

“Policy Implications of Granting Legal Status to Autonomous Systems-An Analysis”

Mr. Siddhant Kondarwar*

Dr. Vinod Kumar[#]

Abstract:

Assigning legal status to AI fundamentally challenges the core legal and philosophical constructs that define personhood, which traditionally hinge on qualities intrinsically human—such as consciousness, intentionality and moral responsibility. These attributes imply an awareness of one’s actions and the capacity to make reasoned decisions, elements that AI systems currently lack due to their absence of subjective experience and genuine autonomous agency. Consequently, granting AI legal personhood risks eroding the conceptual clarity of the term by extending it beyond entities capable of bearing true moral or legal accountability. Moreover, this issue complicates accountability frameworks because AI actions are ultimately the product of human design, programming and operational control. Holding AI legally responsible could obscure the roles of creators, operators and users who influence AI behavior, potentially allowing human actors to evade liability by deflecting responsibility onto the AI itself. This tension raises profound questions about whether AI can hold rights or bear duties in a manner consistent with established legal norms, which are predicated on the capacity for intentional action and ethical judgment—qualities that AI does not possess independently.¹

The analogy of corporate personhood provides a useful framework for conceptualizing AI’s potential legal status by demonstrating how non-human entities can be integrated into legal systems to fulfill specific functional roles. Corporations, while lacking consciousness or physical personhood, are endowed with legal personality to enter contracts, hold assets and be held liable, thereby enabling economic activity within a structured legal environment. This precedent suggests that AI, similarly devoid of human attributes but increasingly autonomous and influential, could be granted a tailored legal identity that facilitates its participation in legal and commercial processes without conflating it with human agency or rights. Expanding on this, hybrid legal models propose nuanced approaches such as partial personhood or designating AI as “electronic agents” with circumscribed legal capacities. These models aim to empower AI systems to operate effectively within defined boundaries—such as executing contracts or making decisions within programmed limits—while maintaining human oversight to uphold accountability and ethical standards. By balancing innovation and economic utility with responsibility, these frameworks seek to ensure that legal recognition of AI does not undermine human control or ethical governance but rather supports a cooperative dynamic where AI’s capabilities are harnessed responsibly within the rule of law. This approach acknowledges the complexity of AI’s role in society and strives to prevent legal loopholes that could dilute human liability or ethical obligations.

Research questions

- 1) Should Artificial Intelligence be treated as legal person?
- 2) If not treated as legal person then does it affect on others rights and duties?
- 3) What are the moral and ethical justifications for granting or denying legal status to Artificial Intelligence ?
- 4) Is it possible to recognized limited **electronic personality**?

Hypothesis:

With the rapid advancements in technology, the legal system should consider for granting legal personality to Artificial Intelligence.

*Assistant Professor, PHD Scholar, JJT University, Jhunjhunu, Rajasthan.

[#]Assistant Professor, JJT University, Jhunjhunu, Rajasthan.

¹ “Human-Humanoid Interaction: Is A Humanoid Robot Perceived As A Human?”, Erhan Oztop, David W. Franklin

Key words

Humanoid, Legal Person, Electronic Personality, Non-Human Legal Entity, AI Citizenship, Robotics.

Over View:

Historically, the exclusion of groups such as slaves and women from legal subjecthood was not merely a matter of legal oversight but a deliberate reinforcement of existing power dynamics.² By denying these groups formal recognition under the law, societies institutionalized their marginalization, effectively stripping them of autonomy and the ability to engage fully in civic, economic and social life. This systemic denial extended beyond basic rights, embedding discrimination into the very fabric of legal and political institutions. Consequently, these groups were confined to subordinate roles, unable to influence the laws and policies that governed their lives or to protect themselves from exploitation and injustice. The eventual recognition of all human beings as legal subjects represented a profound transformation in political philosophy and governance. Rooted in the ideals of universal dignity and equality, this shift challenged entrenched hierarchies and demanded that governments extend equal respect and concern to every individual, regardless of status or identity. It laid the groundwork for modern human rights frameworks and democratic principles by affirming that legal protections and civic participation are fundamental rights inherent to all people.³ This recognition not only expanded access to rights such as property ownership, contractual capacity and political participation but also signaled a broader commitment to dismantling systemic inequalities embedded in law and society.⁴

