International and Comparative
Corporate Law Journal
ISSN: 1388-7084 & E- ISSN: 1875-8290

The Nature of Legal Liability in the Field of Artificial Intelligence

Dr. Souhila Mebarki
Lecturer, Class B
Higher School of Commerce, Kolea University Campus,
Tipaza, Algeria
s_mebarki@esc-alger.dz

Dr. Tassadit Nebbad
Lecturer, Class B
Mouloud Mammeri University Tizi Ouzou, Algeria
tassadit.nebbad@ummto.dz

Received: 10.09.2025; Accepted: 04.01.2026; Published: 09.06.2026

Abstract:
Artificial intelligence is considered one of the most prominent technological innovations that has brought about a radical transformation in various sectors. It has now become an essential and indispensable part of our daily lives. At present, it represents one of the most important outcomes of the Fourth Industrial Revolution, given that its applications have diversified and encompassed various sectors, such as the military, healthcare, education, and the economy, among others. Reliance on it is expected to increase in the near future, particularly in light of the technological development and the increasing effectiveness and capabilities of this field.
At a time when the world is witnessing rapid developments in the technical field, particularly in the field of artificial intelligence, this technological advancement raises several precise legal questions regarding the nature of legal liability for actions resulting from artificial intelligence, particularly with regard to assuming liability when damage occurs. Is the programmer liable? Or the user? Or the entity that produced the system?
The importance of this study lies in establishing and clarifying the legal frameworks for determining legal liability arising in the field of artificial intelligence, by examining the party that bears the legal consequences, whether civil or criminal, when damage results from artificial intelligence systems. This calls for the development of legal frameworks and the enactment of new legislation regulating the manner in which these modern technologies are used, ensuring safety and protecting rights.
Keywords: Artificial Intelligence, Legal Liability, Civil Liability, Criminal Liability, Multiple Liable Parties, Modern Legislation.

Introduction:
It is undeniable that artificial intelligence has today become a fundamental pillar of contemporary life, as it represents a qualitative leap in computer science and a technological

International and Comparative
Corporate Law Journal
ISSN: 1388-7084 & E- ISSN: 1875-8290

phenomenon that has invaded all areas of life and permeated various sectors, including the economy, education, healthcare, justice, the media, and others.

The importance of artificial intelligence lies in improving efficiency, analyzing big data, providing innovative solutions to complex problems, in addition to saving time and effort. However, despite these significant benefits and the rapid spread of artificial intelligence applications, several questions arise concerning the legal dimensions associated with the use of these technologies, particularly with the increasing concerns regarding crimes that may be committed by these entities.

In light of the successive developments witnessed in the field of artificial intelligence, the issue of legal liability in this field is considered one of the most complex issues, as it raises several problems, the most prominent of which are: Who bears liability when errors or damages result from the use of artificial intelligence technologies? To what extent are current legal systems prepared to address these challenges? And how can legislation be harmonized with modern technological innovations?

With the rapid advancement of artificial intelligence systems, it has become necessary to address the issue of legal liability in this field and establish the basic principles in preparation for the consequences arising from the use of these application systems. From this perspective, we raise the following main problem:

To what extent can the traditional rules relating to legal liability accommodate damages resulting from the use of artificial intelligence systems? And does this require the establishment of a special legal system and the adoption of new solutions that keep pace with this development and achieve a balance between innovation and the protection of individuals' rights?

The main problem gives rise to the following sub-questions:

- What type of legal liability applies to damages resulting from artificial intelligence technologies?
- Does liability fall upon the programmer, the user, or the entity producing the artificial intelligence system?
- How should crimes resulting from the acts of artificial intelligence be legally characterized?
- What sanctions may be imposed on the person responsible for damages resulting from the use of artificial intelligence technologies?

To answer these questions, it is necessary to follow a legal methodology combining analysis and description. The nature of the subject requires us to adopt the descriptive method in defining the concepts and types of legal liability, and to adopt the analytical method as a means of better understanding the legal application in the field of liability, both civil and criminal.

