International Journal of Law, Justice and Jurisprudence

E-ISSN: 2790-0681
P-ISSN: 2790-0673
www.lawjournal.info
IJLJJ 2025; 5(2): 157-161
Received: 23-06-2025
Accepted: 26-07-2025

Varsha Singh
Research Scholar of Department of Law at Babasaheb Bhimrao Ambedkar University, Lucknow, Uttar Pradesh, India

Amit Kumar Singh
Research Scholar of Department of Law at Babasaheb Bhimrao Ambedkar University, Lucknow, Uttar Pradesh, India

Correspondence Author:
Varsha Singh
Research Scholar of Department of Law at Babasaheb Bhimrao Ambedkar University, Lucknow, Uttar Pradesh, India

AI and Environmental monitoring in India: Legal frameworks for automated enforcement

Varsha Singh and Amit Kumar Singh

DOI: https://www.doi.org/10.22271/2790-0673.2025.v5.i2b.229

Abstract
The rapidly deteriorating environment in India offers severe enough a challenge for both regulators and courts, as also administrators, to confront. Many conventional enforcement approaches have failed to achieve effective enforcement of environmental rules, given an increasingly rapid industrialization, deforestation and urbanization. New technologies, including AI, offer new possibilities to be able to monitor, analyze and act on environmental infringements in real time. From satellite monitoring to predictive analytics to smart sensors, AI-driven technologies hold great potential for automated environmental enforcement. But the technological innovation gives rise to pressing questions on constitutional protection, legal acceptability, regulatory readiness, algorithmic prejudice, data confidentiality and public accountability. This paper offers a critical examination of the intersection between AI and environmental law in India, focusing on the legal lacunae pertaining to automated environmental enforcement. Based on comparative international practice and constitutional jurisprudence, it advocates the development of an integrated legal framework acknowledging the significance of AI in environmental governance, but guaranteeing transparency, fairness and environmental justice. The paper ends with specific proposals for statutory changes, judicial capacity building, and ethical governance models to enable a responsible and rights-based adoption of AI in the environmental regulation mechanism in India.

Keywords: Artificial intelligence, environmental monitoring, legal framework, automated enforcement, India, algorithmic accountability

Introduction
India stands at an important juncture, fighting with environmental crises due to relentless industrial expansion, urban sprawl, and a population outbreak. From causing air pollution in its cities to polluted rivers and deforestation, these challenges impact public health, disrupt ecological harmony, and jeopardize sustainable development. For legal scholars and policymakers, these issues highlight an urgent need for innovative and effective tools for environmental governance. Artificial Intelligence is growing as an indispensable force in this arena, offering methods to track, curb and analyse, ecological violations with efficiency. Technological developments like satellite monitoring and real-time sensor systems are helping to gather and act on environmental data, moving away from existed manual inspections toward streamlined, tech-driven enforcement. This paper deals with the intersection of AI and environmental law, by exploring how India can accept these technologies into its regulatory fabric for environmental protection while dealing with the legal and ethical complexities that arise.

The importance of writing this paper lies in artificial intelligence potential to transform India's approach towards environmental protection, particularly highlighting the systemic shortcomings of existing methods. AI-driven tools implies predictive analysis and automated monitoring, enabling authorities to highlight polluters, track emissions, and anticipate ecological risks in real time. Yet, for law professionals, the adoption of AI raises many questions: Can evidence generated using algorithms be valid in Indian courts? Does automated decision-making is in line with constitutional protections? And what safeguards are necessary to prevent biased algorithms to deal with fairness?

This paper examines AI's role in India's environmental regulatory framework. It begins by highlighting the country's existing ecological challenges and the rise of AI as a response to enforcement loopholes. It then discusses the shift from manual inspections to intelligent surveillance using AI, showcasing practical applications of advanced

technological developments. This paper also scrutinizes the admissibility of AI-generated evidence related to environment, the constitutional and statutory foundations for automated enforcement, and the imperative of upholding due process and accountability. As per on global approaches, the paper gleans insights to help India to forge the legal frameworks that helps in balancing technological innovation with justice.

