

Granting Legal Personality to Artificial Intelligence between Support and Objection

Dr. Seyed Hassan Shobeiri (Zanjani)^{1*}, Ali Hussein Rashid Al-Khayyat²

^{1*} Associate Professor- Faculty of Law, University of Qom, Qom, The Islamic Republic of Iran | Email: shshobeiri@gmail.com

²PhD Student, Faculty of Law, University of Qom, Qom, The Islamic Republic of Iran | Email: Ali.lawyer2315@gmail.com

***Corresponding Author:** Associate Professor. Dr. Seyed Hassan Shobeiri (Zanjani), Faculty of Law, University of Qom, Qom, The Islamic Republic of Iran | Email: shshobeiri@gmail.com

Introduction

First: Introduction to the Subject

During recent decades, the world has witnessed remarkable development in the field of artificial intelligence, as intelligent systems have become capable of performing tasks that were once the exclusive preserve of human beings, such as “making decisions, devising solutions, and managing complex operations independently”. This scientific and technical progress has raised profound legal questions concerning the status of artificial intelligence within the legal system, particularly with regard to its liability for acts and decisions taken without direct human intervention. Among the most prominent issues raised in this context is the question of granting legal personality to artificial intelligence; that is, recognising it as a legal “person” enjoying rights and bearing obligations, similar to natural or juridical persons. Legal scholarship has divided between a supporting view, which regards this as necessary in order to keep pace with technological development and ensure that intelligent entities are held accountable for their acts, and an opposing view, which considers that granting legal personality to a non-human entity constitutes a breach of the fundamental concepts of law and an encroachment upon human responsibility for creating these tools.

Second: Importance of the Research: The study of this subject acquires particular importance because it seeks to achieve a balance between the requirements of technological development and the need to protect firmly established legal principles, in a manner that ensures the harmony of the legal system with the new digital reality. The importance of the issue of granting legal personality to artificial intelligence, between support and objection, stems from the fact that it represents one of the most novel legal questions imposed by the contemporary technological revolution, because of its direct impact on the structure of the traditional legal system and its fundamental concepts, especially the concepts of “legal personality” and “legal responsibility”. With the increasing autonomy of artificial intelligence systems and their ability to make decisions without direct human intervention, the need has emerged to determine who bears the consequences of the acts of these systems.

Third: Research Problem: The research problem lies in the legislative inadequacy concerning rapidly developing artificial intelligence applications. The accelerated development of artificial intelligence technologies has led to the emergence of systems capable of thinking and making decisions in a semi-independent manner, which has raised fundamental questions about the position of these entities within the legal system. The problem is expressed through the following questions:

1. Can artificial intelligence systems be granted independent legal personality enabling them to acquire rights and bear responsibilities, or does this conflict with the traditional principles of law and require maintaining the liability of the human programmer or user?

2. What is meant by legal personality, and what conditions must exist for its acquisition? Does artificial intelligence possess characteristics that qualify it to be a legal person?

3. What are the legal effects resulting from granting or denying this status? How can a balance be achieved between technological innovation and the protection of legal and human values?

Fourth: Research Objectives: This study aims to achieve the following objectives:

1. To clarify the conceptual framework of the terms “legal personality” and “artificial intelligence”.

2. To present the doctrinal and legislative trends supporting and opposing the idea of granting artificial intelligence legal personality, while highlighting the arguments and justifications of each trend.

3. To assess the legal and practical effects resulting from granting artificial intelligence independent legal personality, particularly with regard to civil liability, criminal liability, contracts, and intellectual property.

Fifth: Research Methodology: The study adopts the analytical and descriptive method by describing and analysing the basic concepts related to legal personality and artificial intelligence, presenting the doctrinal and legislative trends concerning the subject, and analysing the justifications relied upon by both supporters and opponents of granting legal personality to artificial intelligence.

Sixth: Research Plan: In order to cover all aspects of the subject, the following research plan has been adopted:

First Section: The Legal Nature of Artificial Intelligence - Legal Personality

Second Section: The Supporting and Opposing Trends Concerning Granting Legal Personality to Artificial Intelligence

First Section

The Legal Nature of Artificial Intelligence - Legal Personality

Acknowledgement of the existence of a right requires the existence of persons, “the human being”, to whom the right is attributed and to whom legal personality is established; this is called the natural person.¹ Personality is also established for non-human entities, namely any group of assets or individuals, and this is called the juridical person.² However, determining the legal nature of artificial intelligence raises numerous problems represented by the legal liability arising from its applications and the extent to which legislation is appropriate and capable of absorbing the rapidly developing technical and technological characteristics of these technological programs. In order to address the subject, it will be examined in the following two Subsection.

¹ Natural person: The Iraqi legislator determined the beginning and end of natural personality by providing that “the personality of a human being begins upon his complete live birth and ends upon his death”. See Article 34(1) of the Iraqi Civil Code No. 40 of 1951.

² The Iraqi legislator defined juridical persons as follows: “A - the State. B - public departments and establishments to which the law grants legal personality independent from the personality of the State under the conditions it determines. C - governorates, municipalities and villages to which the law grants legal personality under the conditions it determines. D - religious communities to which the law grants legal personality under the conditions it determines. E - endowments. F - commercial and civil companies except those excluded by a text in the law. G - associations established in accordance with the provisions prescribed by law. H - every group of persons or assets to which the law grants juridical personality.” Article 47 of the Iraqi Civil Code No. 40 of 1951, as amended.

First Subsection

Legal Personality and Digital Personality of Artificial Intelligence

The legal system rests upon the principal distinction between things and persons, assigning to each category specific legal provisions and rules suited to its nature. The legal person is the principal subject of legal relations, which distinguishes it from the thing, the category opposite to it. Thus, the human being is the only being that represents the category of persons, while everything else must be included within the category of things.³ In order to address this subject, it will be examined in the following two branches.

First Branch

Legal Personality of the “Robot” in the Context of Artificial Intelligence

The European Parliament proposed conferring legal personality upon the robot, which means that such personality would be independent of the human being and responsible for harm caused to third parties. It also proposed granting the robot a form of juridical personality in order to meet practical necessities, including the possibility of defending such personality as broadly as possible so that the machine would occupy an appropriate legal position during its interaction with human beings.⁴

A strand of legal scholarship maintains that the importance and role of artificial intelligence in the various aspects of life must be recognised and that it should be granted legal personality enabling it to acquire rights and bear the obligations incumbent upon it, since the concept of personality is not confined to the natural person alone. This view relies on the proposition that “all human beings are persons, but not all persons are human beings”.⁵

Legal personality is granted, for example, to juridical persons represented by companies, although they are not human beings. Some scholars also consider that legal personality is not confined only to perception, management, or the human quality; rather, it extends to ethical and social values. Moreover, artificial intelligence systems have developed significantly in technological terms and in performing various automated tasks. The awareness of these applications has made them capable of taking necessary and appropriate decisions without human intervention, which has made them entities possessing self-awareness and independent will, thereby giving rise to the argument in favour of granting them juridical personality.⁶ Future generations may look upon our time and describe it as an age of immense and rapid technological changes. Within a short period, we have moved from a society dependent on machines to one dependent on electronics. As the information age continued to mature, society found itself compelled to deal with a wide range of algorithmic and data-based systems. Here, the term artificial tools is used.⁷

Second Branch

Digital Personality of the Robot as a Virtual Entity

The digital personality that should be granted to artificial intelligence applications is one that is distinguished by features and characteristics different from other entities existing in the virtual world and from

³ Ahmed Belhaj Jarrad, “The Legal Personality of Artificial Intelligence: A Misleading Anticipation”, published research in the *Kuwait International Law School Journal*, Issue 2, Year 11, serial issue, Kuwait, March 2023, p. 222.

