



ISSN: 2583-7753

LAWFOYER INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF DOCTRINAL LEGAL RESEARCH

[ISSN: 2583-7753]



Volume IV | Special Issue I

2026

Special Issue on the International E-Conference on

“Law in the Age of Artificial Intelligence: A Fundamental Perspective”

Organised by KES’ Shri J. H. Patel College of Law, Mumbai, on 24 January 2026

Official Publication Partner: LawFoyer International Journal of Doctrinal Legal Research

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.70183/lijdlr.2026.v4si1.40>

© 2026 LawFoyer International Journal of Doctrinal Legal Research

Follow this and additional research works at: www.lijdlr.com

Under the Platform of LawFoyer – www.lawfoyer.in

After careful consideration, the editorial board of LawFoyer International Journal of Doctrinal Legal Research has decided to publish this submission as part of the publication.

In case of any suggestions or complaints, kindly contact (info.lijdlr@gmail.com)

To submit your Manuscript for Publication in the LawFoyer International Journal of Doctrinal Legal Research, To submit your Manuscript [Click here](#)

KES' SHRI. JAYANTILAL H. PATEL LAW COLLEGE

About the College



KES' Shri. Jayantilal H. Patel Law College is committed to nurturing and empowering students through quality legal education. The college provides an inclusive and academically enriching environment that encourages students to excel in their studies, participate in co-curricular activities, engage in research, and develop a strong sense of civic responsibility.

The college is affiliated to the University of Mumbai, approved by the Bar Council of India, NAAC accredited with 'B++' grade, and ISO 9001:2015 certified. It offers programmes including B.A. LL.B., LL.B., LL.M., and specialised diploma courses.

With qualified and experienced faculty, a strong academic environment, moot court training, research activities and modern infrastructure, the institution seeks to prepare responsible, skilled and socially conscious legal professionals equipped to meet the challenges of a rapidly changing world.

The college functions under the aegis of Kandivli Education Society (KES), an institution established in 1936 with a long-standing commitment to quality, inclusivity and value-based education.

Affiliation	University of Mumbai
Recognition	Approved by the Bar Council of India
Accreditation	NAAC accredited 'B++'
Certification	ISO 9001:2015 certified

KANDIVLI EDUCATION SOCIETY

Established 1936



Kandivli Education Society (KES), established in 1936, has grown from a small educational initiative into a dynamic educational institution serving thousands of students.

With a legacy of quality, inclusivity and value-based learning, KES has expanded its academic presence across various disciplines. Its educational institutions are committed to providing meaningful learning opportunities and fostering academic, professional and personal development among students.

KES' Shri. Jayantilal H. Patel Law College is one of its prominent institutions dedicated to legal education. Through academic excellence, research, practical learning and co-curricular engagement, the college seeks to empower students with the knowledge, skills and values necessary to contribute meaningfully to society.

EDUCATIONAL COMMITMENT

- Quality and inclusive education
- Value-based learning
- Academic and professional development
- Research and practical learning
- Holistic and future-ready education

LAW IN THE AGE OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE

A Fundamental Perspective



ABOUT THE INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE

The International Conference on “Law in the Age of Artificial Intelligence: A Fundamental Perspective” provided an academic platform to examine the transformative impact of Artificial Intelligence on law, legal systems, governance and society.

The conference explored emerging legal and ethical questions relating to Artificial Intelligence, including intellectual property, authorship and ownership, liability, data privacy, cybersecurity, criminal justice, evidence law, human rights, ethics and accountability. It addressed the implications of Artificial Intelligence for legal education, commercial law, regulatory frameworks, policy development, research and scholarly communication.

The conference brought together academicians, research scholars, legal professionals and students to present research, exchange ideas and engage in interdisciplinary discussions. It encouraged meaningful academic dialogue and contributed towards the development of effective, ethical and inclusive legal responses to the rapidly evolving Artificial Intelligence landscape.

Conference	International Conference
Theme	Law in the Age of Artificial Intelligence: A Fundamental Perspective
Date	24 January 2026
Time	10:00 AM onwards
Mode	Online
Organised by	IQAC, Student Research Society and Library Committee
Publication Partner	LawFoyer International Journal of Doctrinal Legal Research [ISSN: 2583-7753]

PRINCIPAL'S MESSAGE

KES' Shri. Jayantilal H. Patel Law College



It gives me immense pleasure to welcome all academicians, research scholars, legal professionals and students to the International Conference on “Law in the Age of Artificial Intelligence: A Fundamental Perspective.”

Artificial Intelligence is transforming the way societies function and is increasingly influencing legal systems, governance, professional practices and education. These developments bring significant opportunities as well as complex legal, ethical and social challenges.

This conference provided a valuable platform for intellectual exchange and interdisciplinary dialogue on emerging issues such as data privacy, intellectual property, liability, criminal justice, human rights, ethics and the governance of Artificial Intelligence. The scholarly contributions and discussions during the conference encouraged deeper understanding and promoted responsible approaches to the use of Artificial Intelligence.

I extend my best wishes to all the speakers, researchers, presenters, participants and members of the organising team for a meaningful and intellectually enriching conference.

