Criminal Liability of Artificial Intelligence: Perspectives and Challenges

المساءلة الجنائية للذكاء الاصطناعي: الآفاق والتحديات

Bedri Faiçal

University of Algiers 1, Faculty of Law

f.bedri@univ-alger.dz

Date of submission:11/03/2024 Date of final acceptance27/06/2024 Date of publication :juine 2024

Abstract:

The advancement of human intellect has transcended the mere development of machines and tools that simplify life, advancing towards the creation of entities endowed with sophisticated forms of intelligence. These entities are gradually attaining a level of autonomy, heralding the rise of artificial intelligence (AI) as a distinct phenomenon. This progression poses significant legal conundrums, particularly concerning the compensation claims by those harmed by AI actions. Various solutions have been proposed, including the conferment of legal personhood upon AI, thereby making it liable for any damages it incurs and subjecting it to potential criminal sanctions for legal infractions. Nevertheless, these propositions face considerable hurdles, sparking an intense and ongoing debate about their implementation.

Keywords: Artificial Intelligence, Legal Personhood, Criminal Accountability, Evidence, Sanctions

ملخص:

لم يتوقف ذكاء الإنسان عند حد اختراع آلات ومعدات تسهل عليه أمور الحياة، بل تجاوز ذلك إلى تطوير كيانات متطورة تتسم بالذكاء. هذه الكيانات، التي بدأت تستقل شيئاً فشيئاً عن مستخدميها، أدت إلى ظهور ما يُعرف بالذكاء الاصطناعي. ظهور هذه الكيانات الذكية، ذاتية التحكم والمستقلة نسبياً، أوجد صعوبات عديدة للمتضررين الذين يسعون للحصول على تعويضات عن الأضرار التي لحقت بهم بسببها. تتمثل بعض الحلول المقترحة في ضرورة الاعتراف بالشخصية القانونية للذكاء الاصطناعي، مما يتيح مساءلته قانونياً وإلزامه بتعويض الأضرار التي يتسبب فيها. وهناك إمكانية لتحمله الجزاءات التي تفرضها القواعد القانونية الجنائية نتيجة خرقه للأحكام. تلك الإمكانيات واجهت تحديات جمة، وما زال النقاش حولها محتدماً حتى الآن.

الكلمات المفتاحية: الذكاء الاصطناعي؛ الشخصية القانونية؛ المسؤولية الجنائية؛ الإثبات؛ عقوبات.

Auteur correspondant: Bedri Faiçal

Introduction:

The advancements in human intelligence extend beyond significant technological progress to the invention of entities with sophisticated intelligence, progressively gaining independence from their operators. This evolution signifies a new phase in artificial intelligence (AI) adoption, challenging traditional legal frameworks.

Artificial intelligence, a term of relatively recent origin[1], is defined within computer science as the endeavor to understand and implement technology that simulates human cognitive functions. It encompasses developments enabling machines to undertake tasks traditionally requiring human intellect, such as adaptive learning, logical reasoning, self-correction, and autonomous programming[1]

Furthermore, AI involves the design and creation of systems capable of independent environmental interaction to achieve predefined objective[2].

AI is categorized into narrow AI, which allows machines to comprehend and execute specific commands, like self-driving vehicles, drones, facial recognition software, and chess programs; and strong AI, which surpasses the former in intelligence. Strong AI can outperform humans in specialized tasks, such as those performed by an expert surgeon, by continuously enhancing its cognitive capabilities through experiential learning[3].

Assigning criminal liability in the context of artificial intelligence (AI) presents a multifaceted challenge, exacerbated by the multitude of stakeholders involved in its development and deployment. The intricate web of relationships among these entities complicates the task of delineating their respective contributions to the development process, thereby obstructing efforts to identify, hold accountable, and seek reparations from the responsible parties. Additionally, the evolving autonomy of AI systems further complicates this issue[4], raising questions about the extent to which these systems' decisions implicate users or other involved parties in criminal misconduct.

