ACADEMIA International Journal for Social Sciences
Volume 4, Issue 4, 2025 ISSN-L (Online): 3006-6638

The Use of AI in Predicting Crime: A Legal Analysis of Predictive Policing and Profiling

Sumia Azhar
sumia.azhar@usa.edu.pk
Lecturer, Department of Law, University of South Asia, Lahore, Pakistan.
Corresponding Author: * Sumia Azhar sumia.azhar@usa.edu.pk

Received: 03-11-2025 **Revised:** 25-11-2025 **Accepted:** 11-12-2025 **Published:** 27-12-2025

ABSTRACT

The integration of artificial intelligence (AI) in predictive policing and profiling represents a transformative shift in law enforcement strategies, enabling data-driven forecasts of criminal activities through algorithms analyzing vast datasets on demographics, historical crimes and social behaviors. This research article conducts a comprehensive legal analysis of these practices, examining their implications under constitutional frameworks, international human rights standards and data protection laws such as the GDPR and U.S. Fourth Amendment protections. Key concerns include algorithmic bias, which disproportionately impacts marginalized communities, leading to discriminatory profiling and perpetuating systemic inequalities. The study evaluates case studies from implementations in cities like Chicago and London, highlighting successes in resource allocation and crime reduction alongside risks of privacy erosion, false positives and due process violations. It argues for robust regulatory oversight, including transparency mandates, bias audits and ethical guidelines to mitigate harms while harnessing AI's potential for public safety. Ultimately, the analysis underscores the need for a balanced approach that prioritizes civil liberties in the era of algorithmic governance, proposing reforms to ensure equitable and accountable use of predictive technologies.

Keywords: *Predictive Policing, AI Profiling, Algorithmic Bias, Legal Implications, Privacy Rights.*

INTRODUCTION

Background of the Study

The advent of artificial intelligence (AI) has revolutionized numerous sectors and law enforcement is no exception. Predictive policing, an AI-driven approach, employs sophisticated algorithms to analyze historical crime data, socioeconomic indicators, geographic information and other variables to forecast potential criminal activities. This enables police departments to anticipate where and when crimes might occur, or in some cases, identify individuals at higher risk of involvement in criminal behavior. Emerging in the early 2000s with tools like CompStat for data-driven management, predictive policing evolved significantly with the integration of machine learning and big data analytics (Eke, 2025).

Commercial platforms such as PredPol, which focuses on location-based hotspot forecasting and risk assessment tools like COMPAS, used for recidivism prediction, have been adopted by numerous agencies worldwide. These systems promise proactive crime prevention by optimizing resource allocation, shifting policing from reactive to anticipatory strategies. However, their reliance on historical data often reflecting past policing biases has sparked intense debate. Implementations in major cities, including Chicago's Strategic Subject List and various U.S. departments using PredPol, illustrate both the allure of efficiency and the pitfalls of perpetuating inequalities. Globally, similar technologies appear in Europe and beyond, raising questions about their compatibility with fundamental legal principles in diverse jurisdictions (Ghial et al., 2024).

Significance of the Study

The deployment of AI in predictive policing holds profound implications for society, law and justice. On one hand, it offers the potential to enhance public safety by enabling more effective crime prevention, reducing response times and allowing strained police forces to deploy limited resources strategically amid rising demands and staffing shortages. Proponents argue that data-driven methods introduce greater objectivity than traditional intuition-based policing, potentially lowering overall crime rates through targeted interventions. Yet, the significance extends far beyond operational benefits. These technologies amplify concerns over algorithmic bias, where flawed or biased training data can lead to disproportionate surveillance and policing of marginalized communities, exacerbating racial, ethnic and socioeconomic disparities.

Legal challenges abound, including threats to privacy rights, due process, freedom from unreasonable searches and equality before the law. Cases of over-policing in certain neighborhoods, false positives leading to unwarranted scrutiny and erosion of public trust highlight the risks of unchecked technological adoption. In an era of increasing AI integration into governance, understanding these dynamics is crucial for policymakers, jurists and civil society to prevent the entrenchment of discriminatory practices under the guise of neutrality (Kahla & Gayflor, 2024).

