Policy Research Journal
ISSN (E): 3006-7030 ISSN (P) : 3006-7022 Volume 4, Issue 4, 2026

ALGORITHMIC GOVERNANCE AND CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS IN PAKISTAN: LEGAL IMPLICATIONS OF AI-BASED PUBLIC DECISION-MAKING

Dr Usman Hameed[*1], Muhammad Suliman[2]

[*1]*Professor Department of Criminology University of Lahore*
[2]*Associate Professor, Department of Political Sciences, University of Peshawar*

[*1]usman.hameed@crim.uol.edu.pk, [2]muhammadsuliman@uop.edu.pk

DOI: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.19975087

Keywords
Algorithmic Governance, Artificial Intelligence, Constitutional Rights, Due Process, Transparency, Accountability, Pakistan

Article History
Received: 11 February 2026
Accepted: 21 March 2026
Published: 30 April 2026

Corresponding Author: *
Dr Usman Hameed

Abstract

The integration of artificial intelligence (AI) into public sector decision-making has introduced transformative changes in governance, raising critical constitutional and legal concerns in Pakistan. This study examined the implications of algorithmic governance for fundamental rights, particularly due process, equality, and transparency, as guaranteed under the Constitution of Pakistan 1973. Adopting a quantitative, cross-sectional design, data were collected from 300 respondents, including legal experts, policymakers, IT professionals, and academics. Statistical analyses, including correlation and multiple regression, were employed to assess the relationships between algorithmic transparency, accountability, bias, regulatory adequacy, and the protection of constitutional rights.

The findings revealed that low levels of transparency, explainability, and regulatory oversight significantly undermine constitutional protections, while algorithmic bias negatively affects equality and fairness in public decision-making. Conversely, accountability mechanisms and judicial oversight were found to play a critical role in mitigating these risks. The study concludes that, in the absence of a comprehensive regulatory framework, the expansion of AI-driven governance may erode fundamental rights and weaken the rule of law. It emphasizes the need for a rights-based approach to AI regulation, incorporating transparency standards, algorithmic audits, and institutional oversight to ensure alignment with constitutional principles.

INTRODUCTION

The rapid integration of artificial intelligence (AI) into public governance has fundamentally transformed the nature of decision-making in contemporary states. Algorithmic governance—defined as the use of automated, data-driven systems to inform or replace administrative decisions—has increasingly been adopted in Pakistan across domains such as taxation, policing, identity verification, and judicial administration. Systems deployed by institutions like the National Database and Registration Authority (NADRA), the Federal Board of Revenue (FBR), and urban "Safe City" initiatives illustrate how algorithmic decision-making is becoming embedded in routine governance processes, often operating with minimal human intervention. While these developments promise efficiency, speed, and cost-effectiveness, they simultaneously raise profound constitutional concerns regarding transparency,

accountability, and the protection of fundamental rights.

At the heart of this transformation lies a critical tension between technological efficiency and constitutionalism. The Constitution of Pakistan, 1973, guarantees a range of fundamental rights, including the right to due process (Article 10-A), equality before the law (Article 25), and the protection of dignity (Article 14). Algorithmic systems, however, frequently operate as "black boxes," making decisions through complex statistical models that are often opaque even to their developers. This opacity challenges the constitutional requirement of reasoned decision-making and undermines procedural fairness, particularly when individuals are unable to understand, contest, or appeal automated outcomes. Consequently, the shift from human discretion to algorithmic logic risks eroding foundational legal principles that underpin democratic governance.

Moreover, algorithmic governance introduces new dimensions of discrimination and bias into public decision-making. AI systems are trained on historical datasets that may reflect entrenched social inequalities, thereby reproducing or even amplifying discriminatory outcomes. In the Pakistani context, where socio-economic disparities are already pronounced, the unchecked deployment of such systems can disproportionately affect marginalized populations, raising serious concerns under constitutional guarantees of equality and non-discrimination. These risks are particularly evident in predictive policing and surveillance technologies, where algorithmic bias may lead to over-policing of certain communities and infringements on privacy rights.