The Environmental Crisis and the Emergence of AI Technologies in India: India is at a crossroads in its environmental journey. Declaring at a time when environmental damage, carbon intensification, biodiversity collapse, water deprivation and chaotic urban development have become ecological and governance emergencies. India has a fairly robust set of laws on environment and a dynamic public interest litigation but enforcement of law is one of the weakest links in the chain of India's environmental governance. Agencies such as the Central Pollution Control Board (CPCB) and State Pollution Control Boards (SPCBs) face issues related to manpower, resources and technical capability for regular monitoring and analysis of the massive data generated from the various sources of pollutants across India [1].

The emerging of Artificial Intelligence may dramatically reshape this landscape. AI can be joined with environmental sensors, drones and satellite systems to recognize levels of pollution follow illegal activities and predict environmental risks-using technologies like computer vision, neural networks, machine learning algorithms and big data analytics. These technologies can acquire, process and analyse environmental information at an extent and speed beyond what would have been feasible through human observation alone [2].

For instance, AI drones that can monitor forest incursions, mining and wetland degradation in thousands of square kilometers with live imagery are now a reality. Predictive computer code can forecast bursts of pollution by analyzing everything from the weather to traffic patterns. In the same manner, machine learning algorithms could leverage data of past compliance records to identify high-risk industrial units for advance inspections. These trends have been picked up to an extent by Indian governmental agencies, research institutions and environmental NGOs, in a disjointed and trial-and-error like fashion [3].

The technology offers much promise, but implementing without a firm legal and regulatory base would be a dangerous foreshore. Questions such as due process, legal admissibility of AI-generated evidence, data security, surveillance ethics, and the potential of algorithmic bias are formidable obstacles for the authority and acceptance of automated enforcement instruments. What's more, the law of the environment is not, unlike the laws of finance or cybercrime, historically designed to accommodate automated or predictive models. The goal of this paper is, thus, to provide an 'update' to the present literature and to fill a void by offering a critical assessment of legal hurdles and a reasoned legal way forward to make use of AI for environmental enforcement in India.

From Manual Inspections to Intelligent Surveillance: The Evolution of Environmental Monitoring in India

India's system of environmental surveillance has been based on regular but intermittent checks from samples of air and water bodies, and visits to physical locations for site inspections by regulators. Although these tools played an important part in the early days of environmental regulation, they have proved that they are insufficient to respond to the growing level and sophistication of environmental abuse. Industrial effluents, illegal structures, deforestation, littering, and toxic discharges frequently remain unreported for a considerable period of time, mainly because regulators are forced to operate under significant logistical and infrastructural constraints [4].

This is changing with the introduction of AI-enabled technologies. ISRO with the help of Artificial Intelligence powered Image Recognition systems are being used to detect illegal mining and wetland encroachments. AI based air quality sensors have been deployed by Urban Local Bodies (ULBs) in cities such as Hyderabad and Pune which send real time data to designated Pollution Control Centers [5]. Around biodiversity conservation, it's seen that machine learning models are trained to identify species distribution change and habitat loss, using forest cover data.

Yet these deployments are still mostly restricted to pilot schemes, academic partnerships or donor-led programmes. There is no centralised policy or national strategy to regulate the use of AI-produced environmental data, such as how they can and cannot be used ethically or legally in a court of law. And because environmental laws in India are a function of the decentralised powers enjoyed by its constituent states, different states end up adopting radically different technological standards, which are nothing but inconsistent and fragmented.

Most importantly, many AI models depend on third-party data sets, some of which are privately held or scraped from ungoverned digital properties. This gives rise to concerns about the authenticity and verification of data and the legality of any third-party derived intellectual property [6]. Without common data governance architecture and transparent model training process, AI-based environmental intelligence could have doubts in court, especially when being used to prosecute violators or levy fines. For that reason, the development of environmental monitoring should be dealt with alongside a legal evolution that recognises and controls such novel forms.

Legal Admissibility of AI-Generated Environmental Evidence in Indian Courts: The Act by which the admissibility of evidence are governed in Indian is Evidence Act, 1872. Though the Act was amended in the year 2000 to include electronic evidence in Section 65B, it was primarily conceived keeping into account digital evidence such as email or CCTV footage and not outputs of AI powered autonomous systems [7].