Accordingly, we have divided our research into two sections. The first section addresses civil liability for acts resulting from the use of artificial intelligence, while the second section addresses criminal liability for acts arising in this field.

First Section: Civil Liability for Acts Resulting from the Use of Artificial Intelligence

International and Comparative
Corporate Law Journal
ISSN: 1388-7084 & E- ISSN: 1875-8290

First Section: Civil Liability for Acts of Artificial Intelligence

Some legal scholars consider that civil liability for damages resulting from the uses of artificial intelligence is based on contractual liability, emphasizing the fundamental rule that "the contract is the law of the contracting parties," while another view in legal scholarship links it to tort liability (First Subsection). Given the insufficiency of these traditional rules in determining the party responsible for damages caused by artificial intelligence machines, some scholars have proposed establishing civil liability on the basis of strict liability and the liability of the human representative (Second Subsection).

First Subsection: Establishing Civil Liability on the Basis of the Traditional Theory

In this subsection, we will examine the extent to which the traditional rules of civil liability are appropriate for addressing damages resulting from the use of artificial intelligence technologies, by dividing the subsection into two branches:

First Branch: Contractual Liability for Damages Caused by Artificial Intelligence Technologies

Second Branch: Tort Liability for Damages Caused by Artificial Intelligence Technologies

First Branch: Contractual Liability for Damages Caused by Artificial Intelligence Technologies

A contract is considered an agreement between two or more wills to produce a legal effect, whether by creating, modifying, or extinguishing an obligation. This is provided for in Article 106 of the Civil Code: "The contract is the law of the contracting parties, and it may not be revoked or amended except by agreement of the two parties or for reasons determined by law" (Law No. 75-58, dated September 26, 1975).

There are two types of contracts relating to artificial intelligence technologies. The first consists of contracts relating to artificial intelligence technology, whereby the two parties agree to provide the other contracting party with a type of artificial intelligence technology. The parties are the client and the producer or developer. This type of contract is subject to the traditional general conditions of contracts and is governed by the principle of freedom of contract. For example, when a person purchases a self-driving car or a robot from a seller, a contractual relationship exists between the seller and the purchaser by virtue of the contract of sale concluded between them. Any breach of the contractual terms by either party subjects that party to the provisions governing contractual liability.

The second type of these contracts is the smart contract concluded through artificial intelligence technologies, which is referred to as the smart agent or electronic agent.

The two parties to the contract enter all the information and specified requirements relating to the artificial intelligence technology in order to conclude the contract in their name and for their benefit (Saadawi, 2021). These technologies thus play the role of an intermediary between the two contracting parties.

According to the provisions of the Civil Code, when one of the parties to the contract fails to fulfill its obligations, contractual liability arises, and the other injured party may claim

International and Comparative
Corporate Law Journal
ISSN: 1388-7084 & E- ISSN: 1875-8290

compensation for the damage suffered. The amount of compensation may be determined in the contract; where it has not been determined, the court shall assess its value according to the losses suffered by the injured party.

A breach of contract may take several forms, such as when the seller fails to deliver the subject matter of the sale in accordance with the terms and specifications agreed upon in the contract. In Europe, for example, if the robot does not conform to what was previously agreed upon in the contract, the purchaser has the right to terminate the contract. Consequently, contractual liability arises if the robot is delivered with specifications different from those stated in the contract, even if the robot has not caused any damage or harm to the purchaser (Abdel Razzaq and Sayed Ahmed, 2020, p. 20).

As part of the efforts to address errors and damages arising from artificial intelligence technologies that go beyond the terms of the contract, legal scholarship has called for liability for such damages to be established on the basis of the principle of the obligation to ensure safety, in order to protect both users and those dealing with such technologies. This principle constitutes a safeguard for the consumer, or what is known as the user, protecting them from any unfair terms contained in the agreement, avoiding potential damages, and strengthening the position of the consumer (or user) with regard to artificial intelligence technologies (Maouch, 2015–2016, p. 90).

