Page 813 - 829 **DOI:** *https://doij.org/10.10000/IJLMH.119698*

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF LAW MANAGEMENT & HUMANITIES

[ISSN 2581-5369]

Volume 8 | Issue 3

2025

Jobless Wheels, Lawless Roads?: Legal Challenges of Autonomous Vehicles in India

JYOTI[1] AND MOHIT KUMAR[2]

ABSTRACT

Autonomous vehicles (AVs) are poised to redefine transportation globally, offering the promise of safer roads, reduced congestion, and technological advancement. However, in India, the journey toward autonomous mobility is fraught with unique legal, regulatory, and socio-economic challenges. While other countries are actively developing legal frameworks to accommodate AVs, India's legal system remains rooted in conventional fault-based liability models that are ill-equipped to address the complexities of machine decision-making, data-driven navigation, and algorithmic accountability. This paper examines the current state of Indian law regarding motor vehicles, product liability, and consumer protection in the context of AVs. It highlights the inadequacy of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 (as amended), and the Consumer Protection Act, 2019, in determining responsibility in AV-related accidents. Furthermore, the role of artificial intelligence in decision-making raises pressing questions about accountability, transparency, and the need for access to driving data and algorithms. A distinctive concern in India is the socio-political resistance to AV adoption due to potential job loss. Union Minister Nitin Gadkari has publicly opposed driverless cars, estimating that 70–80 lakh professional drivers could lose employment. This resistance exemplifies the broader tension between technological progress and labor rights. Drawing from international experiences in the UK, Germany, and the USA, this paper proposes a nuanced regulatory approach that balances innovation with accountability, safety, and employment preservation. Legal reform, data governance, and inclusive policymaking are essential to ensure that India does not fall behind in the global mobility revolution.

***Keywords**: Autonomous Vehicles, Legal Liability, India, Employment Displacement, Regulatory Framework*

I. INTRODUCTION

Autonomous vehicles (AVs), also known as self-driving cars, represent one of the most transformative technological innovations of the 21st century. By integrating artificial intelligence (AI), machine learning, and advanced sensor technologies, AVs can navigate and

[1] Author is an Assistant professor at Department of Laws, Panjab University, Chandigarh, India.
[2] Author is a Senior Research Fellow at Department of Laws, Panjab University, Chandigarh, India.

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

operate without human intervention, promising dramatic improvements in road safety, fuel efficiency, and overall mobility. These vehicles are equipped with an array of sensors such as radar, lidar, cameras, and GPS, which allow them to "see" their surroundings, make decisions in real time, and adapt to changing traffic conditions. With the potential to reduce accidents caused by human error, AVs can significantly lower the risk of traffic fatalities, making them a key part of the future of transportation. The global evolution of autonomous vehicle technology has been rapid and has drawn substantial interest from both the private and public sectors. The development of AVs began in the 1980s with experimental projects by universities and research organizations, but it was not until the early 2000s that technology giants like Google (now Alphabet) and automakers like Tesla, BMW, and Audi began seriously investing in self-driving technology. The advent of AI and machine learning has been crucial to the rapid advancement of AV capabilities. In 2009, Google launched its self-driving car project, which became a defining moment in the development of autonomous driving. This initiative helped accelerate research and development, leading to the creation of increasingly sophisticated AV prototypes capable of navigating complex urban environments. By 2014, Google's self-driving cars were already testing on public roads, and other companies soon followed suit. Tesla's "Autopilot" system, which was introduced in 2015, brought the promise of semi-autonomous driving closer to reality for consumers. Unlike fully autonomous vehicles, which can operate without any human oversight, Tesla's Autopilot allows for semi-autonomous driving in certain conditions, with the expectation that the driver remains alert and ready to take control when necessary. This marked a pivotal moment in the global evolution of autonomous vehicle technology, signaling that self-driving cars were no longer just a futuristic concept. The development of AVs has been supported by governments, which see the potential of this technology to reduce accidents, ease traffic congestion, and create new business opportunities. In the United States, the federal government, along with individual states like California, have actively engaged in creating regulatory frameworks to oversee the testing and deployment of AVs. In 2017, the U.S. Department of Transportation released its first official policy on AVs, encouraging the safe testing and deployment of autonomous vehicles on public roads. The United Kingdom also introduced regulatory frameworks in 2018, aiming to ensure that AVs are tested safely while fostering innovation. Similarly, Germany passed laws in 2017 that allow for the testing of autonomous vehicles on public roads, provided the vehicles meet stringent safety standards. While these countries have made significant strides in the development and regulation of AVs, India's journey towards autonomous vehicles faces distinct challenges. The country's existing legal infrastructure is

