



ISSN: 2181-9416

YURIST AXBOROTNOMASI

ВЕСТИНИК ЮРИСТА * LAWYER HERALD

HUQUQIY, IJTIMOIIY, ILMIY-AMALIY JURNAL



CYBERLENINKA

НАУЧНАЯ ЭЛЕКТРОННАЯ
БИБЛИОТЕКА
LIBRARY.RU

YURIST AXBOROTNOMASI

5-SON, 7-JILD

ВЕСТНИК ЮРИСТА

НОМЕР 5, ВЫПУСК 7

LAWYER HERALD

VOLUME 7, ISSUE 5



ISKANDAR Nematjonov

Senior advisor, Namangan Regional
Department of Justice, Ministry of Justice of the Republic of Uzbekistan
E-mail: iskandarskyfall1997@gmail.com

SHOKHJAKHON Tuhtamirzaev

Head Legal Counsel, Podshoota-Chodak Irrigation System Administration,
Ministry of Water Resources of the Republic of Uzbekistan
E-mail: uzlegalai@gmail.com

ETHICAL AND LEGAL DILEMMAS OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE: FROM COPYRIGHT TO FAIR DECISION-MAKING

For citation (iqtibos keltirish uchun, для цитирования): I. Nematjonov, Sh.Tuhtamirzaev. Ethical and legal dilemmas of artificial intelligence: from copyright to fair decision-making // Yurist axborotnomasi – Вестник юриста – Lawyer herald. № 5 (2025) P. 45-54.



5 (2025) DOI <http://dx.doi.org/10.26739/2181-9416-2025-2-15>

ANNOTATION

This article provides a comprehensive analysis of the ethical and legal dilemmas arising from the rapid development of artificial intelligence (AI) technologies. The primary objective of the study is to examine three pressing issues – copyright, algorithmic fairness, and liability of autonomous systems – within both the international and the national legal context of Uzbekistan. The research methodology is based on normative legal analysis, comparative legal methods, as well as the examination of international legal instruments and foreign judicial practice. The findings demonstrate that, first, the issue of authorship of AI-generated works remains unresolved under Uzbekistan's current legislation. In this regard, the experience of the United Kingdom and China may serve as a basis for effective legal mechanisms to eliminate uncertainty. Second, algorithmic fairness and the prevention of discrimination constitute a crucial prerequisite for the protection of human rights. Accordingly, the approaches established in the EU AI Act and UNESCO's recommendations should be adapted to the national framework. Third, the examples of autonomous transport and AI-based medical diagnostics reveal that traditional civil liability doctrines are insufficient to address the challenges of the digital era, necessitating the adoption of strict and risk-based liability regimes. The scientific novelty of this article lies in its integration of international legal practice with Uzbekistan's national "Digital Uzbekistan – 2030" strategy, offering theoretically grounded and practically oriented proposals for legislative improvement. The conclusions of this study bear significant implications for legal doctrine, state policy, and the broader process of AI governance.

Keywords: artificial Intelligence (AI), AI ethics, copyright, algorithmic fairness, algorithmic impartiality, discrimination, autonomous systems, liability, legislation of Uzbekistan, legal dilemmas, "Digital Uzbekistan 2030", data integrity.

NEMATJONOV Iskandar No'monjon o'g'li

O'zbekiston Respublikasi Adliya vazirligi
Namangan viloyat adliya boshqarmasi bosh maslahatchisi
E-mail: iskandarskyfall1997@gmail.com

TO'XTAMIRZAYEV Shoxjaxon Baxodirjon o'g'li

O'zbekiston Respublikasi Suv xo'jaligi vazirligi tizimidagi
Podshoota-Chodak irrigatsiya tizimi boshqarmasi bosh yuriskonsulti
E-mail: uzlegalai@gmail.com

