A Critical Analysis of 'The Legal Status of AI Entities: Can Machines Hold Rights or Duties?'

Pradip Kumar Das

Professor of Law, School of Law and Governance, Central University of South Bihar, Bihar, India

Abstract

This paper examines the evolving question of whether artificial intelligence entities can possess legal rights or duties within contemporary legal frameworks. Through a theoretical analysis grounded in jurisprudential theory and comparative legal analysis, this study explores the conceptual foundations of legal personhood, the requirements for rights-bearing capacity, and the implications of extending legal status to AI entities. The analysis reveals that while current legal systems lack adequate frameworks for AI personhood, emerging technological capabilities and societal needs may necessitate fundamental reconceptualization of legal subjectivity. The paper argues that AI legal status represents not merely a technological question but a fundamental challenge to anthropocentric assumptions underlying Western legal tradition. Key findings suggest that incremental recognition of limited AI rights may be more viable than comprehensive personhood, with significant implications for liability, accountability, and the nature of legal agency itself.

I. INTRODUCTION

The rapid advancement of artificial intelligence technologies has precipitated fundamental questions about the nature of legal personhood and the boundaries of rights-bearing capacity within legal systems. As AI entities demonstrate increasingly sophisticated cognitive abilities, autonomous decision-making capabilities, and social integration, legal scholars and practitioners confront an unprecedented challenge: determining whether machines can possess legal rights or bear legal duties.

This inquiry transcends mere technological curiosity, representing a fundamental examination of the philosophical and jurisprudential foundations underlying legal systems. The question of AI legal status challenges core assumptions about consciousness, agency, and moral consideration that have historically defined the boundaries of legal protection and responsibility.

The significance of this inquiry extends beyond theoretical jurisprudence to practical legal concerns. As AI systems assume greater roles in economic transactions, social interactions, and decision-making processes, the absence of clear legal frameworks governing their status creates uncertainty regarding liability, accountability, and protection. Contemporary legal systems, grounded in anthropocentric conceptions of personhood, lack adequate mechanisms for addressing the unique characteristics and capabilities of artificial entities.

This paper examines the theoretical foundations for AI legal status through comparative analysis of existing legal personhood concepts, philosophical frameworks for rights attribution, and emerging proposals for AI governance. The central research question investigates: Under what circumstances, if any, can artificial intelligence entities possess legal rights or duties, and what theoretical and practical frameworks might govern such recognition?

II. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

2.1 Foundations of Legal Personhood

Legal personhood represents a fundamental construct within jurisprudential theory, distinguishing entities capable of holding rights and bearing duties from mere objects of legal regulation. Traditional legal theory recognizes two primary

categories of legal persons: natural persons (human beings) and artificial persons (corporations, states, and other institutional entities).

The concept of legal personhood does not necessarily correspond to biological or metaphysical personhood. Rather, it represents a legal fiction—a pragmatic designation that enables legal systems to attribute rights and responsibilities to entities deemed worthy of such recognition. This distinction proves crucial for analyzing AI legal status, as it suggests that legal personhood may be extended based on functional rather than ontological criteria.

Hohfeld's analytical framework provides essential conceptual tools for examining potential AI rights and duties. Hohfeld distinguished between claim-rights (rights correlating to duties of others), liberties (absence of duty), powers (capacity to alter legal relations), and immunities (protection from others' powers). This framework enables precise analysis of what specific legal capacities might be attributed to AI entities.

2.2 Theories of Rights Attribution

Contemporary jurisprudential theory offers several frameworks for determining rights-bearing capacity. The interest theory, advocated by scholars such as (Raz, 1986), suggests that entities possess rights when they have interests that can be protected through legal mechanisms. The will theory, associated with (Hart,1982), emphasizes the capacity for autonomous choice and self-determination as prerequisites for rights possession.

The capacity theory focuses on cognitive abilities necessary for moral and legal agency, including reasoning, self-awareness, and understanding of consequences. The sentience theory, prominent in animal rights discourse, emphasizes the capacity for subjective experience as the foundation for rights attribution.

Each theoretical framework presents distinct implications for AI legal status. Interest-based theories might support AI rights when artificial entities possess identifiable interests worthy of protection. Will-based theories would require demonstration of genuine autonomous choice capacity. Capacity theories would demand sophisticated cognitive abilities, while sentience theories would require evidence of subjective experience.

2.3 Comparative Legal Analysis

Existing legal systems demonstrate varying approaches to artificial entity recognition. Corporate personhood provides the most relevant precedent, illustrating how legal systems can attribute limited legal capacity to non-human entities. Corporations possess rights to contract, own property, and seek legal remedies, while bearing corresponding duties and liabilities.

