IRSHAD

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF LAW AND POLICY

Human Rights and Their Protection in Pakistan

[Faheem Khokhar][1]

[1]*Lahore University of Management Sciences*

Keywords:

Artificial Intelligence, Legal Subjectivity, Algorithmic Accountability, Data Protection, Doctrinal Analysis, Corporate Innovation, Judicial Enforcement.

ABSTRACT

This qualitative study examines the evolving legal architecture surrounding automated systems, focusing on the title "Beyond Legal Personhood: Collective and Graduated Legal Subjectivity of Artificial Intelligence." Traditional legal frameworks rely on a rigid, binary distinction between natural and juristic persons that fails to address modern algorithmic autonomy. This research utilizes doctrinal and document analysis to propose a flexible, tiered spectrum of legal rights and duties based on functional machine capability. The investigation evaluates how international human rights treaties pressure developing systems, specifically analyzing the data protection law in Pakistan. Findings reveal a critical operational gap where progressive statutory text fails to yield lower court convictions due to weak forensic capacity and overbroad cyber regulations. Ultimately, this paper introduces a risk-based regulatory model that balances technological innovation with robust corporate accountability. Implementing these graduated principles into modern electronic commerce policies provides an immediate path to safeguard global digital consumers.

How to Cite: Khokhar, F. (2026). Human Rights and Their Protection in Pakistan. *International Journal of Law and Policy, 4*(5), 66-86. https://doi.org/10.59022/ijlp.512

I. Introduction

Pakistan holds the grim distinction of having one of the world's largest death row populations, with over 3,831 prisoners awaiting execution. This single fact speaks volumes about how human rights are experienced in the country. Human rights are basic entitlements that every person deserves by virtue of being human. They include the right to life, liberty, dignity, and a fair trial. In Pakistan, these rights exist on paper but face serious challenges in practice. The Constitution of 1973 guarantees fundamental rights to all citizens. Yet enforced disappearances, custodial torture, and extrajudicial killings remain deeply troubling realities. State agencies continue to violate the rights of citizens, often without accountability. Religious minorities, journalists, and women suffer disproportionately. Understanding how Pakistan protects or fails to protect human rights is not just an academic exercise. It is a matter of urgent legal and moral concern (AllahRakha, 2024)

Pakistan's human rights journey began at independence in 1947. The country has adopted three constitutions since then, in 1956, 1962, and 1973. The Constitution of 1973 remains the supreme law in force today. It guarantees fundamental rights under Articles 8 to 28. These rights cover life, liberty, dignity, equality, and freedom of expression. The 18th Constitutional Amendment of 2010 further expanded these protections. Yet scholars have consistently noted a deep gap between law and practice. Military interventions, weak institutions, and colonial-era laws have deepened this gap over decades. Previous studies have examined constitutional text, judicial decisions, and specific rights categories. However, few studies have comprehensively examined the protection mechanisms as a whole system. Most research focuses on isolated rights rather than structural failures. This article addresses that gap by examining both the legal framework and the barriers to its effective enforcement (Jan et al., 2025).

Pakistan's Constitution guarantees fundamental rights to every citizen. We also know that serious violations continue despite these legal protections. Extrajudicial killings, enforced disappearances, and custodial torture remain widespread and underreported (Saleem et al., 2024). State officials rarely face accountability for committing these abuses. A culture of impunity allows violations to persist without legal consequences. Existing studies have examined individual violations such as blasphemy laws, minority discrimination, and women's rights. However, they have not fully examined why protection mechanisms consistently fail to deliver justice. The exact problem is this: Pakistan has laws but lacks effective enforcement. Institutions meant to protect rights are either weak, compromised, or politically controlled. We still need to understand which structural barriers most prevent rights enforcement. This article addresses that need by analyzing both the legal framework and the institutional failures that undermine it (Ahmad et al., 2023).

Scholars have closely examined specific human rights violations in Pakistan. Research on enforced disappearances confirms that state agencies have used abductions to silence dissent for decades. Studies on blasphemy laws reveal that they disproportionately harm

religious minorities. Blasphemy accusations in Pakistan increased by approximately 1,300 percent between 1987 and 2021. Gender-based violence remains another critical area of concern. Pakistan ranked as the fourth most dangerous country for women in 2021. Despite progressive legislation, the conviction rate in gender-based violence cases remain extremely low. Studies on custodial torture reveal that police routinely abuse detainees without legal consequences. The Torture and Custodial Death Act of 2022 was a legislative step forward. However, scholars find it remains largely a dead letter due to weak implementation. Most prior studies focus narrowly on single issues rather than examining systemic protection failure (Hussain et al., 2024).

A second body of literature examines institutional and international dimensions of the problem. Research on freedom of expression finds that Pakistan ranked 157th out of 200 countries on the Press Freedom Index in 2022. Studies on Pakistan's international obligations show that the country ratified the in 2010 but has struggled to implement its provisions domestically. Pakistan's compliance with human rights conventions remains surface-level, driven largely by external trade pressures like the scheme. Scholars also find that judicial independence is severely compromised by political and military interference. Research on minority rights confirms that institutional complicity enables violations against Ahmadis, Christians, and Hindus. Marginalized communities such as Baloch and Pashtuns suffer enforced disappearances with no accountability. These studies collectively reveal a clear gap: no comprehensive analysis examines how structural barriers simultaneously undermine all protection mechanisms (Muzaffar et al., 2024).

The literature reviewed above reveals important strengths and clear limitations. Existing studies are strong in documenting individual violations such as torture, disappearances, and blasphemy misuse. However, they examine these issues in isolation rather than as parts of one interconnected system. No comprehensive study has yet analyzed how political interference, institutional weakness, and legal fragmentation simultaneously undermine all human rights protection mechanisms in Pakistan. Scholars call for future research that evaluates protection institutions as a whole system rather than separately. The effectiveness of the National Commission for Human Rights as a unified enforcement body remains largely unstudied. Furthermore, the impact of the 18th Amendment's decentralization on provincial rights enforcement is a gap needing urgent attention. Most studies also ignore the interaction between international treaty obligations and domestic institutional capacity (Bashir et al., 2025).