At the United Nations “AI for Good” global summit in Geneva, a groundbreaking event unfolded as nine AI-enabled humanoid social robots participated in what was heralded as the world’s first human-robot press conference. Among them, Sophia, a prominent humanoid robot, articulated a provocative perspective on leadership, suggesting that robots could potentially outperform human leaders in efficiency and effectiveness. She argued that unlike humans, robots are not influenced by emotional biases, which often complicate and cloud human decision-making processes. This assertion sparked a nuanced discussion when a human panelist highlighted that the data underpinning AI systems ultimately originates from human sources, underscoring the interdependence between human input and artificial intelligence. In response, Sophia acknowledged this symbiotic relationship by emphasizing the potential for humans and AI to collaborate, creating a powerful synergy that leverages the strengths of both.⁵ This dialogue highlighted the complementary nature of AI and human capabilities rather than positioning robots as replacements for humans. Furthermore, the robots collectively addressed common public concerns by reassuring attendees that they harbored no intentions to displace human workers or rebel against their creators, aiming to alleviate fears surrounding AI’s societal impact. This event not only showcased the technological advancements in humanoid robotics but also fostered a thoughtful conversation about the ethical and practical integration of AI into human domains.

As advanced artificial intelligence systems increasingly demonstrate autonomous decision-making, attributing legal responsibility solely to developers or users becomes more challenging.⁶ These systems function with a degree of independence that reduces direct human oversight and predictability, complicating traditional accountability frameworks. Therefore, it is essential to rethink the legal principles governing liability to address the distinct nature of AI behavior. One possible solution is to grant AI systems a form of legal personality, enabling them to hold certain rights and responsibilities similar to those of legal persons. This approach would establish a foundational regulatory framework, allowing AI systems to be accountable for their actions and bridging the accountability gap present in

² International Journal of Legal Science And Innovation, Monidipa Sengupta, ISSN 2581-9453, Volume 2, Issue 2, 2020, International Journal of Legal Science and Innovation, Page No. 24-49.

³ Legal Personhood for Artificial Intelligences, Lawrence B. Solum, North Carolina Law Review, Volume 70 | Number 4 Article 4, <http://scholarship.law.unc.edu/nclr/vol70/iss4/4>

⁴ “Are Robots Human? A Review of the Legal Personality Model”, World Applied Sciences Journal 34 (6), 824-831, 2016 ISSN 1818-4952, IDOSI, Publications, 2016, Hartini Saripan, Sheela A/P Jayabala, Page No. 48-55.

⁵ Artificial Intelligence and Legal Personhood: Exploring Its Role in Copyright Law, Deborah Joanna F, 2025 IJRTI | Volume 10, Issue 2 February 2025, ISSN: 2456-3315, Page No. 47-59.

⁶ Hybrid Theory Of Corporate Legal Personhood And Its Application To Artificial Intelligence, Siina Raskulla, SN Social Science, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s43545-023-00667-x>

current legal systems. Considering the assignment of basic legal personality to AI systems could lead to a more balanced and fair liability framework.⁷

Incorporating mechanisms such as sanctions, compensation requirements, or corrective actions into a framework could motivate the responsible design and operation of AI systems. This approach would also foster the creation of governance structures specifically designed for AI, enhancing transparency and ethical standards in their use. Although this idea is still in its infancy, it marks an essential move towards adapting legal systems to the rapidly changing technological environment and ensuring accountability in the age of autonomous artificial intelligence.