Although some legal scholars acknowledge the sufficiency of the rules of contractual liability to address damages that may result from the use of artificial intelligence technologies, relying on the principle that "the contract is the law of the contracting parties," this view remains subject to debate. This has led some scholars to advocate the application of the rules of tort liability.

Second Branch: Tort Liability for Damages Caused by Artificial Intelligence Technologies

Tort liability arises from a breach of an obligation imposed by law. This liability is based on a civil fault that may be committed by one individual against another (Al-Awadi, 2017, p. 23). This fault must contain two elements: the first is material, consisting of the infringement or deviation, and the second is moral, consisting of awareness and discernment (Tanago, 2009, p. 227).

Tort liability is based on the concept of vicarious liability of the principal for the acts of the subordinate, as well as liability for things. In this research, we will attempt to apply this liability to artificial intelligence technologies and examine the extent to which it can be compatible with these modern technologies.

First: The Extent to Which Liability Based on the Concept of the Principal for the Acts of His Subordinate Is Compatible with Artificial Intelligence Technologies

Article 136 of the Algerian Civil Code stipulates: "The principal shall be liable for the damage caused by his subordinate through his harmful act when it occurs in the course of performing his duties, because of them, or on the occasion thereof. The relationship of subordination is established even if the principal is not free to choose his subordinate, provided that the latter works for the account of the principal."

International and Comparative
Corporate Law Journal
ISSN: 1388-7084 & E- ISSN: 1875-8290

From the wording of this article, it becomes clear to us that the Algerian legislator relied on a general concept to determine the relationship between the subordinate and the principal. As soon as the subordinate works for the account and benefit of the principal, a relationship of subordination is established between them, and the principal becomes liable for the damage caused by his subordinate.

With regard to artificial intelligence technologies, legal scholars have considered that anyone who benefits from the services of artificial intelligence technologies is a principal. However, in reality, it is difficult to establish a relationship of subordination between two parties where one of them is an artificial intelligence technology, given the characteristics of these technologies, primarily their ability to learn and develop autonomously without human intervention. When these technologies perform harmful acts beyond their basic functions, it is therefore not possible to establish their liability on the basis of the rules of liability of the principal for the acts of his subordinate. This leads us to seek other rules of liability that are compatible with the nature of these technologies.

Second: The Extent to Which Liability for Acts of Things Is Compatible with Artificial Intelligence Technologies!

The concept of custody under the Algerian Civil Code is based on the liability of the custodian with regard to things, and what is meant by this is "moral custody," which is based on the power of authority over the thing, whereby the custodian possesses the actual and independent authority to act with regard to things through their use, management, and supervision.

The power of use means the custodian's ability to use the thing. If we apply this concept to artificial intelligence technologies, we find that the primary purpose of the existence of these modern technologies is to facilitate human life through the adoption and use of these technologies to perform specific tasks (Rafaf and Maouch, 2023, p. 184).

Although it may be possible to apply the power of use to artificial intelligence technologies, it would be difficult to apply the powers of management and supervision to these technologies. With regard to the power of management, it has become difficult today to predict and control the behavior of artificial intelligence, as it has reached a high degree of functional autonomy, enabling it to make decisions individually and independently, although such safety may be achieved, albeit incompletely, when operating instructions are provided or certain information is entered by the owner or user.

As for the power of supervision, which means monitoring the thing during its use, examining it, ensuring its maintenance, and correcting its defects, if we apply this concept to artificial intelligence, we find that it is difficult to apply it to its owner or user due to their lack of expertise, although it may be applied to the manufacturer of the artificial intelligence system. Accordingly, if the scope of the power of supervision includes the designer and manufacturer, it generally does not include the owner and user of these technologies (Rafaf and Maouch, 2023, pp. 84–87).

Based on what has been discussed above, we can say that it is difficult to apply the rules of contractual and tort liability to artificial intelligence, as the latter remains merely a device or

International and Comparative
Corporate Law Journal
ISSN: 1388-7084 & E- ISSN: 1875-8290

program controlled by the designer or manufacturer, despite its autonomy in some cases. This has led to the emergence of modern dimensions for establishing civil liability for damages caused by artificial intelligence technologies.