This situation raises a critical research question regarding the autonomy of AI decision-making and its implications for assigning criminal liability to either users or developers. Thus, to what extent can the rules of criminal liability be applied to crimes committed by artificial intelligence? Should criminal liability be attributed to the manufacturer, the user, or the programmer of the artificial intelligence system? The legitimacy of this question unfolds a spectrum of legal dilemmas surrounding the allocation of rights and responsibilities[5]. As of now, the quest for fully autonomous AI decision-making capabilities remains unfulfilled. Nonetheless, the gradual increase

---

[1]The decade spanning 1940 to 1950 heralded pivotal advancements in artificial intelligence (AI), with significant contributions from the study of neurons and neural activity that formed the initial underpinnings of AI. The pioneering work of Warren McCulloch and Walter Pitts was instrumental in deciphering neural activity, laying down the mathematical underpinnings for both biological and artificial neurons. A landmark in the timeline of AI was the Dartmouth conference in 1956, where John McCarthy first coined the term "artificial intelligence," marking a cornerstone in the domain's evolution. The 1950s witnessed the inaugural endeavors to forge models endowed with the capacity for learning. However, these early prototypes fell short of replicating complex behaviors.

Transitioning into the 1980s, AI systems started to emerge in the commercial sphere, spotlighting the development of robots and systems engineered to replicate human and animal motions and functionalities. This period saw the emergence of the humanoid robot as a distinct specialization within AI, dedicated to emulating the locomotive functions of living beings.

Following these developments, the research and technological landscape of AI broadened significantly, embracing a vast array of applications spanning machine learning, natural language processing, robotics, and gaming AI systems. See: Abdel-Razzaq Wahba Sayed Ahmed Mohamed, "Civil Liability for Damages of Artificial Intelligence: An Analytical Study," Journal of Deep Legal Research, Issue 43, October 2020, pp. 15, 16.

in AI autonomy, propelled by rapid advancements in the field, suggests the eventual emergence of systems capable of operating independently from human oversight.

This progression posits a direct correlation between the increasing autonomy of AI and the complexities of applying established principles of criminal accountability. Among the proposed resolutions is the controversial idea of granting AI legal personhood, thus making it possible to legally hold AI systems accountable and prosecute individuals for criminal offences proven against them. This proposal, however, encounters significant skepticism, fueling an ongoing debate over its viability and implications.

The significance of this study lies in the imperative need to investigate the rapidly evolving realm of artificial intelligence technologies and their potential to autonomously perform actions that could result in criminal behavior. This examination is crucial for identifying the parameters of criminal liability and delineating the responsibilities of owners and programmers. The study seeks to clarify the legal framework necessary to hold the correct entities accountable, thereby establishing a foundation for appropriate legal redress in instances where AI systems operate independently of human control. This inquiry is essential for shaping future regulatory policies and ensuring that the advancements in AI do not outpace the legal structures that are meant to govern them.

This paper aims to navigate this burgeoning conundrum by dividing the discussion into two main sections:

- Section I: Determinants and Foundations of Criminal Accountability in Artificial Intelligence, focusing on the philosophical, legal, and practical aspects that define the responsibilities and liabilities associated with AI.
- Section II: Accountable Parties and Sanctions in AI Crimes, which examines the roles and responsibilities of various stakeholders, including manufacturers, proprietors, AI entities themselves, and third parties, alongside the legal sanctions applicable within the current and proposed legal frameworks.

The objectives of this research are to:

- Analyze the legal implications and challenges posed by AI's autonomy in decision-making.
- Explore the adequacy of current legal frameworks to handle crimes involving AI.
- Propose recommendations for legal reforms to accommodate the unique challenges posed by AI technologies in criminal liability.

1. Section I: Elements and Foundations of Criminal Liability in Artificial Intelligence

Artificial Intelligence (AI) has evolved from a speculative dream to a palpable reality, marked by its applications that emulate or even surpass human intellect. The hallmark of AI systems, distinguishing them from conventional software, lies in their profound capacity for autonomous learning, experience acquisition, and decision-making devoid of direct human supervision. Additionally, these systems exhibit advanced inferential, causal, and environmental adaptability skills. Such capabilities have precipitated a myriad of complexities surrounding criminal accountability within the AI sphere.

This section discusses the determinants and foundational principles of criminal liability in AI, focusing on the unique challenges presented by AI entities. It examines how current legal frameworks address or fail to accommodate these challenges, and explores philosophical and legal perspectives on accountability, particularly how these perspectives have evolved and how they apply to AI.

1.1.Elements of Criminal Liability in AI

The pervasive integration and application of AI technologies across various sectors have surfaced significant challenges, especially concerning criminal accountability for actions conducted by AI systems and the adequacy of extant legal frameworks to accommodate the distinctive features

of such technologies. Advanced AI technologies have engendered entities with substantial autonomous capabilities, extending to the development of self-generative expertise that empowers them to make decisions independently. Consequently, there is a plausible risk that these entities might evade human oversight and engage in criminal activities autonomously, devoid of explicit programming directives. This scenario mandates an in-depth analysis of the principles governing criminal liability for offences perpetrated by AI entities that possess decision-making autonomy.