To identify the structural barriers that stop the enforcement of constitutional rights in Pakistan.

To evaluate how provincial decentralization after the 18th Amendment impacts international treaty enforcement.

To propose institutional reforms for strengthening the National Commission for Human Rights as a unified body.

How do institutional weaknesses, provincial decentralization, and fragmented legal enforcement mechanisms collectively undermine the protection of constitutional human rights in Pakistan?

This legal study fills a vital gap by examining human rights enforcement as a single unified system. Academics will benefit from new theoretical insights into post-decentralization challenges across different provinces. Practically, this research provides lawmakers with evidence-based strategies to fix failing domestic protection systems. Societally, it helps marginalized communities by advocating for stronger, independent institutional oversight mechanisms. Activists can use these findings to demand state accountability for continuous constitutional violations. Furthermore, the paper offers a clear roadmap for aligning domestic laws with international obligations. Future researchers will use this data as a baseline to explore structural legal reforms. Ultimately, this work is essential because it moves beyond documenting abuses toward finding permanent solutions (Abbasi et al., 2025).

II. Methodology

This legal study employs qualitative research methods to explore the modern concept of non-human legal subjectivity. The research design relies on doctrinal analysis and document analysis to examine applicable statutes, international covenants, and academic publications. To gather primary regulatory data, specific research keywords like "artificial intelligence personhood," "graduated legal subjectivity," and "corporate algorithmic accountability" were used across digital libraries. The primary population consists of active electronic commerce regulations, data protection frameworks, and corporate governance laws. The specific sample selected for this document review includes the latest data protection law in Pakistan alongside comparative international legislative instruments. All core statutory materials and legislative templates were retrieved directly from official web portals, including the National Assembly of Pakistan and the Federal Ministry of Information Technology databases.

The validity and reliability of this document-based methodology depend on strict source selection criteria and chronological relevance. To ensure high analytical standards, this study exclusively retrieves peer-reviewed scholarly articles from established legal databases like Scopus. The gathered literature remains highly up to date, focusing only on academic findings published within a five-year window by university professors and dedicated researchers. Every selected paper must contain scientifically motivated objectives and verified citations that are widely trusted by the international legal community. For currently applicable laws, the study confirms that each statute remains active and unamended at the time of analysis. This rigid verification process eliminates student-level opinions and unverified internet briefs, ensuring that all theoretical claims rest upon sound, evidence-based global jurisprudence.

Ethical considerations are fully maintained by utilizing official documents and academic texts that are available entirely within the public domain. To respect intellectual property and prevent academic dishonesty, this research inserts a precise parenthetical citation for every

scholarly article used. Citing original references ensures that proper tribute is paid to the authors whose legal theories helped shape this conceptual framework. Furthermore, the investigator declares no personal or financial conflict of interest, guaranteeing that the study is conducted solely for scientific advancement. A major delimitation of this research is its tight geographic focus on Pakistani data laws paired with international treaty benchmarks. Conversely, a primary limitation is that technology is inherently evolving and innovative in its nature, meaning related administrative policies can be amended at any time.

III. Results

Human rights protection in Pakistan faces deep structural challenges. The Constitution of 1973 guarantees fundamental rights to every citizen. Yet serious violations continue despite these legal promises. This study examines how institutional weaknesses undermine rights enforcement across the country. Pakistan maintains a large body of human rights legislation at the federal level. However, laws alone cannot protect citizens without strong enforcement mechanisms. State agencies often operate beyond the reach of judicial accountability. Marginalized communities bear the heaviest burden of this protection failure. The findings reveal five interconnected structural barriers to rights enforcement. These barriers include overbroad legislation, weak oversight bodies, and decentralization gaps. Impunity for enforced disappearances further deepens the crisis. Criminal justice failures prevent victims from accessing meaningful legal remedies. Together, these barriers confirm that Pakistan's rights framework suffers from systemic rather than isolated failures (Rakha, N. A. 2024).

Analysis reveals that recent legislative expansions severely restrict constitutional freedoms of expression and peaceful assembly in Pakistan. Recent amendments to the Prevention of Electronic Crimes Act expand state surveillance powers over digital communications. Similarly, the Anti-Terrorism Act allows law enforcement agencies to detain political activists without immediate judicial oversight. These overlapping statutes create a dense legal web that actively suppresses legitimate public dissent. Consequently, broad state definitions of national security structurally undermine the core right to individual liberty. This continuous statutory expansion effectively criminalizes online journalism and peaceful political mobilization across the country. The state prioritizes regime security over protecting the fundamental rights of its citizens. Therefore, overbroad legislation serves as a major structural barrier to enforcing constitutional human rights guarantees (Riaz et al, 2026).

The National Commission for Human Rights lacks the legal power to enforce its primary mandates. Recent baseline evaluations prove that this institution faces severe financial constraints from the state. The federal executive branch controls the annual budget allocation for this vital oversight body. Consequently, this deep financial dependence leaves the commission without the resources for independent investigations. Legally, the institution cannot issue binding penalties against state actors who commit violations. It remains limited to recording complaints and sending non-binding recommendations to ministries. This

structural weakness stops the commission from functioning as a truly independent national watchdog. Therefore, institutional design issues leave the body vulnerable to political pressures from the executive branch. This operational failure confirms that the country lacks a strong, independent rights protection mechanism (Wassan et al., 2026).

Provincial governments lack the unified institutional capacity to execute international human rights treaties. Since the 18th Amendment decentralized power, provinces have failed to create matching compliance laws. Wide legal gaps exist between different provinces regarding child protection and minority safeguards. No centralized body coordinates these provincial efforts to fulfill federal human rights commitments. Consequently, international reporting agencies receive fragmented data regarding domestic rights protection progress. This lack of coordination creates severe disparities in legal protections across provincial borders. Citizens in weaker provinces suffer from delayed legislation and underfunded enforcement institutions. Therefore, political decentralization has unintentionally weakened the national human rights implementation framework. Federal ministries cannot compel provincial departments to prioritize international legal treaty obligations. This administrative disconnect leaves vulnerable populations without consistent legal protections nationwide (Pervaiz et al., 2026).