⁴ The European Union Resolution issued on 16/2/2017 concerning the conferral of legal personality upon the robot.

⁵ Bilal Bou Arour, Akram Bou Selham, Salma Hannou, *The Nature of Law in the Age of Artificial Intelligence*, memorandum for obtaining a degree in public law, Mohammed I University, Multidisciplinary Faculty of Nador, Morocco, 2024, p. 21.

⁶ Abdullah Mousa and Ahmed Bilal, *Artificial Intelligence: A Revolution in the Technologies of the Age*, 1st ed., Dar Al-Kutub Al-Misriyya, Cairo, 2019, p. 24.

⁷ Artificial tools: These refer to devices and decision-support tools that rely on algorithmic, automated, or data-based learning procedures that include artificial intelligence applications in their various types and forms. These tools take two forms: 1. Ordinary devices, such as Roomba robots and recommendation engines on Internet networks. 2. Advanced devices, namely more developed cognitive systems such as Watson. These tools are an integral part of decision-making. For more, see: Osonde Osaba and William Welser IV, *The Risks of Artificial Intelligence to Security and the Future of Work: An Analytical Perspective*, RAND Corporation, research published on the website <https://www.rand.org/content/dam>, last visited on 4/2/2025.

the characters present on the electronic network that are managed by human beings, such as social media accounts. Digital personality is also confined to the digital virtual world and operates within it. Some forms have material embodiment and can act and move in a manner similar to human conduct; by such conduct they move outside the scope of digital personality.⁸

Granting legal personality to artificial intelligence would place it in a legal position similar to that of a natural person and a juridical person. Granting legal personality to artificial intelligence is also a relatively recent issue because there are different jurisprudential efforts, opinions, and doctrinal views concerning it. Since there is no necessary connection between legal personality and the human being, legal personality is a pure capacity to acquire rights, bear obligations, and participate in legal relations protected by law for the purpose of achieving certain objectives. Following economic and social developments and the emergence of many commercial activities, including the trademark industry, personality has been granted to non-human entities such as companies, which lack the human quality. Accordingly, it has become possible to grant legal personality to the artificial intelligence entity on the basis that legal and digital personality is independent and has no relation to humanity.⁹

Second Subsection

Virtual Personality and Electronic Personality of Artificial Intelligence

It is difficult to apply the law to electronic transactions, which has prompted legal scholarship to devise special rules for electronic transactions, including artificial intelligence applications that have gradually begun to occupy a place in human social and economic life and in commercial activities, including trademark creation and design. This has led to calls for granting artificial intelligence applications virtual personality and electronic personality as persons within the legal system, similar to the juridical person, and for the use of the robot in “design - product - use - utilisation, etc.” However, the characteristics of the virtual personality of artificial intelligence remain ambiguous. In order to address the subject, it will be examined in the following two branches.

First Branch

Virtual Personality within the Scope of Artificial Intelligence

The virtual personality of artificial intelligence applications is regarded as consisting of entities that affect and are affected in reality by other virtual entities. Virtual personality is a reality that has social, economic, political, cultural, commercial, and security connections, and so on. This personality in the virtual world represents a new reality that legal frameworks have not yet been broad enough to bring under their umbrella and regulate by legal provisions, because reality precedes legislation. Virtual personality also interacts in this electronic world and leaves legal marks, positions, and effects. In other words, this new personality embodies an entity that expresses one aspect of legal personality, and may be an independent legal personality like juridical personality; that is, it is a technological reality that produces legal effects.¹⁰ This personality is based on the theory of legal fiction of legal personality, on the basis that the logical and applicable trend is that human beings alone possess will, whereas recognition of personality for an immaterial thing takes place through fiction.¹¹

⁸ Dr. Hussein Abdullah Abdul-Rida Al-Kalabi and Kazem Hamdan Sadkhan, “The Legal Personality of Artificial Intelligence Entities between Acceptance and Rejection”, published research in the *Journal of the College of Law for Legal and Political Sciences*, Issue 46, 2023, p. 429.

⁹ Dr. Abdul-Razzaq Ahmed Mohammed Al-Miri, “Criminal Liability for Artificial Intelligence Crimes”, published research in the book of the Arab Democratic Center for Strategic, Political and Economic Studies, Germany, Berlin, 2024, p. 54.

¹⁰ Abdul-Fattah Helmy Bilal, “The Legal Features of Virtual Personality within the Electronic World”, research published on the website seconf.wordpress.com, 2015, last visited on 31/1/2025.

¹¹ Dr. Mohammed Abdel-Zaher Hussein, *The Injured Party's Fault and Its Effect on Liability*, Dar Al-Nahda Al-Arabiyya, Cairo, 2007, p. 20.

As for the electronic personality of artificial intelligence applications,¹² it has been described as “a personality closer to the technical side than to the legal side that is granted to ordinary persons who engage in activities through the Internet, and which differs from ‘virtual personality’, which represents a legal presumption arising from the necessities of practical reality”.¹³

Some scholars also advocate adopting the bundle theory of legal personality, through which artificial intelligence is granted legal personality possessing a bundle of characteristics corresponding to its nature as a machine equipped with artificial intelligence technology, having rights and bearing obligations enjoyed by the natural person and the juridical person. The purpose of this theory is to grant artificial intelligence systems electronic personality.¹⁴

An electronic person is every robot capable of making independent decisions intelligently or interacting independently with third parties. However, by its nature the robot is merely a machine carrying artificial intelligence in the physical world. Accordingly, the robot is non-visible, “virtual” artificial intelligence. It is therefore necessary to examine the nature of the robot’s belonging in terms of the existing legal categories, represented by “natural person - juridical person - animal - anything else”. It cannot be included within any of these categories; rather, it requires a new category bearing a special legal personality related to artificial intelligence applications. The electronic person cannot conclude certain contracts, such as gifts and marriage, because they depend on human perception and senses. It is also incapable of bringing lawsuits and cannot determine the extent of the harm it has suffered, especially if the harm is moral.¹⁵

We consider that the majority of legal systems recognise the legal personality of the natural person and the juridical person. However, recognition of legal personality for the natural person is based on a simple fact, namely that he is human, irrespective of his capacity for discernment and perception, although his real existence is required. As for the juridical person, it is a non-human entity to which the law grants certain rights and obligations, and the law lays down general prior conditions that must be fulfilled before granting it legal personality. These entities must be capable of acquiring rights and bearing the obligations incumbent upon them independently of the legal personality of the persons or companies constituting them. Moreover, granting artificial intelligence the acquisition of legal personality remains an assumption that is inconsistent with legal logic, even if it is granted a special form of personality, as some have called it “electronic personality”.