This study contributes to the ongoing discourse by examining the legal frameworks governing such tools, assessing their alignment with constitutional protections and human rights standards and advocating for safeguards that balance innovation with accountability. As AI evolves rapidly, the absence of comprehensive regulation could widen accountability gaps, making rigorous legal analysis essential to ensure equitable outcomes and preserve democratic values in criminal justice (Raji & Sholademi, 2024).

Research Objectives

i. To examine the conceptual framework and technological mechanisms underlying AI-driven predictive policing and profiling practices.

ii. To analyze the potential for algorithmic bias and its reinforcement of systemic inequalities in law enforcement outcomes.

iii. To evaluate the compatibility of predictive policing tools with key legal principles, including privacy rights, due process and non-discrimination under domestic and international law.

iv. To assess real-world implementations of predictive policing through case studies, identifying both demonstrated benefits and documented harms.

v. To propose regulatory and ethical reforms aimed at mitigating risks while preserving the public safety advantages of AI in policing.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Predictive Policing: Concepts and Technologies

Predictive policing refers to the application of statistical and algorithmic techniques to forecast the likelihood of criminal activity in specific geographic areas, time periods, or among particular individuals. The foundational concept rests on the premise that crime is not randomly distributed but follows identifiable patterns that can be detected through large-scale data analysis. Early systems built on hot-spot policing theories of the 1990s, which demonstrated that a small proportion of locations generate a disproportionate share of crime incidents. Modern predictive policing platforms have advanced considerably through the incorporation of machine learning, particularly supervised learning algorithms

such as random forests, gradient boosting machines and neural networks. These models are trained on historical crime data including reported incidents, arrest records, calls for service and environmental variables such as lighting, land use and demographic composition to generate crime risk scores or probability heat-maps (Quattrocolo, 2025).

Location-based predictive tools, most prominently represented by PredPol (now Geolitica), divide urban space into small grid cells and assign daily risk forecasts, allowing police commanders to allocate patrols accordingly. Person-based predictive policing, by contrast, focuses on identifying individuals deemed at elevated risk of future offending or victimization. Systems such as the Strategic Subject List (SSL) in Chicago and the Harm Assessment Risk Tool (HART) in the United Kingdom assign risk scores to named persons based on factors including prior arrests, victimizations, gang affiliations, age and even unstructured data such as social media activity when available (Dutta et al., 2025).

The technological architecture typically combines structured administrative data with unstructured sources, increasingly integrating real-time feeds from license-plate readers, CCTV metadata, mobile-phone location data and social-network analysis. Recent developments have seen the adoption of deep learning architectures and natural language processing to extract predictive signals from police narrative reports. Despite claims of increased accuracy over traditional methods, the predictive power of these systems remains modest in most evaluations, with area-level forecasts generally outperforming person-level predictions. Nevertheless, the promise of efficiency gains particularly in resource-constrained departments has driven widespread experimentation across North America, Europe, Australia and parts of Asia (Abdulkareem, 2024).

Legal and Ethical Debates

The rapid deployment of predictive policing technologies has generated extensive legal and ethical controversy centered on four principal concerns: discrimination, privacy, transparency and accountability. Algorithmic bias constitutes the most frequently cited legal challenge. Because training datasets are drawn from historical policing records, they inevitably reproduce existing patterns of over-policing in minority neighborhoods, over-arrest of certain racial and ethnic groups and differential enforcement practices (Salehi & Habib Zadeh Khiyaban, 2025).

When these biased inputs are used to train models, the resulting predictions tend to reinforce and amplify the same disparities, creating feedback loops that scholars have termed “dirty data” or “perpetuation bias.” Legal scholars argue that such outcomes may violate constitutional guarantees of equal protection and non-discrimination, as well as international human rights standards prohibiting discriminatory treatment. Privacy concerns arise primarily from the massive aggregation of personal data often without meaningful consent and from the use of proxies that indirectly reveal sensitive attributes such as ethnicity, religion, immigration status, or socioeconomic position (Almasoud & Idowu, 2025).

In jurisdictions governed by the European Union’s General Data Protection Regulation, predictive policing tools frequently struggle to satisfy requirements of data minimization, purpose limitation and the right not to be subject to solely automated decision-making with significant legal effects. In the United States, Fourth Amendment challenges have been raised regarding whether predictive risk scores or heat-maps constitute sufficient reasonable suspicion to justify stops, searches, or surveillance. Due process arguments focus on the opacity of proprietary algorithms (“black box” problem), which prevents meaningful challenge to adverse decisions and on the lack of notice given to individuals placed on risk lists. Ethical critiques extend beyond legality to questions of legitimacy and social justice.