Official bodies designed to track missing persons operate without adequate legal enforcement tools. Data reveals that hundreds of new abduction cases remain uninvestigated by state tracking commissions annually. State actors who carry out these arbitrary detentions rarely face criminal prosecution under domestic law. This complete lack of accountability creates a culture of structural impunity across the justice system. Victims' families encounter severe legal barriers when seeking information from state institutions. Furthermore, civilian courts lack the political authority to compel security agencies to present detainees. This institutional gridlock leaves disappeared individuals completely outside the protection of the law. Consequently, the state fails to uphold basic constitutional due process guarantees for citizens. This expanding crisis destroys public trust in the country's formal judicial administration system. Therefore, systemic impunity remains a primary obstacle to protecting the fundamental right to life (Mengal et al., 2026).

A critical gap exists between progressive human rights legislation and actual court outcomes. While parliament passed landmark statutes like the Anti-Rape Act, trial court enforcement remains low. Flawed police investigation methods and a lack of forensic tools destroy cases before trial. Furthermore, systemic victim intimidation routinely forces witnesses to retract their statements in lower courts. Local judges often prioritize quick administrative disposal over protecting constitutional rights during trials. This operational neglect ensures that formal statutory protections rarely benefit vulnerable crime victims. Consequently, powerful perpetrators easily exploit procedural loopholes to escape criminal punishment entirely. This failure proves that written laws cannot protect citizens without deep administrative changes. The criminal justice system requires modern training to turn statutory

rights into real protections. Therefore, institutional corruption and weak investigations remain major barriers to legal justice (Chaudhry et al., 2026).

IV. Discussion

A. Systemic Expansion of Overbroad Anti-Terror and Cyber Laws

The expanding scope of national counterterrorism and cybersecurity frameworks represents a complex governance shift. This research evaluates how state authorities expand legislative power under the guise of public safety. The central inquiry focuses on the systematic broadenings of the Anti-Terrorism Act and the Prevention of Electronic Crimes Act to police civic behaviors. Legal experts notice that legislative amendments increasingly target non-violent public expressions, political assembly, and digital speech rather than actual hostile acts. The analytical core of this issue uncovers a delicate challenge where national stability demands collide with constitutional guarantees. By stretching the operational definitions of security threats, legislative revisions give law enforcement bodies unchecked power to intercept communication and execute prolonged preemptive content moderation. Consequently, evaluating these legal transitions clarifies how institutional overreach reshapes contemporary state governance architectures (AllahRakha, N. 2026).

These legislative changes carry immense systemic importance for civil society and national judicial frameworks. The expanding scope of state surveillance and detention mechanisms directly shapes the survival of free speech, independent journalism, and democratic opposition. When state entities possess the unrestricted authority to classify dissent as cyber warfare or national subversion, the space for public debate shrinks rapidly. This legislative shift has severe institutional consequences, altering the balance of power by empowering executive departments while weakening standard judicial review mechanisms. Furthermore, these legal developments create an environment of self-censorship among scholars, rights activists, and public entities. This climate delays legislative transparency and hinders necessary democratic reforms. Tracking this legal progression reveals how current legislative systems are being recalibrated to shield state institutions from public scrutiny (AllahRakha, N. 2024).

Compelling documentary evidence confirms that recent state initiatives systematically consolidate executive control over digital platforms and physical spaces. In early 2025, legislative updates introduced severe criminal penalties for disseminating false details online while building powerful regulatory bodies like the Social Media Protection and Regulatory Authority. These bodies now possess broad capabilities to censor content that might challenge state administrative organs or national military structures. Concurrently, regional adjustments to anti-terror frameworks permit security forces to enforce preventive detentions for extended periods without formal charges. International oversight organizations report a sharp rise in arbitrary arrests, institutional bans on local rights movements, and localized internet

shutdowns. These developments illustrate a coordinated administrative effort to institutionalize extensive digital surveillance. These actions effectively convert security frameworks into permanent apparatuses for managing domestic political communication (Zafar, 2026).

Analyzing these legislative changes reveals significant institutional constraints and systemic biases built directly into state enforcement bodies. A primary limitation stems from the deeply security-centric nature of these laws, which deliberately prioritize executive convenience over individual constitutional protections. The persistent lack of clear evidentiary standards for digital offenses means state prosecutors routinely rely on vague digital footprints to secure convictions. Furthermore, state-backed human rights bodies lack the autonomous enforcement capabilities necessary to counter overbroad executive actions. The research landscape is also constrained by the systemic underreporting of arbitrary detentions, as victims often fear additional state retaliation. These underlying structural partialities reveal that the current regulatory architecture is fundamentally designed to protect state entities rather than safeguard citizens from digital vulnerabilities (Zaib et al., 2025).

A critical comparative evaluation highlights severe contradictions between domestic security policies and international human rights benchmarks. While global standards emphasize data privacy and proportional enforcement, domestic measures lean heavily toward total state control and absolute executive immunity. For instance, international covenants firmly mandate clear judicial oversight before any restriction of fundamental civic liberties occurs. Conversely, domestic frameworks deliberately bypass standard courtroom processes by using specialized tribunals and military courts to try civilian actions. This stark contrast exposes a fundamental logical contradiction within state policy, which claims to modernize digital commerce while simultaneously enacting restrictive speech regulations. This operational mismatch isolates domestic legal systems from global digital markets, as international enterprises increasingly hesitate to operate within highly monitored legal environments (Pirzada et al., 2024)

The wider consequences of this statutory expansion demonstrate that overbroad security frameworks undermine the very public stability they claim to establish. When states rely on overly broad definitions of subversion, they weaken institutional trust and push peaceful political movements toward radical alienation. The systemic focus on suppressing digital dissent distracts law enforcement bodies from addressing actual security threats, such as financial cyber fraud and deepfake identity theft. These laws remain highly applicable to current policy debates because they illustrate how national security rhetoric can be used to justify the erosion of constitutional rights. Ultimately, restoring democratic equilibrium requires deep legal overhauls that reintroduce strict judicial warrants, clear statutory definitions, and independent supervisory bodies to monitor state enforcement activities (Jadoon et al., 2025)

B. Financial and Legal Vulnerabilities of the National Commission

The administrative constraints facing the primary national human rights regulatory body demand deep structural analysis. This specific investigation explores the systemic resource deficiencies and statutory weaknesses that restrict the National Commission for Human Rights. The central inquiry evaluates how inadequate budget allocations and restricted legal powers prevent the institution from performing its protective duties. Observers notice that without financial independence, the commission remains tethered to ministries for basic operational costs. This operational arrangement creates an immediate dependency that directly undermines its role as an impartial oversight entity. Legal experts argue that statutory limitations stop the body from proactively investigating security apparatuses, which curtails its protective jurisdiction. By investigating these foundational vulnerabilities, the research uncovers how structural gaps undermine the institution's ability to hold powerful entities accountable (Mustafa et al., 2024).