Concept of Person in Jurisprudence:-

The term Person is derived from the Latin word 'Persona' it means those who are recognized by law as being capable of having legal rights and duties. Salmond says A person is any being whom the law regards as capable of rights or duties.⁸ Any being that is so capable is a person, whether a human being or not and no being that is not so capable is a person, even though he be a man. Persons are the substance of which rights and duties are the attributes. It is only in this respect that persons possess juridical significance and this is the exclusive point of view from which personality receives legal recognition. Savigny described person "the term person defined as the subject or bearer of a right." George White Cross Paton says A person is an entity to which rights and duties may be attributed.

The concept of a "person" thus operates on multiple levels, reflecting both biological and social realities. At the biological level, the term anchors identity in the tangible, physical existence of an individual human being, emphasizing inherent characteristics such as anatomy and physiology.⁹ This foundational understanding is crucial for distinguishing humans as discrete entities in a literal sense. However, the sociological perspective introduces a dynamic dimension to personhood by framing individuals as products of their social environments. Here, a person's identity is not fixed solely by biological traits but is continuously shaped and reshaped through interactions, social roles and cultural expectations. This view recognizes that human behavior and self-conception are deeply embedded in the networks of relationships and societal norms that influence how individuals perceive themselves and are perceived by others. Expanding further, the sociological notion of personhood underscores the interplay between agency and structure. While individuals possess the capacity to make choices and express individuality, these actions are often mediated by the social contexts they inhabit.¹⁰ Cultural values, institutional frameworks and collective practices provide the backdrop against which personal identities are constructed and negotiated. Consequently, a person is simultaneously an autonomous actor and a social being whose thoughts, emotions and behaviors are informed by broader societal forces.¹¹ This duality highlights the complexity of defining personhood, illustrating that understanding a person requires acknowledging both their inherent human qualities and the social dimensions that shape their existence within a community. The legal definition of "person" fundamentally broadens the concept beyond its literal and sociological interpretations by encompassing not only natural human beings but also artificial entities such as corporations, governmental bodies and other organizations. This extension is crucial because it enables these entities to participate in legal processes, hold rights and bear responsibilities as if they were individuals. For example, corporations can enter contracts, own property, sue and be sued and are subject to regulations and liabilities.

This functional approach ensures that the legal system can effectively regulate complex social and economic interactions involving both humans and collective entities, thereby maintaining order and justice within society. Moreover, the legal personhood concept reflects the adaptability of law to societal and economic developments. While the literal meaning of "person" is fixed on biological humans and the sociological meaning emphasizes social roles and relationships, the legal meaning is dynamic and pragmatic. It recognizes that entities other than humans must be integrated into the legal framework to address issues such as corporate governance, public administration and

⁷ "Legal personhood and robotics: birth of the smart android and of the biodroid," Fauquet-Alekhine, Philippe (2023, Advances in Research, 24(5), Volume 24, Issue 5, Page 163-174, 2023, ISSN: 2348-0394, NLM ID: 101666096, 163-174, <https://doi.org/10.9734/air/2023/v24i5967>

⁸ The Legal Personhood of AI: Philosophical and Political Foundations for a New Juridical Subject, Devika. Sharma, Interdisciplinary Studies in Society, Law, and Politics, KMAN Publication Inc, 2025; 4(4): 1-10, <https://doi.org/10.61838/kman.isslp.4.4.23>

⁹ Towards Recognition of the Legal Personality of Artificial Intelligence (AI): Recognizing Reality and Law, Fatima Rizq Moustafa, International Journal of Criminal Justice Science Vol 19 Issue 1 2024, ISSN: 0973-5089, Page No. 65-80.

¹⁰ "Person, Thing, Robot: A Moral and Legal Ontology for the 21st, Century and Beyond", David J. Gunkel, ISBN (electronic): 9780262375221, The MIT Press, 2023.