SUN'YI INTELEKTNING AXLOQIY VA HUQUQIY DILEMMALARI: MUALLIFLIK HUQUQIDAN TORTIB, ADOLATLI QAROR QABUL QILISHGACHA

ANNOTATSIYA

Ushbu ilmiy maqola sun'iy intellekt (SI) texnologiyalarining jadal rivojlanishi oqibatida yuzaga kelayotgan axloqiy va huquqiy dilemmalarni chuqur tahlil qilishga bag'ishlangan. Tadqiqotning asosiy maqsadi – mualliflik huquqi, algoritmik adolat va avtonom tizimlar javobgarligi kabi uchta dolzarb masalani xalqaro huquqiy tajriba hamda O'zbekiston milliy qonunchiligi doirasida qiyosiy o'rganib, huquqiy yechimlar ishlab chiqishdan iborat. Metodologik jihatdan maqola normativ-huquqiy tahlil, qiyosiy huquqiy tahlil va xalqaro huquqiy hujjatlar hamda xorijiy sud amaliyoti o'rganish usullariga asoslangan. Tahlillar shuni ko'rsatadiki, birinchidan, SI tomonidan yaratilgan asarlarning mualliflik maqomi O'zbekiston qonunchiligida yetarlicha yoritilmagan bo'lib, bu masalada Buyuk Britaniya va Xitoy tajribasidan foydalanish huquqiy aniqlikni ta'minlashi mumkin. Ikkinchidan, algoritmik xolislik va diskriminatsiyani oldini olish masalasi inson huquqlarini himoya qilishning muhim sharti hisoblanib, Yevropa Ittifoqi AI qonuni hamda YuNESKO tavsiyalari asosida milliy huquqiy normalarni kuchaytirish lozim. Uchinchidan, avtonom transport va tibbiy diagnostika tizimlari misolida javobgarlikni an'anaviy fuqarolik-huquqiy mexanizmlar bilan belgilash yetarli emas, shuning uchun qat'iy va xavfga asoslangan javobgarlik mexanizmlarini joriy etish talab qilinadi. Maqolaning ilmiy yangiligi shundan iboratki, u O'zbekiston sharoitida xalqaro tajribani "Raqamli O'zbekiston – 2030" strategiyasi bilan uyg'unlashtirib, SI sohasida huquqiy noaniqliklarni bartaraf etishga qaratilgan amaliy va nazariy takliflarni ishlab chiqadi. Ushbu natijalar milliy qonunchilikni takomillashtirish, davlat siyosati va huquqiy doktrinaning yanada rivojlanishiga xizmat qiladi.

Kalit so'zlar: sun'iy intellekt (SI), SI etikasi, mualliflik huquqi, algoritmik adolat, algoritmik xolislik, diskriminatsiya, avtonom tizimlar, javobgarlik, O'zbekiston qonunchiligi, huquqiy dilemmalar, "Raqamli O'zbekiston 2030", ma'lumotlar xolisligi.

HEMATЖОНОВ Искандар

Главный консультант Управления юстиции
Наманганской области Министерства юстиции
Республики Узбекистан
E-mail: iskandarskyfall1997@gmail.com

ТУХТАМИРЗАЕВ Шохжохон

Главный юрисконсульт
Управления Подшоота-Чодак ирригационной
системы Министерства водного хозяйства
E-mail: uzlegalai@gmail.com

ЭТИЧЕСКИЕ И ПРАВОВЫЕ ДИЛЕММЫ ИСКУССТВЕННОГО ИНТЕЛЛЕКТА: ОТ АВТОРСКОГО ПРАВА ДО СПРАВЕДЛИВОГО ПРИНЯТИЯ РЕШЕНИЙ

АННОТАЦИЯ

Данная научная статья посвящена всестороннему анализу этических и правовых дилемм, возникающих в результате стремительного развития технологий искусственного интеллекта (ИИ). Основная цель исследования заключается в выявлении и комплексном изучении трёх ключевых проблемных направлений: авторское право, алгоритмическая справедливость и ответственность автономных систем. Методологическую основу работы составляют нормативно-правовой анализ, сравнительно-правовой метод, а также изучение международных правовых актов и

судебной практики зарубежных стран. Результаты исследования показывают, что, во-первых, вопрос авторства произведений, созданных ИИ, остаётся неопределённым в национальном законодательстве Узбекистана. В этом контексте изучение опыта Великобритании и Китая позволяет предложить эффективные правовые механизмы для устранения неопределённости. Во-вторых, проблема алгоритмической справедливости и предотвращения дискриминации приобретает фундаментальное значение для защиты прав человека. В связи с этим представляется необходимым заимствование подходов, закреплённых в Законе ЕС об ИИ и рекомендациях ЮНЕСКО. В-третьих, пример автономного транспорта и медицинской диагностики демонстрирует, что традиционные институты гражданско-правовой ответственности не полностью отвечают вызовам цифровой эпохи, что обуславливает необходимость внедрения строгих и риск-ориентированных моделей ответственности. Научная новизна работы состоит в том, что она впервые в контексте Узбекистана сопоставляет международный опыт с национальной стратегией «Цифровой Узбекистан – 2030», формулируя практико-ориентированные предложения по совершенствованию законодательства. Полученные выводы имеют как теоретическое, так и прикладное значение для правовой доктрины и государственной политики.