Second Subsection: Establishing Civil Liability on the Basis of Modern Dimensions

In view of the developments witnessed in the field of artificial intelligence, it is difficult to determine who is responsible for the damages arising from its technologies based on the traditional rules of liability. Accordingly, it is necessary to abandon the traditional concepts based on fault and damage and adopt new foundations for establishing civil liability in this field. On this basis, some legal scholars have proposed that strict liability be imposed when using artificial intelligence technologies (First Branch), while the Legal Affairs Committee of the European Union has developed the theory of the human agent (Second Branch).

First Branch: Strict Liability for Damages Caused by Artificial Intelligence Technologies

Technological development has led to a shift towards the theory of strict liability, or what is known as assumption of risk, as a form of liability based on the concept of damage rather than fault. This idea has been proposed as a new approach in fields where risk predominates, such as artificial intelligence (Brabeh, 2021, p. 200).

At present, the judiciary has moved towards determining liability for damages resulting from the use of artificial intelligence systems on the basis of strict liability, in accordance with the principle of new risks and assumption of liability, given that artificial intelligence systems operate for the benefit of the operator or user. Whoever derives profits from the activities they perform must therefore bear the consequences of this complex activity and its damages (Said, 1998, p. 124).

Accordingly, whenever damage occurs as a result of the use of artificial intelligence systems and technologies, strict liability arises, in order to ensure compensation for the injured party for the damage suffered. This liability is imposed on the beneficiary of the activity causing the damage, without requiring the injured party to bear the burden of proving the fault of the liable party. This constitutes the essence of justice, which requires every person who causes harm through the exercise of an activity to bear the consequences arising therefrom.

Second Branch: The Theory of the Human Agent

The theory of the "human agent" is considered one of the most important modern theories developed by the Legal Affairs Committee of the European Union since 2012, with the aim of introducing special laws governing robots operating through artificial intelligence technologies. This theory emerged as a result of the disagreements concerning the legal nature of these technologies, given their characteristics and features that make them close to humans, through their ability to think and make decisions independently, in addition to their ability to develop. This led the European legislator to adopt the idea of the human agent, which the French legislator called the "robot counterpart" (Bonlange & Jaggie).

The liability of the human agent is an innovative form of legal liability in European legislation. Some legal commentators refer to it as "human agent liability," while others refer to it as "legal

International and Comparative
Corporate Law Journal
ISSN: 1388-7084 & E- ISSN: 1875-8290

agent liability," expressing it as the liability of the "person having control over the robot," that is, the person who controls the robot.

Through the European legislator's use of the term "agent" or "representative," it implicitly recognizes that the robot is not a mechanical machine or a thing, with the responsible human being regarded as the agent (Al-Qousi, 2018, p. 82). However, the robot cannot be held liable within the current legal framework; the matter is limited to "agency" relating to liability for the acts or negligence of the robot by operation of law (Bouchareb & Klou, 2022, p. 103).

The European legislator imposed legal agent liability in two cases:

Negligence and liability for fault: This is a case requiring the presence of the elements of liability, namely fault, damage, and a causal relationship between them. Negligence is considered a form of fault consisting of dereliction.

Since robots are not like human beings, their autonomy is not measured by the existence of consciousness; rather, their autonomy is purely technical, enabling them to make decisions based on algorithms. The more autonomous these robots become, the less possible it is to regard them merely as simple tools in the hands of users (Rossum, 2017, p. 36).

Liability based on risk management and the obligation to insure: This is liability arising from the agent's failure to fulfill the duty of risk management, which requires anticipating risks, avoiding them by reducing risks, and dealing with negative consequences (Section AD, 2017). This led the European legislator to combine direct liability with risk management through the preparation of a report containing recommendations to the Committee on Civil Law Rules on Robotics by the Legal Affairs Committee. Risk management is addressed through the obligation to insure against damages by means of insurance contracts (59a, 2017). Insurance may also be supported by a fund to ensure compensation and remedy the damage in the absence of insurance (58, 2017), or in cases of inadequacy or where the person causing the damage lacks the means to provide compensation (Rossum, 2017, p. 41).