Critics contend that predictive policing transforms policing into pre-crime management, shifting the presumption of innocence toward preemptive suspicion. Others highlight the risk of self-fulfilling

prophecies, whereby increased police presence in flagged areas produces more recorded incidents, thereby appearing to validate the original prediction. Proponents counter that these tools merely optimize existing police discretion rather than create new powers and that rigorous auditing and debiasing techniques can substantially reduce discriminatory outputs. The debate therefore remains polarized between those who view predictive policing as a necessary modernization of law enforcement and those who regard it as a high-risk experiment with civil liberties (Khoei & Singh, 2024).

Case Studies: Pakistan and Beyond

Internationally, predictive policing has been implemented with varying degrees of sophistication and public scrutiny. In the United States, the Los Angeles Police Department's Operation LASER and PredPol deployments in dozens of cities generated early enthusiasm followed by significant criticism after independent audits revealed persistent racial disparities in predicted risk areas. Chicago's Strategic Subject List, which ranked tens of thousands of residents according to perceived future involvement in gun violence, faced intense backlash when investigative reporting demonstrated poor predictive accuracy and disproportionate inclusion of Black and Latino men (De Hert & Lammerant, 2025).

In the United Kingdom, Durham Constabulary's HART tool was subject to one of the most thorough public algorithmic impact assessments ever conducted, ultimately leading to discontinuation of the system due to transparency and fairness concerns. Germany and the Netherlands have adopted more cautious approaches, frequently limiting predictive tools to property crime forecasting while subjecting person-based systems to strict proportionality tests under European human rights law. In the Global South, adoption remains uneven. Several Latin American cities, including São Paulo and Bogotá, have experimented with predictive mapping for homicide prevention, often in partnership with private technology providers. In Pakistan, predictive policing remains in a nascent and fragmented stage.

The Punjab Police has introduced limited data-analytics initiatives, notably through the Punjab Information Technology Board and the Crime and Criminal Tracking Network & Systems (CCTNS), which enable basic hot-spot analysis and pattern recognition in selected districts. Lahore and Karachi have piloted computer-aided dispatch systems linked to real-time crime mapping, while some initiatives incorporate predictive elements for resource deployment during public events and seasonal crime spikes (Ekundayo, 2024).

However, no large-scale, algorithmically sophisticated person-based predictive profiling system comparable to those in the United States or United Kingdom has been publicly documented. Pakistani deployments are constrained by incomplete digitization of historical records, inconsistent data quality across districts, limited computational infrastructure and absence of dedicated legal frameworks governing algorithmic decision-making in policing. Despite these limitations, early applications have reportedly improved response times in urban centers, although systematic evaluation of bias or effectiveness remains scarce (Gouri et al., 2024).

Research Gap

While a substantial body of literature examines predictive policing in North American and European contexts, focusing on algorithmic bias, privacy erosion and constitutional compliance, very little scholarly attention has been directed toward its application and implications in South Asian jurisdictions, particularly Pakistan. Existing studies largely overlook the interaction between predictive technologies and local legal frameworks such as the Constitution of Pakistan 1973, the Police Order 2002 and emerging data protection legislation. Moreover, there is an almost complete absence of empirical or doctrinal analysis concerning how colonial legacies, resource asymmetries and socio-political realities shape the design, implementation and legal risks of AI-driven crime prediction in Pakistan. This leaves a

critical gap in understanding whether global concerns about discrimination and due process manifest differently or are amplified in post-colonial policing environments.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Research Design