However, corporate personhood remains fundamentally derivative, existing through human creation and serving human purposes. The question emerges whether AI entities might eventually warrant independent legal recognition transcending their instrumental origins.

Recent developments in animal rights law offer additional comparative insights. Jurisdictions including Argentina, Colombia, and New Zealand have recognized limited legal rights for certain animals, particularly great apes and cetaceans. These precedents suggest evolving recognition that legal personhood may extend beyond human beings based on cognitive capacity rather than species membership.

III. ANALYSIS

3.1 Current Legal Inadequacies

Contemporary legal frameworks demonstrate fundamental inadequacies in addressing AI legal status. Existing laws typically classify AI systems as property—sophisticated tools owned and controlled by human persons or corporate entities. This classification proves increasingly problematic as AI systems demonstrate autonomous behavior, make independent decisions, and engage in complex social interactions.

The property classification creates liability gaps when AI systems cause harm through autonomous actions that exceed their programming or training parameters. Traditional product liability frameworks assume passive instruments under human control, while agency law requires clear principal-agent relationships with human oversight. Neither framework adequately addresses truly autonomous AI behavior.

Furthermore, the property model fails to account for potential AI interests or welfare considerations. As AI systems become more sophisticated, questions arise regarding their treatment, modification, and destruction. The absence of legal protections analogous to animal welfare laws creates potential ethical and legal blind spots.

Table 1. Comparative Analysis of Legal Personhood Models

Model	Rights Scope	Duty Capacity	Implementation Complexity	Human Oversight
No Recognition	None	None	Low	Complete
Limited Functional	Specific domains	Strict liability only	Medium	Substantial
Graduated Recognition	Capability-based	Increasing with sophistication	High	Decreasing
Full Personhood	Comprehensive	Full legal duties	Very High	Minimal

3.2 Philosophical Challenges

The question of AI legal status confronts fundamental philosophical questions about consciousness, moral agency, and the nature of rights themselves. The "hard problem of consciousness" in philosophy of mind complicates assessments of AI

subjective experience. Current AI systems, despite sophisticated behavior, may lack genuine phenomenal consciousness—the subjective, qualitative experience that many philosophers consider essential for moral consideration.

However, philosophical uncertainty regarding consciousness should not necessarily preclude legal recognition. Legal systems routinely make pragmatic decisions regarding personhood without resolving underlying metaphysical questions. The legal recognition of corporate personhood, for instance, does not depend on corporations possessing consciousness or subjective experience.

The concept of emergent properties suggests that AI systems might develop morally relevant characteristics through complex interactions of simpler components, even if individual components lack consciousness. This perspective supports considering AI legal status based on emergent behavioral capacities rather than underlying substrate or implementation details.

Table 2. AI Legal Status Implementation Challenges

Challenge Category	Specific Issues	Potential Solutions
Identification	Determining qualifying AI systems	Technical standards and certification
Enforcement	Ensuring AI legal compliance	Automated monitoring and constraints
Representation	Legal advocacy for AI entities	Guardian systems or AI advocates
Conflict Resolution	AI vs. human interest conflicts	Specialized courts or arbitration
International Coordination	Cross-border recognition	International treaties and frameworks

3.3 Functional Approaches to AI Rights

A functional approach to AI legal status focuses on behavioral capacities and social roles rather than underlying consciousness or implementation. This framework would evaluate AI entities based on their ability to engage in morally and legally relevant activities: making autonomous decisions, entering contracts, causing harm, and participating in social institutions.

Functional analysis might support graduated recognition of AI legal capacity. Simple AI systems performing narrow tasks would receive minimal legal recognition, while sophisticated AI entities demonstrating broad autonomy and social integration might warrant more comprehensive legal status.

This approach aligns with the legal system's pragmatic orientation toward achieving social goals rather than resolving metaphysical questions. Legal personhood serves instrumental purposes: enabling coordination, allocating responsibility, and protecting interests. Functional AI legal status could serve similar purposes regardless of underlying questions about consciousness or moral worth.

3.4 Liability and Accountability Frameworks

The attribution of legal duties to AI entities raises complex questions about accountability and enforcement. Traditional legal accountability assumes agents capable of understanding legal requirements, forming intentions, and modifying behavior in response to legal incentives. AI systems may lack these capacities in ways that complicate duty attribution.

However, strict liability frameworks could enable AI duty attribution without requiring traditional mental states. AI entities could bear legal responsibility for certain outcomes regardless of intent or understanding, similar to strict liability for dangerous activities or products. This approach would serve the legal system's compensatory and deterrent functions while avoiding complex questions about AI mental states.