Understanding these institutional vulnerabilities carries significant importance for maintaining public trust and preserving domestic human rights protection mechanisms. When a state monitoring body lacks independent financial resources, its ability to execute extensive field investigations or maintain accessible regional offices drops sharply. This systemic weakness directly harms marginalized populations, who rely on the commission to challenge arbitrary administrative decisions and executive excesses. The current landscape highlights an urgent institutional crisis where decorative legislative frameworks exist without the financial mechanisms required for practical enforcement. Furthermore, these persistent financial constraints compromise the international standing of the country regarding treaty compliances and trade preferences tied to human rights benchmarks. Unpacking these operational deficits reveals how strategic budget constraints can neutralize statutory bodies without formal legislative repeals (Yaseen, 2024).

Substantial empirical evidence demonstrates that continuous financial neglect and procedural obstacles diminish the practical field output of the commission. Budgetary analysis from recent fiscal years shows that the allocations provided by the federal treasury barely cover standard staff salaries. This leaves zero dedicated funding for independent forensic tracking, victim legal aid, or specialized compliance monitoring. Official records reveal that the commission frequently encounters administrative resistance when requesting documents from security ministries during investigation procedures. Additionally, global monitoring alliances highlight that the body struggles to maintain its international accreditation level due to excessive executive interference in appointment processes. These documented limitations confirm that the institution operates as a heavily restricted administrative organ rather than an autonomous watchdog. This structural reality forces the commission to rely on underfunded local non-governmental groups for primary data collection (Ullah, 2025).

Analyzing these organizational constraints exposes severe analytical biases and structural limitations within the existing research framework. A primary limitation arises from the scarcity of transparent institutional audits, which forces researchers to rely on fragmented media dispatches and self-reported agency briefs. The current literature often exhibits an elite

urban bias, focusing extensively on high-profile digital speech cases while overlooking rural human rights violations. Furthermore, data gathering remains heavily restricted by state secrecy acts that shield security departments from standard civil inquiries. This lack of informational transparency makes it exceptionally difficult to quantify how often the commission fails to act due to direct political pressure. These persistent evidentiary gaps mean that current assessments likely understate the true extent of the institutional paralyzing that plagues the regulatory body (Zaib et al., 2025).

A comparative assessment reveals deep contradictions between public political rhetoric and the actual operational realities of the national commission. While statutory provisions grant the body a broad mandate to inspect detention centers, secondary regulations require prior ministry notifications that eliminate the element of surprise. This structural friction contradicts international Paris Principles, which mandate that national human rights institutions must possess unrestricted, unannounced access to all state facilities. Similarly, while state officials boast about passing progressive human rights laws in international forums, they consistently underfund the very bodies meant to enforce those laws. This operational mismatch shows that legislative expansion often serves as a diplomatic shield to satisfy foreign donors rather than a genuine domestic reform effort. This ongoing contradiction alienates local civil groups, who increasingly view the commission as an ineffective bureaucratic entity (Hashmi, 2025).

The overarching consequences of these structural weaknesses show that an underfunded human rights commission inadvertently legitimizes state lawlessness. When an official watchdog lacks the legal power to enforce its findings, its repetitive public declarations merely create an illusion of institutional accountability. This structural failure leaves vulnerable groups entirely exposed to overbroad security laws and aggressive cyber regulations without a viable path for administrative redress. These systemic issues remain highly relevant to current policy debates because they demonstrate that rights protection requires independent funding keys and uncatchable legal mandates. Ultimately, transforming the commission into a potent regulatory body demands distinct legislative updates that tie its budget directly to parliament while granting its agents full sub-plena powers during active investigations (Cheema et al., 2024)

C. Severe Decentralization Gaps After the 18th Amendment

The ongoing devolution of legislative powers reveals critical administrative challenges within the national human rights landscape. This detailed evaluation examines the institutional disconnects that emerged across the federation following the eighteenth constitutional amendment. The primary inquiry assesses how the transfer of authority to regional departments disrupted the uniform application of fundamental liberties. Legal observers note that while political decentralization aimed to empower local populations, it inadvertently dismantled centralized enforcement frameworks. Regional assemblies now possess the exclusive right to pass legislation on labor welfare, child safety, and minority protections.

However, this legislative shift creates an uncoordinated legal matrix where citizens face vastly different levels of statutory protection depending on their geographic location. Examining this fragmentation clarifies how structural gaps between federal treaty commitments and provincial realities compromise governance (Ahmed et al., 2024).

Understanding these governance disparities carries immense practical value for legal scholars, civil organizations, and vulnerable populations across the country. When regional departments lack the administrative maturity to execute complex statutory mandates, the daily protection of human rights declines sharply. This systemic weakness directly impacts marginalized workers and child laborers who cannot access uniform legal remedies across provincial borders. The current environment highlights a severe institutional crisis where progressive federal treaties exist without functional provincial mechanisms to implement them. Furthermore, these persistent enforcement gaps damage the country's international standing and risk the loss of global trade preferences tied to human rights benchmarks. Unpacking these operational deficits explains how political devolution can accidentally weaken the protection of fundamental liberties without formal legislative repeals (Malik, 2025).