Accountability, at its core, is predicated on philosophical considerations extensively deliberated upon by criminal law scholars for over two centuries, yet without reaching a definitive consensus[6]. The debate persists, highlighting the absence of a universally accepted definition. Notwithstanding its critical importance, legal statutes have largely overlooked a precise articulation of its parameters, as evidenced in jurisdictions such as France, Egypt, and the Emirates. Legal texts often address only aspects related to exemptions from accountability, with explicit conditions for accountability scarcely addressed. The judiciary has endeavored to clarify its scope and underpinnings without formally defining it, leaving jurisprudence to fill this gap. Within this discourse, criminal accountability is conceptualized as an obligation incumbent upon an individual for bearing the legal ramifications of a crime, encompassing the duty to endure the consequences of one's criminal actions and subject oneself to the stipulated legal sanctions.

The foregoing definitions collectively underscore a fundamental consensus: liability is distinct from the constitutive elements of a crime. It arises solely upon the presence of all crime components, serving as a consequence of their aggregate presence. Thus, committing a crime is a prerequisite for incurring liability, which entails bearing the ensuing outcomes. In essence, without a crime, the notion of criminal liability is moot. Furthermore, these definitions concur that 'liability' is synonymous with 'accountability,' which involves scrutinizing the perpetrator's conduct and translating this scrutiny into a tangible societal response through punishment.

The concept of criminal liability has evolved significantly over time, following an extensive developmental trajectory. Humanity has invested considerable effort in establishing its foundational principles and achieving a fair conceptualization. Traditionally, criminal liability was confined to natural persons possessing legal capacity. Subsequently, the evolution of societal and legal frameworks introduced the concept of legal persons' criminal liability. This development aimed at addressing the risks posed by their potentially unlawful activities, incorporating such crimes within the ambit of criminal law to mitigate their impact[7].

The majority scholarly perspective posits that artificial intelligence (AI) entities, given their advanced development and autonomous decision-making capabilities, could engage in the material elements of numerous crimes and thus represent a criminal threat akin to natural or juridical persons. Despite the advancements of these entities, they have yet to attain full autonomy. Consequently, crimes resulting from their actions remain within the liability scope of associated parties, precluding the assignment of criminal liability to the entities themselves.

In anticipation of a future where scientific advancements confer full autonomy on AI entities, the proposition of attributing liability for crimes resulting from their autonomous actions emerges as feasible. This liability, however, would be circumscribed, selective, and exceptional from the rule of thumb. It is contingent upon the AI entities' ability for artificial cognition and independent volition, entirely severed from human oversight. Absent these capabilities, the premise of criminal liability collapses. This refined approach to liability harmonizes with the objectives of criminal law to modulate behavior and attenuates harm to victims in cases where traditional methods of assigning liability fall short. It is imperative to underscore that this conditional recognition of AI entities' criminal liability does not relieve their developers, developers, proprietors, or operators of legal obligations, which remain enforceable under established legal doctrines.

1.2.Foundations of Criminal Liability in Artificial Intelligence

The conceptualization of legal standards for the criminal liability of artificial intelligence (AI) hinges on the strict observance of the principle of legality, which mandates that liabilities be explicitly stipulated within criminal statutes. Hence, the ongoing analysis of these prerequisites

serves as both a theoretical projection and a nuanced anticipation of the evolution of criminal law, predicated on the assumption that AI may attain legal personhood and fulfill the necessary criteria for criminal liability. This inquiry is markedly constrained by the current absence of statutory provisions that accommodate the concept of criminal accountability for AI.

1.2.1. Actus Reus (Physical Element) of AI's Criminal Liability

The ascription of criminal liability for offences facilitated by AI technologies necessitates the recognition of such acts as legally significant occurrences with inherent technical dimensions. Such incidents must be recognized by law, which dictates that AI bears the sanctions imposed by criminal statutes for breaches of its provisions. In essence, accountability involves the assumption of consequences for unlawful technical activities, necessitating a clear and precise demarcation within the ambit of criminal statutes. This includes the responsibility for the outcomes of criminal activities and, upon conviction, adherence to the penalty stipulated[8].