Second Branch

Parties to Liability Arising from Artificial Intelligence Applications in the Context of the Trademark

Considering the legislative vacuum, modern technology and legal legislation are interconnected for the purpose of searching for and investigating more effective means of achieving legal certainty¹⁶ and achieving the necessary legal solutions when harmful acts affecting the trademark occur in a manner consistent with newly emerging requirements. No legislation or regulation can be issued without considering the consequences and effects arising from it, through regulating the legal liability arising from such acts, while specific applications exist in some laws.¹⁷ Legal liability arising from the acts of artificial intelligence systems in the context of the trademark is linked to several parties, as follows.

¹² The legal personality of the robot differs legally from the juridical personality granted by law to juridical persons, because the robot would be granted autonomous machine thinking rather than human thinking, which justifies granting it independent financial patrimony. For more, see: Dr. Hossam El-Din Mahmoud Hassan, “The Reality of the Legal Personality of Artificial Intelligence”, published research in *Ruh Al-Qawanin Journal*, Issue 102, 2023, p. 154.

¹³ Dr. Hussein Abdullah Abdul-Rida Al-Kalabi and Kazem Hamdan Sadkhan, previous source, p. 429.

¹⁴ Khaled Mamdouh Ibrahim, *The Legal Regulation of Artificial Intelligence*, Dar Al-Fikr Al-Jami'i, Egypt, 2022, p. 135.

¹⁵ Dr. Musab Ibrahim Mohammed, “Artificial Intelligence and the Legal Vision”, published research in the book *The Future of Artificial Intelligence: Legal and Ethical Challenges*, Arab Democratic Center for Strategic, Political and Economic Studies, 1st ed., Berlin, 2024, p. 89.

¹⁶ Omari Mousa and Weiss Bilal, *The Legal Effects Arising from the Use of Artificial Intelligence*, Master’s thesis, Ziane Achour University, Djelfa, 2020-2021, p. 46.

¹⁷ Articles 173-178 of the Egyptian Civil Code No. 131 of 1948; Articles 288-291 of the Jordanian Civil Code No. 43 of 1976; and Article 316 of the Civil Transactions Law of the United Arab Emirates No. 50 of 2022, which provides that “whoever has under his control things that require

First: The Manufacturer: This is also called the “producer”.¹⁸ It covers all movable things without specifying their material or immaterial nature, which applies to artificial intelligence technologies. Its primary objective is to obtain the greatest possible profit without taking into account any other dimensions or harms that its product may cause to third parties, and without observing the required quality during manufacturing. This is what is called “development risks”.¹⁹ The manufacturer is the sole controller of operating systems. Its liability arises when the robot commits an act contrary to law, when the technology goes out of control, or when decisions result from defective design. However, the manufacturer provides itself with a protective cover by including in the user contract conditions signed by the other party, “the owner”. Thus, the manufacturer abandons and evades legal liability and shifts it to the owner for the acts arising from and committed by artificial intelligence.²⁰

The Iraqi legislator defined the supplier as “every natural or juridical person who is a producer, importer, exporter, distributor, seller of a commodity, or provider of a service, whether as principal, intermediary, or agent”.²¹

The producer is liable not on the basis of fault or risk, but on the basis of a defect in the machine arising from poor manufacturing, under liability arising from defective products, because it does not provide safety and is subject to the obligation of safety. Poor manufacturing or negligence in manufacturing leads to the robot departing from its work and its normal use.²²

The European directives referred to exempting the producer from liability by stating that “the producer may be discharged from civil liability for the defective product if he proves that the state of science and knowledge at the time the product was put into circulation was not sufficient to discover that defect”.²³

Given the seriousness of this exemption, which serves the interests of producers and causes harm to consumers, the European Directive at the same time gave Member States, as a compromise solution, the right to accept or reject this defence. Each State may derogate from Article 7 and maintain in its national legislation the producer’s liability for development risks even if the state of scientific or technical knowledge became clear at the moment the product was placed in circulation.²⁴

As for the French legislator,²⁵ it deemed the producer liable for harm by providing that “the producer is liable by operation of law unless he proves that the state of technical and scientific knowledge at the time the product was placed in circulation did not permit discovery of the defect”. However, the French legislator yielded to pressure from major production companies, insurance companies, professional organisations, and

special care to prevent their harm, or mechanical machines, shall be liable for the harm caused by such things or machines except for what cannot be avoided, without prejudice to any special provisions in this regard.”

¹⁸ Product: A thing offered by a company to satisfy customers, whether tangible or intangible. This product may be a single product, a group of products, or a combination of product and service. For more, see: Nano Fares, *Legal Liability for the Use of Artificial Intelligence*, Master’s thesis, Faculty of Law and Political Science, Mohamed Boudiaf University of M’sila, 2023-2024, p. 18.

¹⁹ The term development risks is a relatively modern term that has spread recently and is also called “risks of growth”, “risks of progress”, or “risks of technical development”. However, “development risks” is a general and comprehensive term. Although most legislations regulating producer liability have referred to this term, they have not defined it, which led legal scholars to define these risks as “science revealing defects in products after they have been placed in circulation at a time when the state of scientific and technical knowledge did not allow their discovery before they were placed in circulation”. For more, see: Dr. Dara’ Hammad, “Civil Liability for Risks of Technical Development”, published research in the *Journal of the Faculty of Law*, Al-Nahrain University, Vol. 9, Issue 16, 2006, p. 209; Dr. Saad Yahya, *Regulating the Transfer of Scientific Knowledge*, Mansha’at Al-Ma’arif Publishing, Alexandria, 1986, p. 10. The European Directive on product liability defined development risks as “the state of scientific and technical knowledge at the time products are placed in circulation that does not allow discovery of the defect”. See Article 7 of the European Directive on Product Liability No. 374 of 1985.

²⁰ Omari Mousa and Weiss Bilal, previous source, p. 38.

²¹ Article 1(Sixth) of Consumer Protection Law No. 1 of 2010.

²² Nano Fares, *Legal Liability for the Use of Artificial Intelligence*, Master’s thesis, Faculty of Law and Political Science, Mohamed Boudiaf University of M’sila, 2023-2024, p. 45.

²³ Article 7(5) of the European Directives of 1985.

²⁴ Article 15(1) of the European Directives of 1985.

²⁵ The French legislator introduced the provisions of European Directive No. 85-374 into its civil law by issuing Law No. 98-389 on 19/5/1998, which added a fourth bis chapter to the third book of the French Civil Code under the title “Liability for Defective Products”.

consumer associations opposed to that approach, which led to development risks being considered a ground for exempting the producer from liability.²⁶

Second: The Programmer: This is the person who programs and designs artificial intelligence applications. The harmful act represented by fault may occur on the part of the programmer of these systems, for example by installing a program to design a trademark for a particular commodity or commercial service, thereby causing harm to third parties.²⁷

Third: The Owner: This is the professional person who uses and exploits artificial intelligence, “the robot”, for his personal interest, whether for his own service or for the service of his consumer public, and disposes of it to third parties whether for consideration or without consideration. It is presumed that he is responsible for it and for its operation.²⁸ His liability arises when artificial intelligence applications are misused, leading to the occurrence of an act contrary to legal rules.²⁹ Legal liability for fault arises in two forms, as follows:

1. The owner’s legal liability arises when the fault occurs as a result of the owner’s use of artificial intelligence applications, or when he has a role in prompting artificial intelligence alone, without others, to commit conduct contrary to law, or when he fails to follow the instructions and preventive or directive guidelines issued by the manufacturer.³⁰
2. Legal liability is joint when the harmful act occurs by the owner in conjunction with other parties represented by “the manufacturer, the programmer, the artificial intelligence technology itself, or an external party”.³¹

Fourth: The Artificial Intelligence Systems Themselves: Artificial intelligence applications do not perform hostile acts against the trademark, violate it, or make decisions contrary to applicable laws by themselves. Rather, this is determined, trained, and programmed by human beings, since artificial intelligence is merely a tool that the programmer equips with technologies that enable it to infringe the trademark.³²

Nevertheless, legal liability arises if artificial intelligence systems, “the robot”, cause harm to third parties of their own accord without a programming fault; that is, as a result of self-development occurring in the artificial intelligence system in which it operates and its ability to think and issue decisions. In other words, artificial intelligence systems may issue erroneous decisions on behalf of users without obtaining their prior approval.³³ There are two forms of fault giving rise to the harmful act, as follows:

1. The legal liability of artificial intelligence arises through its participation with another party, and thus it is considered a participant in committing the harmful act. An example is the robot exceeding the limits set for it by the programmer in making the trademark, placing it in a state of disconnection from the manufacturer and giving it complete freedom in its actions without the restrictions imposed by the programmer to prevent it from committing the harmful act.
2. The harmful act is committed by artificial intelligence itself, without a programming fault by the manufacturer or intervention by any other party, through modern technologies that enable artificial intelligence to think and issue autonomous decisions, so that it alone is responsible for issuing them.³⁴

²⁶ Article 1245/4-10 of the French Civil Code 1998.

²⁷ Mohammed Al-Awadi, “Producer Liability for Industrial Products”, published research in the *Civil Law Journal*, Moroccan Center for Legal Studies and Consultations and Dispute Resolution, Issue 1, 2014, p. 25.

²⁸ Dr. Khaled Mustafa Fahmy, *Legal Liability Arising from the Use of Artificial Intelligence and Robots in Light of European Directives and National Legislation: A Comparative Study*, Dar Al-Fikr Al-Jami’i, Alexandria, 1st ed., 2024, p. 247.

²⁹ Nano Fares, previous source, p. 46.

³⁰ Omari Mousa and Weiss Bilal, previous source, p. 39; Dr. Khaled Mustafa Fahmy, previous source, p. 248.

³¹ Nano Fares, previous source, p. 46.

³² Dr. Khaled Mustafa Fahmy, previous source, p. 254.

³³ *Principles and Ethics of Artificial Intelligence*, Saudi Data and Artificial Intelligence Authority (SDAIA), second edition, Definitions, 2024, p. 31.

³⁴ Omari Mousa and Weiss Bilal, previous source, p. 40.

Fifth: The External Party: This refers to artificial intelligence programs being exposed to intervention by an external party and an attempt to disable them or expose them to harmful viruses that make them operate in an unexpected manner capable of causing harm to third parties, or to hack the electronic cloud through which commands are collected and sent to artificial intelligence technology.³⁵ Legal liability arises when an external party enters artificial intelligence systems to commit a harmful act by hacking or by any other means, controls them, and exploits them in committing the harmful act. This intervention occurs in two forms, as follows:

1. The external party exploits a vulnerability in artificial intelligence systems to commit the harmful act, whether this intervention results from negligence by the owner or by the manufacturer of this technology. In that case, legal liability is joint between the external party and the person whose negligence occurred, such as the owner of artificial intelligence allowing another person to access the control system of artificial intelligence technology, thereby making it easier for him to issue commands, including commands causing harm to the making or design of a particular trademark.
2. The external party exploits a vulnerability in artificial intelligence systems without assistance or negligence by the owner of the artificial intelligence systems. In this case, legal liability rests upon the external party alone, such as entering and issuing commands to artificial intelligence to infringe the trademark.³⁶

We consider that recognising legal personality for artificial intelligence applications would lead to relieving the producers, manufacturers, and owners of these applications from the burdens of liability, and would take us to the logic of holding the application accountable by resorting to vicarious liability on the basis that the intelligent application is subordinate to the producer, manufacturer, operator, user, or owner. The development occurring in artificial intelligence systems has begun to rival human intelligence and has become an unavoidable reality that we live. Harmful acts arising from artificial intelligence applications cannot be excluded from the circle of legal liability, whether civil or criminal. Traditional legal rules are unsuitable for application and are incapable of finding legal solutions and determining legal liability arising from harmful acts resulting from the use of artificial intelligence applications, which are connected with more than one party to liability, represented by “the producer, user, owner, designer, artificial intelligence itself, consumer, and third party”.

Second Section

The Supporting and Opposing Trends Concerning Granting Legal Personality to Artificial Intelligence

Legal personality enables its holder to be an actor at the legal level, allowing it to interact with corresponding legal positions and perform specific legal acts as a means of regulating social conduct. The acquisition of legal status is not confined to human beings, but has extended to juridical entities through calls to broaden the concept of legal personality and make it include entities that share with human beings the attribute of biological life. These entities include “animals, machines, products, elements of nature, and inanimate entities”, with recognition³⁷ of legal personality for them. Granting legal personality to artificial intelligence and its various applications is among the difficult and complex questions and problems raised by the emergence and spread of artificial intelligence in recent times. Opinion has divided into two trends. In order to address the subject, it will be examined in the following two subsections.

³⁵ Dr. Khaled Mustafa Fahmy, previous source, p. 253.

³⁶ Omari Mousa and Weiss Bilal, previous source, p. 41.

³⁷ General recognition: the issuance of a general legal regulation that sets certain conditions; whenever they are fulfilled by a group of persons or a group of assets, they acquire legal personality by operation of law and are deemed juridical persons. As for special recognition, it is the recognition required by the legislator and considered necessary for an authority, institution, or organisation to enjoy legal personality. For more, see: Dr. Majid Ahmed Ibrahim, “The Legal Nature of Artificial Intelligence Systems and Its Effect on Establishing Civil Liability: A Comparative Study”, published research in *Legal Researcher Journal for Legal Sciences*, Vol. 4, Issue 1, August 2023, p. 88.

First Subsection

The Supporting Trend for Granting Legal Personality to Artificial Intelligence

Many legislations and international agreements have recognised artificial intelligence. However, this recognition has not included a comprehensive legal treatment of the various aspects related to it. They have also confused the concept of automation with the autonomy of these applications. In order to address the subject, it will be examined in the following branches.

