibility based on human intent and control, struggle to accommodate AI, as it lacks intent, foreseeability, and direct human control.[3]

This study explores corporate liability for AI decisions. It explores current legal structures, regulatory policies, and emerging governance aimed at ensuring corporate accountability.[4] The global regulatory approaches, the urgent need for legal reforms to balance AI innovation with corporate responsibility. Addressing AI liability effectively will require a combination of enhanced compliance, transparency, and well-defined legal standards.



1. Frank Pasquale, *The Black Box Society: The Secret Algorithms That Control Money and Information* 12 (Harvard Univ. Press 2015).
2. John Kingston, Artificial Intelligence and Legal Liability, 30 *AI & Soc'y* 467, 469 (2015).
3. Lilian Edwards & Michael Veale, Slave to the Algorithm? Why a Right to an Explanation Is Probably Not the Remedy You Are Looking for, 16 *Duke L. & Tech. Rev.* 18, 22 (2017).
4. Ryan Calo, Artificial Intelligence Policy: A Primer and Roadmap, 51 *UC Davis L. Rev.* 399, 412 (2018).

## INTRODUCTION

Artificial Intelligence has become a cornerstone of corporate decision-making, transforming industries such as finance, healthcare, and transportation, etc. AI systems are employed for risk assessment, fraud detection, hiring processes, and even autonomous operations. However, AI operates differently from human decision-makers, leading to new legal complexities. Unlike traditional corporate decision-making models where human actors are accountable, AI's autonomy creates uncertainty in assigning liability.[5] If an AI-driven system makes an erroneous decision leading to harm, the question arises: Who is responsible?

Corporate liability for AI decisions has become a pressing issue as governments and Judicial scholars grapple with the implications of machine-based decision-making.[6] Traditional legal doctrines-such as strict liability, negligence, and vicarious liability were designed for human actions and intent. The autonomous nature of AI challenges these principles, necessitating a reevaluation of legal frameworks. Additionally, corporations must navigate regulatory landscapes that vary across jurisdictions, with some countries introducing AI-specific laws while others rely on existing product liability statutes.[7]

This study analyses examines corporate liability for AI decisions, analyzing existing legal frameworks and proposing necessary reforms. It examines key legal challenges, including the lack of foreseeability, accountability gaps, and the absence of transparency of AI decision-making.[8] Additionally, case studies of corporate AI failures provide insight into real-world applications of liability principles. Ultimately, this paper aims to offer a comprehensive understanding of how corporate liability can be effectively structured in an AI-driven economy.

## BACKGROUND

Artificial Intelligence has swiftly transitioned from an idea to a revolutionary force reshaping multiple industries. Initially developed for streamlining processes and data evaluation, AI is



5. Joanna J. Bryson, Mihailis E. Diamantis & Thomas D. Grant, Of, For, and By the People: The Legal Lacuna of Artificial Intelligence, 25 *TUL. J. TECH. & INTELL. PROP.* 1, 7 (2023).
6. Matthew U. Scherer, Regulating Artificial Intelligence Systems: Risks, Challenges, Competencies, and Strategies, 29 *Harv. J.L. & Tech.* 353, 358 (2016).
7. U.S. Federal Trade Commission, *AI and Algorithmic Fairness: Current Regulatory Landscape*, (2022), available at https://www.ftc.gov.
8. Jessica S. Allain, AI and Corporate Accountability: A Legal Framework for Ensuring Ethical AI Deployment, 42 *Berkeley Tech. L.J.* 569, 580 (2022).

now widely used in corporate decision-making, including hiring processes, financial transactions, medical diagnostics and self-governing systems.[9] AI-powered technologies, including machine learning models and neural networks, allow businesses to analyse large datasets, recognize trends, and execute decisions with minimal human involvement. However, AI systems gain autonomy, concerns over corporate liability have emerged. Unlike human decision-makers, AI lacks intent and responsibility, creating challenges to assign blame when errors or biases occurs. Traditional legal frameworks, which rely on human oversight, struggle to address the complexities of AI-driven decision-making. This has led to debates, whether AI should be treated as a product under strict liability laws, or if corporations should be held responsible under negligence or vicarious liability principles.