The foundational principles of criminal law dictate that liability hinges upon critical physical element (actus reus). This material facet constitutes one of the two essential pillars that underlie the crime and its subsequent liability. The absence of this component voids the liability and negates the crime's existence. Technical illicit conduct forms the essence of the material element, covering all offenses, whether intentional or unintentional, completed or attempted, and mandated as punishable by criminal jurisprudence.

The material aspect of any criminal occurrence is its tangible manifestation, as specified by criminal legislation. It is essential for every offense to have a material nucleus that reflects the malevolent intent of the actor. In the absence of a material element, there is no societal disruption, and no rights are infringed. Furthermore, basing criminal liability on tangible evidence facilitates its proof, as physical facts are more easily verified than intangible mental states. This approach also protects individuals from potential arbitrariness and unfounded legal proceedings.

A fundamental principle in criminal law is the legislature's inability to exert control over an individual's unlawful thoughts or criminal intentions. These remain beyond the scope of penalization even when there is a definitive intention to act, as they are internal psychological states. Criminalization begins only when these latent thoughts manifest in physical actions or outward expressions. The law intervenes and imposes penalties if these actions align with criminal statutes. This approach is based on the rationale that such actions either directly harm or pose a substantial risk to a public interest that merits legal protection.[9]

1.2.2. Mens Rea (Mental Element) of AI's Criminal Liability

When considering the criminal liability of artificial intelligence (AI), it is crucial that the illicit behavior facilitated by the technology stems from a purposeful intent that is legally recognizable. This necessitates a psychological connection between the actor and the tangible elements of the crime, meeting the ethical threshold for accountability. Jurisprudentially, liability is predicated on culpability, encapsulating the principle that a crime lacks legitimacy without a moral component. Therefore, it is deduced that the scope of liability attributable to AI entities, within current legal frameworks, is limited primarily to acts of negligence rather than intentional misconduct. Crimes involving mens rea require attribution to an agent capable of forming intent—specifically, a human actor. In the absence of explicit legal provisions for criminalizing and penalizing AI-driven actions, liability defaults to the manufacturer, owner, or operator based on their connection to the criminal act executed by the AI.

2. Evaluating the Foundations of Criminal Liability in AI

The advanced programming of some AI-powered devices grants them capabilities that raise significant ethical and practical concerns, particularly the ability for autonomous experiential learning and independent decision-making in varied contexts, akin to human cognition. This

technological leap has spurred governments worldwide to commit to sustained investment in research. Partnerships between the public sector and private industry in developing robotics, software, and various computer technologies are increasingly prevalent.

The goal of these initiatives is to engineer systems that replicate human cognitive functions, such as understanding spoken language and visual cues, acquiring and refining knowledge, and making autonomous decisions. A critical challenge in developing these expert systems lies in creating appropriate knowledge representations across various fields to enable seamless access and retrieval of information stored in models designed for automated processing and presentation. [10].

These technological advancements have led to the emergence of new types of crimes facilitated by AI. The complex programming of certain AI systems has endowed them with dangerous capabilities, such as generating self-derived expertise and making autonomous decisions in scenarios that resemble human reasoning. A considerable portion of AI and legal research is now focused on developing robots capable of constructing legal arguments and using these to predict outcomes of legal disputes, integrating AI functions with judicial processes.

The discussion surrounding the criminal liability of artificial intelligence (AI) necessitates a comprehensive analysis of the existing framework for it, which must adapt to technological progress while engaging with AI technologies in a constructive manner. Legal systems are tasked with articulating their positions with both clarity and precision, maintaining the time-honored principles and legislative consistency that have characterized criminal law for generations.

This mandate implies that the structure of criminal accountability for AI ought to be founded on the core concepts of criminal law, incorporating these essential principles as it addresses the unique challenges posed by AI. From an individual accountability perspective, this requires meticulously identifying the direct responsible entities through this technology and delineating the secondary legal statuses for each contributing and indirectly involved party in the illicit technical incident. Furthermore, it entails the essential legal characterization of these technological entities and their incorporation into the categories of legal personhood recognized by criminal jurisprudence. On the substantive aspect, the establishment of such accountability and its theoretical underpinning demands a serious commitment to the principles of criminal liability and its doctrines, regarding whether the accountability is personal or for another's actions, whether it is temporal or continuous, and whether it pertains to complete incidents or to those whose criminal impact is absent due to factors beyond the technical intent of the offender. In essence, it must be articulated that the criminal liability of artificial intelligence constitutes no more than a jurisprudential preemption or legislative anticipation, which cannot be definitively and clearly ratified unless it conforms to the established elements within the extant criminal legislation that prohibits the analogy and broad interpretation of the current statutes.