Ключевые слова: искусственный интеллект (ИИ), этика ИИ, авторское право, алгоритмическая справедливость, алгоритмическая беспристрастность, дискриминация, автономные системы, ответственность, законодательство Узбекистана, правовые дилеммы, «Цифровой Узбекистан 2030», объективность данных.

Introduction

The unprecedented development of artificial intelligence (AI) technologies is driving profound transformations within society. These technologies are often described as a “highly disruptive force” with the potential to radically alter human lifestyles, modes of work, education, and everyday living [1]. AI promises significant benefits and efficiencies across diverse sectors, ranging from improvements in medical diagnostics to the advancement of autonomous transportation [2]. However, this technological transformation simultaneously generates a range of pressing ethical and legal challenges that are being seriously debated at the global level [4]. Among the most urgent issues to be addressed are algorithmic impartiality, the protection of personal data, copyright, and the determination of liability in the context of autonomous systems [5].

At the international level, efforts to regulate these challenges are intensifying. For example, the European Union (EU), through its Artificial Intelligence Act, has established a risk-based legal framework for AI, prohibiting certain AI systems while imposing strict obligations on others [7]. Similarly, the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), through its *Recommendation on the Ethics of Artificial Intelligence*, has advanced a set of universal principles grounded in human rights [4]. Such global initiatives demonstrate a transition in AI regulation from broad normative principles to concrete and enforceable strategies.

The purpose of this scholarly article is to provide an in-depth legal analysis of three fundamental ethical and legal dilemmas associated with AI: the issue of copyright protection for works generated by AI; the potential for AI algorithms to produce discriminatory outcomes in matters of fairness and impartiality; and the complex problem of assigning liability when autonomous systems malfunction. By examining these three issues as distinct yet inherently interconnected phenomena, the study offers a comprehensive account of their legal, economic, and social implications.

In Uzbekistan, the *Uzbekistan 2030 Strategy* and the *Strategy for the Development of Artificial Intelligence until 2030*, adopted at the initiative of the President, reflect the country’s strong commitment to becoming a regional IT hub [8]. By 2030, Uzbekistan has set the ambitious goal of joining the top 50 countries in the “Government AI Readiness Index,” a target that requires

substantial investment in education, research, and IT infrastructure [8]. As the integration of AI technologies into the national economy and public governance accelerates, the national legal framework must adapt to these new realities. Against this backdrop, the present article seeks to identify existing legal gaps, account for global regulatory trends, and advance concrete proposals for the improvement of national legislation in order to safeguard the country's digital future.

Copyright in works generated by artificial creativity

Copyright law has traditionally served as a legal mechanism designed to protect “original works of authorship,” a concept reflected both in U.S. legislation and in the laws of most jurisdictions worldwide [11]. U.S. courts and the Copyright Office (USCO) have consistently emphasized that the term “author” applies strictly to human beings. The landmark case *Thaler v. Perlmutter* reaffirmed that copyright law requires human authorship. In this case, the court underscored that certain provisions of copyright law—such as the rule that copyright endures “for seventy years after the author's death,” or that rights may pass to a “spouse or heirs”—can only be meaningfully applied to natural persons [11]. Consequently, the court denied copyright protection to the work at issue, as it had been created independently by AI [11].

A critical distinction in addressing this complex issue lies between works “created with the assistance of AI” and those “created by AI” [13]. Where AI functions merely as a tool in the creative process (for example, when a writer employs AI to edit text), the resulting work is still deemed to possess human authorship and may thus be eligible for copyright protection [14]. According to the 2025 USCO report, eligibility for copyright requires sufficient “human creative control” over the work [11].

Furthermore, the USCO introduced the concept of “separability” [15]. Under this principle, if a human contribution (e.g., modifications or edits) can be clearly distinguished from the AI-generated portions, copyright protection extends only to the human-authored elements [15]. Conversely, if the AI-generated modifications so thoroughly subsume the human input that the latter cannot be separated, the work as a whole is ineligible for copyright protection [15]. This principle prevents copyright protection for, for example, an image generated in the style of Van Gogh's *Starry Night*, since the AI's transformations wholly subsume any traceable human authorship [15].

