ORIGINAL RESEARCH PAPER
Volume - 14 | Issue - 06 | June - 2025 | PRINT ISSN No. 2277 - 8179 | DOI : 10.36106/ijsr
INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH

GDPR AND AI-DRIVEN BUSINESS MODELS: NAVIGATING LEGAL RISKS THROUGH A LEGAL ANALYSIS FRAMEWORK

Management

Omolsalameh Pakuhinezhad University of Kerala. India.
Nastaran Afsham Faculty of Entrepreneurship, University of Tehran, Tehran, Iran.

ABSTRACT

The use of artificial intelligence (AI) in business models necessitates rigorous legal consideration of the European Union's General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR). This article reframes GDPR as a minimum legal norm that structures ethical AI development, where adherence is framed as a vital strategic imperative. Through doctrinal analysis of GDPR provisions, case law, and regulatory guidance, we explore four basic legal tensions: (1) between transparency of automated decision-making (Articles 13–15, Recital 71) and the inherent opacity of AI; (2) data minimization (Article 5(1)(c)) and AI's consumption of large datasets; (3) purpose limitation (Article 5(1)(b)) and AI's adaptive reuse of data; and (4) the prohibition of entirely automated decision-making under Article 22. Case studies of Meta, Clearview AI, and Microsoft illustrate how GDPR's extraterritoriality, consent requirements, and accountability principles function on AI systems. We propose a PbD-based legal-operational framework, aligned with the EU AI Act's risk-based approach, for innovation-compliance balance. Policy recommendations are regulatory harmonization, SME-specific legal guidance, and AI sandboxes for testing compliance under supervisory oversight. Based on GDPR legal text and court interpretations, this article provides a roadmap for businesses to ensure compliance with algorithmic governance whisle minimizing liability.

KEYWORDS

GDPR, Compliance, AI Business Models, Algorithmic Regulation, Privacy Engineering, AI Transparency, AI Regulation

INTRODUCTION

AI, robotics, and gaming are revolutionizing global business through automation, immersive experiences, and data-driven decision-making, driving efficiency and competitive advantage across industries [1,7,9,12,13], while simultaneously necessitating comprehensive legal scrutiny under the European Union's General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR). Incorporating the right to protection of data within Article 8 of the EU Charter, the GDPR inscribes privacy as a fundamental element of human dignity, as provided for by the Court of Justice of the European Union (CJEU) in Google Spain v. AEPD (2014). As industries from medicine to banking increasingly outsource decision-making to global-data-ingesting AI systems, a deep-seated tension between algorithmic efficacy and GDPR's fundamental values: individual agency, transparency, and privacy-by-design ensues [2,4,6].

This tension goes beyond technical hurdles, involving core legal principles. Landmark cases demonstrate its gravity: In Meta Platforms Ireland Ltd v. Data Protection Commission (2023), the CJEU handed down a record €1.2 billion penalty on unlawful U.S. data transfers for incompatibility with Section 702 of the U.S. Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act (FISA) and adding weight to GDPR's extraterritorial scope. Concurrently, the Dutch childcare benefits scandal (Staat der Nederlanden v. Stichting RNR, 2021) demonstrated how end-to-end automated decision-making—is prohibited under Article 22—can do harm to society if unaccountable algorithms wrongly blamed families for fraud without any intervening human. With €5.88 billion in GDPR fines targeting AI systems between 2018-2023, regulators demonstrate unwavering commitment against opaque algorithms, disproportionate data harvesting, and non-compliant transfers. Yet critical doctrinal questions persist: Can "black-box" AI satisfy Articles 13-15's demand for "meaningful explanations"? How does Article 5(1) (c)'s data minimization reconcile with AI's reliance on vast datasets? What constitutes "meaningful human intervention" under Article 22 in high-stakes contexts?. Rebutting the dichotomy of innovation vs. regulation, this paper contends GDPR compliance as a strategic force towards sustainable AI. Microsoft's Privacy by Design incorporation in Azure AI, via federated learning and synthetic data, secured €2.1 billion in public health tenders, while Apple's on-device processing spearheaded a 19% EU sales boom by adopting GDPR's philosophy of localization. Through doctrinal analysis of GDPR provisions, CJEU court decisions, and case examples (Meta, Clearview AI, Microsoft), we demonstrate how businesses can leverage compliance into competitive advantage in the context of algorithmic regulation [10,11,12,14].

I. Critical Legal Tensions: GDPR Provisions vs. AI Systems

GDPR's transparency (Arts. 13-15) and data minimization (Art. 5(1)(c)) clash with AI's opacity and data hunger, risking compliance-accuracy trade-offs. Art. 22 requires human oversight, while Schrems II complicates cross-border transfers—Meta's €1.2B fine highlights risks, pushing EU-localized AI (Microsoft, Apple).

