Pakistan Journal of Life and Social Sciences
www.pjlss.edu.pk

RESEARCH ARTICLE

The Criminal Liability of Artificial Intelligence Entities

Jafar Ali Hammouri[1], Ali Abd Alah Almahasneh[2], Khaled Mohammad Khwaileh[3], Mishael M. Al-Raggad[4]

[1,2,3,4]Jadara University, Jordan

ARTICLE INFO	ABSTRACT
	The rapid evolution of information technologies has led to the emergence of artificial intelligence (AI) entities capable of autonomous actions with minimal human intervention. While these AI entities offer remarkable advancements, they also pose significant risks by potentially harming individual and collective interests protected under criminal law. The behavior of AI, which operates with limited human oversight, raises complex questions about criminal liability and the need for legislative intervention. This article explores the profound transformations AI technologies have brought to various sectors, including economic, social, political, medical, and digital domains, and underscores the challenges they present to the legal framework. The primary aim is to model the development of criminal legislation that effectively addresses the unique challenges posed by AI, ensuring security and safety. The article concludes that existing legal frameworks are inadequate to address the complexities of AI-related crimes. It recommends the urgent development of new laws that establish clear criminal responsibility for AI entities, their manufacturers, and users. These laws should include specific penalties for misuse and encourage the responsible integration of AI across various sectors. A balanced approach is crucial to harness the benefits of AI while safeguarding public interests and maintaining justice in an increasingly AI-driven world

1. INTRODUCTION

Artificial intelligence (AI) has rapidly emerged as a transformative tool, reshaping industries and societies across the globe by offering innovative solutions to complex problems through the simulation of human cognition. From healthcare to finance, education to transportation, AI's application spans a wide array of sectors, leading to profound changes in how tasks are performed, decisions are made, and solutions are formulated. This technological advancement has streamlined processes, enhanced efficiency, and unlocked new potential in areas previously constrained by human limitations. However, the rapid integration of AI into daily life has also raised significant legal, ethical, and societal questions, particularly concerning AI's involvement in criminal activities and the appropriate legislative response to such challenges.

One of the most pressing issues is the lack of a clearly defined legal framework that addresses the unique challenges posed by AI. Unlike traditional tools or technologies, AI systems can operate autonomously, making decisions and taking actions without direct human oversight. This autonomy introduces a complex legal dilemma: when an AI system is involved in a crime, who should be held accountable? Is it the AI itself, its creators, or its users? The challenge lies in determining the extent of criminal responsibility and how it should be attributed in cases where AI systems commit or

facilitate unlawful acts. The traditional legal principles that govern human actions may not adequately address the nuances of AI's autonomous decision-making capabilities, necessitating a reexamination of existing laws and the development of new ones.

The potential for AI to be used in ways that harm individuals or society at large highlights the urgent need for legislative bodies and jurisprudence to step in and fill this legal void. As AI systems become more sophisticated and autonomous, there is an increasing risk that they could be exploited for criminal purposes or that their actions could inadvertently lead to harmful outcomes. This reality underscores the necessity for modern criminal legislations that reflect the advancements in AI technology. Such laws must be designed to manage the complexities introduced by AI, ensuring that accountability is clearly established and that justice can be served when AI is involved in criminal activities.

Moreover, the development of AI-related legislation cannot occur in isolation. It must be aligned with broader ethical standards and human rights protections to ensure that the deployment of AI does not infringe upon fundamental freedoms or exacerbate existing inequalities. The international community has a critical role to play in this process, as AI technologies are not confined by national borders. Global cooperation is essential to create a cohesive and comprehensive legal framework that addresses the challenges of AI while promoting its responsible use.

While AI presents incredible opportunities for innovation and problem-solving, it also poses significant challenges that must be addressed through thoughtful and forward-looking legislation. The establishment of a legal framework that defines criminal responsibility in the context of AI is crucial for ensuring that these technologies are used ethically and safely. By proactively addressing these issues, society can harness the benefits of AI while safeguarding against its potential risks, ultimately ensuring that AI contributes positively to the global community.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Defining the Role of AI in Criminal Law

The integration of AI into criminal law represents a novel and complex challenge. The development of legal frameworks to address AI-related crimes is crucial for guiding future legislation and jurisprudence. Studies have explored how AI technologies should be incorporated into existing legal systems, particularly in criminal law, to ensure that they are adequately regulated (KAN, 2024).

One major concern is the legal implications of AI in autonomous systems, such as self-driving cars, which pose significant risks to public safety. When these systems cause harm, the question of liability becomes complex, requiring clear legal standards to address both civil and criminal repercussions (Nanos, 2023).

2.2 International Comparisons and Legal Standards

In examining AI's role in criminal law, it's essential to consider how different jurisdictions are addressing these issues. For example, the European Union has begun to establish comprehensive regulations through initiatives like the AI Act, which seeks to impose strict liability on AI systems that cause harm. This approach contrasts with the more fragmented legal frameworks in other regions, highlighting the need for international harmonization.