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

built around traditional models of liability, where human drivers are held responsible for accidents. However, AV technology operates on the premise that human intervention is not necessary for the vehicle to function. This creates a gap in India's legal framework, as it does not account for the complexities of autonomous driving, such as determining fault in the case of an accident involving a machine instead of a human.

Moreover, India's socio-economic context adds an additional layer of complexity to the integration of AVs. The country's transportation sector is heavily reliant on millions of professional drivers, including taxi drivers, truck drivers, and auto-rickshaw operators, many of whom work in the informal sector. The introduction of AVs threatens to displace a large portion of this workforce, leading to concerns about unemployment and social instability. The government has expressed reservations about the rapid adoption of this technology, fearing that the loss of jobs for professional drivers could exacerbate India's existing unemployment problems. Union Minister for Road Transport and Highways, **Nitin Gadkari**, has voiced strong opposition to the introduction of autonomous vehicles in India, citing employment concerns as a key issue. He remarked:

"I will never allow driverless cars to come into India because it will take away the jobs of several drivers and I will not let that happen."

This statement encapsulates the tension between technological innovation and the protection of traditional livelihoods. Gadkari's opposition underscores the socio-political resistance that AV technology faces in India, where millions of people depend on driving as a primary source of income. His comments also reflect the broader societal concern that the country may not be prepared for the economic and social upheaval that could accompany the widespread adoption of autonomous vehicles.

While the debate surrounding AVs in India is shaped by employment concerns, it is also fueled by the legal uncertainties surrounding liability and accountability. India's current motor vehicle laws, such as the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988, do not address the specific challenges posed by AVs. The Act, which was last amended in 2019, continues to hold human drivers accountable for accidents. However, in a world where machines are driving the cars, questions arise as to who is responsible when an accident occurs—Is it the vehicle manufacturer, the software developer, or the owner of the vehicle? How will Indian insurance companies handle claims involving AVs, particularly when the technology behind them is constantly evolving? These questions point to the critical need for a legal framework in India that can address the complexities of autonomous vehicle technology while safeguarding public interests. The

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

introduction of AVs in India will require significant legal and regulatory reform to ensure that issues related to liability, insurance, safety standards, and data privacy are adequately addressed. At the same time, policymakers must take into account the socio-economic impact of AVs, particularly the loss of jobs in the transportation sector, and explore ways to mitigate these effects. This paper critically explores the legal and socio-economic challenges that India faces in adopting autonomous vehicles, focusing on the issues of liability, regulatory gaps, and the impact on employment. By examining the experiences of other countries that have begun to implement AVs, the paper proposes a roadmap for legal reform that balances technological innovation with the protection of public welfare. In doing so, it seeks to offer a comprehensive framework that can guide India in navigating the legal complexities of autonomous mobility, ensuring that the benefits of AV technology are realized without compromising societal stability.

II. Levels of Automation and Legal Considerations

Autonomous vehicles are typically classified into five levels of automation, as defined by the **Society of Automotive Engineers (SAE)**. These levels range from **Level 0** (no automation) to **Level 5** (full automation). The levels of automation are as follows:

- **Level 0**: No automation—The human driver is responsible for all aspects of driving, including control of the vehicle.
- **Level 1**: Driver assistance—Basic functions such as steering or acceleration/deceleration are automated, but the driver is still responsible for the vehicle's overall operation.
- **Level 2**: Partial automation—The vehicle can control both steering and acceleration/deceleration, but the driver must remain engaged and supervise the driving process.
- **Level 3**: Conditional automation—The vehicle can perform most driving tasks, but the driver must be available to take over control in certain situations.
- **Level 4**: High automation—The vehicle can perform all driving tasks autonomously, but only within specific operational domains or geofenced areas. No driver intervention is needed within these limits.
- **Level 5**: Full automation—The vehicle can drive itself under all conditions and in all environments without any human intervention.