The use of generative AI tools has also sparked debate over the role of “prompting.” According to the USCO, even detailed prompts are insufficient to establish the requisite “human control” over authorship, as the AI system expresses the underlying ideas in its own “creative” manner [14]. Consequently, the USCO does not accept prompting as a basis for copyright [14]. This position reflects the U.S. tradition of rejecting the notion of granting copyright solely for “sweat of the brow,” i.e., effort expended in generating a work [14].

Other jurisdictions, however, have adopted divergent approaches. For example, under the United Kingdom's *Copyright, Designs and Patents Act* (CDPA), authorship is assigned to “the person by whom the arrangements necessary for the creation of the work are undertaken,” thereby enabling AI users to claim authorship rights [16]. A Chinese court similarly held that a user's intellectual input through prompts could meet the thresholds of “intellectual achievement” and “originality” sufficient to justify protection for an AI-generated image [16].

Uzbekistan's *Law on Copyright and Related Rights* defines the author as a natural person [16]. Much like the USCO's position, this law interprets authorship as the product of an “individual's creative activity,” which is inherently incompatible with the nature of AI [16]. Nevertheless, the current legislation contains no explicit provisions addressing the legal status of AI-generated works. This gap produces legal uncertainty for creators, entrepreneurs, and legal practitioners—particularly in cases where AI models have been trained on copyrighted datasets without authorization [11].

Uzbekistan's legal scholarship has begun to engage actively with these issues. For example, Professor Said Gulomov of Tashkent State University of Law, in his book *Intellectual Property in the Digital Age: Rethinking IP Law in the Era of Artificial Intelligence*, analyzes these challenges in depth [17]. Moreover, the Oliy Majlis (Parliament) of Uzbekistan is currently considering a draft law on AI regulation, which introduces requirements for labeling AI-generated outputs when published in mass media or on the internet [20]. While this represents an important step forward in ensuring transparency of provenance, it does not resolve the copyright dilemma.

This analysis suggests that Uzbekistan, in its aspiration to become an “IT hub,” may benefit from studying the experiences of jurisdictions such as the United Kingdom and China. Their approaches allow recognition of human input—even when expressed through prompts—as a sufficient basis for authorship. Adopting a similar framework could provide legal protection for creative works produced in human-AI collaboration, thereby stimulating innovation and safeguarding intellectual property in the country.

Table 1. International Principles of Copyright: The Question of AI Authorship

Jurisdiction	Core Principles
United States	Requires human authorship; works created solely by AI are ineligible for copyright; the “creative control” standard applies; prompts are insufficient; human contributions must be clearly separable [11].
United Kingdom	The “author” is defined as the person who undertakes the necessary arrangements for the creation of the work [16].
China	Court rulings have recognized that a user’s intellectual contribution through prompts may suffice to establish authorship [16].
European Union	The EU AI Act establishes transparency obligations for generative AI, including disclosure of AI involvement in content creation and summaries of datasets used for training, particularly where copyrighted material is concerned [16].

AI Fairness and Impartiality Algorithm: Preventing Discrimination

Algorithmic Fairness (Algorithmic Bias) refers to the emergence of unfair or discriminatory outcomes within AI systems as a result of systemic errors or violations that disproportionately affect certain groups [22]. This phenomenon often reflects or even amplifies existing socio-economic, racial, or gender-based discrimination present in society [23]. As AI systems learn from data, the main causes of unfairness can be summarized as follows:

Errors in Data: The datasets used to train AI algorithms may be inaccurate, incomplete, or reflective of historical discrimination [23]. For example, if credit history data underrepresents certain demographic groups, the AI system may produce unfair decisions against them. If such biased outputs are used for retraining, unfairness may further intensify [23].

Errors in Algorithm Design: Subjective decisions made by developers or mistakes in programming may also lead to bias [23]. For instance, an AI designer may assign disproportionate importance to certain factors in decision-making.

Errors in Proxy Data: AI systems sometimes rely on proxy variables, which may indirectly correlate with protected attributes such as race or gender [23]. For instance, if postal codes are used

as proxies for economic status, and specific postal codes are strongly associated with particular racial groups, this may result in discriminatory outcomes [23].

Errors in Evaluation: Even if the algorithm itself is neutral, biased interpretations of its outputs—shaped by prior assumptions or misconceptions of human evaluators—may lead to unfair decisions [23].