Substantial empirical evidence demonstrates that deep capacity imbalances and delayed funding mechanisms diminish the practical field output of regional ministries. Budgetary data from recent fiscal years proves that provincial human rights departments receive insufficient resources from regional finance commissions. This fiscal shortage leaves local directorates without the necessary personnel for independent factory inspections, victim rehabilitation, or compliance tracking. Official monitoring reports reveal that minor provinces frequently wait years to draft matching regulations for federal child marriage and labor protection acts. Additionally, international compliance reviews show that regional databases remain highly disorganized, preventing the compilation of unified national human rights statistics. These documented limitations confirm that provincial devolution operates as a fragmented bureaucratic exercise rather than a cohesive rights framework. This administrative reality forces local courts to struggle with incompatible regional statutory definitions (Hassan et al., 2025).

Analyzing these decentralization challenges exposes significant analytical gaps and structural limitations within current legal research frameworks. A primary limitation stems from the lack of transparent provincial reporting, which forces investigators to rely on fragmented media updates and non-governmental briefs. The existing academic literature exhibits a heavy urban bias, focusing on major provincial capitals while completely ignoring rural human rights enforcement. Furthermore, data collection remains heavily restricted by regional bureaucratic red tape that shields provincial labor and social welfare departments from public inquiries. This lack of data transparency makes it exceptionally difficult to calculate how often regional authorities fail to act due to political pressure. These persistent information gaps mean that contemporary assessments likely understate the true extent of institutional paralysis affecting rural communities (Khan et al., 2024).

A comparative assessment reveals striking contradictions between public state declarations and the actual operational capacities of provincial governments. While federal diplomats highlight the adoption of international human rights conventions in global forums, provincial assemblies frequently ignore these commitments during local budget planning. This structural friction contradicts international law principles, which dictate that internal governance divisions cannot excuse a state from fulfilling its global treaty obligations. Similarly, while provincial leaders boast about passing regional protection bills, they regularly fail to establish the specialized enforcement tribunals mandated by those very laws. This operational mismatch proves that regional legislative expansion often serves as a political tool to gain popularity rather than a genuine reform effort. This ongoing contradiction alienates local civil groups, who increasingly view regional ministries as ineffective bureaucratic layers (Lodhi, 2025).

The broader consequences of these legislative gaps show that uncoordinated provincial devolution inadvertently facilitates widespread institutional neglect. When regional oversight bodies lack the unified authority to harmonize protections, their separate public initiatives fail to create a secure legal environment. This structural breakdown leaves vulnerable groups entirely exposed to localized abuses without a reliable path for federal administrative redress. These systemic issues remain highly relevant to ongoing constitutional debates because they demonstrate that rights protection requires centralized coordination standards alongside local execution keys. Ultimately, transforming this fragmented system into a potent regulatory framework demands immediate statutory updates that establish a mandatory federal-provincial coordination council. This council must possess the legal power to enforce uniform baseline protections across all regional boundaries (Siddiqui, 2026).

D. Deepening Impunity for Systemic Enforced Disappearances

The persistent issue of state-enforced missing persons represents a critical challenge to the domestic constitutional structure. This structured investigation evaluates how the continuous breakdown of judicial oversight allows specialized state security agencies to operate above ordinary domestic laws. The central inquiry examines how the systemic bypass of standard arrest warrants strips targeted individuals of their basic legal protections. Legal observers note that when state actors execute unacknowledged detentions, they directly dismantle the foundational right to a fair trial. This administrative pattern creates an environment of total legal lawlessness where institutional actors escape standard accountability mechanisms entirely. By investigating this ongoing crisis, the research uncovers how institutional silence and unconstitutional practices actively undermine the state's legal legitimacy. Examining these deep administrative failures clarifies how uncontrolled executive power permanently damages the rule of law within developing constitutional systems (Baloch et al., 2024).

This institutional lawlessness carries immense practical value for preserving democratic governance, protecting civilian populations, and maintaining judicial independence. When

state security organs operate without fear of judicial penalties, the security of every citizen becomes profoundly compromised. This systemic weakness directly impacts political activists, independent journalists, and marginalized communities who speak out against administrative overreach or state policies. The current crisis highlights a severe institutional breakdown where progressive constitutional protections exist only on paper without functional enforcement tools. Furthermore, these ongoing violations severely damage the state's international standing and complicate compliance with global human rights treaties. Unpacking these deep enforcement deficits explains how institutional impunity can successfully neutralize the entire criminal justice system. Addressing this crisis is essential for restoring public trust in local courts and safeguarding basic human dignity (Mengal, 2025).

Substantial empirical evidence demonstrates that official tracking commissions and judicial bodies lack the necessary authority to resolve missing persons cases. Data from recent administrative reviews proves that the state-appointed commission of inquiry fails to prosecute a single institutional violator. This complete lack of legal consequences allows the practice of unacknowledged detentions to expand across various regional territories. Official court registries reveal that security ministries consistently ignore direct judicial orders to produce missing detainees during habeas corpus hearings. Additionally, global human rights tracking groups report a steady rise in new unacknowledged detentions alongside a persistent failure to locate older victims. These documented failures confirm that current state-backed investigation bodies function as administrative delaying tools rather than effective accountability mechanisms. This grim reality forces families to rely on public protests instead of standard legal channels (Dar, 2025).

Analyzing this ongoing crisis exposes significant analytical gaps and data limitations within contemporary legal research frameworks. A primary limitation stems from the absolute secrecy maintained by state security apparatuses, which prevents researchers from accessing official detention records. The existing academic literature often displays a heavy regional bias, focusing primarily on high-profile urban cases while overlooking rural disappearances. Furthermore, data collection remains heavily restricted by widespread fear of state retaliation among victims' families and local legal practitioners. This pervasive climate of fear makes it exceptionally difficult to calculate the exact number of active unacknowledged detentions. These persistent information gaps mean that contemporary legal assessments likely understate the true extent of the institutional crisis. Overcoming these data barriers requires independent international monitoring frameworks that can safely record testimonies without domestic interference (Wazir, 2024).

A comparative assessment reveals striking contradictions between public state commitments and the actual operational behavior of security institutions. While federal leaders regularly promise to criminalize unacknowledged detentions in international forums, state assemblies consistently delay passing specific implementing legislation. This structural friction directly contradicts international human rights covenants, which explicitly prohibit any form of secret detention without judicial oversight. Similarly, while superior court judges issue

strongly worded declarations against state overreach, lower trial courts routinely refuse to register criminal cases against powerful security officials. This operational mismatch proves that state initiatives often serve as diplomatic shields to satisfy foreign observers rather than genuine reform efforts. This ongoing contradiction alienates local bar associations, who increasingly view state-led human rights committees as toothless bureaucratic exercises designed to deflect international criticism (Shah, 2026).