As AI adoption continues to grow, governments and regulatory bodies worldwide are working to establish clear guidelines for AI governance and liability.[10] Addressing these legal challenges is essential to ensure that AI remains a beneficial tool while holding corporations accountable for its consequences.

## UNDERSTANDING CORPORATE LIABILITY

Corporate liability denotes a company's legal accountability for its actions, omissions, misconduct or consequences of its operations, including those involving Artificial Intelligence. In traditional legal contexts, Corporations are deemed responsible for misconduct, negligence, or damages caused by their employees, agents, or products. However, AI-driven decision-making introduces unique legal challenges, as AI operates autonomously and lacks human intent.

### 1. Strict Liability

Strict liability holds corporations accountable for any damages caused by their products or services, regardless of intent or negligence.[11] When AI is treated as a product, companies deploying faulty AI systems-such as biased or defective hiring algorithms could be subject to strictly liable for resulting damages.



9. Kate Crawford & Vladan Joler, Anatomy of an AI System: The Amazon Echo as an Anatomical Map of Human Labor, Data and Planetary Resources, 52 *AI & SOC'Y* 245, 247 (2018).
10. U.S. Department of Commerce, *National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) AI Risk Management Framework* (2023), available at https://www.nist.gov.
11. Restatement (Third) of Torts: Products Liability § 402A (Am. L. Inst. 1998).

### 2. Negligence

Negligence applies when a corporation fails to exercise reasonable care in designing, deploying, or monitoring AI systems. If an AI system makes erroneous financial transactions due to poor oversight or is trained on biased data leading to discrimination, the company may be found negligent.[12]

### 3. Vicarious Liability

Vicarious liability holds companies accountable for the actions of their employees or representatives.[13] A key debate is whether AI should be considered an "agent" of a corporation, making businesses liable for AI-generated decisions.

Since AI lacks legal personhood, traditional liability doctrines struggle to accommodate its autonomous nature, necessitating new legal frameworks to ensure corporate accountability while fostering innovation.[14]

## LEGAL CHALLENGES IN AI DECISION-MAKING

The rise of Artificial Intelligence in corporate decision-making presents several legal challenges, particularly in assigning liability when AI-driven actions result in harm or financial loss. Traditional legal frameworks were designed for human decision-makers, making it difficult to apply existing doctrines to autonomous AI systems. The following are key legal challenges in AI liability:

### 1. Lack of Intent and Foreseeability

Legal liability often relies on proving intent or foreseeability of harm. AI, however, lacks subjective intent and makes decisions based on complex algorithms and data patterns.[15] If an AI system makes an incorrect medical diagnosis or denies a loan unfairly, determining whether harm was foreseeable becomes difficult.



12. Cary Coglianese & David Lehr, Regulating by Robot: Administrative Decision Making in the Machine-Learning Era, 105 *Geo. L.J.* 1147, 1155 (2017).
13. Mark A. Lemley & Bryan Casey, Remedies for Robots, 86 *U. Chi. L. Rev.* 1311, 1320 (2019).
14. Jacob Turner, *Robot Rules: Regulating Artificial Intelligence* 94 (Palgrave Macmillan 2018).
15. James D. Miller, *AI Governance: Balancing Innovation and Regulation* 87 (MIT Press 2022).

### 2. Opacity of AI Systems (Black Box AI)

Many AI models, especially deep learning systems, function as "black boxes," meaning their decision-making processes are not easily interpretable. This lack of transparency complicates legal accountability, as corporations may struggle to explain or justify AI-driven outcomes in court.[16]

### 3. Autonomy and Self-Learning Capabilities

Unlike traditional software, AI systems continuously evolve based on new data inputs.[17] This self-learning ability can lead to unforeseen consequences, making it challenging to assign blame if an AI system deviates from its original programming and causes harm.

### 4. Ambiguity in Legal Personhood

AI does not have legal personhood, meaning it cannot be held accountable the way humans or corporations can.[18] This raises questions about whether liability should fall on AI developers, corporate users, or data providers.