As the level of automation increases, the role of the human driver diminishes, and ultimately,

at Level 5, the vehicle can operate entirely without human oversight. In this context, the primary legal concern is the transition from human-operated vehicles, where liability is generally straightforward, to machine-operated vehicles, where the machine makes decisions, and human involvement is minimal or nonexistent. In such situations, traditional legal principles around liability and responsibility are insufficient to account for the new complexities introduced by AVs.

In India, existing legal frameworks, such as the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 (as amended), which regulates road safety and assigns responsibility for accidents to human drivers, do not foresee a system where machines, rather than humans, are responsible for driving decisions. The Consumer Protection Act, 2019, which provides consumer rights in cases of product defects and accidents, also assumes human agency in driving. These frameworks are based on the premise that a human driver controls the vehicle, making decisions in real time, and thus, the driver is accountable for any mistakes or accidents.

However, when an autonomous system makes a decision, the situation becomes legally complex. Who is liable when an autonomous vehicle causes an accident? The traditional answer, which attributes liability to the human driver, is no longer applicable. Instead, new questions emerge regarding who should be held responsible for accidents involving AVs. There are several possibilities:

- **Vehicle Manufacturer**: In cases where a malfunction in the vehicle's hardware or software contributes to an accident, liability may fall on the manufacturer. This could be similar to the product liability laws that hold manufacturers accountable for defective products that cause harm. If the vehicle's sensors, hardware, or overall design fail, the manufacturer may be found at fault.
- **Software Developer**: Since autonomous vehicles heavily rely on AI, machine learning algorithms, and software systems to make driving decisions, the software developer may also be held liable if an algorithm or system malfunction causes an accident. The problem becomes more complex if the AV is using data-driven decision-making processes that continuously evolve. Software bugs or programming errors could contribute to accidents, and the question of who is accountable for the code errors arises.
- **Vehicle Owner**: In cases where the vehicle owner is not the manufacturer or the software developer, but the owner's actions—or inactions—contribute to an accident, such as failure to maintain the vehicle properly, they might be held partially liable.

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

This could happen if the owner fails to install necessary software updates or ignores warning signs of system malfunction, assuming the system is capable of self-diagnosis.

- **Insurance Companies**: As autonomous vehicles become more common, the role of insurance will likely undergo significant changes. Traditional car insurance policies typically cover driver responsibility in the event of an accident. However, with AVs, insurance companies may need to rethink how they approach liability. They may need to offer policies that cover both the vehicle manufacturer and the software developer, as well as traditional liability in case of vehicle-owner negligence.

The legal landscape regarding AVs in India is thus full of uncertainties, as the existing laws do not address these new issues effectively. The Motor Vehicles Act, 1988, which has been amended several times to address evolving concerns such as road safety and environmental regulations, has yet to include provisions for AVs. The current Act holds human drivers accountable for accidents, but it does not provide a clear framework for allocating liability when a vehicle is driven autonomously.

Further complicating the legal framework is the question of algorithmic errors or software malfunctions**.** Autonomous systems rely heavily on complex algorithms that analyze vast amounts of data from sensors and cameras. These algorithms make real-time decisions, such as identifying obstacles, following traffic rules, and determining the best course of action in different traffic situations. However, these systems are not infallible. A malfunction in the algorithm or a failure to process data accurately could lead to accidents, raising questions about how to assign fault and what legal recourse exists for victims.

For instance, consider a scenario where an autonomous vehicle crashes into a pedestrian due to a failure in the vehicle's sensor system. If the sensor fails to detect the pedestrian due to poor weather conditions or other environmental factors, is the manufacturer liable for the failure of the sensor, or does the responsibility fall on the software developer who wrote the code that processes the sensor data? And how does one prove that the system malfunctioned and caused the accident? These are complex issues that require new legal definitions and frameworks.