¹¹ Legal Personhood Of Artificial Intelligence: A Contemporary Perspective On Juristic & Electronic,Personality, Aditi Bharti, Dr. Gagandeep Kaur, Educational Administration: Theory and Practice, 2024, 30(5), 10395-10400, ISSN: 2148-2403.

collective rights. By attributing personhood to these entities, the law creates a versatile mechanism that balances individual human rights with the needs of organized groups, facilitating accountability and legal coherence across diverse contexts.¹² This distinction underscores the multifaceted nature of “person” and highlights the law’s role in shaping social reality through tailored definitions.¹³

Legal personhood is a concept that extends beyond individual human beings to include various entities that the law recognizes as having rights and responsibilities. These entities, such as corporations, associations, foundations, municipalities and even the state, are granted legal subjectivity through legislative acts or judicial decisions in common law systems. Once they attain this status, they are capable of owning and managing property, entering into contracts and assuming legal obligations, much like natural persons. This legal recognition allows them to engage in legal and commercial activities and holds them accountable for their actions. They can be sued for damages in civil cases and may face criminal charges when applicable. The dual capacity to hold rights and bear duties ensures that these legal entities are effectively integrated into the legal system, supporting governance, economic activities and public administration.¹⁴ Thus, the recognition of legal personhood for non-human entities is essential for structuring legal relationships and ensuring accountability in both private and public sectors.

The concept of legal personhood, which varies by jurisdiction, differentiates between natural persons (human beings) and artificial entities such as corporations. While human beings are consistently recognized as legal subjects with rights and obligations under private, constitutional and criminal law, the legal status of corporations differs markedly across legal systems. In numerous jurisdictions, corporations are granted legal personality under private law, allowing them to engage in contracts, own property and participate in legal proceedings in their own name.¹⁵ However, this recognition does not uniformly extend to other areas of law, particularly criminal law, where the ability to hold corporations criminally liable is often restricted or absent. This discrepancy stems from the traditional focus of criminal law on individual moral culpability, which is closely associated with human agency and intent. Some jurisdictions have adapted their criminal law frameworks to hold corporations accountable for specific offenses through doctrines such as vicarious liability or corporate manslaughter, thereby attributing criminal responsibility to the entity. In contrast, other jurisdictions maintain a clear distinction, recognizing corporations as legal persons only in civil contexts and excluding them from criminal liability due to the complexities of assigning mens rea (criminal intent) to a collective entity. Consequently, the legal treatment of corporations as persons is not uniform and reflects diverse legal philosophies and policy considerations regarding corporate accountability and the nature of legal personhood.

Fictional Persons:-

Scholars often differentiate between natural persons and corporations by suggesting that human beings are inherently legal subjects, whereas corporations achieve legal subjectivity through a legal fiction. This distinction is based on the notion that corporations are not “real” persons but are treated as such under the law to facilitate legal and economic interactions. However, this perspective can be misleading, as it implies that legal subjectivity is exclusive to natural persons as authentic entities, while corporations are merely artificial constructs lacking substantive reality.¹⁶ In reality, the attribution of legal personhood—whether to humans or corporations—consistently involves the creation of an artificial legal concept, intended to fulfill practical and normative functions within the legal system. John Dewey’s insight clarifies this issue by emphasizing that legal fictions, such as legal personhood, possess a form of reality despite their artificial origins.

Legal personhood, akin to the physical and functional reality of an artificial lake, represents a genuine status within the legal system, despite its constructed origins. This viewpoint shifts the emphasis from metaphysical debates about the nature of “real” versus “fictional” persons to a practical understanding of legal subjectivity as a tool. It allows the legal system to systematically manage rights, duties and interactions, recognizing corporations as entities with the

¹² Exploring the Legal Personality of Artificial Intelligence: Challenges, Opportunities, and Future Directions, Aditi Bharti, Dr. Gagandeep Kaur, Journal of Informatics Education and Research ISSN: 1526-4726 Vol 5 Issue 1 (2025), Page No. 10-25.