Algorithmic bias poses particularly severe risks in areas where decisions directly affect human lives [23]. For example:

Criminal Justice: Facial recognition systems may produce inaccurate results when identifying individuals from Black or other racial minority groups, thereby reinforcing systemic racism and discrimination [3]. Cases such as *Clearview AI* illustrate serious challenges concerning privacy and fairness in law enforcement's use of AI [3].

Education and Financial Services: AI systems employed in exam scoring or credit scoring may introduce discriminatory practices that limit access to education or financial resources based on race or socio-economic background [7]. This deepens existing social inequalities.

At the international level, several approaches have been adopted to address these challenges. The **European Union's AI Act** employs a risk-based framework. According to this regulation, systems that present “unacceptable risk” (e.g., social scoring systems) are prohibited, while “high-risk” systems—including those used in law enforcement, education, and financial services—are subject to strict obligations concerning data quality, human oversight, transparency, and accountability [7]. This framework establishes safeguards to minimize unfair outcomes.

The **UNESCO Recommendation on the Ethics of AI** advances principles such as fairness, non-discrimination, transparency, and human oversight [4]. It obliges AI practitioners to ensure that AI technologies promote social justice and that the benefits of AI remain accessible to all [4].

Practical strategies for mitigating algorithmic bias also exist. These include the collection of diverse and representative datasets, conducting regular fairness testing and audits, ensuring human oversight, and applying technical fairness interventions (e.g., balancing representation within datasets) [23]. Open-source tools such as IBM's *AI Fairness 360* and Microsoft's *Fairlearn* assist developers in detecting and reducing algorithmic bias [24].

In Uzbekistan, the **newly adopted law on the legal regulation of AI** incorporates advanced provisions [25]. One of its most significant rules is the requirement that decisions affecting human rights and freedoms must not rely solely on AI outputs [20]. This principle ensures that AI conclusions are not final and that mandatory human oversight is preserved. It directly aligns with the humanitarian values enshrined in UNESCO's Recommendation and the EU AI Act.

Furthermore, the law establishes administrative liability for unlawful processing or dissemination of personal data through AI technologies, including fines and administrative detention [20]. This rule, aimed at safeguarding data privacy and security, constitutes a core element of ethical AI governance [6]. Given that the Government of Uzbekistan is actively implementing AI-based digital services such as *PalmPay* (palm-based payments) and *MyID* (digital identity verification), these legal protections are both practical and urgently necessary [8]. Such measures foster public trust in emerging technologies.

Liability of AI Autonomous Systems: Who Is Responsible?

Liability Issues in Case of Autonomous System Failures pose serious challenges to traditional legal theories. Classical civil law is largely based on the principle of fault attribution. However, since the development and application of AI systems involve multiple stakeholders — including manufacturers, software developers, users, and data processors — assigning fault to a single party becomes extremely difficult [27].

The theory of strict liability, such as product liability, also requires adaptation. Traditionally, this doctrine holds manufacturers liable for defective products. Yet it remains unclear whether software itself (if not embedded in hardware) qualifies as a “product,” which creates a legal gap [27].

Autonomous Vehicles (AVs): Liability for autonomous vehicles depends on the level of autonomy. According to the six-level classification of the Society of Automotive Engineers (SAE), in vehicles ranging from levels 0 to 2, liability primarily rests with the driver. However, in fully autonomous vehicles (levels 4 and 5), liability shifts to the manufacturer or software developer [28]. A recent U.S. court case involving Tesla set an important precedent: a federal jury found Tesla partially liable for an accident, ordering the company to pay USD 243 million in damages due to “deceptive safety claims and design defects” [28]. This case demonstrated that even in the absence of specific regulation, courts can hold manufacturers accountable [28].

Medical Diagnostic Systems: In healthcare, the use of AI raises complex questions of liability among doctors, hospitals, and AI developers [30]. For instance, a physician relying on an incorrect AI diagnosis may be liable for malpractice. However, the physician may in turn pursue claims against the AI provider [2]. At the same time, if AI proves to deliver more accurate results than human judgment, a doctor who refuses to use AI could also be held liable for malpractice [2].