AI-generated evidence poses unique challenges. "Unlike normal evidence, which a witness can be cross-examined about or otherwise verified using witness testimony, AI works are frequently based upon probabilistic numbers extracted from black-box models that do not connote traceability". If a deep-learning model classifies a factory as the polluter using heat maps, the meshed logic or weighting applied by the model is often not interpretable to the developers [8]. This is anathema to the "best evidence" rule, which stipulates that the highest admissible form of evidence shows what occurred in court.

And it's worsened by the fact that there's no judicial bench-side AI literacy training. The overwhelming majority of

judges and practitioners do not have the tools to scrutinize AI methodologies, and either defer to technology or attack it out of ignorance. A trend is emerging in cybercrime/digital fraud cases where digital trails which are substantiated as valid evidence under Section 65B are being extended to Section 65B of the Act but the same set of principles cannot be directly employed in the context of AI generated environmental data.

Amend the Evidence Act or issue supporting agnostic legal instruments which either specifically recognize outputs generated by AI models as evidences or declare them as valid evidence subject to conditions (such as model auditability, certification and reproducibility). In addition, there is the need for courts to sanction the appointment of independent scientific experts to interpret the esoteric AI produced data in connection with environmental litigation.

Constitutional Foundations and Statutory Implications of AI-Based Environmental Enforcement

The introduction of AI in India's environmental enforcement apparatus is impossible in a legal void. It has to be weighed in the broader spectrum of constitutional imperatives, human rights and legal duties. The right to have a clean and healthy environment has become the staple of Indian constitutional jurisprudence in the wake of the Supreme Court's expansive interpretations of Article 21. In *Subhash Kumar v. State of Bihar* [9] and *Vellore Citizens' Welfare Forum v. Union of India* [10], the Court expressed that the protection of environment is a part of right to life [11].

At the same time, the Constitution imposes environmental obligations on the citizens and to the States. Article 48A of the Directive Principle of State Policy envisages that "*the State shall strive to protect and improve the environment and to safeguard the forests and wildlife*." Article 51 A (g) of Fundamental Duties of citizens of India mandates it to be "*the duty of every citizen of India to protect and improve the natural environment including forests, lakes, rivers and wildlife.*" Such provisions represent the basis for the design of an AI-driven automatic environmental enforcement framework.

But this expansion must be restricted in accordance with Article 14 (right to equality) and Article 21 (right to privacy) so as to not make AI an instrument of arbitrary and invasive surveillance. The historical judgment of *K.S. Puttaswamy v. Union of India* lugged informational privacy as a fundamental right and provided the three-fold test for violation- (i) legality, (ii) necessity, and (iii) proportionality [12]. Therefore the AI technologies that regulation authorities use must have a legal basis, pursue a legitimate environmental objective and use the least restrictive tool available.

From a statutory standpoint, the country's main environmental legislations - the Environment (Protection) Act, 1986, and the Water (Prevention and Control of Pollution) Act, Air (Prevention and Control of Pollution) Act, 1981 and Forest (Conservation) Act, 1980 mention no reference to digital technologies and AI-driven enforcement tools. While they afford regulators virtually unlimited powers for monitoring and preventing pollution, the absence of clear statutory recognition of the use of evidence and methods produced by AI is casting regulators into an "AI-related evidential twilight zone". In practice, however, the CPCB and SPCBs frequently use AI-generated data, considering it as supplementary evidence, rather than the main datum, due to legal ambiguities about the status of AI-driven information [13].

In order to guarantee legitimacy and consistency new environmental statues need to be updated to incorporate provisions that address AI tools, set data accumulation standards, specify the rights and duties of regulators and regulated, and put in place a grievance process if there are algorithm errors or misidentification.

Algorithmic Bias, Due Process, and the Problem of Accountability in AI Enforcement: With government regulatory bodies looking to leverage AI technology tools for use in monitoring the environment, concern about accountability, bias, and procedural fairness has increased. One of the biggest concerns is the opaqueness of a lot of machine learning algorithms. These models can often be "black boxes," making decisions based on millions of data points with no decipherable trajectory from input to output that can inform it. This lack of explainability is problematic notably when such outputs serve as a ground for punitive regulatory actions [14].