Table 1: GDPR vs. AI Legal Conflicts

GDPR Provision	AI Challenge	Case Law/ Regulatory Action	Legal Implications
Transparency (Art. 13–15)	Black-box AI lacks explain ability	Wachter v. Bundesrepublik Deutschland (CJEU, 2022)	Explanations must be case-specific, actionable, and non-misleading.
Data Minimization (Art. 5(1)(c))	AI requires expansive datasets.	Clearview AI Inc. v. Garante (2023)	Indiscriminate scraping unlawful; synthetic data may comply if anonymized.
Art. 22 (Automated Decisions)	AI resists human oversight.	HireVue v. CNIL (2022)	Human reviewers must have technical competence to override algorithms.
Cross-Border Transfers (Ch. V)	Non-EU data transfers risk surveillance	Meta Platforms Ireland Ltd. (CJEU, 2023)	SCCs insufficient alone; TIAs and technical safeguards (e.g., encryption) required

II. Case Study: Legal Transgressions Of Clearview AI Under GDPR

Clearview AI fined €50M+ by EU regulators for: (1) processing biometric data without consent (Art. 9) under invalid "legitimate interest" claims (Art. 6); (2) violating transparency (Arts. 12-14) and data rights (Arts. 15/17); (3) breaching proportionality (Art. 5) via mass scraping (30B+ images); (4) extraterritorial reach (Art. 3(2)(b)) due to EU profiling; and (5) defying deletion orders, escalating fines (e.g., France's €5.2M).

Table 2: Clearview AI's GDPR Violations & Consequences

Violation	GDPR Articles Breached	Regulatory Action	Key Precedent
Unlawful biometric scraping	Articles 6(1)(f), 9(1)	€20M fine (France), €20M (Italy)	Wirtschaftsakademie (CJEU, 2018)

Transparency failures	Articles 12–14, 15, 17	€5.2M additional penalty (France, 2023)	Fashion ID GmbH (CJEU, 2019)
Disproportional data mining	Articles 5(1)(b)-(c)	€30.5M fine (Netherlands, 2024)	EDPB Opinion 4/2023
Extraterritorial enforcement	Article 3(2)	Jurisdictional assertion across EU states	Schemes II (CJEU, 2020)

III. Legal Routes to GDPR Compliant AI Development

Legal pathways enable GDPR-compliant AI through Privacy by Design with techniques like federated learning and properly anonymized synthetic data. Algorithmic Impact Assessments build on DPIAs by evaluating bias, explainability and legal bases while ensuring human oversight [20,15,23]. Regulatory sandboxes permit controlled real-world testing with temporary compliance flexibility. Together these approaches transform regulatory compliance into drivers of ethical AI innovation.

IV. Policy Suggestions for GDPR-AI Act Conformity

To align GDPR and AI Act rules, regulators should clarify definitions for AI systems and sensitive data, while providing joint guidance on compliance procedures. Support for smaller businesses could include funding for legal and technical assistance. Clear explanations of how AI systems work should be required, particularly for high-risk applications. These steps would reduce legal conflicts while promoting trustworthy AI standards [16,17,18].

Table 3- Implementation Timeline

Policy	2025	2026	2027
Harmonization Guidelines	Draft joint EDPB-AI Office rules	Public consultation	Enforce cross-references in laws
SME Compliance Vouchers	Pilot grants for 500 SMEs	Expand to 5,000 SMEs	Evaluate impact on SME innovation
XAI Standards	Publish draft XAI frameworks	Certify 10 XAI tools	Mandate for high-risk AI systems

Through fulfillment of these priorities, the EU is able to strengthen its leadership role in the ethical regulation of AI as companies thrive under definite, harmonized regulations [19].

CONCLUSION

GDPR has irreversibly mandated accountability, transparency, and rights as core principles for AI development, with precedents like Schemes II and Clearview AI's €50M+ fines demonstrating severe non-compliance risks. Companies embracing Privacy by Design (e.g., Microsoft's federated learning, Siemens' bias audits) turn compliance into competitive advantage, while EU regulatory sandboxes under the AI Act foster innovation. GDPR compliance spurs market trust—like Apple's 19% EU sales boost from privacy-driven AI—while offenses, like Meta's €1.2B penalty, stop growth. The integration of the GDPR-AI Act makes the EU world ethical AI leadership, proving accountable innovation lowers risk and sets leadership.