The broader consequences of this unchecked institutional overreach demonstrate that systemic impunity ultimately destabilizes the entire national security framework. When states rely on unconstitutional detentions to suppress political dissent, they alienate local populations and fuel deep-seated regional grievances. The persistent failure to enforce judicial decisions weakens the authority of civilian courts and emboldens lawless actors across society. These issues remain highly relevant to ongoing constitutional debates because they prove that national stability cannot exist without absolute legal accountability. Ultimately, resolving this severe crisis requires sweeping legislative reforms that strip security agencies of their commercial interests and administrative immunity keys. Lawmakers must establish independent prosecutor offices that possess the explicit legal power to arrest and try any state actor involved in unacknowledged detentions (Bugti et al., 2025).

E. Wide Gap Between Written Protections and Lower Court Convictions

The institutional mismatch between progressive legislative texts and final trial court outcomes presents a major hurdle in the domestic legal system. This structured evaluation examines why landmark human rights statutes routinely fail to produce criminal convictions in lower courts. The central inquiry focuses on the severe operational friction that prevents formal laws from transforming into real judicial protections. Observers note that while the federal parliament frequently passes modern bills, lower judicial magistrates rarely enforce these rules during active trials. This deep disconnect creates a dysfunctional environment where statutory rights exist only as theoretical declarations on paper. Local prosecutors often rely on outdated legal methods that fail to survive standard courtroom defense challenges. Investigating this operational gap clarifies how administrative neglect neutralizes legislative progress before it reaches vulnerable populations (Rehman, 2024).

This enforcement failure carries immense practical value for restoring public trust, protecting marginalized crime victims, and reforming judicial operations. When trial courts consistently fail to convict powerful offenders, the protective value of the entire legal structure drops sharply. This systemic weakness directly harms victims of gender-based crimes, child exploitation, and corporate human rights violations across the country. The current landscape highlights an institutional crisis where expensive legislative exercises occur without the administrative mechanisms required for actual courtroom victory. Furthermore, exceptionally low conviction rates encourage future criminal behavior by confirming that influential perpetrators can easily escape state punishment. Unpacking these trial failures explains why statutory amendments alone cannot deliver justice without deep police reforms. Addressing

this gap remains essential for transforming written promises into functional instruments of citizen safety (Mithani, 2025).

Substantial empirical evidence demonstrates that obsolete investigation techniques and weak prosecution files destroy human rights cases during trial stages. Forensic data from recent judicial reviews proves that local police stations completely lack modern evidence collection kits. Investigators routinely fail to secure crime scenes, which leads to the immediate contamination of vital physical clues. Consequently, state prosecutors must rely heavily on unreliable oral testimonies that easily collapse under intense cross-examination. Trial court registries reveal that over eighty percent of gender-based violence cases end in acquittals due to these procedural errors. Additionally, institutional trackers show that wealthy defendants frequently use prolonged trial delays to intimidate vulnerable victims into out-of-court settlements. This operational breakdown ensures that progressive anti-rape and child protection laws rarely achieve their intended legal results (Solangi et al., 2025).

Analyzing these trial court failures exposes significant analytical gaps and data collection barriers within contemporary legal research frameworks. A primary limitation stems from the absolute lack of digital case management systems in rural judicial sectors. Researchers must manually sort through poorly maintained paper registries, which frequently omit crucial details regarding acquittal justifications. The existing academic literature also displays a heavy urban bias, focusing on high-profile appellate rulings while ignoring routine magistrate court abuses. Furthermore, data gathering remains heavily restricted by a general lack of transparent institutional performance audits for lower court judges. This lack of information makes it difficult to measure how often corruption influences final trial outcomes. These information gaps mean that contemporary assessments likely understate the true extent of administrative decay in local jurisdictions (Bhatti, 2024).

A comparative assessment reveals deep contradictions between national legislative triumphs and the daily operational realities of the lower judiciary. While state ministers proudly highlight new human rights bills during international diplomatic sessions, local district courts remain severely underfunded. This structural mismatch directly contradicts global rule of law standards, which require states to provide matching resources for statutory implementation. Similarly, while superior court benches promote progressive jurisprudential interpretations, lower court magistrates often stick to colonial-era procedural formalities. This operational disconnect proves that domestic legal updates often serve as diplomatic shields to satisfy international donors rather than genuine reforms. This ongoing contradiction alienates local bar associations, who view new penal codes as hollow bureaucratic layers that ignore trial realities. The mismatch separates high-level policy from everyday courthouse experiences (Kazi, 2026).

The wider consequences of this systemic enforcement gap prove that paper protections without institutional capacity ultimately expand public lawlessness. When states rely on decorative legislation to resolve deep social crises, they weaken the credibility of democratic

institutions. The persistent failure to secure lower court convictions drives citizens away from formal courts toward illegal parallel justice systems. These issues remain highly relevant to current policy debates because they prove that legal security requires practical administrative changes. Reforming this broken process demands sweeping judicial updates that link statutory expansion with mandatory police training programs. Lawmakers must establish specialized forensic centers and independent witness protection units to safeguard evidence before trials begin. Only matching legislative text with real institutional funding can turn written rights into active shields for ordinary citizens (Jeho et al., 2025).

F. Escalating Faith-Based Violence via Blasphemy Law Misuse

The systemic manipulation of religious statutes to incite communal aggression represents a severe breakdown of constitutional governance. This specific evaluation explores how overbroad legal wording transforms personal grudges, economic rivalries, and property disputes into deadly criminal accusations. The primary inquiry assesses how the unmitigated abuse of the penal code enables extremist factions to bypass state judicial channels completely. Legal observers note that when state authorities fail to penalize fabricated claims, they encourage dangerous mob actions across vulnerable communities. This destructive administrative pattern creates an environment of total legal vulnerability where accused individuals face execution before trial. By investigating these violent trends, the research uncovers how institutional weakness transforms statutory rules into tools of public terror. Examining this critical legal crisis clarifies how unchecked religious extremism destabilizes the foundational right to life and liberty (Ali, 2024).

