Minnesota Journal of Business Law and Entrepreneurship

Volume 2026, No. 1

ISSN: 1540-3270

Legal Frameworks for Artificial Intelligence Startups: Comparative Insights from India and the United States

[1]Rashi Makhija, [2]Prof. (Dr.) Anuradha Jha, [3]Priyanshu Dennis Pascal, [4]Dr. M. Madhuri Irene, [5]Mr. Yogesh Chandra Gupta

[1]Research Scholar, University School of Law and Legal Studies,

Guru Gobind Singh Indraprastha University, Delhi

rashi.11516590023@ipu.ac.in

[2]Professor, University School of Law and Legal Studies,

Guru Gobind Singh Indraprastha University, Delhi

aj@ipu.ac.in

[3]B.Tech. (Student of Master's of Science in Business Analytics),

Wichita State University, Kansas, USA.

priyanshudennis2@gmail.com

[4]Associate Professor, ICFAI Law School,

The ICFAI University, Dehradun.

madhuriirene@ifheindia.org

[5]Assistant Professor

TMCLLS, Teerthanker Mahaveer University, Moradabad.

Abstract

The current paper also presents the comparison of the legal and regulatory environment of Artificial Intelligence startups in India and the United States and how the national approach to innovation, the speed of data privacy and transactions influence the manner in which they expand and evolve their operations. Specifically, it discusses the hidden issues of liability, responsibility, and intellectual property development in the AI creation context, and a set of urgent factors of data handling and algorithm responsibility which characterise the legislative response to both fields. The weaknesses of laws in India are also discussed, where the provisions in policies are typically in place before the specific AI law is discussed, compared with a more fragmented but more substantial provision in the legal system in the United States. Within the framework of qualitative research, a comparative study design is used in the study, which would help in critically assessing how AI is transforming and redefining the legal regimes in these two dissimilar national settings. To identify the characteristics of differences in the political approach to regulation and how it is done, the research is based on the content analysis of primary sources including legislation, policy papers, and government reports in the two countries. It also resorts to the expertise of the academic sources and the view of the experts in providing a comprehensive perspective of the evolving legal environments. Lastly, the paper is meant to describe the implications of this regulatory non-alignment in AI start-up ecosystems to inform policymakers and entrepreneurs to figure out how AI innovation works in different countries.

Keywords: Artificial Intelligence, India, United States, Legal Frameworks, Startups, Data Privacy, Algorithmic Accountability, Regulatory Gaps, Intellectual Property, AI Ethics.

1. Introduction

The rapid development of Artificial Intelligence technologies has provoked the emergence of AI-oriented startups on an unprecedented scale all around the world, affecting several sectors including healthcare in order to change the way they deal with money [1]. However, these rapid developments are followed by complex challenges as well without exception, primarily regarding the ethical issues, regulatory preparedness, and cross-border regulation of AI systems. The purpose of the paper is to overview the legal system in India and the United States and compare them to uncover how these two jurisdictions respond to the opportunities and challenges posed by AI innovation in place of their natural differences. Specifically, here the regulatory heterogeneity covering market accessibility, the innovation necessity, and their strategic legal compliance practices between AI companies in the two nations will be discussed. The paper shall also look at the regulatory loopholes that are present and the market upheavals that arise as a result of absence of special AI laws particularly in the emerging economies like India[2]. This legislative vacuum has meant that regularly AI startups are forced into an exercise in navigating an industry specific policy labyrinth, consuming essential research and development funding in the compliance exercise. United States, however, lacks a single federal law of AI and instead incorporate a mixture of other sectoral laws and principles of common law to address the problems of AI. This disjointed system is flexible and allows innovations but it complicates AI start-ups that must operate on quite different scales and under very different conditions[3]. These divergent regulatory ideologies in the paper will be further divided and their implications on the AI start-up communities, investor trust and the big global AI governance debate at large will be analyzed. It will also address how these various legal environments will affect the growth of ethics, application and scaling of AI solutions, to present information on the best practice and the path that the international regulation of AI solutions could follow. The mixed-method approach will be employed to enrich the qualitative analysis of the legal legislation, legal regulatory reports with the case studies of AI startups in the two countries to illuminate the practical consideration of the frameworks[4]. It will in addition demonstrate their points of convergence and differences in their regulatory strategies and offer recommendations on how they can develop more comprehensive and adaptive systems of laws in encouraging responsible AI innovation. The ultimate goal is to decide how these nations can better adjust their laws to be less restrictive of AI growth and simultaneously control it to safeguard societal interests and have AI implemented in an ethical manner. The second source that will guide this comparative analysis will be the existing literature and policy to provide an understanding of the motivation and underlying philosophy underlying the approaches to regulation of each country. It will also examine the role that international frameworks which influence domestic policy debates in India and the United States such as the AI Act of the European Union play. Through these various solutions, the paper aims to shed light on developments which may be made in the future of creating stronger and internationally oriented AI governance frameworks that could allow sustainable innovation and reduce the uncertain dangers.