The **European Union’s new Product Liability Directive (New PLD)** is a significant legal instrument designed to address liability challenges associated with AI [27]. This directive recognizes software and AI, whether embedded in hardware or distributed independently, as “products,” thereby closing the gap in previous legislation. Importantly, the New PLD extends liability beyond the point of sale: if a defect arises due to software updates or continuous learning in AI systems, the manufacturer remains liable [27]. Moreover, when victims face “excessive difficulties” in proving their case, defects in complex AI systems may be presumed.

In Uzbekistan, current laws — including the *Law on Road Transport* — are based on the driver’s fault and responsibility, making them incompatible with autonomous vehicles [29]. At present, no special legal framework exists for autonomous vehicles [29]. Although general principles of the Civil Code apply, they are insufficient to address the complexities associated with AI and software [7].

This legal gap constitutes a major barrier to the deployment of autonomous systems in Uzbekistan. It not only restricts innovation but also leaves victims without adequate legal protection in cases where autonomous systems cause harm. Therefore, Uzbekistan must develop its own legal mechanisms, drawing upon advanced international practices such as the EU’s New PLD.

A relevant precedent for Uzbekistan’s readiness to adopt international liability regimes exists. The country’s accession to the *Vienna Convention on Civil Liability for Nuclear Damage* demonstrates its willingness to create new and specific liability regimes for high-risk technologies [7].

Table 2. Liability of Autonomous Systems: Potential Subjects and Grounds of Responsibility

Emergency Scenario	Liable Parties
Accident involving a Level 2 autonomous vehicle	Driver, Vehicle Manufacturer, Software Developer
Accident involving a Level 5 autonomous vehicle	Vehicle Manufacturer, Software Developer
Misdiagnosis by an AI-powered medical device	Physician/Hospital, AI Software Developer
Incorrect calculations generated by AI	User/Entrepreneur, Software Developer

Recommendations on Strategy and Legislative Improvement for Uzbekistan

In Uzbekistan's new AI law, the requirement to label AI-generated products constitutes an important step towards enhancing transparency [20]. However, this provision does not resolve the fundamental issues related to copyright.

Recommendation: Amend Uzbekistan's *Law on Copyright and Related Rights* to explicitly define the legal status of works created with the assistance of AI. Drawing on the experience of countries such as the United Kingdom and China, mechanisms could be introduced that grant copyright to the user by recognizing AI's role as an "assisting contribution" or "execution of necessary arrangements" [16]. Such an approach would stimulate innovation while ensuring legal certainty.

The principle enshrined in Uzbekistan's new law that decisions affecting human rights and freedoms must not rely solely on AI conclusions is of paramount importance [20]. This principle acts as a strong safeguard against the "human-out-of-the-loop" problem.

Recommendation: Establish a risk-based AI governance framework similar to that of the European Union's AI Act. Under this system, high-risk AI applications (e.g., those in criminal justice, education, and finance) should be subject to mandatory **Algorithmic Impact Assessments (AIA)** designed to evaluate fairness in data, design, and evaluation processes [4].

Regarding liability for autonomous systems, current Uzbek legislation remains insufficient [29].

Recommendation: Develop a new draft law on "Liability for AI Products," modeled on the EU's new Product Liability Directive (New PLD). This law should explicitly classify software and AI as "products" [27]. It should further provide that liability is determined by the level of autonomy (for instance, according to SAE classification for vehicles), and that manufacturers and software developers are held accountable for defects arising from continuous learning or post-sale updates [27].

Effective AI regulation requires collaboration among diverse stakeholders [4].

Recommendation: Establish a dedicated **National AI Governance Council** or inter-agency working group that includes representatives of the government, academia (e.g., Tashkent State University of Law), and private sector experts. This body would also serve as a forum for international cooperation, enabling the study of foreign experience and the improvement of national legislation [36].

Table 3. Key Provisions of Uzbekistan's New "AI Law" and Proposed Improvements

Existing Provision	Proposed Improvement
AI-generated decisions cannot serve as the sole basis when they affect human rights [20].	Formalize this rule by introducing a mandatory "human-in-the-loop" requirement and supervisory procedures in high-risk sectors such as finance, judiciary, and healthcare.
Administrative liability is established for the unlawful processing and dissemination of personal data through AI [20].	Develop a graduated system of fines based on the severity of harm and the type of data involved, including provisions for civil liability.
Obligation to label products generated by AI [20].	Complement the copyright legislation with a new legal framework, drawing upon international best practices, that clearly regulates ownership of works created with the assistance of AI and those created entirely by AI .