In the absence of a clear legal framework for AVs, questions about the accountability of data owners also arise. AVs are essentially data-driven machines, and the data generated by AVs can be extensive. This includes data about driving patterns, traffic conditions, accidents, and even personal information about the vehicle owner and passengers. The Data Protection Bill,

2019, which is still under discussion in India, could have important implications for AV data usage and privacy, especially with regard to who owns the data generated by AVs and who has access to it in the event of a dispute.

In conclusion, the introduction of autonomous vehicles in India presents significant legal challenges. The current legal system is not equipped to deal with the complexities of machine-driven decision-making and liability. Legal reforms are needed to address the accountability of manufacturers, developers, and owners in the event of accidents involving AVs, as well as to create a comprehensive regulatory framework that addresses both safety and technological innovation.

PRODUCT LIABILITY AND CONSUMER PROTECTION

The legal landscape surrounding product liability in India is primarily governed by the Consumer Protection Act, 2019, which provides a framework for holding manufacturers accountable for defects in products that cause harm to consumers. In theory, this law could apply to autonomous vehicles (AVs) if the vehicles are found to be defective or if the defect leads to accidents or injury. However, the application of this law to AVs is fraught with challenges due to the unique nature of autonomous technology, particularly the role of software in driving the vehicle's operations and decision-making processes.

Product Liability Under the Consumer Protection Act, 2019

The Consumer Protection Act, 2019 outlines product liability in Section 2(34) and establishes that manufacturers and service providers can be held liable for harm caused by defective products or services. According to the Act, a product is deemed defective if it does not meet the safety standards that a reasonable consumer would expect. In cases involving harm due to a defect, the victim can seek compensation from the manufacturer, service provider, or seller responsible for the defect.

Under this framework, if an autonomous vehicle were to malfunction or cause an accident due to a defect in its design, manufacturing, or functioning, the manufacturer could be held liable for the defect. However, the intricacies of autonomous technology complicate the application of this law, as the systems in an AV are far more complex than traditional mechanical vehicles. Autonomous vehicles rely on AI algorithms**,** machine learning**, and** sensor-based technologies to make real-time decisions and control the vehicle's actions. These systems are continuously evolving and can receive updates or modifications, often without consumer awareness or involvement.

One significant challenge in applying product liability laws to AVs is determining whether the

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

vehicle's design or the software responsible for its operation is defective. Unlike a traditional vehicle, where the cause of an accident may be traced to mechanical failure or a manufacturing defect, AVs involve a multitude of interconnected systems, such as sensors, software algorithms, and hardware, that work in tandem. If an AV causes an accident, identifying the root cause becomes more difficult, and liability may lie with several parties involved in the development and maintenance of the vehicle's complex technology.

Challenges in Applying Product Liability Laws to Autonomous Vehicles

The core of the issue lies in the "black-box" nature of autonomous vehicle systems. AVs, particularly those equipped with AI and machine learning, operate by processing vast amounts of real-time data from their sensors, cameras, and other onboard technologies. This data is then used by algorithms to make decisions about navigation, braking, acceleration, and collision avoidance. The complexity of these systems is further compounded by continuous software updates and the evolving nature of AI decision-making processes. This "black-box" behavior—the inability to fully trace how decisions are made by the AI—raises significant challenges when attempting to establish fault in the event of an accident.

For example, if an AV fails to recognize an obstacle or collides with another vehicle due to a software malfunction, identifying whether the fault lies with the vehicle's hardware, its software, or the AI algorithm becomes difficult. Since autonomous vehicles rely on algorithms that learn and adapt over time, understanding how these algorithms function at any given moment may be obscure, making it hard to prove that a defect or flaw in the system directly caused the accident.

Moreover, AVs frequently receive over-the-air (OTA) software updates, which can alter how the vehicle operates. These updates, while improving vehicle performance, can also inadvertently introduce new bugs or errors into the system. If an accident occurs shortly after such an update, determining whether the update contributed to the malfunction, or whether the software itself was defectively designed, becomes complicated.