2. Conceptualizing Artificial Intelligence and Startup Ecosystems

Here, the historical principles of Artificial Intelligence will be outlined, the difference between the different AI paradigms will be identified, and all the different elements of an efficient startup ecosystem will be outlined. It will also analyze the peculiarities of AI startups like data-dependency, sophisticated algorithms, and talents that require specific legal and regulatory protection.

2.1. Defining Artificial Intelligence and its Sub-disciplines

Artificial intelligence is a broad area of computational methods that allows the machine to replicate the ability of the human intelligence, such as the learning process, solving problems, and making decisions. Many different paradigms are used to achieve this simulation, such as machine learning, deep learning, natural language processing, and computer vision, each of which exploits some algorithmic method and computational model to implement certain cognitive functions[5]. One of the most notable sub-disciplines of AI is machine learning, where systems can learn without explicit programming, and deep learning is a further sub-discipline of machine learning that utilizes neural networks with multiple layers to discover complex patterns and representations of

large datasets. Natural language processing is aimed at allowing computers to comprehend, interpret and generate human language, whereas computer vision is meant to provide computers with capabilities of interpreting and making decisions when looking at visual data just like human vision. These sub-disciplines although different tend to overlap and blend into develop more advanced AI systems that can execute a complex task on a wide variety of applications. The fast growing character of these sub-disciplines of AI requires the adoption of a dynamic regulation framework that would be able to keep up with the new technological developments and corporate effects.

2.2. Characteristics of AI Startups

Unlike more conventional technology companies, AI startups are intensely data-driven and heavily focus on proprietary algorithms, large datasets to train and validate, and a highly specialized workforce with competencies in data science, machine learning engineering, and AI ethics. The intellectual property in their business models is usually based on new models of AI and new applications of existing AI technology, and well-developed intellectual property protection and data regulation laws are essential in this case. Additionally, their pace of rapid development, as well as their capacity to impact society deeply, can oftentimes levy solemn investment in venture capitals and thus the clear legal provisions of responsibility, AI development grounded on ethical principles and adherence to the laws, in different jurisdictions, become extremely urgent. The division of AI technologies including traditional machine learning, natural language processing, Computer vision and robotics is likely to put more emphasis on the fact that they are highly reliant on machine learning techniques and emphasizes the knowledge that goes into the development and deployment of these systems. Specifically, machine learning, which defines machine enhancement in an automatic way depending on the experience, through the examination of the accessible information, serves as the foundation of many AI applications, as systems are capable of creating their principles of functioning[6].

2.3. Global Landscape of AI Innovation

This is flexible enough to enable the AI systems to accomplish broad objectives such as automated natural language processing, knowledge representation, and automated reasoning, which over time transforms a variety of human activities. As a result, the increasing trend of investment in AI startups globally, especially in such major countries as the United States, China, and the United Kingdom, indicates the major economic and social consequences of the technologies. Such a fast-paced technology development, though, has major moral, legal, and social issues, and different nations have come up with laws to counter these problems. Bringing up these issues, especially the ones related to ethical use of AI, is still a primary concern of new startups in the field of AI. These ethical facets typically include the issue of algorithmic bias, justness and openness and accountability and demand active measures and tangible legal rules to ensure confidence in AI technologies by society. The insective existence of the legally usual composition of policies which regulate AI needs precise effort to understand need of the society and shape concrete legislations to grasp human rights[7].