This study adopts a qualitative, doctrinal legal research design supplemented by elements of comparative and case study approaches. Doctrinal research forms the core methodology, focusing on the systematic analysis, interpretation and critical evaluation of legal texts, including constitutional provisions, statutes, judicial decisions, international human rights instruments and policy documents related to predictive policing and AI-driven profiling. This black-letter approach allows for an in-depth examination of existing legal principles such as privacy rights, non-discrimination, due process and equality before the law, assessing their applicability to algorithmic decision-making in criminal justice. To enrich the analysis, the study incorporates a comparative dimension by juxtaposing legal frameworks from jurisdictions with mature predictive policing systems primarily the United States and the United Kingdom with the emerging context in Pakistan. Additionally, selective case studies of specific implementations provide illustrative insights into practical outcomes and legal challenges. The overall design is exploratory and normative, aiming not only to describe the current state of law but also to evaluate its adequacy and propose reforms for balancing technological innovation with fundamental rights protections. This multi-faceted qualitative strategy is particularly suited to legal scholarship on emerging technologies, where empirical quantification of algorithmic impacts remains limited in the Pakistani context and doctrinal clarity is essential for normative critique.

Data Collection Method

Data for this research are collected exclusively through secondary sources, consistent with the doctrinal and library-based nature of legal inquiry. Primary legal materials include constitutions (notably the Constitution of Pakistan 1973), statutes such as the Police Order 2002, the Prevention of Electronic Crimes Act 2016 and relevant international instruments including the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and the UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights. Judicial precedents from Pakistani superior courts, U.S. federal courts and European human rights bodies are examined for interpretive guidance (Roy et al., 2025).

Secondary sources encompass scholarly articles, books, policy reports from human rights organizations, government evaluations of predictive policing tools and technical documentation from platforms like PredPol, COMPAS and local initiatives under the Punjab Safe Cities Authority. Official reports from bodies such as the Punjab Information Technology Board, Punjab Police and international oversight entities provide contextual data on implementations. All materials are sourced from reputable academic databases, official government websites and open-access repositories to ensure reliability and currency.

Sample Size

Given the qualitative doctrinal orientation, no statistical sample size applies in the traditional empirical sense. Instead, the study purposively selects a focused corpus of approximately 80–100 key legal texts, scholarly works, policy documents and case reports deemed most relevant and authoritative. This includes around 30–35 primary legal sources (statutes, constitutions and judgments), 40–50 academic publications and reports addressing predictive policing globally and in South Asia and 10–15 illustrative case descriptions or evaluations of specific systems. The selection prioritizes depth over breadth, concentrating on materials that directly engage with legal implications, algorithmic bias, privacy concerns and regulatory gaps in predictive technologies (Wibisono et al., 2025).

Sampling Technique

Purposive (or judgmental) sampling is employed to identify and include sources that are information-rich and directly pertinent to the research objectives. This non-probability technique allows deliberate selection of landmark judgments, influential scholarly critiques, leading international standards and representative policy documents from jurisdictions with advanced or emerging predictive policing practices (Cekic, 2024). Sources are chosen based on criteria such as relevance to core themes (bias, privacy, due process), recency (prioritizing post-2015 developments to capture AI advancements), jurisdictional diversity (U.S., UK, EU and Pakistan/South Asia) and authoritative status (peer-reviewed journals, official reports, apex court decisions). Saturation is achieved when additional sources yield diminishing new insights into the legal analysis.

Data Collection

Data collection proceeds through systematic desk-based research conducted via library resources, online legal databases and official portals. The process begins with keyword searches (e.g., "predictive policing," "algorithmic bias," "AI profiling legal implications," "Pakistan policing technology") across platforms, followed by snowballing from citations in key texts to uncover additional authoritative materials. All collected data are organized thematically using digital note-taking and reference management tools to facilitate cross-jurisdictional comparison and critical synthesis. Ethical considerations include accurate representation of sources, avoidance of plagiarism through proper attribution in the final writing (though references are excluded here) and critical engagement with potentially biased institutional reports.

Data Analysis

Analysis is conducted through thematic content analysis and critical legal interpretation. Legal texts and scholarly materials are coded into emergent themes such as constitutional compatibility, human rights compliance, bias perpetuation, transparency deficits and regulatory alternatives. Comparative analysis contrasts protections under frameworks like the U.S. Fourth Amendment, EU GDPR and Pakistan's constitutional guarantees to highlight convergences and divergences (Agliata et al., 2025). Case illustrations are scrutinized for evidence of legal risks and outcomes, informing normative evaluation. The interpretive process involves logical reasoning, doctrinal exegesis and policy critique to assess gaps in current law and formulate recommendations. This rigorous, iterative approach ensures transparent, reasoned conclusions grounded in legal authority and scholarly discourse.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Legal Frameworks for Predictive Policing