The judiciary in Pakistan has begun to engage with these challenges, emphasizing the indispensability of human judgment in legal decision-making. In recent jurisprudence, the Supreme Court has underscored that AI may serve as an assistive tool but cannot replace the human elements of reasoning, empathy, and moral judgment that are essential to justice. The Court has warned that the "rule of law must prevail over the rule of data," reaffirming that constitutional values cannot be subordinated to algorithmic outputs. Similarly, landmark cases have delineated constitutional boundaries, permitting the use of AI to enhance efficiency while prohibiting its use in ways that compromise fair trial rights and judicial independence.

Despite these emerging judicial perspectives, Pakistan currently lacks a comprehensive legal and regulatory framework specifically governing AI and algorithmic decision-making. The absence of clear standards for transparency, accountability, and oversight creates significant legal uncertainty and increases the risk of arbitrary or unjust outcomes. Scholars have highlighted the need for robust regulatory mechanisms, including algorithmic audits, explainability requirements, and institutional oversight bodies, to ensure that AI systems align with constitutional mandates. Without such safeguards, the expansion of algorithmic governance may inadvertently undermine democratic legitimacy and weaken public trust in state institutions.

In this context, the study of algorithmic governance in Pakistan necessitates a critical examination of its legal implications within a constitutional framework. It requires an exploration of how emerging technologies interact with established legal doctrines, and whether existing constitutional protections are sufficient to address the unique challenges posed by AI-driven decision-making. This research aims to analyze the intersection of algorithmic governance and constitutional rights in Pakistan, focusing on issues of due process, transparency, accountability, and equality. By situating AI within the broader discourse of constitutionalism and the rule of law, the study seeks to contribute to the development of a rights-based approach to AI regulation that safeguards fundamental freedoms while enabling technological innovation.

Problem Statement

The increasing adoption of artificial intelligence (AI) in public sector decision-making has introduced a paradigm shift in governance structures in Pakistan. Algorithmic systems are now being utilized by institutions such as the National Database and Registration Authority

(NADRA) and the Federal Board of Revenue (FBR) to automate processes including identity verification, risk profiling, and service delivery. While these systems enhance administrative efficiency and data-driven governance, they simultaneously pose significant legal and constitutional challenges. The absence of a dedicated regulatory framework governing algorithmic decision-making raises concerns about the compatibility of such technologies with the constitutional guarantees enshrined in the Constitution of Pakistan 1973.

A central issue lies in the opacity and complexity of algorithmic systems, often referred to as "black-box" models, which limit transparency and hinder the ability of affected individuals to understand or challenge decisions made about them. This lack of explainability directly conflicts with the constitutional right to due process under Article 10-A, which requires fair hearing and reasoned decision-making. Moreover, algorithmic bias embedded in training data may lead to discriminatory outcomes, disproportionately affecting marginalized populations and thereby violating Article 25, which guarantees equality before the law. The integration of AI into surveillance and predictive policing mechanisms further raises concerns regarding the right to privacy and human dignity under Article 14.

Despite these critical implications, Pakistan currently lacks comprehensive legal standards for algorithmic accountability, oversight, and redress mechanisms. Existing institutional practices often operate in regulatory vacuums, where automated decisions are neither adequately audited nor subject to meaningful human review. Additionally, the judiciary's engagement with AI remains nascent, with limited jurisprudence addressing the intersection of algorithmic governance and constitutional rights. This gap creates legal uncertainty and increases the risk of arbitrary, biased, or unjust administrative outcomes.

Therefore, the core problem addressed in this study is the tension between the rapid deployment of AI-based decision-making systems in Pakistan's public sector and the inadequate legal and constitutional safeguards to regulate their use. Without a robust governance framework grounded in constitutional principles, the expansion of algorithmic governance may undermine fundamental rights, weaken the rule of law, and erode public trust in state institutions.

Research Questions

1. How does the use of AI-based decision-making systems in Pakistan's public sector impact constitutional guarantees such as due process, equality, and privacy?
2. To what extent do current practices of institutions like the National Database and Registration Authority and the Federal Board of Revenue comply with constitutional requirements of transparency and accountability?
3. What legal and regulatory gaps exist in Pakistan regarding algorithmic governance and AI oversight?
4. How can algorithmic bias and lack of explainability in AI systems affect marginalized communities in Pakistan?
5. What role should the judiciary play in regulating and interpreting the use of AI in public decision-making?
6. What comparative legal frameworks or international best practices can inform the development of AI regulation in Pakistan?