3. Legal and Regulatory Landscape in India

The contemporary legislation concerning AI in the Indian context is still developing; this field is characterized by a fragmented mass of legal regulations and the tendency to reform the current policies afresh in order to adapt them to the AI-related scope of issues instead of designing an explicitly tailored set of laws. This slow transition may cause gray boxes, particularly when data privacy, algorithmic accountability, and intellectual property become issues with AI applications. In the example of the Information Technology Act, 2000, and the offered Digital Personal Data Protection Bill, the provisions are a few and relevant to the data handling, but the specifics of the mass data processing and autonomous decision making the AI suggests is not completely addressed.

3.1. Overview of Indian Technology Law

Furthermore, the legal regime and structure that we are presently working with (like the Information Technology Act of 2000) was not initially designed to handle the issues of AI and problems of decisions made

by algorithms, demonstrating an incredible lack of foresight regulation. The Indian legal system of AI is thus fragmented and lacks a serious intention to counter the special threats and opportunities of AI, specifically regarding the factors of privacy of data and the potential of AI misuse in a diverse society. Costly in its lexons, the Ministry of Electronics and Information Technology is also in active process of formulating policy initiatives to ensure responsible AI development, though overarching legislation is currently at early, fledgling preventive. Such a changing process demonstrates a reserved, but still needed way to apply ethical aspects, like fairness, accountability, and transparency, to the implementation of AI and its regulation. The enthusiasm of India in building AI abilities is also shown by other projects such as the 2018 in-country initiative as the #AIforAll Strategy, which is focused on inclusivity in key domains, including healthcare and education, and the 2021 Responsible AI Principles, both of which focus on responsible aspects of AI innovation[8]. Further, both the National AI Strategy by India and the Digital Personal Data Protection Act put the responsible practice of AI in the forefront as data sovereignty is key focus, and sensitive health data should be stored domestically to restore trust in AI solutions and privacy for the patients. Regardless of these precursory measures, the current law continues to grapple with the dilemma of black-box algorithms in AI, especially in sensitive areas such as healthcare, wherein failure to breath life into the outputs of the algorithm is of great consequence in matters concerning medical malfeasance and product liability[9].

3.2. Data Protection and Privacy Regulations (e.g., DPDP Act)

The Indian right to privacy is under dynamic changes, mainly as there is a need to realize the vast acceleration of digitalization and the advent of multimedia technologies. The groundbreaking Puttaswamy decision confirmed the right to privacy as prior, thus providing a valuable basis on the establishment of data protection laws regarding AI systems, despite the unrestricted AI-specific law. References to the context, however, even the current Indian regulatory tools, including the Telecommunications Act, 2023, and the Digital Personal Data Protection Act, 2023, are primarily devoted to cybersecurity and data breaches, which leaves a notable regulatory gap with AI-specific instances of operation, including performance degradation as well as algorithmic bias[10]. Such an omission is also enhanced by the structural impediments to disclosure and constraints existing in the contemporary AI incident repositories, which impedes successful supervision and responsibility of AI systems. The existing guidelines do not tend to be specific as per AI applications, thus there is a void in responsibility and supervision, which results in a kind of environment where AI systems can function without the necessary clarity, which poses a threat to the viability of the data protection and privacy systems[11]. As a matter of fact, the absence of clear principles on how to approach the problem of algorithmic responsibility and individual data protection significantly weakens the Indian justice system and puts the safety of individual rights at risk, which should have a more paramount and AI-focused approach to regulation.

3.3. Intellectual Property Rights for AI Innovations

The dynamic aspect of artificial intelligence creates new problems to the traditional intellectual property systems, particularly concerning the questions of inventorship, ownership, and copyrightability of the AI-created content. Specifically, it is possible to ask about the ownership of inventions or other inventive projects, developed by AI systems, and independently, and how the legislation that exists in the field of patents and copyright can be altered to recognize such work. Such a situation demands a rethink of the traditional dogmas in intellectual property that must conform to the specifics of AI-oriented innovation to guarantee that it encourages its creation and is safeguarded in the law field. Moreover, these challenges are enhanced by the fact that specific laws are still not in place that would govern AI usage in India and it would be required to create a broad framework of law that also applies the best practice in transparency and accountability and ethical behavior[12].