First Branch

Recognition of Legal Personality for Artificial Intelligence Applications

Granting legal personality to artificial intelligence is not an easy matter, as it is accompanied by many risks and legal challenges. Recognition of legal personality means that the rights and interests of the person concerned are protected by law. As a result of technical development in artificial intelligence applications, they have come to share the skill of intelligence with human intelligence. If the law perceives intelligence, understanding, and perception in artificial intelligence applications that share with the human being the vital quality, then these entities are more deserving of legal personality.³⁸ Artificial intelligence systems are originally composed of a set of software programs that simulate human intelligence and sometimes surpass it. This is a human intellectual creation falling within the scope of property rights. Supporters of this trend rely on several foundations and pillars for recognising legal personality, represented by the following:

1. Granting legal personality to artificial intelligence is not for its protection alone; rather, such protection extends to society from unlawful uses of it that may cause harm to others, especially where it is accompanied by a clear and tangible physical existence together with mental and intellectual existence, sensory perception, and thought that cannot be ignored or denied.³⁹
2. Legislators attempt to enact legislation that determines a new legal status for artificial intelligence systems in order to control the future development of such machines. In addition, several international agreements have indirectly acknowledged the role of machines operating through artificial intelligence systems, although they have not included a comprehensive treatment of the various aspects related to it. They treated them in the same manner as belonging to a single group without distinguishing among them on the basis of their degree of development and autonomy. They also confused the concept of autonomy with automation in these programs, as most considered their acts to be an extension of their users.⁴⁰ In 2017, the European Parliament submitted a request to the European Commission for a proposal calling for conferring legal personality upon the robot that can interact and communicate independently with third parties, and this was approved.⁴¹
3. In view of the flexibility of the concept of legal personality and the weakening of the distinction between person and thing, supporters of this trend rely on a central idea: that expanding the concept of legal personality remains possible, and that changing the value-based view of some things makes it capable of accommodating artificial intelligence and removing it from the category of the system of things into the category of the system of persons as an effect of the autonomy characteristic possessed by artificial intelligence, which makes it suitable for legal regulation of its provisions.⁴²

³⁸ Ahmed Belhaj Jarrad, previous source, p. 223.

³⁹ Bilal Bou Arour, Akram Bou Selham, Salma Hannou, previous source, p. 14.

⁴⁰ Dr. Farida Ben Othman, "Artificial Intelligence", *Journal of Politics and Law Notebooks*, Vol. 12, Issue 2, 2020, p. 160.

⁴¹ Zuhour Ismail Mohammed Bazar, "The Possibility of Applying Artificial Intelligence Technologies to the Legal Profession", published research in the book *The Future of Artificial Intelligence: Legal and Ethical Challenges*, Arab Democratic Center for Strategic, Political and Economic Studies, 1st ed., Germany, Berlin, 2024, p. 247.

⁴² Ahmed Belhaj Jarrad, previous source, p. 223.

4. Artificially intelligent entities may be granted limited legal personality,⁴³ that is, restricted within the limits that ensure their accountability for harms they cause to third parties. This means implicit recognition for robots of some powers of the juridical person, subjecting them to registration procedures in a register specially prepared for that purpose, granting them financial patrimony for insuring their activities, and granting them limited capacity for dealing with compensation claims that may be brought against them.⁴⁴

5. Any entity that possesses independent will, thought, and self-awareness is qualified to enjoy legal personality. This description applies to artificial intelligence entities because they are capable of operating independently without human intervention. Supporters of this trend rely on awareness, perception, and the approach of developing systems capable of thinking like human beings.⁴⁵

6. The European Parliament's 2017 resolution on civil law rules on robotics, which recognises the specificity of robots as "electronic persons"⁴⁶ equipped with the capacity to learn and the need to develop new rules of liability, may be regarded as a qualitative legal shift concerning recognition of the legal personality of artificial intelligence. It takes into account the extent of the development of robots and the control of the human user over them. This prompted inquiry into the nature of the robot's belonging in terms of existing legal categories: natural person, juridical person, animal, or any element of nature. Accordingly, the robot cannot be included within any of those categories; rather, it requires a new category bearing legal personality specific to this application of artificial intelligence and its entry into the legal system.⁴⁷

7. Calls have emerged to grant legal personality to artificial intelligence systems because they have become more complex. The Korean legislator granted legal personality to the robot, defining it as "a mechanical instrument that perceives its external environment, distinguishes circumstances, and moves voluntarily". It was given the right to life and not to be destroyed. If the robot causes any harm, it must provide compensation through the existence of an independent financial patrimony.⁴⁸

We consider that artificial intelligence technologies are nothing more than human products with inherent danger. Their material independence from the human being, represented by "the producer, designer, programmer, user, consumer, etc.", does not make them an independent legal subject unless this is accompanied by legal recognition of their legal personality and the consequent independence of financial and administrative patrimony and legal capacity. Intelligent systems are still restricted by software input and cannot make decisions outside their programming. The clear deficiency in the legal frameworks regulating artificial intelligence applications complicates the possibility of granting legal personality to artificial intelligence.

Second Branch

The Opposing Trend against Granting Legal Personality to Artificial Intelligence

Proponents of the opposing trend consider that artificial intelligence technologies do not deserve to be granted legal personality definitively, especially at the present stage, because they have not yet reached the level of human intelligence, are not independent, and cannot enjoy legal capacity.⁴⁹ Supporters of the

⁴³ Ahmed Ali Hassan Othman, "The Reflections of Artificial Intelligence on Civil Law: A Comparative Study", published research in the *Journal of Legal and Economic Research* "Mansoura", Vol. 11, Issue 67, July 2021, p. 1510.

⁴⁴ Dr. Majid Ahmed Ibrahim, "The Legal Nature of Artificial Intelligence Systems and Its Effect on Establishing Civil Liability: A Comparative Study", published research in *Legal Researcher Journal for Legal Sciences*, Vol. 4, Issue 1, August 2023, p. 79.

⁴⁵ Dr. Hussein Abdullah Abdul-Rida Al-Kalabi and Kazem Hamdan Sadkhan, previous source, p. 436.

⁴⁶ European Civil law rules in Robots, 3.1, p. 18.

⁴⁷ Mustafa Rateb Hassan Ali, "Civil Liability for Damage Caused by the Robot: A Comparative Study", published research in the *Journal of Jurisprudential and Legal Research*, Faculty of Sharia and Law, Al-Azhar University branch, Damanhur, Vol. 36, Issue 44, January 2024, p. 859.

⁴⁸ Article 2 of the Korean Act on the Development of Intelligent Robots and Promotion of Distribution No. 9014 of 2008.

⁴⁹ Zuhour Ismail Mohammed Bazar, previous source, p. 249.

opposing trend against granting artificial intelligence legal personality⁵⁰ also argue that adapting certain legal provisions and judicial precedents through broad interpretation for specific purposes, in order to infer a legal will as the first foundational elements for recognising legal personality for a category of elements of nature, does not alter the fact that the vision and conclusions confirm the binary distinction between person and thing. Legislative choices give these things special regimes and provisions for their protection without elevating them to the status of rights holder, which is consistent with legal logic. Supporters of this rejecting trend rely on several grounds, represented by the following:

1. Although legal personality is connected to the human being and granted to him because he is human, the legal position contradicts this, because legal personality is granted to the human being when he is capable of acquiring rights and bearing obligations, whether as principal or representative. Here there is no escape from recognising legal personality for him, because it is a legal acknowledgement of him and not an assumed legal innovation.⁵¹

2. Recognising legal personality for artificial intelligence entities and linking this personality to liability would lead to dangerous deviations represented by the non-liability of “the producer, designer, programmer, user, etc.”. This would reduce their degree of care during manufacturing, production, design, or safe and non-dangerous use, because liability would be confined to artificial intelligence itself.⁵²