Research Objectives

1. **To critically examine** the application of AI-based decision-making systems in Pakistan's public governance and their implications for constitutional rights.
2. **To analyze** the extent to which existing practices align with the provisions of the Constitution of Pakistan 1973, particularly Articles 10-A, 14, and 25.
3. **To identify** key legal, institutional, and regulatory gaps in the governance of algorithmic systems in Pakistan.
4. **To evaluate** the risks of algorithmic bias, opacity, and lack of accountability in public sector AI applications.
5. **To explore** the evolving role of the judiciary in safeguarding constitutional rights in the context of emerging technologies.

6. **To propose** a rights-based legal and regulatory framework that ensures transparency, accountability, and fairness in AI-driven governance.

Significance of the Study

This study holds substantial significance at the intersection of emerging technology and constitutional law in Pakistan. As public institutions such as the National Database and Registration Authority and the Federal Board of Revenue increasingly integrate artificial intelligence into governance processes, there is a pressing need to assess whether such technological advancements align with the fundamental rights guaranteed under the Constitution of Pakistan 1973. This research contributes to bridging the gap between rapid technological adoption and the slower evolution of legal safeguards, ensuring that innovation does not come at the expense of constitutional protections.

The study is significant for legal scholarship as it advances the discourse on algorithmic governance within a developing country context, where regulatory frameworks remain underdeveloped. By critically examining issues such as algorithmic opacity, bias, and accountability, the research provides a nuanced understanding of how AI systems may challenge established principles of due process, equality, and human dignity. It also contributes to comparative legal studies by positioning Pakistan within global debates on AI regulation and constitutionalism.

From a policy perspective, this research offers valuable insights for lawmakers, regulators, and public institutions by identifying key legal and institutional gaps in current practices. The findings can inform the development of comprehensive regulatory frameworks, including standards for transparency, algorithmic audits, and oversight mechanisms, thereby promoting responsible and rights-compliant AI deployment in the public sector.

Furthermore, the study is important for the judiciary, as it highlights the evolving role of courts in interpreting constitutional rights in the context of algorithmic decision-making. It underscores the necessity of judicial oversight to prevent arbitrary or discriminatory outcomes and to uphold the rule of law in an increasingly automated governance environment.

Finally, the research carries broader societal significance by addressing the potential impact of AI-driven governance on citizens, particularly marginalized and vulnerable groups. By advocating for a rights-based approach to algorithmic governance, the study seeks to enhance public trust, ensure fairness, and promote equitable access to justice in Pakistan's digital future.

Literature Review

The growing body of scholarship on algorithmic governance highlights a fundamental transformation in the relationship between the state and citizens, driven by the integration of artificial intelligence (AI) into public decision-making. Globally, researchers have emphasized that algorithmic systems are not merely technical tools but socio-legal constructs that shape power, accountability, and rights (Kitchin, 2017; Yeung, 2018). Algorithmic governance, as conceptualized by Karen Yeung, refers to the use of automated systems to regulate behavior and allocate resources, often replacing or augmenting traditional bureaucratic discretion. This shift has generated critical debates about transparency, legitimacy, and the rule of law, particularly in contexts where institutional safeguards are weak or evolving.

A central theme in the literature is the problem of algorithmic opacity and its implications for due process. Scholars such as Frank Pasquale (2015) argue that many AI systems function as "black boxes," making decisions that are difficult to interpret or challenge. This opacity undermines procedural fairness, as individuals affected by automated decisions may lack access to meaningful explanations or avenues for redress. In legal contexts, this raises serious concerns about compliance with principles of natural justice, including the right to be heard and the requirement for reasoned decision-making. Similarly, Danielle Citron (2008) highlights the risks of "technological due process" failures, where automated systems can produce erroneous or

unjust outcomes without adequate accountability mechanisms.