Conclusion

The Government of Uzbekistan has developed a comprehensive national strategy aimed at fostering the development of AI and has already taken important initial steps in its implementation. The newly adopted law, with its advanced provisions particularly focused on the protection of human rights and data privacy, has established a solid foundation for regulatory governance in this field.

As analyzed in this report, unresolved challenges concerning copyright, fairness, and liability remain key obstacles to the full integration of AI into society. Global practices, such as those in the United States and the European Union, demonstrate that there are diverse approaches to addressing these issues. For Uzbekistan, it is of critical importance to study these international trends and adapt them to its national context.

In conclusion, future-oriented, human-centered, and risk-sensitive legal frameworks are not barriers to innovation but essential conditions for strengthening public trust in AI and ensuring its long-term societal adoption. By building upon global precedents while tailoring them to national needs, Uzbekistan can position itself as a leader in creating a legal ecosystem that both promotes innovation and safeguards fundamental human rights and values.

References/Iqtiboslar/Сноски:

1. Addressing equity and ethics in artificial intelligence - American Psychological Association, accessed August 14, 2025, <https://www.apa.org/monitor/2024/04/addressing-equity-ethics-artificial-intelligence>
2. The Risks of AI in Healthcare - Parsons Behle & Latimer, accessed August 14, 2025, <https://parsonsbehle.com/insights/the-risks-of-ai-in-healthcare>
3. How AI can support—not undermine—criminal justice - Beyond: UBC, accessed August 14, 2025, <https://beyond.ubc.ca/how-ai-can-support-not-undermine-criminal-justice/>
4. Ethics of Artificial Intelligence | UNESCO, accessed August 14, 2025, <https://www.unesco.org/en/artificial-intelligence/recommendation-ethics>
5. www.techuk.org, accessed August 14, 2025, <https://www.techuk.org/resource/ai-regulation-a-framework-for-responsible-artificial-intelligence.html#:~:text=Ethical%20AI%20frameworks%20must%20uphold,process%20behind%20AI%20driven%20recommendations.>
6. Aligning AI Ethics with Privacy Compliance: Why It Matters for Your Business | TrustArc, accessed August 14, 2025, <https://trustarc.com/resource/ai-ethics-with-privacy-compliance/>
7. AI Act | Shaping Europe's digital future, accessed August 14, 2025, <https://digital-strategy.ec.europa.eu/en/policies/regulatory-framework-ai>
8. O'zbekiston sun'iy intellekt sohasida axloqiy me'yorlarni ishlab chiqadi — Abdulla Aripov, accessed August 14, 2025, <https://www.spot.uz/oz/2025/02/01/ai-development/>
9. Sun'iy intellekt - Hukumat portali, accessed August 14, 2025, https://gov.uz/oz/digital/activity_page/sun-iy-intellekt
10. UZBEKISTAN - International Science Council, accessed August 14, 2025, https://council.science/wp-content/uploads/2025/02/AI-Paper-Case-Study-Uzbekistan_V1.pdf
11. Generative Artificial Intelligence and Copyright Law | Congress.gov ..., accessed August 14, 2025, <https://www.congress.gov/crs-product/LSB10922>
12. AI, art and the law: new frontiers in creativity and IP - The Global Legal Post, accessed August 14, 2025, <https://www.globallegalpost.com/news/ai-art-and-the-law-new-frontiers-in-creativity-and-ip-875197916>
13. The interaction between intellectual property laws and AI: Opportunities and challenges, accessed August 14, 2025, <https://www.nortonrosefulbright.com/en/knowledge/publications/c6d47e6f/the-interaction-between-intellectual-property-laws-and-ai-opportunities-and-challenges>
14. Copyright Office Publishes Report on Copyrightability of AI-Generated Materials | Insights | Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher & Flom LLP, accessed August 14, 2025, <https://www.skadden.com/insights/publications/2025/02/copyright-office-publishes-report>
15. Copyright Protection for AI-Generated Works (BitLaw), accessed August 14, 2025, <https://www.bitlaw.com/ai/AI-copyright.html>
16. AI vs. Copyright: Navigating the Legal Maze of Generative AI ..., accessed August 14, 2025, <https://uzbekistanlaw-blog.com/ai-vs-copyright-navigating-the-legal-maze-of-generative-ai-content-creation/>