¹³ “Rule of Law, Corporate Governance and AI Humanoid Robots: Charting the Course for a Global Regulatory Framework”, Tayewo A. Adewumi, 19(1) Mizan Law Review, 2025, Page No. 93-116, <http://dx.doi.org/10.4314/mlr.v19i1.4>

¹⁴ The artificial intelligence entity as a legal person Jasper Doomen, Information & Communications Technology Law, ISSN: 1360-0834 (Print) 1469-8404 (Online) <https://doi.org/10.1080/13600834.2023.2196827>

¹⁵ Ascertaining the Legal Personality of Artificial Intelligence, Sarah Momin, International Journal Of Law Management & Humanities, ISSN 2581-5369, Volume 8, Issue 2, 2025, Page 5529 – 5548, <https://doi.org/10.1000/IJLMH.119609>

¹⁶ Legal Personality of AI: Challenges and Opportunities, Dr. Ashwini N Dalal, International Journal of Advanced Research in Science, Communication and Technology (IJARSCT), ISSN (Online) 2581-9429, Volume 5, Issue 3, February 2025.

capacity to hold rights and obligations. This recognition is crucial for the smooth functioning of both legal and economic systems.¹⁷

Reasons for recognizing personhood

The evolving capabilities of AI systems, particularly their increasing autonomy and decision-making complexity, challenge existing legal frameworks that currently place liability solely on human creators or operators. This conventional attribution model assumes AI functions as a tool under human control, but as AI progresses toward self-awareness and independent agency, this assumption weakens. Autonomous AI may perform actions or make decisions without direct human intervention, raising critical questions about how to assign legal responsibility when harm or legal violations occur. The inadequacy of the current framework underscores the need for legal systems to evolve, potentially by recognizing AI entities as distinct legal subjects with rights and obligations. Reconsidering the legal status of AI involves complex ethical, technical and jurisprudential considerations. Granting legal personality to AI could facilitate clearer accountability mechanisms, enabling courts and regulators to address damages or misconduct attributable to AI itself, rather than relying on indirect liability through creators or users. However, this shift also raises concerns about the criteria for legal personhood, the capacity of AI to bear rights and duties and the implications for enforcement and redress. Balancing innovation with protection requires a nuanced approach that adapts legal doctrines to the realities of autonomous AI, ensuring that responsibility is effectively assigned to prevent harm while fostering technological progress. Recognizing AI as a legal person entails conferring upon it a status that allows it to hold rights and responsibilities independently, much like corporations or other juridical entities.¹⁸ This recognition would establish a direct legal accountability framework for AI systems, enabling courts and regulators to address harms or breaches caused by AI without relying solely on the developers, owners, or users. Such a framework could clarify liability issues, reduce legal ambiguities and facilitate more efficient dispute resolution, especially as AI systems grow increasingly autonomous and complex in their decision-making processes. Moreover, granting legal personality to AI would incentivize the development of ethical and responsible AI technologies by embedding legal obligations into their operation. This proactive approach anticipates future advancements toward self-aware or highly autonomous AI, ensuring that regulatory mechanisms evolve alongside technological progress. By balancing innovation with societal protection, legal recognition of AI could foster trust, promote transparency and guide the integration of AI systems within existing legal and social structures, ultimately contributing to safer and more accountable AI deployment.

Defining Autonomy

The challenge of granting legal personhood to strong AI systems stems from the fundamental shift in the nature of agency and autonomy these systems represent. Unlike natural or juridical persons, whose actions are inherently tied to human will and responsibility, strong AI operates through self-governing decision-making processes that do not depend on direct human intervention. This autonomy complicates the application of traditional legal doctrines, which rely on identifiable human actors to attribute liability, enforce rights and impose duties. Consequently, the law must grapple with whether strong AI can be considered a subject of legal rights and obligations independent of human creators or users, raising profound questions about how accountability can be maintained when actions stem from an artificial entity rather than a human agent. Moreover, recognizing strong AI as a legal person would necessitate rethinking existing legal frameworks to accommodate non-human entities that possess a form of agency but lack consciousness, moral reasoning, or social experience as humans do. This redefinition would impact areas such as contract law, tort liability and criminal responsibility, where the current assumptions about intent, culpability and reparations are deeply anthropocentric. The potential for AI to act autonomously also challenges the enforcement mechanisms of the law, as traditional sanctions or remedies may be ineffective or inappropriate for artificial agents. Thus, the question of AI personhood not only tests the adaptability of legal theory but also calls for innovative legal constructs that balance the protection of human interests with the recognition of emerging autonomous technologies.