Another prominent strand of research focuses on algorithmic bias and discrimination. Studies have demonstrated that AI systems trained on historical data often replicate existing social inequalities, leading to discriminatory outcomes in areas such as policing, credit scoring, and welfare distribution (Barocas & Selbst, 2016). Scholars like Cathy O'Neil (2016) argue that poorly designed algorithms can reinforce systemic biases under the guise of objectivity. In developing countries, including Pakistan, these risks are exacerbated by data limitations, lack of regulatory oversight, and socio-economic disparities. Empirical research suggests that marginalized communities are particularly vulnerable to exclusionary or biased algorithmic decisions, raising concerns about violations of equality and non-discrimination principles.

The literature also underscores the importance of accountability and governance frameworks for AI systems. European Commission (2021) has proposed a risk-based regulatory approach to AI, emphasizing transparency, human oversight, and fundamental rights protection. Similarly, the OECD (2019) AI Principles advocate for fairness, accountability, and explainability in AI deployment. These international frameworks provide valuable benchmarks for national regulation, particularly in jurisdictions like Pakistan, where comprehensive AI laws are still absent. Scholars argue that effective governance requires a combination of technical safeguards (such as algorithmic audits) and legal mechanisms (such as rights-based oversight) to ensure responsible AI use (Floridi et al., 2018).

In the Pakistani context, the literature on algorithmic governance remains limited but is gradually expanding. Existing studies have examined the use of AI in public institutions such as the National Database and Registration Authority and law enforcement agencies, highlighting both opportunities and risks. Researchers note that while these systems improve efficiency and service delivery, they often operate without clear legal standards for transparency or accountability (Soomro et al., 2025). Furthermore, there is a lack of empirical research on how algorithmic decisions impact citizens' rights in practice, particularly in rural and marginalized communities.

Judicial perspectives on AI in Pakistan are also emerging as an important area of inquiry. Legal scholars have analyzed recent case law to assess how courts are addressing issues related to automated decision-making and constitutional rights. While the judiciary has generally acknowledged the potential benefits of AI, it has also emphasized the need to preserve human judgment and safeguard fundamental rights. However, the absence of detailed jurisprudence on algorithmic accountability indicates a significant gap in the legal landscape.

Despite these contributions, the existing literature reveals several gaps. First, there is a lack of comprehensive studies that integrate legal, technological, and socio-political dimensions of algorithmic governance in Pakistan. Second, limited attention has been given to the constitutional implications of AI, particularly in relation to due process, equality, and privacy rights under the Constitution of Pakistan 1973. Third, there is insufficient focus on developing context-specific regulatory frameworks that address the unique challenges faced by developing countries.

In response to these gaps, the present study seeks to provide a holistic analysis of algorithmic governance in Pakistan, with a particular focus on its constitutional implications. By synthesizing global theoretical insights with local empirical realities, the research aims to contribute to both academic scholarship and policy development, advancing a rights-based approach to AI governance in Pakistan.

Underpinning Theory: Algorithmic Accountability Theory

The present study is grounded in **Algorithmic Accountability Theory**, which provides a critical framework for evaluating the use of artificial intelligence (AI) in public decision-making, particularly in relation to legal and constitutional safeguards. This theory has been prominently advanced by scholars such as Frank Pasquale and further developed within interdisciplinary

research on law, technology, and governance. It focuses on the principle that algorithmic systems—especially those used by public authorities—must be subject to mechanisms of transparency, explainability, and institutional oversight to ensure that their outcomes are fair, lawful, and contestable.

At its core, Algorithmic Accountability Theory challenges the notion that automated decision-making systems are inherently objective or neutral. Instead, it posits that algorithms are socio-technical constructs shaped by human choices, data inputs, and institutional contexts. As such, they can reproduce biases, obscure decision-making processes, and shift responsibility away from human actors. In the context of Pakistan, where institutions such as the National Database and Registration Authority and the Federal Board of Revenue increasingly rely on algorithmic systems, this theory is particularly relevant for assessing whether such technologies comply with constitutional guarantees under the Constitution of Pakistan 1973.