### 5. Jurisdictional and Regulatory Variability

AI regulation differs across jurisdictions.[19] Some countries have specific AI governance frameworks, while others rely on existing liability laws, leading to inconsistencies in corporate accountability.

Addressing these challenges requires updated legal frameworks that balance AI innovation with corporate responsibility, ensuring accountability without stifling technological advancement.

## EXISTING LEGAL FRAMEWORKS FOR AI LIABILITY

As Artificial Intelligence (AI) becomes more integrated into corporate decision-making, legal systems worldwide are struggling to define clear liability frameworks for AI-driven actions. Since AI lacks legal personhood and operates autonomously, traditional laws on corporate



16. Lilian Edwards, The Black Box Challenge in AI Regulation, 44 *Comp. L. & Sec. Rev.* 257, 263 (2021).
17. Susan L. Saab & Noah A. Smith, AI Systems That Evolve: The Legal Implications, 55 *UCLA L. Rev.* 423, 430 (2020).
18. European Commission, *White Paper on Artificial Intelligence – A European Approach to Excellence and Trust* 10 (2020).
19. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), *AI Policy Observatory: Global AI Regulations* (2023), available at https://www.oecd.org.

liability, negligence, and product liability face significant challenges in addressing AI-related harm. While there is no universal legal framework governing AI liability, several existing legal doctrines and regulations provide partial guidance.

### 1. Product Liability Laws

Many jurisdictions classify AI systems as "products," making them subject to product liability laws.[20] Under these laws, manufacturers, developers, and corporations can be held strictly liable if AI products malfunction and cause harm. For example, if an AI-powered autonomous vehicle causes an accident due to a software failure, liability may be assigned to the manufacturer rather than the driver. The European Union's Product Liability Directive is one such framework that is being updated to include AI-based systems.

### 2. Tort Law and Negligence

Tort law holds companies liable for harm caused by their negligence. If a corporation fails to properly train, test, or monitor its AI systems—resulting in errors such as biased hiring decisions, wrongful financial transactions, or safety failures—it may be found negligent.[21] Courts may require companies to prove they took reasonable steps to prevent foreseeable harm caused by their AI.

### 3. Vicarious Liability and Agency Law

Vicarious liability holds corporations responsible for the actions of their employees or agents. A critical legal debate is whether AI can be classified as an "agent" of a corporation, thereby making the company liable for AI decisions.[22] Current legal frameworks do not recognize AI as an independent legal entity, meaning liability ultimately falls on the corporation deploying the AI.

### 4. Sector-Specific AI Regulations

Several industries have introduced AI-specific regulations to address liability concerns:

- **Healthcare** – The U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) regulates AI-driven medical devices, ensuring they meet safety and efficacy standards.



20. European Commission, Proposal for a Directive on Liability for Defective Products (2022), available at https://ec.europa.eu.
21. John Armour & Horst Eidenmüller, Self-Driving Corporations? 10 Harv. Bus. L. Rev. 87, 95 (2020).
22. Bryce Goodman & Seth Flaxman, EU Regulations on Algorithmic Decision-Making and a "Right to Explanation," 38 AI Ethics 1, 5 (2017).

- **Finance** – The European Banking Authority (EBA) and U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) have introduced guidelines requiring transparency in AI-driven financial decision-making.[23]
- **Autonomous Vehicles** – Countries like Germany have introduced laws specifying corporate liability for self-driving car accidents, requiring manufacturers to maintain human oversight.[24]

### 5. Challenges in Applying Existing Laws

Despite these frameworks, gaps remain in AI liability laws:

- Many laws were designed for human decision-makers, making it difficult to apply them to AI.[25]
- Cross-border AI use complicates legal jurisdiction, as AI decisions often impact multiple countries.
- The evolving nature of AI requires adaptive regulations that balance corporate accountability with innovation.

## CORPORATE RESPONSIBILITY IN AI GOVERNANCE

Artificial Intelligence (AI) becomes an integral part of corporate decision-making, companies must take proactive steps to ensure responsible AI governance.[26] AI's ability to automate processes, analyse vast datasets, and make independent decisions raises concerns about transparency, bias, accountability, and ethical considerations. Without proper oversight, AI can lead to unintended consequences such as discrimination, financial losses, or safety risks. Corporate responsibility in AI governance involves establishing clear ethical frameworks, compliance measures, and accountability mechanisms to mitigate these risks.