3. Artificial intelligence systems and applications absolutely lack capacity and must be attached to other machines, inanimate objects, animals, and other elements of nature. Even if they possess a degree of perception, intelligence, and thinking similar to human intelligence, these systems are regarded as movable property owned by human beings, subject to human custody and control. The human being will bear responsibility for what they cause by way of destruction and harm to third parties if he fails in guarding them or is negligent in supervising them, pursuant to the tort rules governing the liability of the custodian of things. This trend is fully compatible with existing laws and systems.⁵³

4. Expanding the scope of legal personality to include many types of animals and some elements of nature is a trend based on an inaccurate reading of legal data and leads to results that increase the complexity of the relevant provisions. It does not achieve the required effectiveness, which makes it an invalid basis for relying upon and demanding the attribution of legal personality to artificial intelligence.⁵⁴

5. Numerous thorny and complex problems would arise if legal personality were recognised for artificial intelligence, such as the issue of the right to compensation for harms caused to it by third parties as long as it enjoys simulation of the human mind.⁵⁵

6. Granting legal personality to artificial intelligence entities would create major fundamental paradoxes that would be difficult to resolve in the future. These include the difficulty of separating the fault of the artificial intelligence system from the fault of “the producer, operator, manufacturer, owner, or user”. If legal personality is recognised for an artificial intelligence system, how can the conduct of the technical mechanism be assessed independently despite its capacity for learning and autonomous management being linked to the person of the owner or operator? In addition, it is difficult to distinguish between the fault of the artificial intelligence system and the fault of its programmer or operator, except in cases attributable to negligence by the user of the system or to the

⁵⁰ Dr. Musab Ibrahim Mohammed, “Artificial Intelligence and the Legal Vision”, published research in the book *The Future of Artificial Intelligence: Legal and Ethical Challenges*, Arab Democratic Center for Strategic, Political and Economic Studies, 1st ed., Germany, Berlin, 2024, p. 96.

⁵¹ Bilal Bou Arour, Akram Bou Selham, Salma Hannou, previous source, p. 15.

⁵² Dr. Hussein Abdullah Abdul-Rida Al-Kalabi and Kazem Hamdan Sadkhan, previous source, p. 442.

⁵³ Dr. Mohammed Irfan Al-Khatib, “The Legal Status of the Robot: Personality and Liability”, published research in the *Kuwait International Law School Journal*, Year 6, Issue 4, December 2018, p. 121.

⁵⁴ Ahmed Belhaj Jarrad, previous source, p. 237.

⁵⁵ Dr. Hussein Abdullah Abdul-Rida Al-Kalabi and Kazem Hamdan Sadkhan, previous source, p. 442.

artificial intelligence system receiving inaccurate data or inputs that resulted in the fault causing harm to third parties.⁵⁶

7. Artificial intelligence entities lack financial patrimony, which constitutes a principal obstacle to granting legal personality to artificial intelligence applications. This deficiency undermines the objective upon which the idea of granting legal personality was built, namely the protection of their users from errors affecting third parties and arising from use.⁵⁷

8. There are many criticisms directed at legal personality, its expansion, its continuous and growing development, and the exploitation of models of contemporary legislative visions concerning its attribution. There is also a change in the view of certain things and an attempt to interpret them in an expansive direction within the scope of legal personality, together with confusion between the philosophical meaning of personality and the legal meaning, which would make it extend to other entities in order to achieve certain interests that an individual cannot achieve alone.⁵⁸ Moreover, the majority of scholars still view artificial intelligence as falling within the category of things rather than persons and consider it too early to attempt to change this.⁵⁹

9. Granting legal personality to artificial intelligence means creating a legal system for non-humans, which means the emergence of another society parallel to human society. This may indicate the occurrence of numerous problems between the two societies and may ultimately lead to one being given preference over the other, which conflicts with human dignity, for which law was originally established to protect and preserve.⁶⁰

10. Legal personality should not be granted to artificial intelligence because creative work cannot exist without human presence. No matter how capable the machine is of interaction, it cannot be independent of the intervention of the human being who created it and who has the ability to control it. In addition, machines that rely on artificial intelligence depend on the programmer and on the databases established and programmed by the human being.⁶¹

We consider that the objective of recognising legal personality for artificial intelligence systems is the possibility of determining the person responsible for the harms caused by artificial intelligence. Recognition of rights for artificial intelligence also protects it from attacks by third parties, and its bearing of obligations arising from its acts will protect others from it. Therefore, artificial intelligence applications, whether at present or in the future, are not qualified technically, technologically, or legally to acquire juridical legal personality, because they consist of a set of electronic technical systems and programs whose activities aim to provide various services to the public, including services related to trademarks. Accordingly, the need has emerged to grant juridical personality to artificial intelligence so that it may have a recognised legal existence.

Third Branch

Consequences Arising from Artificial Intelligence Acquiring Legal Personality

Legal personality begins for a person when the legislator recognises it either generally or specifically, which is a necessary condition for it. Artificial intelligence systems will produce a new generation alongside human beings, requiring that they be granted legal personality distinguishing them from natural persons and juridical

⁵⁶ Dr. Muammer Ben Taria, "Damage Caused by Robots and Artificial Intelligence Technologies", *Annals of the University of Algiers*, special issue of the international forum, Algeria, 27-28 November 2018, p. 136.

⁵⁷ Dr. Hussein Abdullah Abdul-Rida Al-Kalabi and Kazem Hamdan Sadkhan, previous source, p. 444.

⁵⁸ Ahmed Belhaj Jarad, previous source, p. 224.

⁵⁹ The French Parliamentary Office for Scientific and Technological Assessment confirmed in its report issued on 15/3/2017 that "the framing of incidents arising from the activities of artificial intelligence applications does not fall outside one of two regimes: 1. The first regime: the legal regime of liability for things. 2. The second regime: the legal regime of defective products - warranty against hidden defects. This is the prevailing trend at present in Anglo-American and European scholarship." For more, see: Dr. Majid Ahmed Ibrahim, previous source, p. 79.

⁶⁰ Dr. Musab Ibrahim Mohammed, previous source, p. 97.

⁶¹ Zainab Abdul Latif Khaled Abdul Latif, "Generative Artificial Intelligence: Legal and Technological Challenges for Intellectual Property Laws", published research in the book *The Future of Artificial Intelligence: Legal and Ethical Challenges*, Arab Democratic Center for Strategic, Political and Economic Studies, 1st ed., Germany, Berlin, 2024, p. 342.

persons. This personality is represented by self-autonomous robots, which are considered electronic persons responsible for the faults they commit and for compensating anyone who suffers harm. This, in itself, means recognition of legal personality for artificial intelligence systems. When artificial intelligence acquires legal personality, a number of consequences arise, represented by the following:

First: Considering it a person of law: Pursuant to this recognition, artificial intelligence applications become legal persons, subject to its provisions and addressed by its rules within the limits determined by law and in a manner consistent with the nature of artificial intelligence applications.

Second: Acquisition of rights inherent to legal personality: Artificial intelligence applications obtain rights inherent to their juridical personality that are compatible with them and represented by the following:

1. A specific name: Artificial intelligence entities have a name given to them by the manufacturing companies. This differs from the name of the natural person and from the name of the juridical person; that is, artificial intelligence has a name specific to it and distinguishing it from others. In most cases, it is derived from the nature of the activity it performs, and the law protects this name from any infringement represented by its use or impersonation by third parties.