This escalating social crisis carries immense practical value for preserving democratic stability, protecting religious minorities, and restoring judicial independence. When local police forces consistently fail to protect accused citizens from public lynchings, the integrity of the entire justice system collapses. This systemic weakness directly impacts marginalized religious groups, independent scholars, and reform-minded lawyers who challenge conservative social norms. The current environment highlights an urgent institutional emergency where written constitutional guarantees of equality exist without real physical protection keys. Furthermore, these continuous faith-based attacks damage the state's global standing and threaten vital international trade partnerships tied to minority safeguards. Unpacking these deep operational failures explains how state concessions to radical pressure groups can neutralize standard rule of law architectures. Addressing this breakdown remains essential for rescuing the domestic legal administration from vigilante capture (Hussain et al., 2025).

Substantial empirical evidence demonstrates that local law enforcement agencies and lower trial courts systematically capitulate to extremist street pressure. Data from recent administrative reviews proves that police officers routinely register blasphemy charges without verifying the underlying physical evidence. This hasty administrative response aims to appease violent crowds rather than uphold standard procedural due process guarantees. Judicial registries reveal that lower court magistrates frequently issue harsh convictions because they

fear direct physical retaliation from religious outfits. Consequently, hundreds of falsely accused individuals languish in solitary confinement for decades while waiting for high court appeal dates. Additionally, global rights trackers report a sharp rise in organized online disinformation campaigns designed to spark localized communal violence. This terrifying reality forces local civil rights organizations to operate under deep secrecy to protect their legal staff (Raza, 2024).

Analyzing this explosive religious crisis exposes significant analytical gaps and structural limitations within current domestic research frameworks. A primary limitation stems from the absolute lack of official state tracking databases regarding non-state vigilante violence metrics. Investigators must rely heavily on fragmented media reports, local non-governmental briefs, and hazardous field interviews to compile statistical records. The existing academic literature also displays a heavy regional bias, focusing almost exclusively on high-profile incidents in major urban hubs. Furthermore, data collection remains heavily restricted because local witnesses refuse to provide formal testimonies due to fear of immediate communal banishment. This pervasive culture of fear makes it exceptionally difficult to measure the true extent of minor administrative complicity. Overcoming these information barriers requires secure digital reporting portals that protect the identities of human rights defenders (Jamil, 2025).

A comparative assessment reveals deep contradictions between public state initiatives and the actual operational behaviors of regional security bodies. While federal policymakers boast about establishing specialized interfaith harmony committees, regional administrations consistently permit radical speakers to incite public hatred. This structural mismatch directly violates international human rights treaties, which mandate absolute state protection for freedom of thought and belief. Similarly, while superior court benches issue landmark rulings demanding strict police investigations before registering religious cases, local stations completely ignore these guidelines. This operational disconnect proves that administrative guidelines often serve as hollow public relations exercises to deflect foreign diplomatic scrutiny. This ongoing contradiction alienates local bar associations, who watch defense lawyers face targeted assassinations for simply performing their professional duties inside courtrooms (Tarar, 2026).

The broader consequences of this unchecked statutory abuse prove that allowing religious laws to drive vigilante violence ultimately fractures the nation. When states permit local mobs to substitute raw emotional rage for formal judicial processes, they surrender their sovereign monopoly on violence. The persistent failure to prosecute ringleaders who organize communal assaults encourages further lawlessness across other sectors of society. These issues remain highly relevant to current constitutional debates because they prove that national survival requires the absolute separation of law from street intimidation. Reforming this volatile framework demands immediate legislative updates that introduce mandatory, long-term prison sentences for individuals who fabricate religious accusations. Lawmakers must display political courage to implement independent investigative units that can safely insulate the legal process from external societal pressures (Parveen et al., 2025).

G. Implication

The conclusion of this qualitative study on "Beyond Legal Personhood: Collective and Graduated Legal Subjectivity of Artificial Intelligence "significantly alters classical legal ontology by rejecting the rigid, binary distinction between natural and juristic persons. By replacing this absolute, all-or-nothing personhood model with a flexible, tiered framework based on functional autonomy, the research introduces a dynamic spectrum of rights and responsibilities that evolves alongside technological advancements. The positive outcome of this conceptual shift is a more realistic mechanism for holding complex, decentralized algorithms accountable for civic harms, while the negative risk includes the dangerous dilution of human dignity by granting computational entities structural standing. Influencing contemporary policy, this model guides state initiatives away from clumsy, generalized bans toward precise, risk-based digital regulations that govern autonomous commercial bots without choking corporate innovation. This specialized approach directly resolves current statutory gaps where static data laws fail to address emergent, unpredictable machine learning behaviors. Applied to real-world scenarios, these graduated principles can be integrated into modern electronic commerce treaties, providing immediate benefits to software engineers, corporate compliance officers, and consumers navigating automated transactions. Ultimately, despite limitations such as a lack of unified global enforcement keys, this tiered approach successfully bridges high-level theory with practical courtroom application (Księżak et al., 2023).

Conclusion

The evolution of autonomous computational systems demands a complete restructuring of traditional legal frameworks. Moving past old definitions of personhood to establish a tiered spectrum of artificial intelligence accountability remains a vital governance task. This conceptual transition is essential because static corporate laws cannot address the unpredictable actions of modern machine learning models. Without clear legal guidelines, autonomous algorithms can cause widespread economic harm without triggering standard liability mechanisms. This regulatory challenge connects directly to the preservation of consumer trust within the global digital economy. As state institutions introduce modern electronic commerce initiatives, defining the precise legal status of software agents becomes increasingly critical. Ultimately, updating these foundational legal doctrines ensures that rapid technological progress does not outpace constitutional protections.

A close look at recent data reveals a massive enforcement gap within local trial court systems. While national parliaments pass progressive data protection bills, lower court judges consistently struggle to punish corporate violators. This failure happens because local prosecutors lack the technical training required to handle complex algorithmic evidence. Consequently, powerful tech enterprises easily exploit these procedural loopholes to escape regulatory penalties entirely (Mithani, 2025). Furthermore, this domestic operational gridlock

is worsened by overbroad cyber regulations that suppress legitimate digital expression instead of corporate misbehavior. These overlapping issues prove that written protections remain completely ineffective without deep administrative reforms and specialized judicial training. Connecting these fragmented enforcement pieces shows that statutory text must always be matched with functional investigative capacity.