The issue of attribution of fault further complicates the application of product liability laws. If an accident is caused by a malfunction of the vehicle's software or sensors, the question arises: who is to blame? Is it the manufacturer of the vehicle, the software developer, or a third-party company responsible for providing maintenance or software updates? In such cases, identifying the responsible party may involve complex forensic analysis of the vehicle's systems, requiring specialized expertise to unravel the problem.

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

Transparency and Data Access

The "black-box" nature of AI in autonomous vehicles also brings another challenge: data access. In order to determine liability, transparency regarding the vehicle's data is essential. Data related to the vehicle's operation—such as sensor readings, algorithmic decisions, and software logs—could provide crucial insights into what went wrong during an accident. However, this data is often proprietary and controlled by the manufacturer or the software provider. As such, obtaining access to the necessary data to identify the cause of an accident may require legal action or cooperation from the manufacturers, who may be reluctant to release it due to concerns about intellectual property or reputational damage.

In addition to data access, there is the issue of privacy. Autonomous vehicles collect massive amounts of data about their environment, the vehicle's performance, and the passengers within it. This includes sensitive data, such as location, driving habits, and personal interactions. In the event of an accident, this data could be vital to understanding the circumstances of the crash and attributing fault. However, the use of this data raises significant concerns about privacy rights and how it should be governed. India's evolving Data Protection Bill, 2019, which seeks to regulate the use and processing of personal data, could play a crucial role in setting the framework for how data from AVs is handled, especially in the context of liability and accident investigations.

III. GOVERNMENT RESISTANCE AND POLICY STANCE

The Indian government, under the leadership of Union Minister for Road Transport and Highways Nitin Gadkari, has exhibited significant caution in embracing autonomous vehicle (AV) technology, driven primarily by concerns over its potential impact on employment. This resistance is deeply rooted in socio-economic considerations, particularly the preservation of jobs in sectors that directly depend on human labor, such as taxi drivers, truck operators, and auto-rickshaw drivers, among others. In a country like India, where a large portion of the workforce is employed in the informal sector, these concerns resonate with millions of workers whose livelihoods are tied to the transportation industry.

A. Concerns Over Job Losses and Employment Displacement

Gadkari has publicly stated that he will not allow driverless cars to be introduced in India due to the potential displacement of millions of professional drivers. According to Gadkari's estimates, the introduction of AVs could lead to the loss of approximately 70-80 lakh (7–8 million) jobs, a figure that underscores the magnitude of the socio-economic challenge posed by automation in the Indian context. These jobs encompass a wide range of positions, from

long-distance truck drivers to city-based taxi and auto-rickshaw operators, all of whom depend on the traditional model of human-driven transportation.

In India, where unemployment rates are already a significant concern, and where the informal sector employs a large proportion of the population, the prospect of widespread job losses due to automation raises important questions about economic justice. For many workers in the transportation sector, driving is not merely a job but a crucial source of livelihood and a means of sustaining families. The loss of these jobs could exacerbate existing socio-economic inequalities, particularly in rural areas and lower-income groups where alternative employment opportunities may be scarce.

While the potential benefits of AVs—such as increased road safety, improved fuel efficiency, and reduced traffic congestion—are widely acknowledged, the socio-economic implications of these advancements cannot be ignored. The rapid adoption of AV technology could result in the marginalization of millions of workers, particularly those in low-skilled, manual jobs, thereby widening the gap between the technologically skilled and those left behind by automation.

A. Government's commitment to Job Preservation

The government's resistance to AVs, as articulated by Gadkari, is grounded in a commitment to preserving existing jobs and safeguarding the livelihoods of millions of drivers who rely on the transportation sector. In many ways, this resistance reflects a broader policy stance that prioritizes employment security over technological innovation. Gadkari's emphasis on maintaining jobs highlights the tension between technological progress and the protection of vulnerable sectors of the economy.

The Indian government's position is not unique; similar concerns have been raised globally about the displacement of workers due to automation in various industries. However, in a country like India, where job creation is already a significant challenge, the prospect of automation displacing workers is especially troubling. The government's cautious approach is aimed at ensuring that the human cost of technological advancements does not outweigh the benefits, particularly in a nation where economic inequality remains a pressing concern.