2. Registration: This means registering it officially before the administrative authorities operating in the State, such as the companies registrar, and thus artificial intelligence applications come to enjoy capacity to perform acts and capacity to acquire rights and bear obligations.

3. Legal capacity: The capacity of artificial intelligence includes both capacity to perform acts and capacity to acquire rights and bear obligations. Capacity to perform acts is the ability to dispose, while capacity to acquire rights and bear obligations represents the person's aptitude to establish rights and have obligations attached to him. It is a capacity restricted within the limits recognised by law, represented by the purpose for which this entity was manufactured.⁶² The Iraqi legislator recognised the principle of restricted capacity and the principle of specialisation with regard to the juridical person. It restricted the capacity of the juridical person by providing that "it has capacity to perform acts within the limits indicated by its instrument of creation and imposed by law".⁶³

The juridical person enjoys full capacity to acquire rights and bear obligations, but it is restricted by limitations derived from the nature of its formation and from what is imposed by law, the instrument of creation, or the internal regulations. The Iraqi legislator referred to this limitation by providing that "a juridical person enjoys all rights except those inherent in the quality of the natural person, within the limits prescribed by law".⁶⁴

4. Independent financial patrimony: Artificial intelligence, "the robot", and intelligent systems are granted financial patrimony measured by analogy with the financial patrimony of juridical persons, represented by the market value of the robot, databases, revenues from their use, profits from their sale, and their exploitation.⁶⁵ Artificial intelligence applications have financial patrimony that is inseparably linked to personality. This patrimony is independent from the financial patrimonies of the natural and juridical persons investing in or producing it. These financial assets justify granting it legal personality.⁶⁶

⁶² Dr. Hussein Abdullah Abdul-Rida Al-Kalabi and Kazem Hamdan Sadkhan, previous source, p. 431.

⁶³ The Iraqi legislator recognised the principle of restricted capacity and the principle of specialisation with regard to the juridical person. It restricted the capacity of the juridical person by providing: "it has capacity to perform acts within the limits indicated by its instrument of creation and imposed by law". See Article 48(4) of the Iraqi Civil Code No. 40 of 1951, as amended.

⁶⁴ Article 48(2) of the Iraqi Civil Code No. 40 of 1951, as amended.

⁶⁵ Dr. Hossam El-Din Mahmoud Hassan, previous source, p. 155.

⁶⁶ Dr. Majid Ahmed Ibrahim, previous source, p. 92.

5. Domicile: The domicile of artificial intelligence is represented by its place of registration, which is called the “legal domicile” in which the artificial intelligence technology is registered.⁶⁷

6. Nationality: Some States have granted nationality to artificial intelligence entities, such as the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, which granted nationality to the artificial intelligence entity “Sophia”⁶⁸ at the Future Investment Initiative Conference, making it the first robot in the world to obtain nationality. The nationality of artificial intelligence is represented by the nationality of the State under whose laws it obtained its legal personality.⁶⁹

7. A legal representative of artificial intelligence: This is called the “human deputy”. Since artificial intelligence applications simulate the mental activities of the human being, this leads to the existence of someone who represents these applications and undertakes their legal representation.

Third: The rise of personal civil liability: This concerns its activities and the harms it causes to third parties, and the provision of guarantees that ensure appropriate, fair, rapid, and equitable compensation for the activities of artificial intelligence applications. Limiting liability leads to simplifying procedures and facilitating the direction of litigation in compensation claims instead of searching for the cause of the fault represented by “the producer, designer, programmer, marketer, investor, operator, and subordinate”.⁷⁰

We consider that the general rules are insufficient and remain inadequate for granting legal personality to artificial intelligence, since it is difficult to determine its legal status and the effects arising from it. Granting legal personality to artificial intelligence is something that cannot be achieved except under conditions and in a limited manner. Artificial intelligence is one of the most efficient and developed fields in the modern era. It has proven its efficiency in multiple fields, including commercial activities, trademarks, and industrial activities. Artificial intelligence aims to understand the nature of human intelligence by creating computer programs capable of simulating intelligent human behaviour. A computer program may make independent decisions without referring to its user. In view of the great and evident importance of artificial intelligence systems and the numerous legal problems they raise, manufacturers seek to achieve the greatest possible degree of independence towards forming a legal personality independent of the person operating these systems. There is no doubt that granting artificial intelligence legal personality means granting it an independent legal status, with rights such as the right to independent financial patrimony, the right to a name, intellectual property rights, and others, while obligations and liabilities fall upon it. The granting of legal personality to artificial intelligence must be regulated according to new legal rules and provisions consistent with the rapid development witnessed by artificial intelligence applications in information technology, and work should be undertaken to crystallise a law that regulates and codifies the production, design, and use of artificial intelligence systems.

Conclusion

Through the study of the subject of granting legal personality to artificial intelligence between support and objection, and through analysis of the different jurisprudential and legislative positions, a number of findings and recommendations may be drawn as follows.

First: Findings

1. The traditional concept of legal personality is inadequate to accommodate the technological development occurring in the field of artificial intelligence, as this concept was not designed to deal with non-human entities possessing a degree of autonomy in decision-making. Granting artificial

⁶⁷ Abbas Mustafa Abbas, “The Juridical Personality of Artificial Intelligence between Recognition and Denial”, published research in *The Legal Journal*, University of El Oued, Issue 3, Vol. 18, 2023, p. 1422.

⁶⁸ Dr. Hossam El-Din Mahmoud Hassan, “The Reality of the Legal Personality of Artificial Intelligence”, published research in *Ruh Al-Qawamin Journal*, Issue 102, April 2023, p. 16.

⁶⁹ Dr. Hussein Abdullah Abdul-Rida Al-Kalabi and Kazem Hamdan Sadkhan, previous source, p. 433.

⁷⁰ Dr. Majid Ahmed Ibrahim, previous source, p. 92.

intelligence independent legal personality remains a matter of broad jurisprudential and legislative controversy and has not gained wide acceptance in existing legal systems, except for some theoretical proposals in the European Union that have not been translated into enforceable legislation.

2. The trend opposing the granting of legal personality to artificial intelligence is based on the principle of human responsibility, on the basis that every act of artificial intelligence is the result of human programming or direction. Consequently, legal liability may not be separated from the human programmer or user. Moreover, granting legal personality to artificial intelligence, if adopted, would require a comprehensive reformulation of the legal rules relating to civil liability, criminal liability, contractual obligations, and the protection of rights, which may confuse the traditional legal system.

3. The most realistic solution at present lies in adopting the model of “limited legal personality” or “joint liability”, whereby artificial intelligence is granted a special legal status that permits regulation of its use and accountability within a defined framework, while maintaining the supervisory role and final liability of the human being, without rushing to grant it independent legal personality, and while taking into account the value-based and legal specificity of societies.

4. The future of the debate concerning the legal personality of artificial intelligence is linked to the extent to which its capacities develop towards self-awareness or full autonomy, which may impose a radical reconsideration of traditional legal concepts if this is realised in the future.

Second: Recommendations

1. Enact special legislation on artificial intelligence containing clear provisions regulating its use and legal liability, similar to legislation dedicated to electronic commerce or data protection, without the need to grant it full legal personality at the present time. A special or intermediate legal regime should be adopted that grants artificial intelligence a limited or special legal status, “electronic personality”, enabling it to exercise certain rights and bear specific obligations, while maintaining the liability of the human programmer, owner, or user as the final guarantor.