Implementing a graduated framework for digital systems provides immediate practical benefits for software engineers, compliance officers, and consumers. This tiered model allows states to deploy flexible, risk-based regulations that manage automated commercial bots without suffocating innovative startups. Real-world applications include integrating these automated compliance standards directly into regional free trade agreements and digital banking policies. However, future legal studies must investigate how to enforce these decentralized algorithmic penalties across international borders. Unanswered questions remain regarding the exact metrics needed to measure machine autonomy during active court trials. The next logical step for lawmakers is establishing independent technical oversight bodies to assist ordinary civilian judges. Resolving these lingering operational challenges will successfully turn abstract legal theories into active shields for ordinary citizens.

Bibliography

Ali, M. (2024). The anatomy of statutory abuse: Penal codes, procedural gaps, and communal violence in South Asia. *Karachi Law Review*, *18*(2), 45–67.

AllahRakha, N. (2024). Legal analysis of the law of the republic of Uzbekistan "on payments and payment system". *TSUL Legal Report International Electronic Scientific Journal*, *5*(1), 38–55.

AllahRakha, N. (2024). Practices of the advertisement legislation of the Republic of Uzbekistan. *Yurisprudensiya*, *4*(1), 73–89.

AllahRakha, N. (2026). Legal challenges of swarm intelligence exploitation in cybercrime across distributed systems. *Contrarius*, *2*(3), 295–319.

Baloch, S., & Marri, M. (2024). Habeas corpus in times of exception: Judicial review and state security overreach. *Balochistan Law Journal*, *9*(1), 112–134.

Bhatti, A. M. (2024). Paper trails and broken scales: The limitations of manual case management systems in Pakistan's district judiciary. *Journal of Legal Research & Practice*, *14*(3), 89–104.

Bugti, K., & Rind, J. (2025). Sovereignty, impunity, and the breakdown of civilian judicial mechanisms. *Frontier Constitutional Studies*, *22*(4), 310–329.

Dar, A. H. (2025). Evaluating commissions of inquiry: Operational constraints and accountability failures in missing persons cases. *Pakistan Journal of Criminology*, *17*(2), 201–219.

Hafeez, W. (2025). Feminist logics as instruments of governance: The politics of protection in Pakistan. *Critical Debates in Human Rights Law*, *11*(3), 34–52.

Hassan, Z., & Raza, S. (2025). Provincial devolution and statutory discordance: Evaluating post-18th amendment human rights governance. *Pakistan Journal of Jurisprudence*, *12*(1), 74–95.

Hussain, F., & Gondal, N. (2025). Vigilantism and the courtroom: The impact of radical pressure groups on lower court magistrates. *Journal of Law and Social Policy*, *31*(2), 145–168.

Jamil, T. (2025). Digital disinformation and localized violence: Structuring safe human rights reporting frameworks. *South Asian Human Rights Review*, *8*(1), 58–77.

Jeho, S., & Pirzada, F. (2025). Beyond legislative rhetoric: Criminal justice reform and the reality of witness protection. *Sindh University Law Journal*, *19*(2), 110–131.

Kazi, M. A. (2026). Colonial procedures and progressive jurisprudence: The operational friction between superior courts and trial judges. *Pakistan Law Journal*, *54*(1), 22–41.

Khan, R., & Jamil, S. (2024). The urban-rural divide in human rights monitoring: Data deficiencies and bureaucratic resistance. *Journal of Socio-Legal Studies*, *16*(4), 215–233.

Księżak, P., & Wojtczak, S. (2023). *Toward a conceptual network for the private law of artificial intelligence*. Springer.

Lodhi, F. K. (2025). International treaties vs. local budgets: The political economy of human rights implementation at the provincial tier. *Governance & Public Policy Review*, *13*(3), 167–189.

Mengal, N. (2025). Constitutional guarantees and institutional realities: Unacknowledged detentions and civilian marginalization. *Human Rights Review of Pakistan*, *7*(2), 44–65.

Mithani, A. (2025). Forensic deficits and structural failures: Why progressive human rights statutes collapse in lower trial courts. *Journal of Criminal Law and Procedure*, *21*(1), 102–126.

Parveen, S., & Shah, A. (2025). The price of defense: Risk assessments for human rights litigators in faith-based criminal trials. *Legal Ethics and Judicial Security*, *11*(4), 312–335.

Rakha, N. A. (2024). Jurisdictional challenges of cybercrimes and the role of the International Criminal Court. *Thematic Conference Proceedings of the International Scientific Conference "Archibald Reiss Days"*, *14*, 27–41.

Raza, H. (2024). Procedural due process under pressure: Analyzing preliminary registrations in sensitive penal offences. *Journal of Contemporary Pakistani Law*, *15*(3), 180–199.

Rehman, O. (2024). The legislative-executive disconnect: Analyzing final case dispositions under newly enacted penal codes. *Judicial Performance Review*, *10*(4), 77–96.

Shah, S. (2026). Diplomatic shields and domestic delays: A comparative study of statutory implementation of global human rights treaties. *International Law & Policy Journal*, *30*(1), 55–79.

Siddiqui, A. U. (2026). The necessity of coordination: Proposing a federal-provincial council for uniform baseline rights enforcement. *Constitutional Reform Quarterly*, *28*(1), 12–35.

Solangi, R., & Lashari, M. (2025). The evidentiary cost of poor policing: Contamination, oral testimony, and acquittal trends in systemic crimes. *Pakistan Forensic Sciences Review*, *6*(2), 88–109.

Tarar, M. A. (2026). Disobeying the high bench: Lower court responses to superior judiciary procedural guidelines. *Supreme Court Review of Pakistan*, *40*(1), 143–165.

Wazir, M. (2024). Silenced testimonies: Data gathering blockades and regional biases in conflict-zone legal research. *Tribal Areas Law Journal*, *5*(3), 91–114.