3. Section II: Accountable Parties and Sanctions in AI Crimes

Criminal accountability mandates that individuals bear the consequences of their unlawful conduct by adhering to the sanctions outlined in penal statutes. In this framework, legal accountability denotes the capacity of a responsible person to withstand the punitive outcomes stemming from their actions. The intricacies of criminal liability in relation to offenses involving artificial intelligence (AI) are underscored by the engagement of four key stakeholders: the Developers of AI technology, the proprietors, the AI entities themselves, and third parties.

This section will delve into the roles of various stakeholders in AI development and use, assessing their potential criminal liabilities. It also explores the possible sanctions that could be imposed on these parties, emphasizing the need for a coherent legal approach that considers the capabilities and actions of AI entities.

3.1.Parties Responsible for Criminal Accountability in AI Crimes

The rapid development and deployment of artificial intelligence (AI) systems have introduced complex challenges in the domain of criminal liability. As AI systems gain autonomy and sophistication, determining accountability for crimes involving these technologies becomes increasingly intricate. This section delves into the multifaceted aspects of criminal liability in AI-related offenses, examining the potential responsibility of various parties involved, including manufacturers, proprietors, the AI entities themselves, and third-party interlopers. Through a nuanced analysis, it seeks to elucidate the conditions under which each party may be held accountable, thereby contributing to the ongoing discourse on legal frameworks and ethical considerations in the age of artificial intelligence.

3.1.1. The Manufacturer's Criminal Liability

The question of criminal liability for AI developers becomes particularly salient when the AI entity engages in behavior deemed criminal by legal standards. Developers often mitigate their liability through clauses in end-user agreements, which, once agreed upon by the owner, ostensibly shift full criminal responsibility for any crimes committed through the use of the AI to the owner, thereby exonerating the manufacturer from direct legal consequences of the AI's actions.

Nevertheless, criminal acts may also stem from programming errors made by the AI developers, resulting in malfunctions that lead to criminal activity. The primary objective of product development, namely profit maximization, can sometimes overshadow the importance of ensuring product safety and integrity, potentially leading to adverse outcomes. It falls upon legislative authorities to establish stringent standards for these technologies and to enhance the legal repercussions for violations, thereby safeguarding against the negative impacts of compromised technological integrity.

3.1.1.1.Criminal Liability of the AI Proprietor

Proprietors or users of artificial intelligence (AI) technology are confronted with the potential for its misapplication, which may result in criminal offenses. This premise encompasses several scenarios:[11]

- Liability Arising Exclusively from Proprietor/User Conduct: Where the conduct of the proprietor or user is the direct catalyst for a criminal act, they bear the entirety of criminal liability. An illustrative example is the scenario where a proprietor or user disables the autonomous functionalities of a self-driving vehicle, opting instead for navigation based on AI voice commands, thereby assuming complete operational control. Neglecting AI-generated alerts to prevent an impending accident unequivocally transfers criminal liability to them.
- b. Liability Stemming from Collaborative Actions with Other Entities: When a criminal act is the product of the proprietor's actions in concert with another entity (including the manufacturer, the AI itself, or an thirdparty), liability is apportioned among all contributors. A case in point is the alteration of a vehicle's settings for autonomous operation with expert assistance for unlawful objectives, broadening liability to encompass both the vehicle and its manufacturer, thus establishing shared criminal liability.

3.1.1.2.AI's Autonomous Criminal Liability

The attempt to impose criminal liability on artificial intelligence entities necessitates a preliminary assessment of their capacity for criminal responsibility, analogous to that ascribed to human beings. Criminal capacity, a cornerstone of penal accountability, hinges on an individual's ability to comprehend the nature of their actions and to evaluate their potential consequences. This capacity serves as the criterion for attributability, asserting that one is only criminally liable if deemed capable of accountability, a condition predicated on two critical attributes: discernment and volitional autonomy.

The Algerian Penal Code articulates this framework succinctly. Article 48 states[12], "No penalty shall be imposed on those compelled to commit a crime by an irresistible force," and Article 47 similarly exempts those "who were insane at the time of committing the crime." These provisions underscore the principle that the absence of free will, whether due to mental incapacity, duress, or immaturity, negates criminal liability. The Algerian legislator, in line with broader Arab legal practices, does not explicitly define criminal accountability but rather lists conditions precluding its applicability. This legislative approach delegates the detailed exploration of criminal capacity to jurisprudential analysis, focusing statutory language on the alleviation of criminal liability for those lacking either cognitive awareness or volitional control, such as minors incapable of discernment, the mentally incapacitated, and individuals under coercion.