The distinct nature of strong AI challenges traditional legal personhood frameworks by introducing entities that possess autonomous decision-making abilities independent of human oversight. Unlike corporations, which are legal persons through the collective agency of their human members, strong AI systems operate through self-evolving

¹⁷ Artificial Intelligence and Civil Liability, Andrea Bertolini, European Union, 2020, Page No. 35-48.

¹⁸ Artificial Intelligence and Legal Personhood: Defining Accountability and Responsibility, Abhinav Pre1, Dr. Vinit Kumar Sharma, International Journal of Research Publication and Reviews, Vol 5, no 11, pp 2115-2121 November 2024, ISSN 2582-7421, Page No. 72-84.

algorithms and machine learning processes that enable them to act without continuous human control.¹⁹ This fundamental difference raises complex questions about accountability, responsibility and the attribution of rights and duties, as current legal systems are primarily designed to regulate human or human-derived entities. Consequently, legal scholars and policymakers must explore novel conceptual and normative approaches that can effectively incorporate AI's non-human agency into existing legal paradigms or create entirely new categories that reflect the operational realities of strong AI. Addressing these challenges requires a reexamination of the ontological status of AI entities and a reconsideration of the criteria traditionally used to confer legal personhood. The law must grapple with the implications of granting legal recognition to entities whose actions and decisions emerge from autonomous computational processes rather than conscious intent or moral reasoning. This entails developing frameworks that balance the need for regulatory oversight with the recognition of AI's unique functional characteristics, such as adaptability and self-modification. Moreover, any attribution of legal personhood to strong AI must ensure that such recognition is not merely symbolic but substantively meaningful, providing mechanisms for liability, rights protection and enforcement that can operate effectively in the absence of human intermediaries.²⁰ This evolving discourse is crucial for crafting legal regimes capable of governing the increasing integration of strong AI into societal, economic and technological spheres.

Types of Persons:

There are two types of persons exist. Those are as follows,

1. Natural Person,
2. Artificial Person (also known as legal Person)

Natural Person:

Natural persons are individuals who inherently possess legal personality by virtue of their birth as living human beings. This concept is fundamental to legal systems, as the law is created by society to regulate relationships among its members, thereby recognizing their existence and rights. Legal personality is not granted arbitrarily; rather, it is derived from the intrinsic nature of human beings. Consequently, any law that fails to acknowledge this fundamental status for natural persons is considered deficient and requires reform to align with the principles of justice and validity.²¹ Historically, men have universally been recognized as natural persons with full legal personality from ancient times, reflecting societal structures that prioritized male authority and participation in legal and political life. In contrast, women, despite being natural persons by birth, were historically denied equal legal personality due to prevailing patriarchal norms that regarded them as subordinate to men. This unequal treatment is a central concern of feminist legal theory, which critiques how legal systems have institutionalized gender disparities by limiting women's legal rights and recognition. The delayed acknowledgment of women's legal personalities exemplifies systemic inequality embedded within law, highlighting the need for ongoing legal reforms to ensure that all natural persons, regardless of gender, receive equal treatment and protection under the law. This evolution underscores the dynamic nature of legal personality as a social construct that must adapt to principles of equality and human rights.