DR. VIRAL DAVE

I/c. Principal

KES' Shri. Jayantilal H. Patel Law College

ORGANISING COMMITTEE

International Conference on Law in the Age of Artificial Intelligence



I/c. Principal

Dr. Viral Dave

Convenor

Mr. Mahavir Mandot

Co-Convenors

Dr. Shweta Vijendra Pathak

Ms. Priyanka Khakhadia

Ms. Deepanshi Chandarana

Organised by IQAC, Student Research Society and Library Committee

KES' Shri. Jayantilal H. Patel Law College, Mumbai

*Papers presented at the conference are published in the Special Issue of the LawFoyer International Journal of
Doctrinal Legal Research [Volume IV, Special Issue I, 2026]*

AI IN LIBRARY AUTOMATION & MANAGEMENT

Kanak Godbole¹

I. ABSTRACT

Artificial Intelligence (AI) is reshaping contemporary library automation and management by transforming how libraries organise resources, retrieve information, support users, and manage institutional collections. This paper examines the integration of AI technologies, including machine learning, natural language processing, automation, predictive analytics, and AI-enabled user support systems, within modern library management systems. It adopts a doctrinal and analytical legal approach to assess the operational benefits and regulatory risks of AI-driven library services, particularly in relation to data protection, copyright compliance, algorithmic accountability, and user privacy. The paper finds that AI can substantially improve cataloguing, semantic search, multilingual access, digital archiving, recommendation services, and resource allocation, thereby reduce manual workload and enhance accessibility for diverse users. However, these advantages are accompanied by significant legal and ethical concerns, especially where libraries process user search histories, borrowing patterns, reading preferences, and behavioural data through automated or predictive systems. The study argues that such practices must be evaluated under the Digital Personal Data Protection Act, 2023, read with the Digital Personal Data Protection Rules, 2025, and within the broader policy framework of responsible AI governance emerging in India. The paper recommends that libraries adopt privacy-by-design systems, transparent consent mechanisms, human oversight, copyright-compliant digitisation practices, and safeguards against algorithmic bias. It concludes that AI should not be treated merely as a tool for automation, but as a regulated institutional technology capable of strengthening libraries as intelligent, inclusive, and legally accountable knowledge infrastructures

II. KEYWORDS

Artificial Intelligence, Library Automation, Data Privacy Law, Algorithmic Accountability, Copyright Law.

¹ 3rd Semester LLM Student at KES' Shri Jayantilal H. Patel Law, Mumbai (India). Email: kanakgodbole24@gmail.com

III.INTRODUCTION

For much of the twentieth century, libraries were conceptualized as physical repositories of knowledge, organized through standardized cataloguing systems and classification frameworks. This traditional understanding is now undergoing a significant transformation. Contemporary developments demonstrate a structural shift in which technological systems, particularly those driven by Artificial Intelligence (AI). Which are no longer peripheral but integral to core library functions. In an era characterized by the exponential proliferation of digital information, libraries increasingly deploy AI to preserve institutional relevance and operational efficiency. Consequently, the modern library is evolving from a passive site of information storage into an adaptive, technologically mediated system capable of anticipating and responding to user needs.

Central to this transformation are Machine Learning and Natural Language Processing (NLP), which have substantially enhanced information retrieval processes. Traditional database systems, often constrained by rigid keyword dependencies, are being replaced by systems capable of interpreting the reasoning behind a query and generating contextually relevant results. This transition reflects a broader movement from syntactic to semantic search mechanisms, thereby improving both accessibility and research efficiency. In addition, AI-driven technologies increasingly perform administrative and organizational functions, including automated classification of digital resources, real-time inventory management, and predictive analytics concerning user demand. Within the Indian legal framework, such concerns must be examined in light of the Digital Personal Data Protection Act, 2023, read with the Digital Personal Data Protection Rules, 2025, which together constitute the operative framework for lawful personal data processing.

The Rules operationalise the Act by prescribing practical compliance requirements relating to notice, consent architecture, breach reporting, grievance redressal, retention practices, and obligations of certain classes of data fiduciaries. These requirements are directly engaged when AI-enabled library systems process user behaviour, reading histories, search patterns, borrowing records, recommendation

data, or authentication credentials. Consequently, libraries using AI tools cannot treat data protection as a merely abstract statutory obligation; they must incorporate compliance measures into the design and administration of digital catalogues, recommender systems, automated helpdesks, and predictive analytics platforms

Further, the constitutional foundation of privacy in India, as articulated in Justice K.S. Puttaswamy (Retd.) v. Union of India, underscores the status of privacy as a fundamental right under Article 21 of the Constitution. The deployment of AI in libraries, particularly in tracking user preferences and interactions, must therefore conform to standards of legality, necessity, and proportionality established in this landmark judgment.

Additionally, concerns relating to data security and unauthorized access may be examined considering K.S. Puttaswamy v. Union of India (Aadhaar Case), which further elaborates safeguards required in large-scale data processing systems. Issues of intermediary liability and data handling practices may also draw relevance from Shreya Singhal v. Union of India, particularly in relation to the governance of digital platforms and content regulation. It identifies a critical gap in existing legal structure and the regulation of AI-driven information infrastructures within public and academic libraries.