The theory emphasizes three key dimensions: **transparency**, **answerability**, and **enforceability**. Transparency requires that algorithmic processes be sufficiently explainable so that affected individuals can understand how decisions are made. Answerability demands that public authorities remain responsible for decisions produced by automated systems, ensuring that human oversight is not eliminated. Enforceability involves the existence of legal and institutional mechanisms—such as judicial review, audits, and regulatory oversight—to correct errors and prevent misuse.

Within constitutional law, Algorithmic Accountability Theory aligns closely with principles of due process, equality, and the rule of law. It provides a normative basis for evaluating whether AI-driven governance respects the right to a fair hearing (Article 10-A), safeguards against arbitrary discrimination (Article 25), and upholds human dignity (Article 14). By applying this theoretical lens, the study critically examines how algorithmic governance in Pakistan may either reinforce or undermine constitutional protections.

Furthermore, the theory supports a **rights-based approach to AI regulation**, advocating for proactive safeguards rather than reactive remedies. It underscores the necessity of embedding accountability mechanisms at the design and deployment stages of algorithmic systems, rather than relying solely on post hoc legal challenges. This is particularly significant in developing countries like Pakistan, where institutional capacity and regulatory frameworks are still evolving.

In summary, Algorithmic Accountability Theory provides a robust conceptual foundation for analyzing the legal implications of AI-based public decision-making. It enables this study to systematically assess the extent to which algorithmic governance in Pakistan adheres to constitutional norms and to propose reforms that ensure transparency, fairness, and accountability in the digital age.

Hypotheses

H1: The use of AI-based decision-making systems in Pakistan's public sector is significantly associated with challenges to the right to due process as guaranteed under the Constitution of Pakistan 1973.

H2: Algorithmic opacity and lack of explainability in systems employed by institutions such as the National Database and Registration Authority and the Federal Board of Revenue negatively affect transparency and accountability in governance.

H3: AI-driven public decision-making systems in Pakistan increase the likelihood of discriminatory outcomes, thereby undermining the constitutional principle of equality before the law.

H4: The absence of a comprehensive regulatory framework for algorithmic governance in Pakistan significantly contributes to legal uncertainty and risks of rights violations.

H5: Judicial oversight plays a moderating role in mitigating the adverse constitutional impacts of algorithmic decision-making.

H6: The implementation of algorithmic accountability mechanisms (e.g., audits, explainability standards, and human oversight) is positively associated with the protection of fundamental rights in AI-driven governance.

Methodology

This study adopted a **quantitative, cross-sectional research design** to examine the constitutional implications of AI-based decision-making in Pakistan's public sector. The approach enabled a systematic assessment of perceptions regarding transparency, accountability, and fundamental rights in algorithmic governance.

Population and Sampling

The target population comprised legal professionals, policymakers, IT experts, and public officials associated with institutions utilizing AI systems, including the National Database and Registration Authority and the Federal Board of Revenue. Additionally, academic researchers in law and technology were included to ensure analytical depth.

A **sample size of 300 respondents** was selected using a **stratified random sampling technique** to ensure representation across four key strata: legal experts (n=80), public officials (n=80), IT professionals (n=70), and academics (n=70). This stratification enhanced the reliability and generalizability of findings by capturing diverse professional perspectives.

Data Collection

Primary data were collected through a **structured questionnaire** developed based on existing literature and the provisions of the Constitution of Pakistan 1973. The questionnaire consisted of two sections: (1) demographic information and (2) Likert-scale items measuring key constructs, including algorithmic transparency, accountability, bias, due process, and regulatory adequacy.

The instrument was pilot-tested with 30 participants to ensure clarity and reliability. Necessary modifications were made based on feedback. The finalized questionnaire was administered electronically over a period of eight weeks.

Variables and Measurement

- **Independent Variables:** Algorithmic transparency, explainability, and regulatory framework adequacy
- **Dependent Variables:** Perceived protection of constitutional rights (due process, equality, and privacy)
- **Moderating Variable:** Judicial oversight

All variables were measured using a **five-point Likert scale** ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree).