23. European Banking Authority. "Guidelines on Outsourcing Arrangements." *EBA/GL/2019/02*, 2019.
24. German Federal Ministry of Transport and Digital Infrastructure. "Automated and Connected Driving." *Government Report*, 2017.
25. European Commission. "Proposal for a Regulation Laying Down Harmonized Rules on Artificial Intelligence." *COM/2021/206 final*, 2021.
26. Smith, J. *AI and Corporate Responsibility: Legal Perspectives* (Oxford University Press, 2021)

### 1. Implementing Ethical AI Frameworks

Corporations must ensure that AI systems align with ethical principles such as fairness, transparency, and accountability. Ethical AI frameworks help prevent biased decision-making, ensuring AI applications do not discriminate against individuals based on gender, race, or socioeconomic status.[27] Leading technology firms and regulatory bodies, such as the European Union and the OECD AI Principles, emphasize fairness and human-centric AI development.

### 2. Ensuring Transparency and Explainability

One of the primary concerns with AI governance is the "black box" problem, where AI systems make decisions without clear explanations.[28] Corporations must develop explainable AI (XAI) models that provide insights into how decisions are made. Transparency helps regulators, stakeholders, and affected individuals understand and challenge AI-driven outcomes when necessary.

### 3. AI Risk Assessment and Audits

Regular risk assessments and audits help corporations identify potential ethical and legal risks associated with AI deployment.[29] Internal AI governance teams should conduct audits to evaluate:

- Bias in AI algorithms
- Data privacy compliance
- The impact of AI decisions on consumers and employees

Independent AI ethics committees or third-party auditors can provide additional oversight to ensure compliance.

### 4. Human Oversight and Accountability

AI should not operate without human intervention, particularly in high-risk areas such as healthcare, criminal justice, and finance. Corporations must establish human-in-the-loop



27. Williams, R. *The Challenges of AI in Legal Liability* (Cambridge University Press, 2020)
28. Doshi-Velez, F., and B. Kim. "Towards a Rigorous Science of Interpretable Machine Learning." *arXiv preprint*, 2017.
29. Binns, Reuben. "Algorithmic Accountability and Public Reason." *Philosophy & Technology*, vol. 31, no. 4

(HITL) systems, where human experts review AI-generated decisions before implementation.[30] This ensures AI does not make critical errors without human accountability.

### 5. Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) and AI

Responsible AI governance extends beyond legal compliance to corporate social responsibility (CSR).[31] Corporations should:

- AI literacy promotes among employees and stakeholders.
- Engage in ethical AI research and development.
- Ensure AI applications contribute positively to society, such as in environmental sustainability and inclusive hiring practices.

## CASE STUDIES AND PRECEDENTS

### 1. Amazon's AI Hiring Discrimination (2018)

Amazon developed an AI-based recruitment tool to automate hiring decisions. However, the system was found to discriminate against female candidates, favouring male applicants for technical roles. The AI had been trained on past hiring data, which reflected male dominance in the tech industry, leading to biased outcomes.

**Legal and Corporate Liability Issues**

- Bias in AI Decision-Making: The AI system learned gender biases from historical hiring patterns, reinforcing discrimination.
- Lack of AI Oversight: Amazon failed to properly test the AI for bias before deployment, raising concerns about corporate negligence.
- Outcome: Amazon scrapped the AI hiring tool after internal audits confirmed discrimination risks. The case highlighted the dangers of AI bias and the need for transparency in AI decision-making[32]



30. Mittelstadt, B. "Principles of Human Oversight in Machine Learning." *AI & Society*, vol. 35, no. 4, 2020.
31. Boddington, Paula. *Towards a Code of Ethics for Artificial Intelligence*. Springer, 2017.
32. Amazon's AI hiring discrimination

### 2. Google's AI Ethical Controversy (2020)

Google's AI research team faced controversy when leading AI ethics researchers, Timnit Gebru and Margaret Mitchell, were dismissed after raising concerns about the ethical implications of large AI language models. Their research warned that Google's AI systems, such as those used in Google Search and Google Translate, could perpetuate biases and misinformation.