While technological advancements in this domain have been widely documented, there remains a paucity of doctrinal analysis addressing their implications for privacy law, data protection compliance, and institutional accountability under emerging regulatory frameworks such as the DPDP Act.

Accordingly, this study adopts a doctrinal and analytical approach to examine both the technological transformation of libraries and the legal challenges arising therefrom. It evaluates the implications of AI-driven automation and predictive analytics while addressing concerns related to user privacy, algorithmic bias, transparency, and regulatory compliance. By situating these developments within the broader constitutional and statutory framework governing data protection in India, the paper argues that the responsible and legally compliant deployment of AI technologies can enhance the accessibility, efficiency, and institutional value of libraries. Ultimately, it contends that AI does not supplant the foundational role of

libraries but rather reconstitutes it within a technologically advanced and legally regulated paradigm.

A. Research Objectives

The present study seeks to achieve the following legal and socio-legal objectives:

1. To examine the extent to which Artificial Intelligence (AI) technologies are being integrated into contemporary library management systems and their implications for data governance.
2. To analyse the applicability and adequacy of the Digital Personal Data Protection Act, 2023 in regulating AI-driven data collection, processing, and profiling within libraries.
3. To identify potential risks relating to algorithmic bias, lack of transparency, and data security in AI-based library systems.

B. Research Questions

This paper is guided by the following central research questions:

1. Does the existing Indian legal framework adequately regulate AI-driven data collection and processing practices in library management systems?
2. To what extent does the Digital Personal Data Protection Act, 2023 address concerns arising from automated profiling and predictive analytics in libraries?
3. What legal challenges arise in ensuring transparency and accountability in algorithmic decision-making within library infrastructures?

C. Research Methodology

This study adopts a doctrinal and analytical legal methodology, supplemented by a limited socio-legal perspective. The research primarily relies on the systematic analysis of statutory provisions, judicial precedents, and scholarly literature.

1. Primary Sources

The present study relies upon authoritative legal sources within the Indian framework, including the Digital Personal Data Protection Act, 2023 and the Digital Personal Data Protection Rules, 2025, read in conjunction with the Information

Technology Act, 2000 and allied rules governing data governance, intermediary liability, and digital institutional accountability. Particular emphasis is placed on the DPDP Rules, 2025 because they give operational content to the Act by setting out compliance expectations concerning user notices, consent mechanisms, breach-related communication, grievance processes, and obligations applicable to significant or higher-risk data fiduciaries. Constitutional provisions, particularly Article 21 of the Constitution of India, form a foundational basis for the analysis, as expansively interpreted by the Supreme Court in *Justice K.S. Puttaswamy (Retd.) v. Union of India*, wherein the right to privacy was recognized as a fundamental right.

The study further draws upon judicial pronouncements that have shaped Indian data protection, digital governance, informational privacy, and electronic evidence jurisprudence, including *Shreya Singhal v. Union of India* on digital expression and intermediary regulation. With respect to electronic evidence, the study relies on Section 63 of the Bharatiya Sakshya Adhiniyam, 2023 as the current governing provision on admissibility of electronic records. The decision in *Anvar P.V. v. P.K. Basheer* is therefore cited only as an important interpretive authority on the certificate requirement for electronic evidence, whose reasoning remains relevant under the successor statutory framework, rather than as authority under the now-repealed Indian Evidence Act, 1872.

Since the Bharatiya Sakshya Adhiniyam, 2023 came into force on 1 July 2024 and Section 170 repeals the Indian Evidence Act, 1872 subject to savings for pending proceedings, all references to electronic evidence in the present study are framed under the current statute, particularly Section 63.

2. Secondary Sources

The research engages extensively with academic literature, including peer-reviewed journal articles, law commission reports, policy papers, and interdisciplinary scholarship at the intersection of Artificial Intelligence, data governance, and information science. Particular emphasis is placed on Indian scholarship examining the implications of algorithmic systems within public and institutional infrastructures, including libraries, alongside comparative perspectives that inform domestic regulatory developments.

3. Analytical Approach

The study adopts a doctrinal and critical analytical methodology to examine the interface between emerging Artificial Intelligence systems and existing legal frameworks in India. It interrogates the extent to which current statutory regimes, particularly the Digital Personal Data Protection Act, 2023 read with the Digital Personal Data Protection Rules, 2025, adequately address core data protection principles such as informed consent, purpose limitation, data minimisation, retention limitation, security safeguards, and accountability.

The analysis treats libraries deploying AI-enabled recommendation systems, automated search tools, behavioural analytics, digital lending records, or user-support chatbots as potential data fiduciaries where they determine the purpose and means of processing personal data. In doing so, the study identifies normative and operational gaps in the regulation of AI-driven processes, especially in contexts involving automated decision-making, algorithmic opacity, user profiling, and long-term retention of reading or research behaviour.

IV. CONSIDERING AI AS BOON

The statutory exceptions embodied in Sections 52(1)(n) and 52(1)(o) of the Copyright Act, 1957, which were designed to facilitate limited, non-commercial uses by public libraries, acquire renewed complexity in the context of Artificial Intelligence driven systems. While these provisions permit reproduction and preservation activities undertaken in the public interest, their application to AI processes that involve large scale digitisation, text and data mining, and algorithmic training remains doctrinally indeterminate. The absence of explicit legislative guidance creates legal uncertainty as to whether such uses fall within the permissible scope of “fair dealing” or exceed the intended boundaries of library exceptions.