Imagine a fictitious case where an AI system notices that a manufacturing plant is producing levels of air pollution above the limit, and that the regulator simply sends the factory a closure notice or a fine, without a request for remorse or human check. How would the regulator justify the AI's decision making process, if the company contested this in a court? In the absence of an explainable, auditable, and scientifically reliable data-driven algorithm, such practices may well not pass constitutional muster.

Algorithmic bias is also a significant problem. AI systems developed from biased and unbalanced training data may systematically disadvantage certain regions, sectors or groups. For instance, more stringent monitoring and regulatory punishment may be applied to such historically more industrialized zones than to under-monitored zones, where violations may remain unnoticed. Algorithms could be biased, programmatically or otherwise, exhibiting biases encoded in the training data due to the systemic biases the creators, or the society, so to speak, in which the algorithm was trained [15].

There is also a greater dispersion over accountability in the AI domain. If an AI system written by a private company and put to work by a government makes a mistake for example, wrongly indicating a patch of land is deforested whom do you sue? Who is the responsible person, is it the programmer, is it the vendor or the regulator or the end-user? Indian laws at present does not have a clear terrain about liability when algorithms go rogue algorithmically, particularly in public governance settings.

To mitigate those risks, any legal regime regulating AI-based environmental enforcement must include elements of algorithmic accountability. That includes having enforced documentation for model training, data sources, validated protocols, transparency, and audit trails. The affected parties should also have the chance to challenge algorithmic decisions and to request compensation in a procedure which is fair and transparent. And similarly to the obligation of natural justice and due process in classic environmental enforcement, it should extend to digital and automated systems too.

International Comparative Approaches and Lessons for India: Around the world, countries are trying out A.I.-powered environmental governance, with lessons that may be useful to India. The (European Union) General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) is a sensible framework for data protection and algorithmic transparency, yet already environmental enforcement authorities are using AI to track emissions, analyze satellite data and audit compliance. The EU Environmental Crime Directive was an act of the European Union that explicitly acknowledges digital evidence and procedural guarantees for Computer monitoring system [16].

China offers a different model, where AI-powered facial recognition and environmental detection programs in the "Sky Net" infrastructure network are being used to enforce environmental law. For all its scalability, this strategy is widely reviled for its secrecy, failure to respect civil liberties, and lack of public accountability.

In the United States, the Environmental Protection Agency is already using AI to analyze emissions data and remotely sense wetlands, and hazardous waste sites. These tools are part of enforcement through legal requirement and the enforcement use has a clear distinction between AI-produced risk flags and the final regulatory action for example administrative action which is purely under human discretion [17].

India needs to design its own hybrid model that marries the scale and efficiency that an AI-based monitoring system offers with the democratic principles of due process, transparency and participatory governance. Rather than unthinkingly importing global models, Indian policy makers should emphasize legal pluralism, local context, and safeguarding the interests of societies on the margins, which are the most vulnerable to environmental harms and over regulation. Lessons learned from around the world are that legal protections need to keep pace with tech advances, not play catch up.

Toward a Coherent Legal Framework for AI-Driven Environmental Enforcement in India

To harness the transformational promise of AI in environment monitoring and enforcement, India will need a forward-looking legal framework that conveys legitimacy, protections, and clarity. This framework should include issues relating to technology, process, constitutionality, and ethics in deploying AI.

A statutory acknowledgment of AI-generated environmental data must stand at the heart of this framework. There is a need for updating the environmental laws to recognize and provide explicit regulation on the use of AI tools for monitoring air, water, soil, noise parameters as well as parameters of biodiversity and climate. New norms will have to be formulated under the Environment (Protection) Act of 1986 to stipulate norms for data accuracy, model validity, third party certification and admissibility protocols. Such standards will need to be informed by scientific objectivity, reproducibility, and expert oversight.