4. Legal and Regulatory Landscape in the United States

Nevertheless, the system in the United States is more fragmented, but in a dynamic process, unlike undercodified system in India, both sector-specific administrative statutes on the one hand, and active policy directions of the various agencies of the federal government on the other, are actively contributing to it. This

decentralised approach is a hybrid of early lessee and state tier action, often based on the existing legal systems to settle the novel AI-based challenges without establishing an all-embracive AI-law.

4.1. Overview of US Federal and State Technology Laws

This regulatory environment is further complicated by the separation of powers of the federal and state governments such that even though in spite of the provision of technology laws, different jurisdictions interpret and provide the systems of enforcement differently. To use the California Consumer Privacy Act as an example, the act offers strong data security measures on a state level, yet federal initiatives such as the proposed American Data Privacy and Protection Act strive to enact standards on the national level to ensure a complex network of compliance obligations upon AI developers and deployers. This delicate balance between federal and state laws frequently leaves the control of AI in a subtle and even spotty usage and startups working across the country will have to carefully work around it. Furthermore, the US legal system tends to use the existing laws, including those related to consumer protection, anti-discrimination, and product liability, and utilize them to address the artificial intelligence-related harms, which underscores a tendency to rely on modifying existing laws instead of developing brand-new statutes.

4.2. Data Privacy Regulations (e.g., CCPA, HIPAA)

Although as of now, no major federal data privacy law in the same mould as the European Union-based General Data Protection Regulation has been adopted in the United States, a variety of industry-specific laws and state-based laws come together to define the data privacy environment pertinent to AI development and deployment. These laws, together with the policies of such organizations as the Federal Trade Commission, are designed to reduce the risks of information harvesting and the functioning of algorithms. Both the Federal Trade Commission and the agency have been highly directive in enforcing its powers over unfair or deceptive practices through AI under Section 5 of the FTC Act and has used the available consumer protection schemes to address arising problems. This is not a law that is specific to AI, but could enable the swift reaction to the new AI applications that could threaten consumers and healthy rivalry. Moreover, state-level efforts, including the California Consumer Privacy Act, have become influential in protecting data, with numerous other states following their example to establish a de facto national precedent because of the economic significance of California and the presence of technological firms.

4.3. Intellectual Property Protection for AI Technologies

Intellectual property protection of AI technologies in the US depends more on existing patent, copyright and trade secret statutes modified to accommodate the peculiarities of AI innovations. Such a framework poses difficulties in deciding what to call AI-created output as an invention and having sufficient protection over the algorithms and datasets, which can frequently result in formulating a complex legal interpretation of ownership and infringement. In particular, the copyright statute begs new questions on the issue of originality and authorship, even though the creative work generated with the help of AI systems can be freely copyrighted by patents or trade secrets. In addition, using current anti-discrimination laws, including Title VII of the Civil rights Act and the Americans with Disabilities Act, to apply the AI systems brings forth challenging questions of algorithmic bias and the beneficial impact of such legislation on eliminating AI discrimination[13]. This often necessitates a delicacy where lawyers and policy-makers find methods of returning to past legality notions in order to deal with the more sophisticated forms of discrimination that could emerge as a result of the complexity of AI code. That these legal frameworks are being modified to fit the special requirements of AI (eg, model drift, adversarial inputs, etc) constitutes a broader methodology of viewing AI governance as a subset to the existing regulatory paradigms and not some new systems.

5. Comparative Analysis of Legal Frameworks

In this part, the distinction and overlaps between the divergent and convergent policies of the United States and India towards regulation of AI and in particular in the context of the data privacy, intellectual property rights and ethical controls will be examined critically. In scrutiny of these key areas, we are better able to comprehend

the benefits, weaknesses and opportunities of the harmonization of these two leading jurisdictions that have different philosophies of technological discoveries and regulatory interference. This kind of comparative analysis will assist shed the light on how these two countries grapple with the manner in which they avoid striking a balance between innovation and the necessary regulation and appear to portray an image of the pertinent methodologies to AI regulation in the different legal and socio-economic contexts.