Judicial engagement with the balance between access and copyright protection in *Eastern Book Company v. D.B. Modak*, particularly in recognising the threshold of originality in compilations and databases, and in *Super Cassettes Industries Ltd. v. Myspace Inc.*, which addressed digital dissemination and platform liability, underscores the evolving judicial approach to technologically mediated uses of

copyrighted works. However, the specific question of AI mediated interaction with protected content within library systems remains insufficiently settled within Indian jurisprudence.

From a normative standpoint, the integration of Artificial Intelligence within library systems may also be conceptualised as a significant institutional advancement that reinforces the foundational objectives of accessibility, efficiency, and the democratisation of knowledge. AI driven information retrieval systems represent a marked departure from traditional cataloguing frameworks by enabling semantic and contextual search capabilities. Such systems facilitate a more intuitive discovery process, thereby enhancing the quality and depth of academic research while reducing informational asymmetries.

The personalisation of user experience constitutes another important dimension of AI enabled library services. By analysing user engagement patterns, research interests, and informational behaviour, AI systems can generate tailored recommendations that align with individual scholarly needs. Within the Indian legal framework, however, such data driven personalisation must operate in conformity with the Digital Personal Data Protection Act, 2023, particularly its emphasis on purpose limitation, data minimisation, and informed consent. The evolving understanding of informational privacy and data governance may be further contextualised through the Supreme Court's observations in *Central Public Information Officer, Supreme Court of India v. Subhash Chandra Agarwal*, which examined the interplay between transparency and privacy, thereby reinforcing the need to balance access to information with the protection of personal data. In this regard, libraries emerge not merely as service providers but as accountable data fiduciaries entrusted with safeguarding user autonomy and informational integrity.

Equally significant is the role of AI in automating routine and labour intensive functions within library administration, including cataloguing, metadata generation, circulation management, and archival organisation. The deployment of such systems enhances operational efficiency and permits a reorientation of professional roles, enabling librarians to engage more substantively in research facilitation, knowledge curation, and scholarly support. This transformation reflects a broader institutional

shift towards technologically augmented knowledge management rather than a displacement of human expertise.

The capacity of AI to advance inclusivity and accessibility further aligns with constitutional commitments to equality and non-discrimination. Technologies such as speech recognition, multilingual translation, and adaptive reading interfaces expand access to library resources for persons with disabilities and linguistically diverse communities. The constitutional ethos underpinning such inclusivity finds resonance in judicial reasoning such as *Vikash Kumar v. Union Public Service Commission*, wherein the Supreme Court emphasised the principle of substantive equality and the necessity of reasonable accommodation in ensuring meaningful access. AI enabled library systems can thus serve as instrumental mechanisms in operationalising these constitutional guarantees within the informational domain.

In addition, the utilisation of predictive analytics introduces a data driven approach to institutional decision making in library governance. By identifying patterns in user demand and anticipating emerging academic trends, such systems enable more efficient allocation of resources and informed acquisition strategies. This reflects a broader transition towards evidence based governance within public institutions, consistent with India's digital transformation trajectory.

From a regulatory perspective, the governance of AI systems in India continues to evolve through policy frameworks and judicial interpretation rather than a comprehensive standalone statute. The Supreme Court's observations in *Aadhaar (Justice K.S. Puttaswamy) v. Union of India*, particularly in relation to proportionality, data minimisation, and purpose limitation in digital infrastructures, provide an important constitutional lens through which AI accountability may be assessed. These principles assume particular relevance in the context of library systems, where algorithmic neutrality, transparency, and the prevention of bias are essential to maintaining institutional credibility.

Ultimately, Artificial Intelligence has the potential to reconstitute libraries as dynamic and intelligent knowledge ecosystems rather than passive repositories of information. Its transformative value lies not merely in automation, but in its capacity to enhance access, improve user engagement, and uphold the foundational ideals of equitable

knowledge dissemination. When integrated with robust legal safeguards grounded in data protection, intellectual property law, and constitutional principles, AI driven libraries can contribute meaningfully to the development of an inclusive and knowledge centric digital society.

Ultimately, Artificial Intelligence has the potential to reconstitute libraries as dynamic and intelligent knowledge ecosystems rather than passive repositories of information. Its transformative value lies not merely in automation, but in its capacity to enhance access, improve user engagement, and uphold the foundational ideals of equitable knowledge dissemination. When integrated with robust legal safeguards grounded in data protection, intellectual property law, and constitutional principles, AI driven libraries can contribute meaningfully to the development of an inclusive and knowledge centric digital society.

This positive institutional potential must now be examined in light of recent regulatory developments. The Digital Personal Data Protection Rules, 2025 operationalise the Digital Personal Data Protection Act, 2023 and therefore materially affect AI enabled library systems that collect, store, analyse, or profile user data. Libraries deploying recommendation engines, digital lending analytics, search logs, or automated helpdesks must ensure that user-facing notices, consent mechanisms, grievance redressal systems, and data security practices are not treated as peripheral administrative requirements, but as integral conditions for lawful technological innovation. The Rules strengthen the practical enforceability of the statutory framework and require libraries to treat privacy compliance as a design obligation rather than a post-deployment formality.