Second Section: Criminal Liability for Acts of Artificial Intelligence

The development witnessed by artificial intelligence systems may pose a significant risk to the world, as various crimes may be committed in this field, giving rise to criminal liability for artificial intelligence crimes, which are considered crimes of the future, although their emergence is currently accelerating.

The study of criminal liability for acts of artificial intelligence requires addressing the elements of such liability (First Subsection) and the procedural rules governing this liability (Second Subsection).

First Subsection: Elements of Criminal Liability for Acts of Artificial Intelligence

In this subsection, we will examine the material element (First Branch) and the moral element (Second Branch), which constitute the elements of criminal liability arising from the damages that may be caused by artificial intelligence technologies.

First Branch: The Material Element as an Element of Criminal Liability

The material element of a crime is defined as the criminal activity consisting of committing an act or refraining from performing it, when such act or omission is contrary to the law (Idlibi,

International and Comparative
Corporate Law Journal
ISSN: 1388-7084 & E- ISSN: 1875-8290

2021, p. 370). The material element of a crime includes three basic elements: the criminal act, the result, and the causal relationship between them.

First: The Criminal Act

The criminal act or criminal conduct consists of an unlawful act manifested in positive or negative actions that contradict the provisions of the law. Positive criminal conduct appears in the acts and behaviors that a person performs voluntarily, such as theft, murder, defamation, etc. Negative criminal conduct appears when a person fails to perform an act required by law, such as paying taxes or appointing an auditor in joint-stock companies (Idlibi, 2021, p. 370).

Second: The Result

There are two concepts of the result: the first relates to the tangible result, while the second relates to the legal result. Accordingly, the result refers to the existence of an infringement of an interest protected by law, or the possibility of exposing that interest to danger. It is not necessary for damage to occur to a specific person as a result of the crime, as long as the result punishable by law has occurred. This distinguishes criminal liability from civil liability, which requires the occurrence of damage as a result of the crime committed (Al-Khalaf, 1991, p. 13).

Third: The Causal Relationship

The causal relationship means that the criminal activity is the cause of the occurrence of the result; that is, there is a link between the criminal activity and the criminal result.

When examining the extent to which the elements of the material element of the crime apply to acts committed by artificial intelligence systems, we can say that criminal conduct may exist when an artificial intelligence entity engages in unlawful positive conduct, such as when a self-driving car accidentally runs over a person, or when it refrains from performing a legal duty, such as when a robot refrains from performing its task of assisting patients, causing one of the patients to fall and suffer harm. Accordingly, the positive or negative conduct issued by the artificial intelligence entity must be the cause of the criminal result that occurs (Idlibi, 2021, pp. 370–371).

Second Branch: The Moral Element as an Element of Criminal Liability

In determining the moral element of a crime, we focus on the perpetrator's intention to commit the crime and the extent to which a psychological link exists between the perpetrator and the facts of the crime.

The moral element of a crime appears in two forms: either the crime is intentional, involving criminal intent, or it is unintentional, involving unintentional fault (Idlibi, 2021, p. 371).

Applying these two forms to crimes committed by artificial intelligence entities requires distinguishing between two possibilities:

- **First possibility:** When it is established that the crime resulting from artificial intelligence technologies was committed due to the programmer, manufacturer, owner, user, or an external party, the moral element may be established, given that the perpetrator is a human being and possesses criminal intent. This consists of knowingly directing their will toward engaging in criminal activity and achieving a criminal result. An example of this would be a person using a robot with the intention of carrying out a

International and Comparative
Corporate Law Journal
ISSN: 1388-7084 & E- ISSN: 1875-8290

killing, or an error committed by the manufacturer, such as negligence and failure to take the necessary precautions during the manufacture of the robot. In this case, the moral element is established in the acts of the user and the manufacturer due to the existence of criminal intent or fault in their conduct.