B. Implications for Innovation and Global Competitiveness

While the government's stance on job preservation is understandable from a socio-economic perspective, it also carries risks, particularly with regard to innovation and global competitiveness in the transportation sector. The world is increasingly moving towards automation, with countries like the United States, Germany, and China already investing

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

heavily in autonomous vehicle technology. By delaying or restricting the development of AVs, India risks falling behind in the global race for technological leadership and innovation.

The automotive industry is one of the largest contributors to India's economy, and the advent of AVs could offer opportunities for economic growth, technological advancement, and new business models. By embracing AVs, India could position itself as a leader in the emerging mobility ecosystem, creating new jobs in areas such as AI development, data analytics, software engineering, and robotics. However, the government's resistance to AV adoption may hinder the country's ability to tap into these opportunities, limiting the potential for growth and innovation in the sector.

Moreover, as the global demand for autonomous vehicles continues to rise, companies that are hesitant to adopt this technology may find themselves at a competitive disadvantage. This could affect both Indian automobile manufacturers and technology firms that could otherwise play a leading role in the development and deployment of AVs. The global supply chains for autonomous vehicle technologies are rapidly evolving, and India's ability to compete in these markets may be compromised if it maintains a conservative stance on AV adoption.

C. Balancing Socio-economic Concerns with Technological Progress

The key challenge facing the Indian government is to find a balance between protecting existing jobs and ensuring that the country does not miss out on the economic opportunities presented by automation. While job displacement is a legitimate concern, it should not be used as an excuse to stifle innovation and technological progress. Rather than a blanket resistance to AVs, the government could focus on developing policies that ensure a smooth transition for workers, such as re-skilling programs, job retraining initiatives, and safety nets for those displaced by automation.

In this regard, the government could adopt a gradual approach to AV implementation, allowing the technology to evolve while providing the workforce with time to adapt. This could include piloting AVs in controlled environments or specific regions, where their impact on jobs could be more closely monitored and managed. Additionally, the development of public-private partnerships could help create innovative models that balance the needs of workers with the benefits of technological advancement.

Furthermore, the government could explore policies that create new types of jobs in the AV ecosystem. For instance, as AVs become more widespread, there will be a growing need for technicians to maintain and repair these vehicles, as well as new business models that could emerge in the transportation sector. By promoting job creation in these areas, the government

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

can help ensure that workers are not left behind as automation becomes a key component of the economy.

IV. Legal Frameworks and International Comparisons

The global landscape for regulating autonomous vehicles (AVs) is evolving rapidly, as various countries attempt to create legal frameworks that balance innovation with safety, liability, and ethical considerations. As India contemplates the introduction of AVs, there are valuable lessons to be drawn from how other nations are approaching the complex legal challenges posed by autonomous transportation. This section will examine the legal approaches taken by key countries—the United States**,** the United Kingdom**,** and Germany—and highlight how their experiences can inform India's legal response to AVs.

A. Legal Approaches in Other Countries

United States: State-Based Regulation and Manufacturer Responsibility

In the United States, the legal landscape for autonomous vehicles is highly decentralized, with individual states playing a significant role in regulating the technology. While federal regulations have yet to be fully developed for AVs, states such as California, Arizona, and Nevada have already enacted laws to govern the testing and deployment of autonomous vehicles. These state-level regulations often focus on ensuring the safety of AVs through rigorous testing protocols and by imposing requirements on manufacturers to report accidents or safety-related incidents involving autonomous systems.

One of the key features of U.S. AV regulations is the assignment of liability to manufacturers when accidents occur while the vehicle is operating in autonomous mode. For example, California's regulations mandate that manufacturers of AVs assume responsibility for accidents caused by the vehicle's autonomous systems, particularly when the vehicle is operating without human intervention. This means that in the event of an accident, the manufacturer may be held accountable for defects in the vehicle's design, software, or failure to meet safety standards.