5.1. Similarities in Regulatory Approaches

The preference both India and the United States remain somewhat collegial, in terms of tailoring existing juridical systems to cope with the new complexities of AI, as opposed to passing wholly novel tailor-made legal provisions. In many cases, this practical solution presupposes the re-interpretation of the existing legislation concerning data protection, intellectual property, and consumer rights in new contexts based on the challenges of AI[14]. Nevertheless, this common footing has its own problems such as the lapses in enforcement as a result of the sometimes fractured application of these laws to different uses of AI. Moreover, the common goal of both nations is to promote AI development and, at the same time, to protect the basic rights; however, the accents are shifted to other aspects of controls and enforcement priorities.

5.2. Key Differences and Divergent Philosophies

Although similar concerns are held in trying to strike a balance between innovation and oversight, differences in philosophy between the two countries are expressed in the different approaches to legislation and enforcement priorities, especially the extent of preemptive regulation as compared to the response in the form of adjustment of current legislation. An example is that the US is oriented to market-driven and free structures with a strong dependence on sector regulations and soft-law procedures. In India, on the other hand, although the focus on innovation is similar, it is becoming involved in more intensive regulatory intervention and specific AI policy to look at ethical considerations and wider effects on the society. The focus on promoting innovation means the US would tend to adopt a more laissez-faire approach to regulation, which is wide principles and existing legal frameworks, compared to the European Union, and increasingly India, shift to a more prescriptive risk-based regulation. This divergence is particularly apparent in regards to how privacy is regulated whereby the US values freedom of individuals and right to notice and explanation higher than overarching federal regulation of privacy, in stark contrast to the enthusiast ethical AI approach written in the EU.

5.3. Impact on AI Startup Growth and Innovation

Indian and United States regulatory philosophies are significantly different that influences the type of operations and expansion patterns of AI startups, which influences aspects like market entry barriers to investment appeal. More specifically, it is also the American tendency towards a more context-reflective or rather modular variant of approach, grounded on the modification of the already-existing regulations and the advent of market driven inventions that is inclined to create a highly dynamic though somewhat fragmented landscape of AI firms. Conversely, the progressive regulatory space in India that regulators expect to encompass everything might also introduce other compliance and administration expenses, which could affect the flexibility and scalability of small-scale AI-based businesses. This discrepancy may influence the cross-border patterns of investment, start-ups might be willing to seek lighter-touch treatment of regulatory issues in a particular jurisdiction, and, may also, find a way to influence the competitiveness of AI systems internationally.

6. Conclusion

The paper has critically evaluated the laws of India and the United States of AI startups against one another, which details similarities in how both countries invest in the development of technologies and the differences in the methods, by which they regulate the field of data privacy, intellectual property, and ethical practices. One might use the example of the United States that is more likely to have the market-driven approach with few regulatory constraints to promote creativity, yet it coincides with the probability of a fragmented government across various states and sectors. In comparison, India is slowly adding more systematic, though in the developmental stages, regulatory frameworks, which strive to balance innovation and a portfolio of holistic

ethical principles and data protection. The present comparative analysis reveals that despite the fact that both nations are more engaged in AI development, the legal and socio-economic environment in the two countries is a major determinant of their regulatory practices, which are equally useful contributors towards their adaptive AI regulation practices as applied in the international arena. The findings suggest that the proactive ethical AI strategy picked by the EU offers an interesting alternative to the more reactive options in the two countries, India and the US, particularly in its prospects to facilitate the responsible AI development through the application of strict but globally applicable regulation practices. Along with this, the disparity in the risk-classification, the approaches to compliance and regulatory regulations of these regions illustrates that the harmonization of AI regulation in the global context is a demanding task. The less rigid stance of the United States and the new rules espoused in India, the methodology of decentralization, is far apart in comparison with a more centralized set of rules advanced in governing decisions on cross-border risks in Fin Tech, the methodology developed by agencies like the European Banking Institute and proved to have a world wide dispersion of the varieties of rules. These national and regional orientations towards the innovations of AI and regulation influence one another, as well as the international community in general and the future of AI regulation at the global level. Under these conflicting practices, it can be concluded that further investigations can be carried out to confirm that mutual recognition agreements may be elaborated as one of the ways to eliminate any gaps of regulation and advance AI creation and implementation in the global context, thereby forming a more integrated AI ecosystem. Perhaps, these agreements can one day contribute to making parts of AI ethics and data management more or less standardized, enable more interoperability and ease startup compliances burdens when operating internationally.