- **Second possibility:** When it is not established that the crime resulting from artificial intelligence technologies was committed by the manufacturer, programmer, owner, user, or an external party, and there is no intent or fault on their part, while it is established that the artificial intelligence system committed the crime as a result of its self-development and autonomy, it is not possible to conceive of the existence of the moral element of this crime. This is because this element consists of the artificial intelligence entity's will being directed toward committing the crime, together with the existence of a psychological link between it and the criminal acts, which is impossible regardless of the level of its development (Idlibi, 2021, pp. 372–373).

Second Subsection: Procedural Rules Governing Criminal Liability

In this subsection, we will examine examples of crimes resulting from acts of artificial intelligence (First Branch), followed by the penalties imposed for these crimes (Second Branch).

First Branch: Examples of Crimes Resulting from Acts of Artificial Intelligence

Crimes resulting from acts of artificial intelligence are numerous, although they differ in their degree of seriousness and the degree of human intervention involved.

In this branch, we will address some examples of these crimes, namely crimes involving self-driving cars and crimes involving intelligent robots.

First: Crimes Involving Self-Driving Cars

A self-driving car is defined as: "digitally programmed vehicles capable of sensing their surroundings and moving on their own through traffic and other obstacles, with minimal or no human intervention" (Thiyagarajan, 2020, p. 380).

The levels of self-driving cars are determined as follows:

- Level 00: This level includes cars that do not incorporate any means of autonomous driving, whereby the driver is responsible for controlling the vehicle.
- Level 01: Driver assistance, where a system controls certain aspects of the vehicle-driving process.
- Level 02: This level requires the vehicle to adequately perceive its surroundings and includes systems that control the vehicle's trajectory, even if only partially.
- Level 02+: This is an intermediate stage, involving the vehicle performing driving operations, but driving without a driver is not permitted.
- Level 03: The driver may completely relinquish their role in driving, but only in specific situations.
- Level 04: The vehicle's automated driving software is capable of fully controlling the vehicle and its various functions in the vast majority of situations.

International and Comparative
Corporate Law Journal
ISSN: 1388-7084 & E- ISSN: 1875-8290

- Level 05: There is no need for a human driver, as the vehicle is capable of carrying out the driving process completely (Wadie, 2021).

The crimes resulting from the operation of self-driving cars are generally limited to the following: murder, traffic violations, and unintentional injuries, which is the prevailing view. An example of crimes resulting from these vehicles is the incident that occurred on March 18, 2018, when a self-driving car belonging to Uber struck a woman named Elaine Herzberg in the State of Arizona. The vehicle was operating in autonomous driving mode under the supervision of a human driver. While Elaine was riding her bicycle, the vehicle ran her over after failing to recognize her body movement. Elaine sustained injuries and was taken to the hospital, where she died (Idlibi, 2021, pp. 834–838).

Second: Crimes Involving Intelligent Robots

A robot is defined as "a device with mechanical programming, electronically controlled to perform certain tasks and objectives in place of a human" (Nasser, 2022).

There are several types of robots, including:

- Surgical robots: These are commonly used to perform surgical operations that doctors can control remotely through cameras equipped on them to provide a three-dimensional view.
- Domestic robots: These are used to perform household tasks such as washing dishes, serving food, etc.
- Service robots: These are used in universities or by research and development teams to implement new features and present them to the public.
- Military robots: These are used for bomb disposal, border surveillance, and unmanned aircraft.

An example of crimes resulting from robots is the case of the Japanese employee. In 1981, a 37-year-old Japanese employee was killed in a motorcycle factory by one of the robots operating near him. The robot incorrectly identified him, perceiving that this employee posed a threat to its task and believing that the most effective way to eliminate this threat was to push him into a nearby operating machine using its powerful hydraulic arm. This resulted in the immediate death of the employee (Abdel Wahab & Al-Bayd, 2023, pp. 688–694).

Second Branch: Penalties Imposed for Artificial Intelligence Crimes

The penalties prescribed for artificial intelligence crimes may be imposed on the manufacturer (First), the owner, user, or an external party involved with them (Second), or even on the artificial intelligence itself (Third).