Additionally, some states have implemented strict requirements for data recording and real-time monitoring to help determine fault in the event of an accident. These regulations often mandate that AVs be equipped with comprehensive logging systems to track the vehicle's actions and decisions while operating autonomously. This data can be critical in resolving disputes about the cause of accidents, and it may be used to determine whether the fault lies with the vehicle's technology or another party.

While the approach in the United States provides a clear framework for assigning liability, it also highlights the need for uniformity in regulations, especially given that different states have adopted varying levels of restrictions and requirements. The lack of federal consistency can create confusion for manufacturers and consumers alike, particularly for companies seeking to operate AVs across multiple states with differing legal requirements.

United Kingdom: The Automated and Electric Vehicles Act, 2018

The United Kingdom has taken a slightly different approach to regulating autonomous vehicles with the Automated and Electric Vehicles Act, 2018, which established a legal framework specifically for AVs. One of the most notable features of this legislation is the liability shift from the vehicle owner or manufacturer to the insurer in the event of an accident caused by an AV operating in autonomous mode. This shift is significant because it removes the need to determine fault between multiple parties (such as the manufacturer, software developer, or vehicle owner) and simplifies the process for victims of AV accidents.

Under the Automated and Electric Vehicles Act, insurers are required to cover accidents caused by AVs while they are in autonomous mode, even if the incident occurs due to a malfunction or system error. This provision ensures that victims can receive compensation quickly and reduces the burden on individuals seeking legal recourse in the aftermath of an accident. The law also stipulates that insurance coverage is mandatory for all AVs, ensuring that there is financial protection in place for both owners and third parties involved in accidents.

This approach has the potential to streamline the legal process and avoid lengthy liability disputes, as the focus is placed on the insurance industry rather than determining fault between vehicle owners, manufacturers, and software developers. However, one challenge that remains in the UK system is the determination of fault in cases where the vehicle's AI or decision-making system malfunctions, leading to an accident. To address this, the UK has called for further research and collaboration between the insurance industry, technology developers, and policymakers to ensure that AV insurance can adapt to the evolving needs of the technology.

Germany: Data Recording and Transparency in Legal Disputes

Germany's approach to autonomous vehicle regulation places a strong emphasis on transparency and data collection. In 2017, the German government introduced legislation that mandates all AVs operating in the country to be equipped with systems that record data on driving decisions made by the vehicle's AI. This data is critical in the event of an accident, as

it can help investigators understand the specific decisions made by the AV's algorithm and whether those decisions were consistent with road safety regulations.

The German model is built on the premise that AVs should be able to explain their actions and decisions, much like a human driver would. This concept of explainable AI is essential for resolving legal disputes, particularly in cases where the AV's actions might be questioned. By requiring AVs to record driving decisions and other relevant data, Germany aims to ensure that accidents involving AVs can be investigated with greater precision and that liability can be attributed more accurately.

The data collected by these vehicles could include sensor readings, AI decision logs, and camera footage, all of which would provide a detailed picture of the vehicle's environment and actions at the time of the accident. This data would be invaluable for courts and insurance companies in determining fault and ensuring fair compensation for victims. The requirement for data logging also aligns with the broader trend toward digital accountability, where automated systems must be transparent and auditable to prevent misuse and ensure fairness in legal and regulatory contexts.

While Germany's data-logging approach is promising, it also raises privacy concerns. The collection of detailed data about the AV's operations could lead to potential abuses of personal data, particularly if the data contains information about individuals involved in accidents. As a result, strict regulations surrounding data privacy and data protection must be implemented alongside the data-logging requirements to ensure that the rights of individuals are not compromised.

B. Lessons for India

As India stands at the crossroads of technological advancement and social responsibility, it must forge a unique path in regulating autonomous vehicles (AVs)—one that draws upon global legal innovations while remaining rooted in domestic realities. A hybrid regulatory model is essential to strike a balance between embracing innovation and safeguarding public interest. The following key areas warrant focused attention:

Liability Distribution

A central challenge in the regulation of AVs lies in establishing clear and equitable liability norms. In contrast to traditional vehicles, where drivers are primarily accountable for accidents, AVs introduce multiple stakeholders—vehicle manufacturers, software developers, data analytics firms, and even infrastructure providers. Indian law must delineate these roles with precision. A tiered liability model, which allocates fault based on the specific source of

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

the malfunction (hardware, software, or external input), could serve as a feasible solution. This would not only aid judicial efficiency but also create legal certainty for stakeholders investing in AV technology.