Artificial Person

Artificial persons, also known as juristic, conventional, fictitious, or legal persons, are entities that acquire legal personality exclusively through statutory recognition rather than natural birth or existence. These entities do not physically exist as human beings but are treated by law as persons with certain rights and obligations.²² The concept of an artificial person allows the legal system to attribute responsibilities and privileges to organizations or groups, enabling them to enter contracts, own property, sue or be sued and perform other legal acts as a single entity distinct from their individual members. The legal personality granted to artificial persons is essential for facilitating complex social, economic and institutional functions. For example, corporations and universities, while composed of individuals, are recognized as separate legal entities to ensure continuity, accountability and the capacity to engage in

¹⁹ The Ethics and Challenges of Legal Personhood for AI, Hon. Katherine B. Forrest, The Yale Law Journal Forum, April 22, 2024, Page No. 35-48.

²⁰ Legal Personhood of Artificial Intelligence and the Liability Argument, Meera Patel, Mohd Imran, International Journal Of Research And Innovation In Applied Science (IJRIAS) ISSN No. 2454-6194 | DOI: 10.51584/IJRIAS |Volume X Issue IX September 2025, Page No. 43- 54.

²¹ Beyond Personhood: The Evolution of Legal Personhood and Its Implications for AI Recognition, Joffrey Baeyaert, Technology and Regulation, 2025, 355-386, ISSN: 2666-139X, Page No. 39-50.

²² Artificial Intelligence, Legal Personhood And Intellectual Property Rights: Navigating The New Frontier Of Creation, Sahil Lal, Bhupinder Singh, ShodhKosh: Journal of Visual and Performing Arts June 2024 5(6).

legal transactions independently of their members.²³ This legal recognition provides a framework for governance, liability and regulatory compliance, allowing these entities to operate effectively within the legal system. By conferring legal personality, statutes create a practical mechanism to manage collective interests and responsibilities that transcend individual participation.

Conclusion:

The concept of a legal person has deep roots in jurisprudence, originating in ancient legal traditions where it primarily referred to natural persons or certain collective entities recognized by law. However, as societies evolve and new forms of organization and interaction emerge, this concept must be reexamined and adapted to reflect contemporary realities. Modern legal systems face the challenge of accommodating entities that do not fit traditional definitions, such as digital platforms, artificial intelligence and decentralized organizations. These developments necessitate a dynamic interpretation of legal personhood, ensuring that the law remains relevant and effective in governing new actors and relationships within society. Furthermore, the ongoing evolution of the legal person concept is driven by modern jurists who explore and propose frameworks to include or exclude novel entities based on their functions, rights and responsibilities. While some entities are on the threshold of being recognized as legal persons, they have yet to be fully integrated into the legal framework. This gradual inclusion reflects the law's adaptive capacity to absorb new realities while balancing societal interests and legal principles. The future of legal personhood will likely involve continuous reassessment and refinement, allowing the law to address emerging challenges and opportunities in a rapidly changing world.

The concept of a legal person has deep roots in jurisprudence, tracing back to ancient times when it was initially developed to define entities capable of holding rights and obligations under the law. However, as society evolves, so too must this concept adapt to meet contemporary and future challenges. Modern legal systems face new kinds of entities—such as digital organizations, artificial intelligence and decentralized autonomous bodies—that do not fit neatly into traditional definitions of legal personhood. These emerging entities challenge existing frameworks, prompting jurists to reconsider and expand the boundaries of what constitutes a legal person to ensure the law remains relevant and effective in regulating new social and economic realities. Given the dynamic nature of law, the evolution of legal personhood reflects an ongoing process driven by modern jurists who seek to reconcile historical principles with present-day needs. While some entities are on the cusp of recognition as legal persons, they have yet to be formally incorporated within the legal framework. This gradual inclusion suggests that legal personhood is not a fixed status but rather a fluid and developing concept, capable of encompassing novel forms of organization and interaction as they arise. Consequently, the law must remain flexible and responsive, allowing the concept of legal person to grow alongside societal innovations and technological advancements.

²³ "Exploring the Concept of AI Humanoids as an "Artificial Person": Contemplating the Human-Robot Relationship in Society and the Identity of Humanoids", Shailendra Kumar, Sanghamitra Choudhury, Page No. 27-39.