17. Professor Said Gulyamov Co-Authors Groundbreaking Book on AI and IP Law, accessed August 14, 2025, <https://gulyamov.org/professor-said-gulyamov-co-authors-groundbreaking-book-on-ai-and-ip-law/>
18. gulyamov.org, accessed August 14, 2025, https://gulyamov.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/01/SPS_6_2024.pdf
19. Intellectual property in the digital age - Roma TrE-Press, accessed August 14, 2025, <https://romatrepress.uniroma3.it/libro/intellectual-property-in-the-digital-age/>
20. Uzbekistan takes steps to regulate AI with new legislation - Kun.uz, accessed August 14, 2025, <https://kun.uz/en/news/2025/04/16/uzbekistan-takes-steps-to-regulate-ai-with-new-legislation>
21. Copyright Office Releases Part 2 of Artificial Intelligence Report, accessed August 14, 2025, <https://www.copyright.gov/newsnet/2025/1060.html>
22. greenlining.org, accessed August 14, 2025, <https://greenlining.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/04/Greenlining-Institute-Algorithmic-Bias-Explained-Report-Feb-2021.pdf>
23. What Is Algorithmic Bias? | IBM, accessed August 14, 2025, <https://www.ibm.com/think/topics/algorithmic-bias>
24. Addressing AI Bias: Real-World Challenges and How to Solve Them | DigitalOcean, accessed August 14, 2025, <https://www.digitalocean.com/resources/articles/ai-bias>
25. Uzbekistan Adopts Law Regulating Artificial Intelligence Use, accessed August 14, 2025, <https://uz.kursiv.media/en/2025-08-12/uzbekistan-adopts-law-regulating-artificial-intelligence-use/>
26. Legislative Chamber of Uzbekistan Passes Law on Legal Regulation of Artificial Intelligence, accessed August 14, 2025, <https://uzdaily.uz/en/legislative-chamber-of-uzbekistan-passes-law-on-legal-regulation-of-artificial-intelligence/>
27. AI liability – who is accountable when artificial intelligence ..., accessed August 14, 2025, <https://www.taylorwessing.com/en/insights-and-events/insights/2025/01/ai-liability-who-is-accountable-when-artificial-intelligence-malfunctions>
28. Understanding Driverless Car Liability - Clifford Law Offices, accessed August 14, 2025, <https://www.cliffordlaw.com/what-drivers-need-to-know-about-autonomous-car-liability/>
29. Legal Issues Arising in Autonomous (Driverless) Vehicles: Liability and Privacy, accessed August 14, 2025, <https://gun.av.tr/insights/updates/legal-issues-arising-in-autonomous-driverless-vehicles-liability-and-privacy>
30. Liability for Use of Artificial Intelligence in Medicine - University of Michigan Law School Scholarship Repository, accessed August 14, 2025, https://repository.law.umich.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1569&context=book_chapters
31. CIVIL CODE OF THE REPUBLIC OF UZBEKISTAN PART TWO DD AUGUST 29, 1996 y, accessed August 14, 2025, <https://invest-in-uzbekistan.org/en/zakonodatelstvo/grazhdanskij-kodeks-respubliki-uzbekistan-chast-vtoraya-29-avgusta-1996-g/>
32. CIVIL CODE OF THE REPUBLIC OF UZBEKISTAN - Antislavery in Domestic Legislation, accessed August 14, 2025, <https://antislaverylaw.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/2019/08/Uzbekistan.-Civil-Code.-1995-cis-legislation-English.pdf>
33. O'zbekiston Yadroviy zarar uchun fuqarolik javobgarligi to'g'risidagi Vena konvensiyasiga qo'shildi - UzDaily.uz, accessed August 14, 2025, <https://www.uzdaily.uz/uz/ozbekiston-yadroviy-zarar-uchun-fuqarolik-javobgarligi-tog'risidagi-vena-konvensiyasiga-qoshildi/>
34. What is AI Governance? - IBM, accessed August 14, 2025, <https://www.ibm.com/think/topics/ai-governance>
35. Sun'iy intellekt bo'yicha xalqaro konferensiya: qonunchilikni takomillashtirish sari qadam, accessed August 14, 2025, <https://www.uwed.uz/news/465>

YURIST AXBOROTNOMASI

5-SON, 7-JILD

ВЕСТНИК ЮРИСТА

НОМЕР 5, ВЫПУСК 7

LAWYER HERALD

VOLUME 7, ISSUE 5

ISSN 2181-9416

DOI JURNAL: 10.26739/2181-9416