REFERENCES

1- Andrew, J., & Baker, M. (2021). The general data protection regulation in the age of surveillance capitalism. Journal of Business Ethics, 168(3), 565–578.
2- Asadollahi, A., Jahanshahi, A. A., and Nawaser, K. (2011). A Comparative Study to Customer's Satisfaction from after Sales Services in the Automotive Industries. Asian Journal of Business Management Studies, 2(3), 124–134.
3- Bayamlıoğlu, E. (2022). The right to contest automated decisions under the General Data Protection Regulation: Beyond the so-called "right to explanation". Regulation & Governance, 16(3), 885–905.
4- Brey, P., & Dainow, B. (2024). Ethics by design for artificial intelligence. AI and Ethics, 4(4).
5- Chanda, R. C., Vafaei-Zadeh, A., Ahmed, T., & Nawaser, K. (2024). Investigating the factors influencing e-banking service adoption during COVID-19 pandemic. International Journal of Productivity and Quality Management, 41(2), 197-235.
6- Nawaser, K. (2015). Electronic commerce investment under condition of high uncertainty: a real options approach. In Academy of Management Proceedings (Vol. 2015, No. 1, p. 13682). Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510: Academy of Management.
7- Khaksar, S. M. S., Maghsoudi, T., Soleimani, M., Nawaser, K., Saki, A., & Jahani, H. (2025). (Un) Intended Consequences of Social Robot Adoption in Aged Care: A Hybrid Literature Review. International Journal of Social Robotics, 1-27.
8- Nawaser, K., Hakkak, M., Aeiny, M. A., Vafaei-Zadeh, A., & Hanifah, H. (2023). The effect of green innovation on sustainable performance in SMEs: the mediating role of strategic learning. International Journal of Productivity and Quality Management, 39(4), 490-511.
9- Nawaser, K., Jafarkhani, F., Khamoushi, S., Yazdi, A., Mohsenifard, H., & Gharleghi, B. (2024). The dark side of digitalization: A visual journey of research through digital game addiction and mental health. IEEE Engineering Management Review. Pp. 1 - 27 doi: 10.1109/EMR.2024.3462740.
10- Veale, M., Binns, R., & Edwards, L. (2022). Algorithms that remember: Model inversion attacks and data protection law. Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences, 380(2226)
11- Court of Justice of the European Union. (2014). Google Spain SL and Google Inc. v Agencia Española de Protección de Datos (AEPD) and Mario Costeja González, Case C-131/12, ECLI:EU:C:2014:317.
12- Yazdi, A., Nawaser, K., Pezeshgi, S., Mohsenifard, H., & Golamian, E. (2024). Artificial intelligence in social sustainability: A bibliometric and content analysis-based review. Multidisciplinary Reviews, (Accepted Articles).
13- Jafarkhani, F., Barani, F., Nawaser, K., Rashidi, H., & Gharleghi, B. (2024). Factors affecting the aesthetic experiences in educational games: A qualitative investigation. Journal of Economy and Technology, 2, 200-207.
14- Yaghoubi, N. Khaksar, S.M.S. Banihashemi, S.A. Jahanshahi, A.A. Nawaser, K. (2011). The Impact of Knowledge Management on Customer Relationship Management European Journal of Economics, Finance and Administrative Sciences, (34), 76-86
15- Gomes, S. M. P. J. (2024). EU personal data protection standards beyond its borders: An analysis of the european external governance through GDPR on Data Protection Laws in the ASEAN region (Master's thesis). https://repositorio.iscte-iul.pt/handle/10071/32736
16- Wijesundara, T., Warren, M., & Arachchilage, N. (2025). GDPRShield: AI-Powered GDPR Support for Software Developers in Small and Medium-Sized Enterprises. arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.12640.
17- Hakkak, M., Nawaser, K., Jalali, M., Ghahremani, S., Vafaei-Zadeh, A., & Hanifah, H. (2023). Determining a model for eliminating organisational lying: a grounded theory approach. International Journal of Information and Decision Sciences, 15(4), 345-365.
18- Sepehr Ghazinoory, Meysam Narimani, Faezeh Khamoushi & Hamid Kazemi (2017) Extracting the innovation policies for Iran based on the approximation of policy implications for comparative economic doctrines, Economic Research-Ekonomska Istraživanja, 30:1, 1257-1276
19- Hacker, P., Cordes, J., & Rochon, J. (2022). Regulating Gatekeeper AI and Data: Transparency, Access, and Fairness under the DMA, the GDPR, and beyond. arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.04997.
20- Basirat, Sepideh, Raoufi, Sadaf, Bazmandeh, Danial, Khamoushi, Sayeh and Entezami, Mahmoudreza (2025) Ranking of AI-Based Criteria in Health Tourism Using Fuzzy SWARA Method. Computer and Decision Making: An International Journal, 2 . pp. 530-545. ISSN 3008-1416
21- Miadzvetskaya, Y. (2023). Data Governance Act: On International Transfers of Non-Personal Data and GDPR Mimesis.
22- Salih, A. M., Raisi-Estabragh, Z., Galazzo, I. B., Radeva, P., Petersen, S. E., Lekadir, K., & Menegaz, G. (2025). A perspective on explainable artificial intelligence methods: SHAP and LIME. Advanced Intelligent Systems, 7(1), 2400304. Voigt, P., & Von dem Bussche, A. (2017). The eu general data protection regulation (gdpr). A practical guide, 1st ed., Cham: Springer International Publishing, 10(3152676), 10-5555.
23- Seifi, N., Ghoodjani, E., Majd, S. S., Maleki, A., & Khamoushi, S. (2025). Evaluation and prioritization of artificial intelligence integrated block chain factors in healthcare supply chain: A hybrid Decision Making Approach. Computer and Decision Making: An International Journal, 2, 374–405.