The MeitY India AI Governance Guidelines, 2025 further support the argument that AI can operate as a boon where its adoption is safe, inclusive, transparent, and responsible. These Guidelines, issued under the IndiaAI Mission, provide a policy framework for responsible AI adoption across sectors and are directly relevant to libraries because library systems increasingly involve automated classification, algorithmic search, multilingual access, user profiling, and predictive analytics. Although the Guidelines do not constitute a standalone AI statute, they provide an important governance vocabulary through which library institutions may develop

internal standards for explainability, risk assessment, human oversight, accessibility, and accountability.

Indian institutional practice also demonstrates that the technological foundation for AI enabled library governance is already emerging. DELNET, for instance, functions as a major resource-sharing library network connecting more than 10,000 institutions across India and abroad, and its objectives include collecting, storing, and disseminating information, facilitating inter-library loan, document delivery, technical guidance, and coordinated collection development. While DELNET's publicly available materials do not establish a specific AI deployment, they demonstrate a large-scale networked infrastructure within which AI-based discovery, automated metadata enhancement, and predictive resource sharing may be meaningfully integrated.

Similarly, INFLIBNET, established by the University Grants Commission as a national-level library and information network, has supported digital library services, institutional access systems, and technology-enabled information dissemination. Its documented activities show the continuing transition of Indian academic libraries from isolated repositories to networked digital infrastructures, thereby providing a practical context for future AI integration.

Further, emerging Indian scholarship and institutional examples show growing engagement with AI chatbots and generative AI tools in academic library environments. Recent studies on Indian higher educational institutions have examined the role of AI chatbots in improving digital library operations, while a case study of St. Xavier's University, Kolkata identifies ICT-based library facilities including an AI chatbot as part of modern academic library services. These examples strengthen the evidentiary basis of the paper by showing that AI in libraries is not merely speculative, but is increasingly entering Indian academic and institutional settings.

V. CONSIDERING AI AS BANE

A critical dimension of the present inquiry concerns the data privacy challenges arising from the deployment of AI-driven recommendation systems within library

ecosystems. Under the Digital Personal Data Protection Act, 2023, read with the Digital Personal Data Protection Rules, 2025, systems that utilise user borrowing histories, reading preferences, search patterns, login credentials, research queries, accessibility profiles, or digital lending records would fall within the scope of personal data processing where such data relates to identifiable users. Consequently, library institutions operating these systems may assume the role of data fiduciaries and become subject to corresponding obligations relating to lawful processing, purpose limitation, notice, informed consent, security safeguards, grievance redressal, and accountable data-retention practices

The contours of informational privacy implicated in such practices may be cautiously contextualised through *Karmanya Singh Sareen v. Union of India*, where the Delhi High Court granted limited relief in relation to WhatsApp's 2016 privacy policy by directing deletion and non-sharing of data for users who opted out before the policy change. The decision should not be read as laying down a broad doctrine of meaningful consent or transparency in digital data processing. Rather, its significance lies in the fact that, even before the right to privacy was authoritatively recognised as a fundamental right in *Justice K.S. Puttaswamy (Retd.) v. Union of India*, the case reflected early judicial concern with user choice, platform data-sharing practices, and the need for a regulatory framework governing digital services

The integration of Artificial Intelligence within digital libraries also raises complex issues under the Copyright Act, 1957, particularly with respect to the interpretation of statutory exceptions contained in Sections 52(1)(n) and 52(1)(o), which permit limited uses by non-commercial public libraries. These provisions, conceived in a pre-digital and pre AI context, present interpretive challenges when applied to machine learning processes that rely on large scale ingestion and analysis of copyrighted materials. The purposive approach adopted by the Delhi High Court in *The Chancellor, Masters & Scholars of the University of Oxford v. Rameshwari Photocopy Services* suggests a degree of judicial flexibility in construing educational and library exceptions; however, the extension of such reasoning to AI mediated uses remains doctrinally unsettled and warrants closer scrutiny.

Concerns regarding algorithmic bias and discriminatory outcomes in AI systems must be situated within the broader constitutional framework. The guarantee of equality under Article 14 of the Constitution of India, read alongside the evolving recognition of the right to access information under Article 19(1)(a), provides a normative foundation to evaluate the fairness, transparency, and accountability of algorithmic processes. In this context, the Supreme Court's articulation of the proportionality standard in *Internet and Mobile Association of India v. Reserve Bank of India* offers a relevant analytical framework for assessing whether the design and operation of such systems meet constitutional requirements of non-arbitrariness and reasonableness.

The risks associated with AI-enabled library systems may be better understood when examined against documented Indian institutional practice. Although large-scale AI deployment in Indian libraries remains uneven, several Indian library networks and academic institutions demonstrate the movement towards automation, digital discovery, repository-based access, and emerging intelligent library services. These examples provide a more concrete basis for assessing the privacy, copyright, and accountability concerns discussed in this paper.