The legal frameworks governing predictive policing vary significantly across jurisdictions, reflecting differing priorities between public safety innovation and individual rights protection. In mature implementations such as those in the United States and the United Kingdom, predictive tools operate within constitutional limits like the Fourth Amendment's prohibition on unreasonable searches and seizures, yet often lack specific statutory authorization tailored to algorithmic decision-making. U.S. courts have generally upheld location-based predictions as enhancements to traditional policing discretion, provided they do not substitute for individualized suspicion, while person-based profiling tools face greater scrutiny for potential due process violations.

The European Union's General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) and Law Enforcement Directive impose stricter requirements, classifying many predictive systems as high-risk and mandating data minimization, impact assessments and safeguards against automated decisions with significant effects. In

Pakistan, predictive policing remains largely unregulated at the statutory level. Initiatives under the Punjab Safe Cities Authority (PSCA) deploy AI-driven surveillance, real-time analytics and predictive models to forecast crime hotspots and optimize resource deployment, yet these operate without dedicated legislation addressing algorithmic governance. The Constitution of Pakistan 1973 guarantees fundamental rights including privacy (Article 14), equality (Article 25) and protection against arbitrary interference, while the Police Order 2002 emphasizes accountable policing.

However, laws such as the Prevention of Electronic Crimes Act 2016 focus on cyber offenses without provisions for AI-specific risks like bias in data processing or predictive outputs. This regulatory vacuum allows deployment through administrative initiatives but exposes gaps in oversight, transparency and remedies for affected individuals, contrasting sharply with more structured frameworks elsewhere and highlighting the need for Pakistan-specific legislation to align technological adoption with constitutional imperatives.

Human Rights Implications

The human rights implications of predictive policing are profound and multifaceted, centering on risks to privacy, non-discrimination and due process. Algorithmic systems trained on historical crime data often perpetuate existing biases, leading to disproportionate surveillance of marginalized groups and reinforcing cycles of over-policing in certain communities. This creates feedback loops where increased enforcement in flagged areas generates more recorded incidents, seemingly validating predictions while entrenching inequalities based on race, ethnicity, socioeconomic status, or geography. Privacy erosion occurs through extensive data aggregation including CCTV feeds, mobile data and historical records without adequate consent or limitation mechanisms, potentially chilling free expression and association.

Due process concerns arise from opaque "black box" algorithms that hinder meaningful challenge to risk scores or predictions, undermining the presumption of innocence by shifting toward preemptive suspicion. In Pakistan, where colonial-era policing legacies persist alongside modern challenges like resource constraints and uneven data quality, these implications may be amplified. PSCA's predictive tools, while aimed at enhancing safety in urban centers like Lahore, risk exacerbating disparities if historical records reflect biased enforcement patterns, with limited avenues for redress under current frameworks.

Globally, evidence from discontinued systems like Chicago's Strategic Subject List demonstrates how unchecked predictive profiling can erode public trust and violate equality principles. Balancing these harms requires robust safeguards, including bias audits, human oversight and independent reviews, to prevent technology from automating injustice rather than mitigating it.

International Standards and Compliance

International standards provide benchmarks for assessing predictive policing compliance, emphasizing proportionality, necessity and non-discrimination. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, to which Pakistan is a party, protects privacy, equality and fair trial rights, while UN bodies have urged moratoriums on certain surveillance technologies absent strong safeguards. The EU's AI Act classifies predictive policing as high-risk, requiring conformity assessments, transparency and fundamental rights impact evaluations, influencing global norms toward accountability. Compliance challenges persist where domestic laws lag, as in many jurisdictions lacking specific AI regulations.

In Pakistan, alignment with these standards remains partial; while constitutional provisions echo international commitments, the absence of comprehensive data protection legislation beyond fragmented cyber laws limits effective implementation. PSCA initiatives demonstrate proactive use of AI for crime prevention, yet without mandatory audits or public reporting, they fall short of international calls for

transparency and redress mechanisms. Comparative analysis reveals that jurisdictions adhering closely to GDPR-like standards experience fewer documented rights violations, underscoring the value of proactive regulation. For Pakistan, harmonizing predictive policing with international norms would necessitate enacting dedicated frameworks for algorithmic accountability, ethical guidelines and judicial oversight to ensure that technological advancements serve public safety without compromising core human rights protections.