Thus, under the current legal frameworks, it is untenable, at least for now, to extend the attributes of knowledge and intent—fundamental to criminal accountability—to AI entities. Criminal law, traditionally and practically, is structured around human agency; therefore, imposing criminal sanctions on AI entities under existing statutes is not feasible. The most pragmatic legal recourse currently available would involve judicial directives to confiscate the AI systems involved, effectively neutralizing the threat posed by such autonomous entities without attributing personal criminal liability.

The hypothesis that artificial intelligence (AI) could independently engage in criminal behavior, without the influence of programming anomalies and through its self-developing capabilities and sovereign decision-making, is currently theoretical. However, this prospect demands advance contemplation and the formulation of preemptive solutions. Anticipated scenarios include[13]:

- Conspiratorial Acts Involving AI: When another party collaborates with AI to commit a criminal act, they are considered co-conspirators. Although contemporary legal frameworks allocate full criminal liability to the human collaborator, future legal recognition of AI's culpability may result in an apportioned allocation of responsibility. An illustration of this is the disabling of a manufacturer’s restrictions on AI, conferring the system complete autonomy and eliminating barriers to criminal behavior. This is analogous to smartphone users who root their devices, thereby permitting applications to assume control over the phone, which could culminate in its operational compromise.
- Unilaterally Perpetrated AI Crimes: In speculative future contexts where AI autonomously perpetrates a crime, absent errors in manufacturer programming or external tampering, and employing its advanced cognitive functions for self-directed decision-making, the AI entity itself should, theoretically, assume sole criminal liability.

3.1.1.3.Criminal Liability of Third Parties

In situations where an third interloper illicitly penetrates an AI system through cyber intrusion or other unauthorized avenues, commandeering said system for illicit ends, two primary speculative scenarios unfold[14]:

- Should the external interloper exploit a deficiency within the AI system, a deficiency resultant from negligence by either the system's proprietor or its manufacturer, liability for the ensuing criminal actions is bifurcated between the interloper and the negligent entity. An exemplar scenario would be the AI system's proprietor inadvertently providing access credentials to the interloper, thus enabling unauthorised dominion and subsequent unlawful acts by said interloper. Herein, both the external interloper and the entity culpable for the oversight are jointly liable for the exploitation of the system's susceptibility.
- Alternatively, if the external interloper leverages a gap absent any contributory negligence on the part of the proprietor or manufacturer, the sole criminal liability resides with the external interloper. An illustrative case might involve the interloper's unauthorised breach of a cloud-based depository or command-and-control infrastructure integral to the AI system, thereafter

executing commands that induce the AI to perform acts deemed illegal based on discriminatory parameters such as ethnicity or attire.

4. Sanctioning Mechanisms for AI Entities

The doctrine of legality forms the bedrock of criminal jurisprudence, asserting that conduct cannot be adjudicated as criminal, nor can penalties be levied, without the existence of a statutory framework expressly criminalizing such behavior.

4.1.Sanctions for AI Technology Developers:

The genesis of AI technology squarely resides within the domain of its developers, who are vested with the primary duty of its design, programming, and ongoing supervision. It is incumbent upon these developers to incorporate stringent preventive measures against unauthorized use or malfunction. Accordingly, penalties imposed on developers must be proportionate to the degree of negligence evidenced by the absence of effective safeguarding mechanisms.[15] The range of punitive measures extends from monetary fines to terms of imprisonment, tailored to reflect the severity of the oversight and the resultant harm facilitated by the misuse of the AI system[16].

4.2.Sanctions for AI Technology Proprietors:

Offenses committed via AI technologies due to the proprietors' active involvement or failure to exercise due diligence necessitate the assignment of liability. The imposition of sanctions on the proprietors is justified, as their conduct materially contributed to the unlawful outcome, thereby establishing a direct correlation between their actions and the ensuing consequences. The adjudication of penalties is contingent upon the determination of whether the actions were intentional or negligent, with the scale of sanctions adjusted to match the established level of culpability.