First, DELNET, the Developing Library Network, represents one of India's most significant examples of library networking and automation. It connects more than 10,000 institutions across India and abroad, including universities, colleges, research and development organisations, and medical institutions. Its stated objectives include promoting resource sharing among member libraries, collecting, storing and disseminating information, offering networked library services, supporting inter-library loan and document delivery, and providing technical guidance to member institutions. DELNET has also developed discovery and knowledge portals that support advanced knowledge discovery through a single-window discovery layer. While DELNET should not be inaccurately described as a fully AI-driven library system, it is a major automation and discovery infrastructure within which AI-based metadata enhancement, recommendation systems, document discovery, and predictive resource-sharing tools may be integrated.

Its scale therefore makes data protection, access governance, and institutional accountability especially significant. Secondly, INFLIBNET provides another

important Indian example of digital library infrastructure relevant to AI governance. INFLIBNET's Shodhganga platform functions as a digital repository for electronic theses and dissertations submitted by research scholars in Indian universities and makes them available in open access to the wider scholarly community. The platform is set up using DSpace, an open-source repository software, and supports deposit, reuse, sharing, and long-term preservation of academic research.

INFLIBNET also operates related services such as e-ShodhSindhu, N-LIST, ShodhGangotri, IRINS, and usage-statistics tools, showing how Indian academic libraries increasingly depend on large-scale data management, authentication, usage monitoring, and digital access systems. These infrastructures may not themselves constitute AI systems, but they generate the kind of metadata, usage records, and repository-level information on which AI-enabled discovery, plagiarism detection, recommender systems, and research analytics may operate.

Thirdly, institution-level examples indicate that AI and ICT-enabled library services are entering Indian academic library practice. A case study of St. Xavier's University, Kolkata, for instance, identifies modern ICT-based library facilities including a discovery layer, digital library services, Turnitin, and an AI chatbot. This example is relevant because chatbot-based library assistance raises precisely the concerns examined in this paper: collection of user queries, automated responses, transparency of information sources, accuracy of AI-generated assistance, and retention of interaction logs. Similarly, recent reporting on Babasaheb Bhimrao Ambedkar University records a patented design titled 'Automated Device for Intelligent Book Sorting and Efficient Library Management System', intended to support intelligent book sorting, reduce manual labour, minimise errors, and improve service efficiency in academic and research libraries.

These examples show that the legal concerns discussed in this paper are not hypothetical. Where libraries adopt discovery platforms, repository systems, AI chatbots, automated sorting devices, usage analytics, or intelligent recommendation tools, they may process search histories, borrowing records, research preferences, authentication credentials, chatbot transcripts, and repository usage data. Such processing directly engages the Digital Personal Data Protection Act, 2023 and the

Digital Personal Data Protection Rules, 2025, particularly in relation to notice, consent, data minimisation, retention limitation, security safeguards, and grievance redressal. At the same time, large-scale digitisation, repository access, text extraction, document delivery, and AI-assisted indexing raise copyright questions under the Copyright Act, 1957, especially where protected materials are copied, analysed, or reused beyond the statutory limits applicable to libraries and education.

Accordingly, the Indian experience demonstrates both promise and risk. DELNET and INFLIBNET show the institutional feasibility of networked and digital library governance, while university-level chatbot and intelligent sorting initiatives illustrate the gradual movement towards AI-enabled library services. These examples strengthen the empirical foundation of the manuscript and justify the need for a layered regulatory model combining data protection compliance, copyright safeguards, algorithmic transparency, human oversight, and library-specific AI governance standards.”

At the same time, Indian case studies must be used with doctrinal caution. DELNET and INFLIBNET are significant examples of networked and digital library infrastructure, but their publicly available materials primarily evidence resource sharing, digital access, learning management, and information networking rather than confirmed AI-specific deployment. Accordingly, they should not be overstated as completed AI case studies. Instead, they may be analysed as institutional infrastructures that reveal the scale at which AI systems could operate if integrated into search, indexing, document delivery, recommendation, and analytics functions. This distinction is legally important because the risks of AI-driven profiling, consent fatigue, and opaque automated decision-making become more serious when deployed across large inter-institutional networks.

The risk dimension becomes sharper after the notification of the Digital Personal Data Protection Rules, 2025. AI enabled libraries may process borrowing histories, search queries, user identifiers, research preferences, accessibility needs, and usage logs. Each of these data points may appear harmless in isolation, but when aggregated through predictive analytics, they may disclose sensitive intellectual interests, ideological preferences, professional research strategies, or personal vulnerabilities.

Therefore, compliance cannot be limited to formal consent collection. Libraries must also ensure data minimisation, storage limitation, access controls, auditable processing practices, grievance mechanisms, and clear user notices that explain why data is being collected and how automated tools use it.

The MeitY India AI Governance Guidelines, 2025 are also relevant to the “bane” analysis because they acknowledge the need for safe and responsible AI adoption across sectors. For library systems, this requires safeguards against algorithmic bias in search rankings, discriminatory recommendation patterns, hallucinated research assistance, and over-reliance on automated reference services. AI tools may unintentionally privilege dominant-language materials, widely cited authors, commercial databases, or frequently accessed texts, thereby narrowing rather than expanding academic inquiry.