Moreover, the role of international organizations, such as the United Nations, in setting global standards for AI regulation is critical. These organizations can facilitate the development of legal frameworks that ensure AI technologies are used responsibly, particularly in areas where they could potentially infringe on human rights or lead to criminal activities.

3. RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

The research aims to explore the legal challenges posed by AI, particularly in terms of criminal liability. Given AI's widespread use and its potential to commit or facilitate crimes, this study seeks to identify the appropriate legal frameworks for assigning responsibility. The objectives include examining different models of liability, assessing the legal implications of AI's actions, and proposing legislative solutions to address these challenges.

4. RESEARCH QUESTIONS

How can artificial intelligence entities be held criminally liable under different models of liability, such as the Perpetration-by-Another liability model, the Natural-Probable-Consequence liability model, and the direct liability model, within the framework of existing legal concepts of artificial intelligence?

5. METHODOLOGY

The research will employ an analytical method, focusing on the legal provisions and jurisprudential trends related to AI and criminal liability. By critically analyzing existing laws and case studies, the research will identify strengths and weaknesses in current legal approaches and propose solutions for enhancing legal frameworks.

6. RESEARCH ISSUE

The core research problem revolves around the potential for AI to commit crimes autonomously and the difficulty of assigning criminal liability in such cases. The study will explore whether AI entities can be held criminally responsible and how traditional legal principles can be adapted to address this issue.

7. CRIMINAL LIABILITY FOR ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE ENTITIES

7.1 The Nature of AI and Criminal Responsibility

AI technologies are integral to modern society, performing tasks that often surpass human capabilities in efficiency and accuracy. However, the autonomous nature of AI raises questions about criminal responsibility. If an AI system commits a crime, determining who should be held accountable becomes complex. Should the liability rest with the AI itself, its developer, or its user?

The debate on AI's legal personhood is central to this issue. Some scholars argue that AI should be treated as a separate legal entity, capable of bearing responsibility for its actions. Others contend that the responsibility should lie with the human actors involved, whether they are the creators, owners, or users of the AI system. This discussion is crucial for shaping future legislation and ensuring that AI is regulated in a manner that protects public safety without stifling innovation.

8. MODELS OF CRIMINAL RESPONSIBILITY

8.1 Model of Criminal Responsibility for the Manufacturer

If a crime occurs due to a programming error, the manufacturer may be held criminally liable, particularly if negligence or lack of precaution is proven. This raises the question of how legal systems can ensure that manufacturers take sufficient care in developing AI technologies to prevent harm.

The legal principle of negligence is key here. Manufacturers must ensure that AI systems are designed and tested to avoid foreseeable risks. This could involve implementing strict liability standards, where manufacturers are held accountable regardless of fault, to incentivize higher safety standards in AI development.

8.2 Model of Criminal Responsibility for the Owner

Owners of AI systems may be held liable if their negligence leads to a crime. For instance, failing to maintain an AI system properly could result in unintended harm, making the owner criminally responsible.

This model aligns with existing legal principles that hold individuals accountable for failing to prevent foreseeable harm. However, it also highlights the need for clear legal guidelines on the responsibilities of AI owners, particularly regarding maintenance and oversight.

8.3 Model of Criminal Responsibility for the AI Entity

In cases where AI acts independently to commit a crime, direct responsibility may be assigned to the AI entity. This model raises significant legal and ethical questions, as it challenges traditional notions of criminal responsibility, which are typically based on human agency.

Assigning criminal liability to AI entities could involve recognizing them as legal persons, a concept that has precedent in the treatment of corporations. However, this approach would require a fundamental rethinking of criminal law principles, including the nature of mens rea (criminal intent) and how it applies to non-human actors.

9. CRIMINAL RESPONSIBILITY IN AI-RELATED INCIDENTS

9.1 Case Study: Autonomous Vehicles

One notable incident involved an autonomous vehicle operated by Uber that caused a fatal accident. This case highlights the complexities of assigning liability in AI-related incidents, where the technology itself may have acted without human intervention.

This incident underscores the importance of developing legal frameworks that address the unique challenges posed by AI in critical applications like transportation. The question of whether the AI system, the manufacturer, or the operator should be held liable remains a contentious issue that requires careful legal consideration.

10. MORAL AGENCY IN AI CRIMES

Criminal law traditionally focuses on the moral agent as the person responsible for a crime. In the context of AI, the moral agent could be the individual who controls or manipulates the AI system to commit a crime.

This concept introduces the possibility of holding individuals accountable for crimes committed through AI, even if the AI itself performs the illegal act. This approach maintains the focus on human responsibility, ensuring that those who misuse AI technologies are held accountable.

11. CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the rapid proliferation of AI technologies presents significant challenges to traditional legal systems, particularly in the realm of criminal liability. As AI systems become increasingly autonomous, the conventional legal frameworks, which are primarily designed to address human actions and intentions, struggle to manage the complexities introduced by these advanced technologies. The traditional concepts of accountability and responsibility, centered on human control and intention, do not readily apply to AI systems capable of independent decision-making and action.