Additionally, there is an immediate requirement for statutory provisions for admissibility of AI-generated evidence in judicial/ quasi-judicial bodies. The Indian Evidence Act needs to be amended to develop guidelines for admissibility of AI-generated intelligence data, especially in the realm of environmental litigation and administrative sanctions. Such standards should encompass explainability, transparency, data traceability, and human verification. Courts should also have the power to appoint independent technical panels or amicus experts to evaluate the trustworthiness of AI models and results.

At the same time, checks against misuse must be ingrained into the system. Laws around algorithmic accountability should mandate that regulators release transparency reports and assumptions around its models, as well as periodically audit them for accuracy or bias. So too must industries or individuals be able to question AI-generated notices and appeal review to a human decision-maker. They advocated that non-sensitive sets of data and decision making models should be made available to the civil society organisations and citizen groups, so that there is a democratic oversight.

Ethical review committees, such as interdisciplinary environmental ethics committees, should be created to oversee the introduction of AI systems. Such boards should be made up of environmentalists, technologists, lawyers, ethicists and community representatives. They should have a remit to consider complaints and provide advisory opinions as well as make recommendations for curtailing or remediating excessive or biased surveillance.

Finally, capacity building is essential. Judges, lawyers, regulators, and environmental practitioners will need to be AI literate, which includes understanding basics of data science, algorithmic decision-making, and digital rights. Courses on environmental technology law should be included in law schools and the judicial academies to narrow the divide between legal tradition and technological modernity.

The fate of environmental justice in India will rest not just on innovation as such, but on the capacity of the law to govern, direct, and democratize innovation in the service of ecological sustainability and constitutional ideals.

Conclusion

AI has the potential to revolutionize environmental monitoring in India with real-time detection, predictive analytics and wide area monitoring of ecological violations. Yet, such potential should be realised within constitutional norms, legal procedures and ethical safeguards. Despite which law is protecting its use, it would appear that current law cannot contend with the operational use of "AI-enabled enforcement" because it has no evidentiary standard, accountability or rights-based legal underpinnings to point to.

This paper has shown that Indian environmental law and constitutional jurisprudence together offer a normative framework for adoption of AI, even as actual statutory reforms are the need of the hour. Using foreign templates and local case law as guides, there needs to be a balanced structure that harmonises technological efficiency with transparency, fairness and democratic legitimacy.

Through combining legal innovation with technology, India has the potential to pioneer the Global South in creating a model for AI-driven environmental governance which is responsible, inclusive and effective.

References

1. Narain S. The state of India's environment 2020: In figures. New Delhi: Centre for Science and Environment; 2020.
2. Srivastava R. Artificial intelligence and environmental governance. Econ Polit Wkly. 2021;56(42):20-23.

3. Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change (MoEFCC). Use of drone technology for forest monitoring: Pilot projects. New Delhi: Government of India; 2023.
4. Divan S, Rosencranz A. Environmental law and policy in India. New Delhi: Oxford University Press; 2002.
5. Telangana State Pollution Control Board. AI-based monitoring systems in urban areas. Hyderabad: TSPCB; 2023.
6. Ramesh S. Big data and public policy: Legal challenges in India. Indian J Law Technol. 2021;17(1):32-56.
7. The Indian Evidence Act, 1872. As amended by the Information Technology Act, 2000.
8. Pasquale F. The black box society: The secret algorithms that control money and information. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press; 2015.
9. Subhash Kumar v. State of Bihar, AIR 1991 SC 420.
10. Vellore Citizens' Welfare Forum v. Union of India, AIR 1996 SC 2715.
11. Subhash Kumar v. State of Bihar, (1991) 1 SCC 598; Vellore Citizens' Welfare Forum v. Union of India, (1996) 5 SCC 647.
12. Justice K.S. Puttaswamy (Retd.) v. Union of India, (2017) 10 SCC 1.
13. Ghosh S. Regulating the new age: AI in environmental enforcement. J Environ Law Policy. 2022;13(2):
14. Burrell J. How the machine 'thinks': Understanding opacity in machine learning algorithms. Big Data Soc. 2016;3(1):1-12.
15. European Commission. Directive 2008/99/EC on the protection of the environment through criminal law. Off J Eur Union. 2008;L328:28-37.
16. United States Environmental Protection Agency. Next generation compliance: Use of advanced monitoring tools. EPA Reports; 2023.