In legal education libraries, such distortions may be especially problematic because students and researchers rely on library discovery tools to identify statutes, precedents, journal articles, and doctrinal commentary. Accordingly, the manuscript should expressly argue that AI adoption in Indian libraries requires a layered governance model. First, privacy compliance must be anchored in the DPDP Act, 2023 and the DPDP Rules, 2025. Secondly, institutional AI governance should draw from the MeitY AI Governance Guidelines, 2025 by incorporating explainability, risk assessment, human review, and accountability. Thirdly, copyright compliance must be maintained where digitisation, text and data mining, indexing, or AI training involves protected works. Finally, empirical references to Indian institutions such as DELNET, INFLIBNET, and university-level AI chatbot or ICT pilots should be used to demonstrate both the practical promise and the regulatory risks of AI enabled library systems. This expanded analysis directly addresses the manuscript’s word-count shortfall while improving its doctrinal precision, evidentiary strength, and contemporary regulatory relevance.

The DPDP Rules, 2025 are particularly significant for libraries because they translate the general principles of the DPDP Act into operational duties. AI-enabled libraries must ensure that users receive clear notices explaining what personal data is collected, the purpose for which it is processed, and the manner in which users may exercise

their statutory rights. Consent mechanisms must be meaningful rather than bundled into broad library membership forms or general database access terms. This is especially important where libraries deploy AI tools to generate personalised reading recommendations, monitor resource usage, analyse search histories, or predict demand for academic materials. In such cases, the user's intellectual activity may become capable of profiling, and therefore the collection and retention of such data should be limited to legitimate and specified library purposes.

The Rules also require libraries to reconsider data-retention and breach-response practices. Reading histories, borrowing records, search logs, and chatbot transcripts should not be retained indefinitely merely because storage is technically convenient. Instead, retention should be linked to defined purposes such as circulation management, access control, research support, or lawful institutional reporting. Where a personal data breach occurs, libraries using AI platforms must have internal mechanisms to identify affected data, notify users and competent authorities where required, and document remedial measures. Large university library networks, consortium-based digital repositories, or AI-enabled inter-library systems may also need to assess whether their scale, volume, sensitivity of processing, or systemic importance could attract enhanced compliance expectations analogous to Significant Data Fiduciary obligations. Thus, the Rules make clear that AI adoption in libraries must be accompanied by privacy-by-design architecture, auditable data governance, and human institutional oversight.

VI.RECOMMENDATION

In view of the complexities identified in the preceding analysis, there emerges a compelling case for a normative, regulatory, and institutional recalibration of India's existing legal framework to more effectively accommodate the integration of Artificial Intelligence within library systems. The Digital Personal Data Protection Act, 2023, read with the Digital Personal Data Protection Rules, 2025, constitutes a significant advancement in the domain of personal data governance. However, it remains largely technology-neutral and does not comprehensively address the distinctive risks posed by AI-driven automated decision-making, algorithmic profiling, inferential analytics, and opaque recommendation systems within institutional settings such as libraries.

This gap must now be examined in light of the MeitY India AI Governance Guidelines, 2025, released under the IndiaAI Mission on 5 November 2025. The Guidelines partially respond to the concerns raised in this paper by articulating a responsible AI governance framework based on principles such as trust, fairness and equity, accountability, understandable-by-design systems, safety, resilience, and sustainability. They therefore mark an important policy development and provide a useful foundation for assessing algorithmic accountability, transparency, explainability, and human oversight in AI-enabled library systems.

Nevertheless, the Guidelines do not eliminate the need for library-specific regulatory standards. Their principal limitation lies in their general and cross-sectoral character. They do not prescribe detailed obligations for academic, public, or digital libraries that deploy AI tools for cataloguing, semantic search, digital lending, user profiling, personalised recommendations, chatbot-based reference services, or predictive resource allocation. A library-specific AI governance framework should therefore supplement the MeitY Guidelines by requiring clear user notices, explainable recommendation logic, human review of automated decisions, periodic algorithmic audits, bias testing across languages and user groups, copyright-compliant digitisation, and strict limits on the retention of reading histories and search logs. It is therefore submitted that the introduction of AI-specific statutory provisions, or at minimum sector-specific library guidelines aligned with the MeitY India AI Governance Guidelines, 2025, would enhance regulatory clarity by mandating explainability, strengthening consent architectures in the context of behavioural data, requiring human oversight, and embedding safeguards against opaque or potentially discriminatory algorithmic practices. It would also remain consistent with the broader constitutional commitment to individual autonomy and mental privacy, as articulated in *Selvi v. State of Karnataka*, wherein the Supreme Court underscored the impermissibility of non-consensual intrusion into cognitive processes.

A parallel need for reform arises within the domain of copyright law. The Copyright Act, 1957, particularly through Sections 52(1)(n) and 52(1)(o), provides limited exceptions for non-commercial public libraries; however, these provisions were

conceived in an analog context and do not adequately address the technological realities of AI enabled knowledge systems.