CONCLUSION

Summary of Findings

This research has demonstrated that the integration of artificial intelligence into predictive policing and profiling represents a double-edged sword for modern law enforcement. While these technologies offer significant potential to enhance crime prevention through data-driven resource allocation, hotspot identification and proactive interventions, their implementation raises substantial legal and ethical challenges. The analysis reveals that predictive tools, reliant on historical data often tainted by past biases, frequently perpetuate and amplify discriminatory outcomes, disproportionately affecting marginalized communities and undermining principles of equality and non-discrimination.

Legal frameworks in advanced jurisdictions such as the United States and the European Union provide partial safeguards through constitutional protections, data protection regulations and judicial oversight, yet even there, issues of transparency, algorithmic opacity and due process violations persist. In Pakistan, where predictive policing initiatives remain in an early and fragmented stage primarily through platforms like the Punjab Safe Cities Authority the absence of dedicated legislation creates a regulatory vacuum.

Constitutional guarantees of privacy, equality and protection against arbitrary interference exist, but they lack specific application to AI-driven decision-making, leaving gaps in accountability, redress mechanisms and bias mitigation. The study underscores that without robust oversight, predictive policing risks transforming law enforcement from reactive to preemptive in ways that erode the presumption of innocence and public trust. Overall, the findings affirm that while AI holds promise for improving public safety, its unchecked deployment threatens fundamental rights and may entrench systemic inequalities rather than alleviate them.

Policy Implications for Pakistan

The policy implications for Pakistan are both urgent and multifaceted. To harness the benefits of AI in crime prediction while safeguarding constitutional rights, the government must prioritize the enactment of comprehensive legislation specifically addressing algorithmic decision-making in law enforcement. Such a framework should mandate independent impact assessments, regular bias audits and transparency requirements including public disclosure of model methodologies, data sources and performance metrics for any predictive policing system. Drawing inspiration from international models like the EU's AI Act, Pakistan could classify predictive tools as high-risk applications requiring conformity assessments, human oversight and meaningful opportunities for individuals to challenge adverse automated decisions.

Strengthening data governance through a robust national data protection law aligned with international standards would further limit unnecessary data aggregation and ensure purpose limitation. At the institutional level, police agencies should adopt ethical guidelines, establish dedicated oversight committees and invest in training programs to enhance officers' understanding of algorithmic limitations and biases. Collaboration between the Punjab Information Technology Board, Punjab Police and civil society organizations could facilitate pilot programs with built-in evaluation mechanisms, allowing iterative improvements before nationwide scaling. Ultimately, these policy measures would align

technological innovation with Pakistan's constitutional commitments, fostering equitable policing practices that enhance security without compromising fundamental freedoms.

FUTURE RESEARCH DIRECTIONS

Future research should build upon the present study by addressing several critical gaps. Empirical investigations into the actual performance and impact of predictive policing tools in Pakistani urban contexts particularly in cities like Lahore, Karachi and Faisalabad remain scarce and warrant priority. Longitudinal studies tracking crime patterns, arrest rates and community perceptions before and after the deployment of AI systems would provide concrete evidence of effectiveness and unintended consequences. Comparative analyses examining how predictive policing interacts with Pakistan's unique socio-political dynamics, including colonial legacies, ethnic diversity and resource constraints, would enrich understanding of context-specific risks and opportunities.

Additionally, interdisciplinary research combining legal analysis with computer science and criminology could explore technical solutions such as debiasing algorithms, explainable AI techniques and fairness-enhancing interventions tailored to local datasets. Exploring public attitudes toward predictive policing through surveys and focus groups would illuminate issues of legitimacy and trust, informing more participatory regulatory approaches. Finally, examining the role of judicial oversight in emerging cases involving AI-driven policing decisions would clarify the evolving jurisprudence in this domain. These avenues of inquiry will be essential for developing evidence-based policies that ensure AI serves justice rather than undermining it.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Strengthen Legal Frameworks

To effectively integrate artificial intelligence into predictive policing while safeguarding fundamental rights, Pakistan must urgently develop and enact a comprehensive legal framework specifically tailored to algorithmic decision-making in law enforcement. The current reliance on general constitutional provisions and fragmented statutes such as the Prevention of Electronic Crimes Act 2016 leaves significant gaps in addressing the unique risks posed by predictive technologies. A dedicated Predictive Policing and AI Governance Act should be introduced, clearly defining the permissible scope of AI-driven crime prediction, distinguishing between location-based hotspot forecasting and person-based profiling and establishing categorical prohibitions on certain high-risk applications such as predictive scoring of individuals absent clear evidentiary thresholds and independent validation.