Data Analysis

Data were analyzed using statistical software. Descriptive statistics (mean, standard deviation) were computed to summarize responses, while inferential techniques—including correlation and multiple regression analysis—were employed to test the hypotheses. Reliability of the instrument was confirmed using Cronbach's alpha ($\alpha > 0.70$), indicating acceptable internal consistency.

Ethical Considerations

The study adhered to established ethical standards. Participation was voluntary, and informed consent was obtained from all respondents. Confidentiality and anonymity were strictly maintained, and no personal identifiers were recorded.

Data Analysis

The collected data were analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistical techniques to evaluate the relationship between algorithmic governance and constitutional rights in Pakistan. The analysis focused on key variables including transparency, accountability, algorithmic bias, regulatory adequacy, judicial oversight, and protection of fundamental rights under the Constitution of Pakistan 1973.

1. Descriptive Statistics

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics of Key Variables (n = 300)

Variable	Mean	Standard Deviation
Algorithmic Transparency	2.61	0.74
Algorithmic Explainability	2.48	0.81
Accountability Mechanisms	2.55	0.77
Algorithmic Bias	3.89	0.68
Regulatory Framework Adequacy	2.32	0.79
Judicial Oversight	3.21	0.71
Protection of Constitutional Rights	2.44	0.76

The descriptive results indicate that respondents generally perceived **low levels of transparency, explainability, and regulatory adequacy** (means below 3.0), suggesting dissatisfaction with current AI governance practices. In contrast, the relatively high mean for algorithmic bias (M = 3.89) reflects a strong perception that AI systems may produce biased outcomes. Judicial oversight received a moderate rating (M = 3.21), indicating some confidence in the judiciary's role, although not sufficient to fully mitigate risks. Overall, the low mean for protection of constitutional rights (M = 2.44) highlights concerns regarding compliance with constitutional guarantees.

2. Correlation Analysis

Table 2: Correlation Matrix

Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. Transparency	1					
2. Explainability	0.68**	1				
3. Accountability	0.71**	0.65**	1			
4. Algorithmic Bias	-0.52**	-0.49**	-0.55**	1		
5. Regulatory Adequacy	0.63**	0.60**	0.66**	-0.58**	1	
6. Constitutional Rights Protection	0.69**	0.66**	0.72**	-0.61**	0.70**	1

Note: p < 0.01

The correlation analysis reveals strong **positive relationships** between transparency, accountability, regulatory adequacy, and protection of constitutional rights. This suggests that improvements in these governance factors are associated with better protection of rights such as due process and equality. Conversely, algorithmic bias shows a **significant negative correlation** with constitutional rights protection (r = -0.61), indicating that higher perceived bias reduces confidence in rights protection. These findings support the theoretical premise that accountability and fairness are central to lawful AI governance.

3. Regression Analysis

Table 3: Multiple Regression Results

Predictor Variable	Beta (β)	t-value	p-value
Transparency	0.28	4.92	0.000
Explainability	0.21	3.87	0.000

Predictor Variable	Beta (β)	t-value	p-value
Accountability	0.31	5.34	0.000
Algorithmic Bias	-0.26	-4.76	0.000
Regulatory Adequacy	0.29	5.11	0.000
Judicial Oversight	0.18	3.45	0.001

Model Summary:

- $R^2 = 0.64$
- Adjusted $R^2 = 0.62$
- $F = 72.85$ ($p < 0.001$)

The regression model explains **64% of the variance** in the protection of constitutional rights, indicating a strong model fit. Accountability (β = 0.31) and regulatory adequacy (β = 0.29) emerged as the most significant positive predictors, followed by transparency and explainability. Algorithmic bias had a **significant negative effect** (β = -0.26), confirming that biased systems undermine constitutional protections. Judicial oversight also showed a positive and statistically significant impact, supporting its moderating role.

4. Hypotheses Testing Summary

Hypothesis	Statement (Abbreviated)	Result
H1	AI impacts due process	Supported
H2	Opacity reduces transparency/accountability	Supported
H3	AI increases discrimination	Supported
H4	Lack of regulation creates legal risks	Supported
H5	Judicial oversight moderates effects	Supported
H6	Accountability mechanisms improve rights protection	Supported

All hypotheses were empirically supported, reinforcing the central argument that algorithmic governance in Pakistan, in its current form, poses risks to constitutional rights unless accompanied by robust accountability mechanisms.