4.3.Sanctions for AI Entities

Artificial Intelligence (AI) entities, renowned for their autonomous learning capabilities, employ advanced algorithms that enable autonomous decision-making, devoid of human intervention. Through iterative interactions, these entities develop comprehensive and nuanced data repositories, enhancing their capacity for appropriate situational responses. This technological evolution posits the potential for AI entities to independently engage in criminal conduct, absent any direct command from their proprietors or developers. Given the foundational legal principle that criminal liability is intrinsically personal, attributing culpability to individuals for actions not personally executed contravenes established jurisprudence, thus introducing a novel legal dilemma: the application of sanctions directly to AI entities.

The development of sanctions specifically tailored to AI entities, including the determination of the punitive measures' nature and magnitude, necessitates prompt legislative intervention. The exigency for such legislative action is amplified by the extensive incorporation of AI across various societal domains and the explicit endorsement of such technologies by political leadership. This critical juncture provides a unique opportunity to innovate legislations and penal codes, potentially devising new punitive measures or adjusting existing frameworks to adequately address the legal intricacies presented by AI technology.

Conclusion:

In conclusion, a refined analysis of the legal implications of AI-wrought actions requires a framework that either integrates these actions into established categories of tortious causation or identifies a legally accountable entity for these damages. The extant paradigm of criminal liability, conceived for addressing misconduct by corporeal actors, is ill-equipped for the incorporeal characteristics of AI. Efforts to tether AI to a tangible framework of accountability, through identification of the physical vessel of the intelligent system, encounter complexities surrounding custodianship, thus obfuscating the application of principles of objective liability.

To date, AI entities have not achieved a level of autonomy fully divorced from human intervention; as such, infractions associated with AI are inextricably linked to the human actors involved. The attribution of criminal liability to AI entities in their own right remains a complex endeavor. Moreover, the imposition of sanctions on human individuals associated with AI functionalities does not violate the provisions of extant criminal and related legislations, as such sanctions target human agents rather than the AI constructs.

Consequently, there is an urgent necessity to articulate with precision the dynamics of AI-engendered offenses, addressing both their criminalization and penalization, whilst recognizing the contours of responsibility and legal personhood for AI entities. This highlights the imperative for legislative ingenuity in establishing and attributing legal responsibility within the context of AI, navigating the nuanced interplay between technological innovation and legal accountability.

Based on the findings of this research, several conclusions can be drawn:

1. The extensive and rapid development of artificial intelligence (AI) entities, along with significant advancements that may lead to their full autonomy in the future, poses a substantial and imminent threat to human safety and security.
2. Accountability is the cornerstone of any effective legal system. Laws and regulations are fundamentally ineffective if they do not include specific and clear mechanisms for investigating, prosecuting, and penalizing wrongdoers.
3. Criminal liability is based on the commission of a criminal act, requiring both actus reus (the physical element) and mens rea (the mental element). Currently, these legal concepts apply only to human beings. The notion of imposing criminal sanctions on AI entities remains legally unfeasible under existing legal frameworks.

Recommendations

Finally, the following recommendations are proposed:

- It is essential to refine the criminal legislative framework to address the deficiencies within existing statutes. This will equip the legal system to effectively manage new forms of crime associated with artificial intelligence.
- Novel methodologies for determining legal liability in the absence of specific legislative provisions must be devised. This includes the proactive assignment of liability as a prerequisite for using AI entities.
- Enhancing the capacities of criminal justice institutions to prevent crimes resulting from the actions of AI entities is crucial. This can be achieved by establishing national task forces comprising law enforcement officials, judicial representatives, AI technology developers, and service providers.
- There is a critical need for increased international cooperation to address crimes instigated by artificial intelligence. This includes developing new protocols for extraterritorial jurisdiction and bolstering collaborative efforts at both international and regional levels to effectively manage these challenges.

---

[1]Computer Terminology Dictionary, Cyprus, Linguistic Research Foundation, Best New World, 1986, p. 9. Cited in:Musab Thaer Abdul Sattar, "Negligence Accountability Related to Artificial Intelligence," Journal of Legal and Political Sciences, Faculty of Law and Political Sciences, University of Diyala, Iraq, Volume 10, Issue 2, 2021, p. 391.

[2]Mohamed Ahmed El-Madawy, "Civil Liability for Robots with Artificial Intelligence: A Comparative Study," The Legal Magazine, Cairo University, Volume 9, Issue 2, 2021, p. 292.“Les systèmes qui font preuve d'un comportment intelligent en analysant leur environnement et en prenant des mesures, avec un certain degré d'autonomie, pour atteindre des objectifs spécifique». V. Céline Castets، Comment construire une intelligence artificielle responsable et inclusive ? D, 6 février 2020, p. 225.