References

[1] S. K. S. Pandey, “Regulation of Artificial Intelligence in India: Legal Challenges and the Road Ahead,” *SSRN Electronic Journal* , Jan. 2025, doi: 10.2139/ssrn.5358959.

[2] N. Basu and R. Dave, “Comparative Analysis of Laws in AI,” *Journal of Lifestyle and SDGs Review* , vol. 5, no. 3, Feb. 2025, doi: 10.47172/2965-730x.sdgsreview.v5.n03.pe05575.

[3] N. AllahRakha, “Legal Challenges for International Fintech Startups,” *International Journal of Law and Policy* , vol. 1, no. 8, Dec. 2023, doi: 10.59022/ijlp.148.

[4] V. Singh and D. R. Gautam, “Cyber Crime, Security and Regulation in India,” 2022, p. 147. doi: 10.55662/book.2022ccrs.005.

[5] P. Shrivastava, “An Analytical Exploration of the AI-Based Startup Ecosystem in Madhya Pradesh,” *International Journal for Research in Applied Science and Engineering Technology* , vol. 11, no. 10, p. 1663, Oct. 2023, doi: 10.22214/ijraset.2023.56023.

[6] M. Weber, M. Beutter, J. Weking, M. Böhm, and H. Krcmar, “AI Startup Business Models,” *Business & Information Systems Engineering* , vol. 64, no. 1, p. 91, Dec. 2021, doi: 10.1007/s12599-021-00732-w.

[7] M. N. Joshi, A. K. Dixit, S. C. Saxena, M. Memoria, T. Choudhury, and A. Sar, “A Study of the Application of AI & ML to Climate Variation, with Particular Attention to Legal & Ethical Concerns,” *EAI Endorsed Transactions on Internet of Things* , vol. 10, Mar. 2024, doi: 10.4108/eetiot.5468.

[8] S. Sankaran, “Enhancing Trust Through Standards: A Comparative Risk-Impact Framework for Aligning ISO AI Standards with Global Ethical and Regulatory Contexts,” *arXiv (Cornell University)* , Apr. 2025, doi: 10.48550/arxiv.2504.16139.

[9] M. Singh, “Evolving Ethical and Regulatory Framework for Artificial Intelligence for Health,” *International Journal for Research in Applied Science and Engineering Technology* , vol. 9, p. 1911, Jun. 2021, doi: 10.22214/ijraset.2021.35428.

[10] A. Agarwal and M. J. Nene, "Incorporating AI Incident Reporting into Telecommunications Law and Policy: Insights from India," 2025, doi: 10.48550/ARXIV.2509.09508.

[11] T. Meghwal, "Emerging Challenges in Regulating Artificial Intelligence Under Cyber Security Laws in India," Jan. 2025, doi: 10.2139/ssrn.5030258.

[12] A. Sharma, S. Sharma, S. D. Soni, P. Agrawal, P. K. Mishra, and G. Mourya, "Artificial Intelligence in the Indian Criminal Justice System: Advancements, Challenges, and Ethical Implications," *Journal of Lifestyle and SDGs Review* , vol. 5, no. 1, Jan. 2025, doi: 10.47172/2965-730x.sdgsreview.v5.n01.pe04877.

[13] S. Mirishli, "The Role of Legal Frameworks in Shaping Ethical Artificial Intelligence Use in Corporate Governance," *arXiv (Cornell University)* , Mar. 2025, doi: 10.48550/arxiv.2503.14540.

[14] P. Chopra, R. Sony, and S. Chopra, "Generative AI, Copyright and Personality Rights: A Comparative Legal Perspective," *Legal Issues in the Digital Age* , vol. 6, no. 3, p. 23, Oct. 2025, doi: 10.17323/2713-2749.2025.3.23.51.