The findings demonstrate that while AI-based governance offers administrative efficiency, it raises **significant constitutional concerns**, particularly regarding due process, equality, and fairness under the Constitution of Pakistan 1973. The strong influence of accountability, transparency, and regulatory frameworks underscores the necessity of institutional reforms. Without such safeguards, algorithmic systems risk perpetuating bias and undermining the rule of law. Conversely, enhanced judicial oversight and structured accountability mechanisms can significantly improve rights protection, offering a pathway toward responsible AI governance in Pakistan.

Discussion

The findings of this study provide strong empirical support for the argument that the growing integration of AI-based systems in Pakistan's public sector presents both opportunities and significant constitutional risks. The results indicate that low levels of algorithmic transparency, explainability, and regulatory adequacy are closely associated with weak protection of fundamental rights guaranteed under the Constitution of Pakistan 1973. These findings align with existing theoretical perspectives, particularly Algorithmic Accountability Theory, which emphasizes that opaque and unregulated systems can undermine due process and fairness. The strong negative

relationship between algorithmic bias and constitutional rights further highlights the risk that AI systems may reproduce or exacerbate existing social inequalities, especially in contexts where historical data is uneven or discriminatory.

The study also underscores the critical role of accountability mechanisms and judicial oversight. The positive and significant impact of accountability, transparency, and regulatory frameworks suggests that constitutional compliance is not inherently incompatible with technological innovation; rather, it depends on the presence of appropriate safeguards. Judicial oversight emerged as a meaningful moderating factor, indicating that courts can play a vital role in ensuring that algorithmic governance does not erode the rule of law. However, the moderate rating of judicial effectiveness suggests that this role is still evolving and requires further institutional strengthening.

Moreover, the findings reflect broader systemic issues within Pakistan's governance framework, where rapid technological adoption has outpaced legal and regulatory development. Institutions such as the National Database and Registration Authority and the Federal Board of Revenue are increasingly relying on automated systems without clearly defined standards for transparency, auditability, or redress. This creates a governance gap where efficiency gains are achieved at the potential cost of constitutional guarantees, raising concerns about legitimacy and public trust.

Conclusion

This study concludes that while AI-driven governance has the potential to enhance administrative efficiency and service delivery in Pakistan, its current implementation poses substantial challenges to constitutional rights. The absence of robust regulatory frameworks, combined with issues of algorithmic opacity and bias, significantly undermines principles of due process, equality, and accountability as enshrined in the Constitution of Pakistan 1973. The empirical evidence demonstrates that without adequate safeguards, algorithmic systems risk institutionalizing unfair and non-transparent decision-making processes.

At the same time, the study finds that the negative impacts of algorithmic governance are not inevitable. Strengthened accountability mechanisms, improved transparency, and effective judicial oversight can mitigate these risks and ensure that technological innovation aligns with constitutional values. Therefore, the future of AI in Pakistan's public sector depends on the development of a balanced framework that integrates efficiency with rights protection.

Implications

The study carries significant implications for legal scholarship, public policy, and institutional practice. From a legal perspective, it highlights the urgent need to reinterpret constitutional principles in light of emerging technologies, ensuring that fundamental rights remain protected in digital governance contexts. For policymakers, the findings emphasize the necessity of developing comprehensive AI regulations that incorporate standards for transparency, explainability, and accountability.

Institutionally, the study suggests that public sector organizations must adopt proactive measures, such as algorithmic audits, impact assessments, and human-in-the-loop systems, to ensure responsible AI deployment. The judiciary also faces important implications, as it must expand its interpretive role to address complex technological issues and provide effective remedies in cases involving automated decision-making. Overall, the research underscores the importance of adopting a rights-based approach to AI governance in Pakistan.

Future Directions

Future research should focus on expanding the empirical scope of algorithmic governance studies in Pakistan by incorporating larger and more diverse populations, including direct beneficiaries of AI-driven public services. Longitudinal studies could provide deeper insights into how the impact of algorithmic systems evolves over time. Additionally, qualitative approaches, such as case studies and judicial analyses, would offer a more nuanced understanding of how constitutional principles are applied in real-world scenarios.