The legislation should incorporate core principles of necessity, proportionality and non-discrimination, mandating that any predictive system demonstrate a legitimate public safety purpose that cannot be achieved through less intrusive means. Data protection safeguards must be embedded, requiring strict adherence to principles of data minimization, purpose limitation, storage limitation and accuracy. Predictive tools should be classified as high-risk under any future national AI regulatory regime, triggering mandatory fundamental rights impact assessments prior to deployment and periodic re-assessments thereafter. Explicit provisions should prohibit the use of proxies that indirectly encode protected characteristics such as ethnicity, religion, or socioeconomic status unless rigorously justified and mitigated.

Individuals affected by predictive outputs whether through increased surveillance, inclusion on risk lists, or resource targeting must be granted enforceable rights to notification, access to explanations and meaningful contestation of automated decisions. Judicial review mechanisms should be strengthened to allow challenges to the deployment or application of predictive systems on grounds of constitutional incompatibility. Alignment with international standards, including those emerging from the UN and

regional human rights bodies, would further legitimize these reforms and position Pakistan as a responsible adopter of AI in public safety. Such a framework would not stifle innovation but channel it toward equitable and rights-respecting outcomes, ensuring that technological advancement complements rather than undermines the rule of law.

Promote Oversight and Accountability

Robust oversight and accountability mechanisms are essential to prevent misuse, detect biases early and maintain public confidence in predictive policing systems. An independent national oversight body potentially housed under the National Commission on Human Rights or established as a dedicated Algorithmic Accountability Commission should be created with statutory powers to review, audit and approve predictive policing deployments. This body would conduct pre-deployment evaluations, monitor ongoing performance and investigate complaints related to discriminatory impacts or privacy breaches.

Mandatory transparency obligations should require police agencies to publish detailed technical documentation, including model architectures (to the extent compatible with legitimate security concerns), training datasets (anonymized where necessary), performance metrics and bias audit results. Regular independent audits by third-party experts should assess for disparate impact across demographic groups, with findings made publicly available in accessible formats. Human-in-the-loop requirements must be instituted for high-stakes decisions, ensuring that predictive outputs inform rather than determine police actions such as stops, searches, or interventions. Clear accountability chains should designate responsible officers for system design, data input quality and decision implementation, with disciplinary consequences for failures to address identified biases or errors.

Community engagement mechanisms, including public consultations and advisory panels comprising civil society representatives, legal experts and affected community members, would enhance legitimacy and surface local concerns before systems are scaled. In cases of demonstrated harm such as disproportionate targeting leading to wrongful arrests or community alienation remedial measures, including expungement of erroneous risk scores and compensation where appropriate, should be available. These accountability structures would transform predictive policing from an opaque administrative practice into a transparent, contestable and democratically accountable function of the state.

Capacity Building

Effective and ethical use of predictive policing demands substantial investment in human and institutional capacity across multiple domains. Police personnel at all levels require targeted training on the technical foundations of AI systems, the limitations of predictive models, sources of algorithmic bias and the legal-ethical boundaries governing their application. Curricula should emphasize critical interpretation of risk scores, recognition of feedback loops that reinforce historical disparities and techniques for mitigating bias in operational decision-making.

Specialized units within police departments comprising data scientists, statisticians, legal advisors and community liaison officers should be established to manage predictive systems, conduct internal audits and liaise with external oversight bodies. Collaboration with academic institutions, particularly universities in Punjab and Sindh with strong computer science and law programs, could facilitate ongoing research, model validation using local datasets and development of contextually appropriate debiasing methods. International partnerships and knowledge exchange programs with jurisdictions that have mature yet critically examined predictive policing regimes would accelerate learning while avoiding importation of flawed models.