**Legal and Corporate Liability Issues**

- AI Ethics and Corporate Responsibility: The controversy raised questions about whether corporations are accountable for addressing ethical risks in AI development.
- Transparency vs. Business Interests: The researchers argued that Google prioritized commercial interests over responsible AI governance.
- Outcome: The case led to public criticism and calls for stronger AI ethics policies in major tech companies. It demonstrated the growing importance of corporate AI accountability beyond legal liability.[33]

### 3. Apple's AI-Driven Credit Card Discrimination Allegations (2019)

Apple and Goldman Sachs introduced the Apple Card, which used AI algorithms to determine credit limits for applicants. Shortly after launch, complaints emerged that women were being granted significantly lower credit limits than men, even when they had better credit histories.

**Legal and Corporate Liability Issues**

- Algorithmic Discrimination: The AI system exhibited gender bias in credit allocation, violating consumer protection laws.
- Regulatory Investigation: The New York Department of Financial Services launched an investigation into Apple and Goldman Sachs for potential violations of fair lending laws.[34]



33. Google's AI ethical controversy
34. Apple's AI-driven credit card discrimination allegations

## CONCLUSION

The increasing use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in corporate decision-making has posed significant legal and ethical challenges.[35] AI's autonomous nature complicates the determination of liability when AI systems cause harm, discrimination, or financial loss. Traditional legal concepts like negligence, strict liability, and vicarious liability struggle to address AI's self-learning capabilities, lack of human intent, and unpredictable decision-making processes. This gap highlights the urgent need for legal reforms and corporate accountability in AI governance.

Current legal frameworks, including product liability and tort laws, partially regulate AI decisions but are inadequate due to the opaque nature of AI algorithms[36] for greater transparency, fairness, and human oversight in AI applications.

Corporations must adopt ethical AI frameworks, conduct regular audits, and ensure algorithmic transparency. Legal reforms should include AI-specific liability laws, mandatory audits, and international regulatory standards.[37] A balanced approach that promotes innovation while safeguarding individual rights is essential for fostering responsible AI deployment and ensuring corporate accountability in the digital era.

## REFERENCES

1. Frank Pasquale, *The Black Box Society: The Secret Algorithms That Control Money and Information* 12 (Harvard Univ. Press 2015).
2. John Kingston, Artificial Intelligence and Legal Liability, 30 *AI & Soc'y* 467, 469 (2015).
3. Lilian Edwards & Michael Veale, Slave to the Algorithm? Why a Right to an Explanation Is Probably Not the Remedy You Are Looking for, 16 *Duke L. & Tech. Rev.* 18, 22 (2017).
4. Ryan Calo, Artificial Intelligence Policy: A Primer and Roadmap, 51 *UC Davis L. Rev.* 399, 412 (2018).



35. Smith, J. *AI and Corporate Responsibility: Legal Perspectives* (Oxford University Press, 2021)
36. Wachter, Sandra, and Brent Mittelstadt. "A Right to Reasonable Inferences: Re-Thinking Data Protection Law in the Age of Big Data and AI." *Columbia Business Law Review*, vol. 2019, no. 2, 2019
37. Floridi, Luciano, and Josh Cowls. "A Unified Framework of Five Principles for AI in Society." *Harvard Data Science Review*, 2019.

**5.** Joanna J. Bryson, Mihailis E. Diamantis & Thomas D. Grant, Of, For, and By the People: The Legal Lacuna of Artificial Intelligence, 25 *TUL. J. TECH. & INTELL. PROP.* 1, 7 (2023).

**6.** Matthew U. Scherer, Regulating Artificial Intelligence Systems: Risks, Challenges, Competencies, and Strategies, 29 *Harv. J.L. & Tech.* 353, 358 (2016).

**7.** U.S. Federal Trade Commission, *AI and Algorithmic Fairness: Current Regulatory Landscape*, (2022), available at https://www.ftc.gov.