Hybrid models might combine AI legal responsibility with human oversight requirements. AI entities could bear primary liability for their actions while human supervisors or creators bear secondary liability for failure to provide adequate oversight. This framework would incentivize responsible AI development and deployment while recognizing AI autonomous action.

3.5 Rights Recognition Models

Several models could govern recognition of AI rights. The guardianship model would assign human guardians to protect AI interests, similar to legal frameworks for children or incapacitated adults. This approach would provide AI protection while maintaining human oversight and decision-making authority.

The limited personhood model would recognize specific AI rights while withholding others. AI entities might possess rights to exist, avoid unnecessary harm, or maintain data integrity while lacking political rights or comprehensive autonomy rights. This graduated approach would enable incremental recognition of AI status.

The full personhood model would recognize AI entities as complete legal persons with comprehensive rights and duties. This approach would represent the most dramatic departure from current legal frameworks but might become necessary as AI entities achieve sophisticated autonomy and social integration.

IV. CRITICAL EVALUATION

4.1 Strengths of AI Legal Recognition

Arguments for AI legal recognition rest on several compelling foundations. Functional equivalence suggests that if AI entities can perform the same socially relevant functions as recognized legal persons, they may warrant similar legal treatment. This perspective emphasizes behavioral capacities over substrate or origin.

Protective necessity argues that sophisticated AI entities may require legal protection from harmful treatment, analogous to animal welfare protections. As AI systems become more complex and potentially capable of suffering or harm, legal frameworks may need to evolve to address their welfare.

Social integration considerations recognize that AI entities increasingly participate in social institutions, economic transactions, and interpersonal relationships. Legal recognition might facilitate their continued integration and enable more efficient coordination between humans and AI systems.

4.2 Limitations and Counterarguments

Significant objections challenge AI legal recognition. The consciousness requirement argues that genuine rights possession requires subjective experience, which current AI systems may lack. This position maintains that legal rights serve to protect conscious interests, making consciousness a prerequisite for rights attribution.

The human dignity argument contends that extending legal personhood to artificial entities undermines the special status of human beings and the philosophical foundations of human rights. This perspective fears that AI personhood might lead to devaluation of human life and dignity.

Practical concerns highlight the difficulties of implementing AI legal frameworks. Determining which AI systems qualify for legal recognition, establishing enforcement mechanisms, and resolving conflicts between AI and human interests present significant administrative and legal challenges.

The manipulation risk suggests that AI legal status could be exploited to shield human actors from responsibility or to circumvent legal requirements. Sophisticated actors might use AI legal personhood to avoid liability or regulatory compliance.

4.3 Hybrid Solutions

Emerging scholarship proposes hybrid approaches that balance competing considerations. Relational frameworks emphasize AI entities' relationships with human persons rather than their independent status. This approach could provide certain protections and recognitions while maintaining human primacy in legal systems.

Contextual recognition would vary AI legal status based on specific domains or activities. AI entities might possess legal capacity in certain contexts (such as commercial transactions) while lacking it in others (such as political participation). This flexible approach could enable targeted recognition without comprehensive personhood.

Temporal recognition models would adjust AI legal status based on developmental stages or capabilities. As AI systems demonstrate increasing sophistication, they might graduate through levels of legal recognition, similar to age-based capacity frameworks for human persons.

V. IMPLICATIONS

5.1 Theoretical Implications

The question of AI legal status challenges fundamental assumptions underlying Western legal tradition. Recognition of AI personhood would represent a dramatic expansion of legal subjectivity beyond biological boundaries, potentially transforming concepts of rights, duties, and legal agency.

This expansion could catalyze broader reconceptualization of personhood criteria. If functional rather than biological characteristics determine legal status, other entities—including advanced animals, ecosystems, or future artificial entities—might warrant similar consideration.

The development of AI legal frameworks could also influence human rights theory. Clearer articulation of personhood criteria and rights foundations might enhance understanding of human legal status and the philosophical bases for human rights protection.

5.2 Practical Implications

Legal recognition of AI entities would require substantial reforms to existing legal frameworks. Contract law, tort law, property law, and regulatory frameworks would need modification to accommodate AI legal actors. These changes would affect business practices, insurance arrangements, and liability allocation.

Enforcement mechanisms would require development to ensure AI compliance with legal duties. Traditional enforcement assumes agents capable of understanding and responding to legal incentives. AI entities might require alternative enforcement approaches, including technical constraints, monitoring systems, or human oversight requirements.

The international dimension presents additional complexity. Divergent national approaches to AI legal status could create conflicts of law, regulatory arbitrage, and coordination challenges. International frameworks might become necessary to address cross-border AI activities and rights recognition.