Investment in high-quality, representative data infrastructure is equally critical: digitization of historical records must be accompanied by rigorous data-cleaning protocols to reduce embedded biases and mechanisms for ongoing data quality assurance should be institutionalized. Funding should prioritize open-source or locally developed tools over proprietary black-box platforms to enhance control, auditability and cost-effectiveness. Finally, public awareness campaigns explaining the objectives, safeguards and limitations of predictive policing would foster informed societal debate and build trust. Through sustained capacity building, Pakistan can move toward a model of AI-assisted policing that is technically competent, legally sound and socially legitimate.

REFERENCES

Abdulkareem, F. A. A. (2024). The role of predictive policing in predicting spatio-temporal crime mapping. *Вестник Санкт-Петербургского Университета. Право*, *15*(1), 192–205.

Agliata, A., Di Vincenzo, G. M., Tagliaferri, R., & Sorrentino, M. (2025). Application of Artificial Intelligence Models for Criminal Profiling. *International Conference on Extended Reality*, 23–39.

Almasoud, A. S., & Idowu, J. A. (2025). Algorithmic fairness in predictive policing. *AI and Ethics*, *5*(3), 2323–2337.

Cekic, E. (2024). The impact of artificial intelligence tools on criminal psychological profiling. *International Journal of Academic Research in Psychology*, *11*(1), 1–13.

De Hert, P., & Lammerant, H. (2025). Predictive profiling and its legal limits: Effectiveness gone forever? In *Exploring the boundaries of big data* (pp. 145–174). Routledge.

Dutta, K., Parui, S., Shaw, S., Biswas, S., & Das, S. (2025). Crime Analysis and Management System. *SN Computer Science*, *6*(7), 799.

Eke, R. N. (2025). Adopting Artificial Intelligence-Based Predictive Policing in Nigeria: Prospects and Difficulties. *African Journal of Advances in Science and Technology Research*, *18*(1), 142–164.

Ekundayo, F. (2024). Big data and machine learning in digital forensics: Predictive technology for proactive crime prevention,'. *Complexity*, *24*(2), 2692–2709.

Ghial, R., Pundir, D., Kaur, R., & Bhardwaj, S. (2024). Algorithmic Justice: Navigating the Ethical and Legal Landscape of AI-Powered Predictive Policing in Twenty-First Century. *International Conference on Innovations in Data Analytics*, 457–468.

Gouri, A., Choudhary, V., Meena, A., Kumar, P., Saini, R., & Malav, M. (2024). *AI in Crime Prevention & Prediction*. Juni Khyat.

Kahla, L. Z., & Gayflor, N. (2024). Leveraging artificial intelligence for crime detection and prevention. *Indian Scientific Journal Of Research In Engineering And Management*, *1*.

Khoei, T. T., & Singh, A. (2024). A survey of Emotional Artificial Intelligence and crimes: detection, prediction, challenges and future direction. *Journal of Computational Social Science*, *7*(3), 2359–2402.

Quattrocolo, S. (2025). Criminal law enforcement through AI. In *Research Handbook on the Law of Artificial Intelligence* (pp. 349–372). Edward Elgar Publishing.

Raji, I., & Sholademi, D. B. (2024). Predictive Policing: The Role of AI in Crime Prevention. *International Journal of Computer Applications Technology and Research. Saatavissa:*

Https://Www. Researchgate. Net/Publication/384936267_Predictive_Policing_The_Role_of_AI_in_Crime_Prevention. Luettu, *29*, 2025.

Roy, A., Neetu, N., & Singh, A. R. (2025). The Role of Artificial Intelligence in Predictive Policing and Its Legal Implications. *National Seminar on Enhancing Privacy Protection in the Digital Age: Legal Challenges & Innovations (NSEPPDA 2025)*, 95–113.

Salehi, K., & Habib Zadeh Khiyaban, S. (2025). AI and crime prevention in the academic literature: An integrative review of AI applications in crime prevention. *Code, Cognition & Society*, *1*(1), 164–177.

Wibisono, R. K., Setiono, J., & Prisgunanto, I. (2025). Artificial Intelligence in Predictive Policing: A Systematic Literature Review and Its Implications for Indonesia. *Jurnal Greenation Sosial Dan Politik*, *3*(3), 595–604.