2. Oblige developers and users of artificial intelligence systems to obtain compulsory insurance against harms that may be caused by these systems and robots, thereby ensuring compensation for injured persons without the need to prove intent or direct human fault.

3. Develop civil liability rules while taking into account the specificity of acts issued by artificial intelligence, by adopting the concept of joint or solidary liability among the developer, user, and technical provider, and by including in legislation the principle of transparency and submission to oversight and accountability for every artificial intelligence system, in a manner that enables tracking of the decisions and processes it undertakes and facilitates the determination of legal liability when harm occurs.

4. Encourage comparative legal research among successful international experiences in this field, with the aim of drawing upon the models most suitable for developing a balanced Arab legal framework that preserves human values and keeps pace with technical progress, and integrate principles of digital ethics into legislation to ensure that artificial intelligence is subject to rules of justice, non-discrimination, and respect for human dignity, even if a special legal status is recognised for it in the future.

Sources

First: Books

1. Khaled Mamdouh Ibrahim, *The Legal Regulation of Artificial Intelligence*, Dar Al-Fikr Al-Jami'i, Egypt, 2022.
2. Dr. Saad Yahya, *Regulating the Transfer of Scientific Knowledge*, Mansha'at Al-Ma'arif Publishing, Alexandria, 1986.

3. Abdullah Mousa and Ahmed Bilal, *Artificial Intelligence: A Revolution in the Technologies of the Age*, 1st ed., Dar Al-Kutub Al-Misriyya, Cairo, 2019.

4. Dr. Mohammed Abdel-Zaher Hussein, *The Injured Party's Fault and Its Effect on Liability*, Dar Al-Nahda Al-Arabiyya, Cairo, 2007.

Second: University Theses

1. Omari Mousa and Weiss Bilal, *The Legal Effects Arising from the Use of Artificial Intelligence*, Master's thesis, Ziane Achour University, Djelfa, 2020-2021.

2. Nano Fares, *Legal Liability for the Use of Artificial Intelligence*, Master's thesis, Faculty of Law and Political Science, Mohamed Boudiaf University of M'sila, 2023-2024.

Third: Published Research

1. Ahmed Belhaj Jarrad, "The Legal Personality of Artificial Intelligence: A Misleading Anticipation", published research in the *Kuwait International Law School Journal*, Issue 2, Year 11, serial issue, Kuwait, March 2023.

2. Ahmed Ali Hassan Othman, "The Reflections of Artificial Intelligence on Civil Law: A Comparative Study", published research in the *Journal of Legal and Economic Research "Mansoura"*, Vol. 11, Issue 67, 2021.

3. Dr. Hossam El-Din Mahmoud Hassan, "The Reality of the Legal Personality of Artificial Intelligence", published research in *Ruh Al-Qawanin Journal*, Issue 102, 2023.

4. Dr. Hussein Abdullah Abdul-Rida Al-Kalabi and Kazem Hamdan Sadkhan, "The Legal Personality of Artificial Intelligence Entities between Acceptance and Rejection", published research in the *Journal of the College of Law for Legal and Political Sciences*, Issue 46, 2023.

5. Dr. Khaled Mustafa Fahmy, *Legal Liability Arising from the Use of Artificial Intelligence and Robots in Light of European Directives and National Legislation: A Comparative Study*, Dar Al-Fikr Al-Jami'i, Alexandria, 1st ed., 2024.

6. Zuhour Ismail Mohammed Bazar, "The Possibility of Applying Artificial Intelligence Technologies to the Legal Profession", published research in the book *The Future of Artificial Intelligence: Legal and Ethical Challenges*, Arab Democratic Center for Strategic, Political and Economic Studies, 1st ed., Germany, Berlin, 2028.

7. Zainab Abdul Latif Khaled Abdul Latif, "Generative Artificial Intelligence: Legal and Technological Challenges for Intellectual Property Laws", published research in the book *The Future of Artificial Intelligence: Legal and Ethical Challenges*, Arab Democratic Center for Strategic, Political and Economic Studies, 1st ed., Germany, Berlin, 2024.

8. Abbas Mustafa Abbas, "The Juridical Personality of Artificial Intelligence between Recognition and Denial", published research in *The Legal Journal*, University of El Oued, Issue 3, Vol. 18, 2023.

9. Dr. Abdul-Razzaq Ahmed Mohammed Al-Miri, "Criminal Liability for Artificial Intelligence Crimes", published research in the book of the Arab Democratic Center for Strategic, Political and Economic Studies, Germany, Berlin, 2024.

10. Dr. Farida Ben Othman, "Artificial Intelligence", *Journal of Politics and Law Notebooks*, Vol. 12, Issue 2, 2022.

11. Mohammed Al-Awadi, "Producer Liability for Industrial Products", published research in the *Civil Law Journal*, Moroccan Center for Legal Studies and Consultations and Dispute Resolution, Issue 1, 2014.

12. Dr. Mohammed Irfan Al-Khatib, "The Legal Status of the Robot: Personality and Liability", *Kuwait International Law School Journal*, Year 6, Issue 4, 2018.

13. Dr. Majid Ahmed Ibrahim, "The Legal Nature of Artificial Intelligence Systems and Its Effect on Establishing Civil Liability: A Comparative Study", *Legal Researcher Journal for Legal Sciences*, Vol. 4, Issue 1, 2023.

14. Mustafa Rateb Hassan Ali, "Civil Liability for Damage Caused by the Robot: A Comparative Study", published research in the *Journal of Jurisprudential and Legal Research*, Faculty of Sharia and Law, Al-Azhar University branch, Damanhur, Vol. 36, Issue 44, 2024.

15. Dr. Musab Ibrahim Mohammed, "Artificial Intelligence and the Legal Vision", published research in the book *The Future of Artificial Intelligence: Legal and Ethical Challenges*, Arab Democratic Center for Strategic, Political and Economic Studies, 1st ed., Germany, Berlin, 2024.

16. Dr. Muammar Ben Taria, "Damage Caused by Robots and Artificial Intelligence Technologies", *Annals of the University of Algiers*, special issue of the international forum, Algeria, 27-28, 2018.

17. Dr. Dara' Hammad, "Civil Liability for Risks of Technical Development", published research in the *Journal of the Faculty of Law*, Al-Nahrain University, Vol. 9, Issue 16, 2006.

Fourth: Laws

1. Iraqi Civil Code No. 40 of 1951, as amended.
2. The European Union Resolution issued in 2017 concerning the conferral of legal personality upon the robot.
3. Egyptian Civil Code No. 131 of 1948.
4. Jordanian Civil Code No. 43 of 1976.
5. French Civil Code 1998.
6. Korean Act on the Development of Intelligent Robots and Promotion of Distribution No. 9014 of 2008.
7. Consumer Protection Law No. 1 of 2010.
8. Civil Transactions Law of the United Arab Emirates No. 50 of 2022.
9. European Directive on Product Liability No. 374 of 1985.

Fifth: Foreign Sources

1. European Civil law rules in Robots, 3.1.

Sixth: Electronic Websites

1. <https://www.rand.org/content/dam>
2. seconf.wordpress.com
3. <https://sa.arabisklondon.com>