First: Penalties Imposed on the Manufacturer

The manufacturer of artificial intelligence technology is considered the primary element responsible for creating this technology. The manufacturer is the first party responsible for programming and designing the systems governing its operation, which must meet certain standards to ensure safety and security in the event of a loss of control over the technology. Given the development currently witnessed by these technologies, as well as the development

International and Comparative
Corporate Law Journal
ISSN: 1388-7084 & E- ISSN: 1875-8290

they are expected to undergo in the future, they will become increasingly autonomous in making decisions. The manufacturer will certainly bear criminal liability for crimes resulting from these technologies. This calls for the establishment and enactment of modern legislation with which the manufacturer must comply when producing these technologies, together with the imposition of penalties in the event of a violation of these obligations (Abdel Wahab & Al-Bayd, 2023, p. 690).

Second: Penalties Imposed on the Owner, User, or an External Party Involved with Them

The owner or user benefits from artificial intelligence technologies and their advantages, as they are the direct beneficiaries of these technologies. In the event that they engage in unlawful conduct resulting in a criminal outcome, the owner or user shall bear full criminal liability, and the legally prescribed penalties shall be imposed upon them.

In the event that the owner or user participates with an external party in engaging in criminal conduct and this results in a crime, criminal liability shall be shared between them, and the penalty shall likewise be shared.

Third: Penalties Imposed on Artificial Intelligence Itself

Criminal legislation adopts the principle of "personal criminal liability," which requires the existence of a human being who is subject to such liability, provided that he or she possesses awareness, discernment, and freedom of choice.

When artificial intelligence entities commit a crime, the question arises as to the extent to which these entities can be subject to criminal liability.

Criminal liability cannot be imposed on artificial intelligence entities when they cause the occurrence of crimes, since they do not possess the elements of awareness and will, which constitute essential elements for establishing such liability. These entities do not possess the awareness and discernment enabling them to choose and understand their actions, nor do they possess the will enabling them to freely commit an unlawful act. Their actions are carried out through agents who control them; consequently, these agents are the ones who will bear criminal liability (Amjad & Al-Tamizi, 2022, p. 46).

Conclusion:

Through this study, we can say that artificial intelligence is no longer merely a distant science-fiction concept; rather, it has become a real reality today, upon which the world as a whole relies in various fields. However, the development it is currently witnessing, and will witness in the future, will certainly bring about radical transformations. Its entities have become capable of making decisions without relying on humans, and scientific experiments have demonstrated the ability of these entities to commit serious crimes, even more serious than those that may be committed by human beings. This calls for classifying artificial intelligence programs according to their level of development and autonomy in decision-making, and for the legislator to review laws so that they become more appropriate for addressing this technology. The rules relating to civil and criminal liability should also be updated more broadly so that, in addition to natural and legal persons, they encompass artificial intelligence entities.

International and Comparative
Corporate Law Journal
ISSN: 1388-7084 & E- ISSN: 1875-8290

In this regard, we present a number of recommendations as follows:

- The need to develop innovative methods for determining legal liability in light of the legislative vacuum, particularly with regard to assigning liability in advance as a condition for the use of artificial intelligence entities.
- The need for the Algerian legislator and other legislators in other countries to pay attention to legal liability in the field of artificial intelligence, as an outcome of digital technological development, even though some European countries have witnessed legal developments in this field.
- The need to establish legislation regulating the production and development of artificial intelligence technologies and to establish standards for crimes committed by them.
- The need to organize conferences and workshops to study and discuss legal liability in the field of artificial intelligence, with the aim of broadening knowledge in this regard.
- The need to strengthen penalties for crimes committed through the use of artificial intelligence technologies, given their seriousness and their negative impact on society.