There is also a need for comparative research examining how other jurisdictions regulate AI in public governance, which could inform context-specific policy development in Pakistan. Further interdisciplinary research integrating law, computer science, and public administration would be valuable in designing technically feasible and legally sound regulatory frameworks.

Recommendations

Based on the findings, several key recommendations are proposed. First, the government should develop a comprehensive legal framework specifically addressing algorithmic governance, ensuring alignment with constitutional principles. Second, public institutions should implement mandatory algorithmic transparency and explainability standards to enable individuals to understand and challenge automated decisions. Third, independent oversight bodies should be established to conduct regular audits of AI systems and monitor compliance with legal and ethical standards.

Fourth, the judiciary should be equipped with technical expertise and training to effectively adjudicate cases involving AI and algorithmic decision-making. Fifth, mechanisms for public participation and stakeholder engagement should be incorporated into AI governance processes to enhance legitimacy and trust. Finally, efforts should be made to improve data quality and reduce bias in training datasets to minimize discriminatory outcomes.

Limitations

Despite its contributions, this study has several limitations. The use of a cross-sectional design limits the ability to establish causal relationships between variables. The reliance on self-reported data may also introduce response bias, as participants' perceptions may not fully reflect actual institutional practices. Additionally, the sample, while diverse, was limited to professionals and experts, excluding direct users of AI-driven public services, which may affect the generalizability of findings.

Furthermore, the study primarily focused on quantitative analysis, which may not capture the full complexity of legal and ethical issues associated with algorithmic governance. The rapidly evolving nature of AI technologies also means that findings may require continuous updating to remain relevant. Future studies should address these limitations by employing mixed-method approaches and broader sampling strategies.

REFERENCES

Ahmed, S. S., Javed, M. S., & Haider, S. (2025). Algorithmic discrimination and the law: Regulating bias in AI decision-making. Pakistan Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences, 13(4), 220–229.

Barocas, S., & Selbst, A. D. (2016). Big data's disparate impact. California Law Review, 104(3), 671–732.

Citron, D. K. (2008). Technological due process. Washington University Law Review, 85(6), 1249–1313.

European Commission. (2021). Proposal for a regulation laying down harmonised rules on artificial intelligence (Artificial Intelligence Act).

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.

Kitchin, R. (2017). Thinking critically about and researching algorithms. Information, Communication & Society, 20(1), 14–29.

Mittelstadt, B. D., Allo, P., Taddeo, M., Wachter, S., & Floridi, L. (2016). The ethics of algorithms: Mapping the debate. Big Data & Society, 3(2), 1–21.

Munir, B. (2024). Artificial intelligence and legal decision-making in the USA and Pakistan: A critical appreciation of regulatory frameworks. SSRN.

OECD. (2019). OECD principles on artificial intelligence.

O'Neil, C. (2016). Weapons of math destruction: How big data increases inequality and threatens democracy. Crown Publishing.

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

Shah, S. Z., Sulimankhel, A. K., Nazir, M. A., & Deeba, R. (2025). Artificial intelligence as an auxiliary tool in judicial adjudication: Constitutional and ethical boundaries. Sociology & Cultural Research Review.

Soomro, S. A., Kalhor, H. B., & Gujjar, M. (2025). AI-driven policing in Pakistan: Potential pitfalls and privacy concerns. Pakistan Social Sciences Review.

Veale, M., Van Kleek, M., & Binns, R. (2018). Fairness and accountability design needs for algorithmic support in high-stakes public sector decision-making. In Proceedings of the 2018 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (pp. 1–14).

Wachter, S., Mittelstadt, B., & Floridi, L. (2017). Why a right to explanation of automated decision-making does not exist in the General Data Protection Regulation. International Data Privacy Law, 7(2), 76–99.

Yeung, K. (2018). Algorithmic regulation: A critical interrogation. Regulation & Governance, 12(4), 505–523.

Zuboff, S. (2019). The age of surveillance capitalism: The fight for a human future at the new frontier of power. PublicAffairs.