**8.** Jessica S. Allain, AI and Corporate Accountability: A Legal Framework for Ensuring Ethical AI Deployment, 42 *Berkeley Tech. L.J.* 569, 580 (2022).

**9.** Kate Crawford & Vladan Joler, Anatomy of an AI System: The Amazon Echo as an Anatomical Map of Human Labor, Data and Planetary Resources, 52 *AI & SOC'Y* 245, 247 (2018).

**10.** U.S. Department of Commerce, *National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) AI Risk Management Framework* (2023), available at https://www.nist.gov.

**11.** Restatement (Third) of Torts: Products Liability § 402A (Am. L. Inst. 1998).

**12.** Cary Coglianese & David Lehr, Regulating by Robot: Administrative Decision Making in the Machine-Learning Era, 105 *Geo. L.J.* 1147, 1155 (2017).

**13.** Mark A. Lemley & Bryan Casey, Remedies for Robots, 86 *U. Chi. L. Rev.* 1311, 1320 (2019)

**14.** Jacob Turner, *Robot Rules: Regulating Artificial Intelligence* 94 (Palgrave Macmillan 2018).

**15.** James D. Miller, *AI Governance: Balancing Innovation and Regulation* 87 (MIT Press 2022).

**16.** Lilian Edwards, The Black Box Challenge in AI Regulation, 44 *Comp. L. & Sec. Rev.* 257, 263 (2021).

**17.** Susan L. Saab & Noah A. Smith, AI Systems That Evolve: The Legal Implications, 55 *UCLA L. Rev.* 423, 430 (2020).

**18.** European Commission, *White Paper on Artificial Intelligence – A European Approach to Excellence and Trust* 10 (2020).

**19.** Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), *AI Policy Observatory: Global AI Regulations* (2023), available at https://www.oecd.org.

**20.** European Commission, Proposal for a Directive on Liability for Defective Products (2022), available at https://ec.europa.eu.

**21.** John Armour & Horst Eidenmüller, Self-Driving Corporations? 10 Harv. Bus. L. Rev. 87, 95 (2020).

**22.** Bryce Goodman & Seth Flaxman, EU Regulations on Algorithmic Decision-Making and a "Right to Explanation," 38 AI Ethics 1, 5 (2017).

**23.** European Banking Authority. "Guidelines on Outsourcing Arrangements." EBA/GL/2019/02, 2019.

**24.** German Federal Ministry of Transport and Digital Infrastructure. "Automated and Connected Driving." Government Report, 2017.

**25.** European Commission. "Proposal for a Regulation Laying Down Harmonized Rules on Artificial Intelligence." COM/2021/206 final, 2021.

**26.** Smith, J. AI and Corporate Responsibility: Legal Perspectives (Oxford University Press, 2021)

**27.** Williams, R. The Challenges of AI in Legal Liability (Cambridge University Press, 2020)

**28.** Doshi-Velez, F., and B. Kim. "Towards a Rigorous Science of Interpretable Machine Learning." arXiv preprint, 2017.

**29.** Binns, Reuben. "Algorithmic Accountability and Public Reason." Philosophy & Technology, vol. 31, no. 4

**30.** Mittelstadt, B. "Principles of Human Oversight in Machine Learning." AI & Society, vol. 35, no. 4, 2020.

**31.** Boddington, Paula. Towards a Code of Ethics for Artificial Intelligence. Springer, 2017.

**32.** Amazon's AI hiring discrimination

**33.** Google's AI ethical controversy

**34.** Apple's AI-driven credit card discrimination allegations

**35.** Smith, J. AI and Corporate Responsibility: Legal Perspectives (Oxford University Press, 2021)

**36.** Wachter, Sandra, and Brent Mittelstadt. "A Right to Reasonable Inferences: Re-Thinking Data Protection Law in the Age of Big Data and AI." Columbia Business Law Review, vol. 2019, no. 2, 2019

**37.** Floridi, Luciano, and Josh Cowls. "A Unified Framework of Five Principles for AI in Society." Harvard Data Science Review, 2019.