List of Sources and References:

First: Sources in Arabic

1- Books:

1- Samir Tanago. (2009). Sources of Obligations (1st ed.). Alexandria: Al-Wafaa Legal Library.
2- Saad Abdulsalam Said. (1998). The Problem of Compensation for Damages Caused by the Technological Environment (1st ed.). Cairo, Egypt: Dar Al-Nahda Al-Arabiya.
3- Abdullah Fawzi Al-Awadi. (2017). Tort Liability of Publishers of Programs for the Unlawful Exchange of Intellectual Works: A Comparative Study under French, Egyptian, and Omani Law. Cairo: Dar Al-Nahda Al-Arabiya for Publishing and Distribution.
4- Ali Hussein Al-Khalaf. (1991). General Principles of Criminal Law. Legal Library.

2- Master's Theses:

1- Reda Maouch. (2015–2016). Consumer Protection from Unfair Terms. Master's thesis. Faculty of Law and Political Science, Tizi Ouzou: Mouloud Mammeri University.
2- Sara Amjad Abd Al-Hadi Atmeizi. (2022). Artificial Intelligence under Criminal Law. Master's thesis. Jerusalem, Palestine: Hebron University.

3- Articles:

1- Saida Bouchareb, & Hicham Klou. (March, 2022). The legal status of robots in light of the rules of civil liability. Journal of Judicial Jurisprudence, Vol. 14, No. 01.
2- Omar Mohammed Mounib Idlibi. (2021). The scope of criminal liability arising from artificial intelligence errors. Al-Zaytoonah Jordanian Journal of Legal Studies.
3- Lakhdar Rafaf, & Fairouz Maouch. (2023). The specificity of civil liability for damages caused by artificial intelligence systems under Algerian law. Tabna Journal of Academic Scientific Studies, No. 01.

4- Meriem Abdel Wahab, & Hind Al-Bayd. (2023). Criminal liability for artificial intelligence crimes. Journal of Law and Political Science, Vol. 07, No. 01.
5- Najia Saadawi. (July, 2021). Smart contracts and Blockchain. Vol. 04, No. 01. Khemis Miliana: Al-Fikr Journal of Legal and Political Studies, Algeria: Djilali Bounaama University.
6- Hmam Al-Qousi. (2018). The problem of the person responsible for operating the robot: The impact of the theory of the human agent on the viability of law in the future A prospective analytical study of the European civil law rules relating to robots. Jil Journal for In-Depth Legal Research, No. 21.
7- Wahiba Abdel Razzaq, & Mohammed Sayed Ahmed. (October, 2020). Civil liability for damages caused by artificial intelligence: An analytical study. Jil Journal for In-Depth Legal Research, No. 43.
8- Yamina Brabeh. (November, 2021). The objective approach to civil liability. Algerian and Comparative Public Law Journal, Vol. 7, No. 02.

4- Legal Texts:

1- Ordinance No. 75-58. (September 26, 1975). Concerning the Civil Code, as amended and supplemented.

5- Websites:

1- Ali Hassan Wadie. (April 26, 2021). What Are the Different Levels of Autonomous Driving? And Is There Truly Autonomous Driving Today? Retrieved April 24, 2016, from https://www.menatech.net (https://www.menatech.net/)
2- Nasser, A. (May 22, 2022). Introduction to Robots Definition and Origin Robots in the Real World. Retrieved April 24, 2026, from www.yallanzaker.org

First: Sources in Foreign Languages

1- Books:

1- Rossum, C. (2017). Liability of Robots: Legal Responsibility in Cases of Errors or Malfunctioning. Faculty of Law, Ghent University.
2- 58S. (2017, February 16). General Principles. The European Parliament.
3- 59a, S. (2017, February 16). General Principles. The European Parliament.
4- Section AD. (2017, February 16). Civil Law Rules on Robotics. The European Parliament.
5- Thiyagarajan, M. (2020). Self-Driving Car. International Journal of Psychosocial Rehabilitation.

2- Articles:

1- Bonlange, A., & Jaggie, C. (n.d.). Ethics, Responsibility and Legal Status of the Companion Robot: Review and Perspectives. Retrieved from https://hal.archives.fr/cel-01110281/ (https://hal.archives.fr/cel-01110281/file/TER2012).