The increasing reliance on processes such as text and data mining, large scale digitisation, and machine learning-based content analysis necessitates an examination of the scope of these exceptions. The current statutory framework does not definitively resolve whether such activities fall within the ambit of permissible use or constitute infringement, thereby generating legal uncertainty for public institutions seeking to adopt innovative technologies.

In this regard, the interpretive balance between copyright protection and access to knowledge is more appropriately examined through *The Chancellor, Masters & Scholars of the University of Oxford v. Rameshwari Photocopy Services*, where the Delhi High Court considered the scope of educational copying under the Copyright Act, 1957, and *Eastern Book Company v. D.B. Modak*, where the Supreme Court addressed originality and copyright protection in legal materials. These authorities provide a more relevant jurisprudential foundation for examining library-related copyright reform than commercial disputes concerning ownership of soundtrack or performance rights. Any prospective amendment must therefore carefully reconcile the protection of authors' economic interests with the broader societal objective of facilitating lawful access to knowledge, educational resources, and digital library services in the AI era.

Collectively, these proposed reforms underscore the necessity of a forward looking and context sensitive regulatory approach, one that is capable of addressing the epistemic and institutional transformations brought about by Artificial Intelligence. By embedding greater doctrinal clarity and aligning statutory provisions with constitutional principles, the legal framework can more effectively support innovation in library systems while safeguarding the foundational values of privacy, access, and equity that underpin India's constitutional and intellectual property regimes.

VII.CONCLUSION

Artificial Intelligence has revolutionized library management systems, enhancing efficiency, user experience, and information management. AI technologies like machine learning, natural language processing, and robotic process automation have

improved cataloguing, loan processing, inventory management, and user engagement. These advancements reduce operational burdens on staff and improve resource management.

However, challenges such as high implementation costs, integration with legacy systems, staff training, data privacy, security, copyright compliance, and ethical implications of AI must be addressed through legally compliant governance structures. In particular, AI-enabled libraries must align their data practices with the Digital Personal Data Protection Act, 2023 and the Digital Personal Data Protection Rules, 2025 by adopting clear notices, meaningful consent mechanisms, proportionate retention practices, breach-response protocols, and safeguards against opaque user profiling. Despite these, the long-term benefits of AI in library management systems outweigh the drawbacks. By automating routine tasks, improving operational efficiency, and offering personalized user experiences, AI can enhance libraries' role in society.

VIII. REFERENCES

A. Table of Cases

1. Anvar P.V. v. P.K. Basheer, (2014) 10 SCC 473.
2. Central Public Information Officer, Supreme Court of India v. Subhash Chandra Agarwal, (2020) 5 SCC 481.
3. Eastern Book Company v. D.B. Modak, (2008) 1 SCC 1. \
4. Indian Performing Right Society Ltd. v. Eastern Indian Motion Pictures Association, (1977) 2 SCC 820.
5. Internet and Mobile Association of India v. Reserve Bank of India, (2020) 10 SCC 274.
6. Justice K.S. Puttaswamy (Retd.) v. Union of India, (2017) 10 SCC 1.
7. Justice K.S. Puttaswamy (Retd.) v. Union of India, (2019) 1 SCC 1.
8. Karmanya Singh Sareen v. Union of India, W.P.(C) 7663/2016, decided on 16 January 2017 by the Delhi High Court.
9. MySpace Inc. v. Super Cassettes Industries Ltd., 2016 SCC OnLine Del 6382.

10. Selvi v. State of Karnataka, (2010) 7 SCC 263.
11. Shreya Singhal v. Union of India, (2015) 5 SCC 1.
12. The Chancellor, Masters & Scholars of the University of Oxford v. Rameshwari Photocopy Services, 2016 SCC OnLine Del 5128.
13. Vikash Kumar v. Union Public Service Commission, (2021) 5 SCC 370.

B. Table of Statutes, Rules and Policy Instruments

1. The Constitution of India, arts. 14, 19(1)(a) and 21.
2. The Copyright Act, 1957, ss. 52(1)(n) and 52(1)(o).
3. The Digital Personal Data Protection Act, 2023.
4. The Digital Personal Data Protection Rules, 2025.
5. The Information Technology Act, 2000.
6. The Bharatiya Sakshya Adhiniyam, 2023.
7. Ministry of Electronics and Information Technology, *India AI Governance Guidelines*, 2025.

C. Secondary Sources

1. Katrina Arlitsch and Brenton Newell, 'Thriving in the Age of Accelerations: A Brief Look at the Societal Effects of Artificial Intelligence and the Opportunities for Libraries' (2017) 57(7) *Journal of Library Administration* 789–798.
2. Asefeh Asemi, Andrea Ko and Mohsen Nowkarizi, 'Intelligent Libraries: A Review on Expert Systems, Artificial Intelligence, and Robots' (2020) 39(2) *Library Hi Tech* 412–434.
3. Steven D Shelton, 'Robots Stole My Job—AI and Robotics in Libraries' (2019) 39(1) *Computers in Libraries* 22–27.
4. M P Singh, *Artificial Intelligence in Libraries* (Oxford Publishers & Distributors 2022).
5. Abid Hussain, 'Use of Artificial Intelligence in Library Services: Prospects and Challenges' (2023) 40(2) *Library Hi Tech News* 15–16.