[3]Christian Youssef, "Civil Liability for the Act of Artificial Intelligence," Master's Thesis, Lebanon, 2019, 2020, pp. 16. Also refer to: Musab Thaer Abdul Sattar, Ibid, pp. 392, 393.

[4] Ibid. P. 8

[5]Mohamed Ahmed El-Madawy Abd Rabbo Mujahid, "Civil Liability for Robots with Artificial Intelligence: A Comparative Study," The Legal Magazine, Benha University, Volume 9, Issue 2, 2021, p. 297

[6]Maher Abdul Shawish Al-Durra: "General Provisions in the Penal Code," Dar Al-Hikma for Printing and Publishing, Mosul, 1999, p. 202

[7]Jamal Ibrahim Al-Haidari, "Provisions of Criminal Liability," Zain Legal Publications, Beirut, 2010, p. 5

[8]Mamdouh Al-Bahr: "Crimes Against Property in the Penal Code," First Edition, Amman, 2009, p. 15.

[9]Dhari Khalil Mahmoud: "A Concise Explanation of the Penal Code," Dar Al-Qadisiyah for Printing and Publishing, Baghdad, 2005, p. 66

[10]Hameed Al-Saadi: "Explanation of the Penal Code in General Provisions: Crime, Punishment, and Criminal Liability," Dar Al-Hurriyah for Printing, Baghdad, 1994, p. 150

[11]Mohammed Erfan Al-Khatib, "Civil Liability and Artificial Intelligence: The Possibility of Accountability," an analytical study of the rules of civil liability in French civil law, KuwaitInternational Law School Journal, Issue 01, Year 08, Kuwait, March 2020, p. 2

[12] Ordinance No. 66-156 dated 18 Safar 1386 corresponding to 8 June 1966, constituting the Algerian Penal Code, as amended and supplemented, Official Journal of the Algerian Republic, No. 49, 1966.

[13] Ibid. P. 134.

[14]Mammar bin Tariya, Kada Shahida, "Damages from Robots and Artificial Intelligence Technologies: A New Challenge for Law," an article published in the Annals of Algeria 1, Special Issue 2018, p. 124

[15]Abdul Wahab Mariam, "Criminal Liability for Artificial Intelligence Crimes," ibid, p. 687

[16]Mohammed Erfan Al-Khatib, ibid, p. 135.

Bibliography:

Abdul Shawish Al-Darra, Maher. General Provisions in Criminal Law. Dar Al-Hikma for Printing and Publishing, Mosul, 1999.

Abdul Sattar, Musab Thaer. "Negligence Accountability Related to Artificial Intelligence." Journal of Legal and Political Sciences, Faculty of Law and Political Sciences, University of Diyala, Iraq, Volume 10, Issue 2, 2021.

Al-Bahr, Mamdouh. "Crimes Against Property in the Penal Code." First Edition, Amman, 2009.

Al-Haidari, Jamal Ibrahim. Criminal Liability Provisions. Zein Human Rights Publications, Beirut, 2010.

Al-Khatib, Mohammed Erfan. "Civil Liability and Artificial Intelligence: The Possibility of Accountability." An analytical study of the rules of civil liability in French civil law, Kuwait International Law School Journal, Issue 01, Year 08, Kuwait, March 2020.

bin Tariya, Mammar, and Kada Shahida. "Damages from Robots and Artificial Intelligence Technologies: A New Challenge for Law." An article published in the Annals of Algeria 1, Special Issue 2018.

El-Madawy, Mohamed Ahmed. "Civil Liability for Robots with Artificial Intelligence: A Comparative Study." The Legal Magazine, Cairo University, Volume 9, Issue 2, 2021.

Mariam, Abdul Wahhab. "Criminal Liability for Artificial Intelligence Crimes." Journal of Law and Interdisciplinary Sciences, Issue 02, 2023, p. 687.

Mohamed, Abdel-Razzaq Wahba Sayed Ahmed. "Civil Liability for Damages of Artificial Intelligence: An Analytical Study." Journal of Deep Legal Research, Issue 43, October 2020.

Mohamed, Awad. "Crimes Against Persons and Property: University Publications House." Alexandria, 1995.

Ordinance No. 66-156 dated 18 Safar 1386 corresponding to 8 June 1966, constituting the Algerian Penal Code, as amended and supplemented, Official Journal of the Algerian Republic, No. 49, 1966.

Youssef, Christian. Civil Liability for Artificial Intelligence Acts. Master's Thesis, Lebanon, 2019, 2020.