Insurance Reforms

India's existing motor vehicle insurance regime is designed around human error. To integrate AVs, the insurance sector must undergo transformative reforms. A product-centric insurance framework, as adopted in the United Kingdom, could be adapted wherein insurers cover incidents during autonomous operation and recover costs from liable parties (e.g., manufacturers or developers) through subrogation. Additionally, India may consider the creation of a centralized fund to compensate victims in cases where fault is indeterminate, ensuring swift redressal while litigation unfolds.

Data Regulation and Transparency

Autonomous vehicles operate on vast streams of real-time data generated through sensors, GPS, AI algorithms, and environmental inputs. Establishing norms around data logging, storage, and access is crucial not only for accident investigation but also for public accountability. Drawing inspiration from Germany's model, India should mandate that AVs be equipped with standardized "event data recorders" (EDRs), functioning like aviation black boxes. These should log operational parameters and decision paths of the AI during critical events. Concurrently, stringent data protection measures must be implemented to prevent misuse, aligning with the principles laid out in India's Digital Personal Data Protection Act, 2023.

Job Protection Measures

India's vast informal transport workforce—comprising taxi drivers, truck operators, delivery agents, and auto-rickshaw drivers—faces existential threats from automation. It is imperative that any policy surrounding AV deployment includes a robust social cushioning mechanism. This could take the form of state-supported reskilling programs, particularly in fields such as AV maintenance, fleet operations, and logistics management. Furthermore, India may consider mandating human-assistance roles in AV operations during an interim phase, allowing a phased transition that preserves jobs while technological capacity matures.

V. CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

The emergence of autonomous vehicles (AVs) represents a significant technological leap in the transportation sector, with potential to enhance road safety, efficiency, and accessibility.

However, their adoption in India presents a complex interplay of legal, technological, and socio-economic challenges. The absence of a specialized legal framework, unresolved liability issues, and fears surrounding mass unemployment present formidable obstacles to integration.

As examined, India's current legal instruments such as the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 and the Consumer Protection Act, 2019 are inadequate for addressing the complexities of AV technology. Traditional models of driver liability cannot be easily applied to machine decision-making, especially when actions are taken by algorithms trained on vast datasets with opaque reasoning processes. Additionally, socio-economic considerations—particularly the threat to the livelihood of millions of drivers—cannot be ignored in a country with a significant informal workforce and growing unemployment concerns.

On the global front, countries such as the United States, United Kingdom, and Germany have initiated pragmatic legal and regulatory responses to the AV revolution. These experiences offer useful insights for India, especially in terms of liability assignment, insurance reforms, and transparency measures like mandatory data recording.

To move forward responsibly, India must embrace a cautious yet forward-thinking approach. The following suggestions are proposed:

- Draft a dedicated statute for autonomous vehicles that clearly defines legal categories, liability frameworks, and regulatory oversight mechanisms.
- Revise existing laws to integrate provisions for AI decision-making, software reliability, and automated risk management, particularly in motor vehicle and consumer protection legislations.
- Develop a national insurance policy model that accommodates no-fault liability, mandates data recording, and ensures equitable compensation mechanisms for victims of AV-related accidents.
- Launch large-scale workforce transition initiatives focusing on reskilling and upskilling drivers and transport workers to prepare them for new opportunities in AI-driven transport systems and maintenance.
- Establish a regulatory sandbox environment where AV technologies can be tested under monitored conditions, enabling lawmakers to study their real-world implications before full-scale deployment.

In sum, while the path to integrating autonomous vehicles in India is fraught with legal and socio-political complexities, a balanced approach—rooted in robust regulation, inclusive

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

economic planning, and adaptive legal reform—can turn these challenges into opportunities. India must aim not merely to adopt automation but to shape it in a way that is just, inclusive, and aligned with its unique developmental context.

*****

 [ISSN 2581-5369]