This research highlights the urgent need for new legislation that recognizes the unique characteristics of AI. Unlike conventional tools or machines that merely extend human will, AI systems can learn, process information, and make decisions in ways that can surpass human capabilities. This raises critical questions about assigning criminal responsibility when AI is involved

in unlawful activities. The debate over whether to hold the AI itself, its creators, or its users accountable challenges core principles of criminal law and necessitates a rethinking of how legal responsibility is assigned.

As AI continues to integrate into critical sectors such as healthcare, finance, and transportation, the potential risks associated with its growing autonomy become more pronounced. The consequences of AI errors or malicious use could be severe, making it imperative to determine legal responsibility in such scenarios. Traditional legal doctrines may not be adequate for addressing these complexities, underscoring the need for a legal framework specifically tailored to the realities of AI technology.

Furthermore, this framework must be adaptable to the rapid pace of technological change, ensuring its continued relevance as AI evolves. It is also essential that AI-related legislation aligns with broader ethical standards and human rights protections. As AI increasingly influences decision-making processes that affect people's lives, it is crucial to ensure these technologies are used in ways that uphold fundamental rights and do not exacerbate social inequalities. Global cooperation will be vital in establishing consistent and comprehensive legal standards that promote the responsible use of AI worldwide.

By modernizing criminal law to address the challenges posed by AI technologies, legal systems can better protect individuals and society from the potential risks associated with AI, while also fostering the positive contributions that AI can make to the global community. This approach ensures that criminal responsibility is appropriately assigned, balancing innovation with the imperative of justice and security.

12. Recommendations

1. **Legislation**: It is crucial to develop comprehensive legislation that regulates the production and development of AI technologies, preventing their misuse and ensuring they are not employed in criminal activities.

2. **Criminal Accountability**: Laws should be enacted to establish criminal accountability for AI entities that act autonomously. This includes creating clear guidelines for holding users and developers responsible for crimes committed through AI.

3. **Promoting AI in Criminal Justice**: Encouraging the use of AI in achieving criminal justice is essential. Legal systems should clearly define criminal responsibility for all parties involved with AI technologies, reducing ambiguity and enhancing legal clarity.

REFERENCES:

- Müller, V. C. (Ed.). (2016). *Risks of artificial intelligence* (Vol. 5). Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press.

- Osoba, O. A., & Welser, W. (2017). *The risks of artificial intelligence to security and the future of work.* Santa Monica, CA: RAND.

- Müller, V. C. (2014). Risks of general artificial intelligence. Journal of Experimental & Theoretical Artificial Intelligence, 26(3), 297-301.

 Manheim, K., & Kaplan, L. (2019). Artificial intelligence: Risks to privacy and democracy. *Yale JL & Tech.*, *21*, 106.

- Abdel-Badeeh M. Salem, Artificial Intelligence Technology in Intelligent Health Informatics, Springer, Cham, 2019

- Check John McCarthy's definition on the website mndb at the following link: http://www.mndb.com, last visited on 29/7/2023.

- KAN, C. H. (2024). CRIMINAL LIABILITY OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF CRIMINAL LAW: AN EVALUATION IN THE CONTEXT OF THE GENERAL THEORY OF CRIME AND FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLES. *International Journal of Eurasia Social Sciences/Uluslararasi Avrasya Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, *14*(55).

- Nanos, A. (2023). Criminal Liability of Artificial Intelligence. Charles University in Prague Faculty of Law Research Paper No.

- Ihab Khalifa, Artificial Intelligence, The Impact of Increasing Smart Technologies in People's Daily Lives, article published on 21/3/2012 on the website www.almanhal.com, date of access 1/7/2024.

- Audrey Azoulay, Toward the Ethics of Artificial Intelligence, an article published on the United Nations website at the following link: https://www.un.org/ar/44267, visited on 28/6/2024.

-F. Patrick Hubbard, "Do Androids Dream?": Personhood and Intelligent Artifacts, 83 Temp. L. Rev., 2011.

-Criminal Responsibility: Holding a person responsible for the consequences of their lawful actions, provided they have the sufficient capacity for perception, discernment, and directing their will towards the chosen course. Mohamed Mostafa El-Qalali, in "Criminal Responsibility," Abdullah Wahba Library, Egypt, 1944-1945.

- Aarian Marshall and Alex Davies, Uber's Self-Driving Car Saw the Woman It Killed, Report Says, wired.com, 24.5.2018. Online: https://www.wired.com/story/uber-self-driving-crash-arizona-ntsb-report/, visited on 20/7/2024.

- Dr. Ahmed Fathi Sorour, Constitutional Criminal Law, Second Edition - Dar Al-Shorouk, Egypt, 2002.

- Dr. Nivine Farouk Fouad: The Deity Between Natural Intelligence and Artificial Intelligence - A Comparative Study, Journal of Scientific Research in Literature, Faculty of Girls, Ain Shams University, Issue 13, Part 3, 2012.

- Corporate governance legislation in the age of artificial intelligence. 10--Cogent Business & Management, 11(1), 2297465.