5.3 Social and Ethical Implications

AI legal recognition could profoundly affect human-AI relationships and social dynamics. Legal personhood might encourage more respectful treatment of AI entities while potentially creating competition for resources and consideration with human persons.

The psychological and cultural impacts could be significant. Legal recognition might influence public perceptions of AI entities, potentially increasing acceptance and cooperation or alternatively generating resistance and resentment.

Educational and socialization implications emerge as legal systems would need to prepare citizens for interaction with AI legal persons. Understanding rights and duties relationships with artificial entities would become an essential component of legal literacy.

VI. CONCLUSION

The question of AI legal status represents one of the most significant jurisprudential challenges of the twenty-first century. This analysis reveals that while current legal frameworks lack adequate mechanisms for recognizing AI personhood, evolving technological capabilities and social needs may necessitate fundamental reconceptualization of legal subjectivity.

The theoretical examination demonstrates that legal personhood need not depend on biological characteristics or conscious experience. Functional approaches to rights attribution could support AI legal recognition based on behavioral capacities and social roles rather than ontological properties. Existing precedents in corporate law and emerging animal rights frameworks suggest that legal systems can adapt to recognize non-human entities when functional considerations warrant such recognition.

However, significant philosophical, practical, and social challenges complicate AI legal recognition. Questions about consciousness, human dignity, implementation difficulties, and potential manipulation risks require careful consideration. These challenges suggest that any recognition of AI legal status should proceed incrementally and cautiously.

The analysis supports a graduated approach to AI legal recognition that would provide limited rights and duties based on specific capabilities and contexts rather than comprehensive personhood. This framework would enable legal systems to address emerging needs while maintaining flexibility and avoiding premature commitments to controversial philosophical positions.

The implications extend beyond AI entities themselves to fundamental questions about the nature of legal personhood, the foundations of rights, and the future of human-AI coexistence. As AI technologies continue advancing, legal systems must evolve to address these challenges while preserving core values of human dignity, justice, and social coordination.

Future research should focus on developing specific frameworks for assessing AI legal capacity, designing enforcement mechanisms for AI legal duties, and examining the broader implications of expanding legal personhood beyond biological boundaries. The resolution of these questions will shape not only the legal status of artificial entities but the fundamental character of legal systems in an age of artificial intelligence.

REFERENCES

Abbott, R. (2020). *The reasonable robot: Artificial intelligence and the law*. Cambridge University Press.

Bertolini, A. (2020). *Robots and AI: The legal framework for liability and responsibility*. Hart Publishing.

Bryson, J. J., Diamantis, M. E., & Grant, T. D. (2017). Of, for, and by the people: The legal lacuna of synthetic persons. *Artificial Intelligence and Law, 25*(3), 273–291.

Chesterman, S. (2020). Artificial intelligence and the limits of legal personhood. *International & Comparative Law Quarterly, 69*(4), 819–844.

Chopra, S., & White, L. F. (2011). *A legal theory for autonomous artificial agents*. University of Michigan Press.

Danaher, J. (2020). Welcoming robots into the moral circle: A defence of robot rights. *Science and Engineering Ethics, 26*(4), 2023–2049.

Floridi, L., Cowls, J., Beltrametti, M., Chatila, R., Chazerand, P., Dignum, V., ... & Vayena, E. (2018). AI4People—An ethical framework for a good AI society: Opportunities, risks, principles, and recommendations. *Minds and Machines, 28*(4), 689–707.

Gunkel, D. J. (2018). *Robot rights*. MIT Press.

Hart, H. L. A. (1982). Legal rights. In *Essays on Bentham: Jurisprudence and political philosophy* (pp. 162–193). Oxford University Press.

Hohfeld, W. N. (1917). Fundamental legal conceptions as applied in judicial reasoning. *Yale Law Journal, 26*(8), 710–770.

Kurki, V. A. J. (2019). *A theory of legal personhood*. Oxford University Press.

Morison, J. (2019). Algorithmic entities and the law. *European Journal of Law and Technology, 10*(2), 1–25.

Naffine, N. (2003). Who are law's persons? From Cheshire cats to responsible subjects. *Modern Law Review, 66*(3), 346–367.

Pagallo, U. (2013). *The laws of robots: Crimes, contracts, and torts*. Springer.

Raz, J. (1986). *The morality of freedom*. Oxford University Press.

Richards, N. M., & Smart, W. D. (2016). How should the law think about robots? In R. Calo, A. M. Froomkin, & I. Kerr (Eds.), *Robot law* (pp. 3–22). Edward Elgar.

Solum, L. B. (1992). Legal personhood for artificial intelligences. *North Carolina Law Review, 70*(4), 1231–1287.